



Similarity Measure of Plithogenic Cubic Vague Sets: Examples and Possibilities

S. Anitha ^{1,*}  and A. Francina Shalini ² 

¹ Research Scholar, Department of Mathematics, Nirmala College for Women, Coimbatore 641018, India; anitharaj.ps@gmail.com.

² Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, Nirmala College for Women, Coimbatore 641018, India; francshalu@gmail.com.

* Correspondence: anitharaj.ps@gmail.com.

Abstract: The crisp, fuzzy, intuitionistic fuzzy and neutrosophic sets are the extension of the plithogenic set, in which elements are characterized by the number of attributes and each attribute can assume many values. To achieve more accuracy and precise exclusion, a contradiction or dissimilarity degree is specified between each attribute and the values of the dominating attribute. A plithogenic cubic vague set is a combination of a plithogenic cubic set and a vague set. The key tool for resolving problems with pattern recognition and clustering analysis is the similarity measure. In this research, we characterize and investigate the similarities between two Plithogenic Cubic Vague sets (PCVSs) for $(z \equiv F)$, $(z \equiv IF)$ and $(z \equiv N)$. Also, examples are given to examine similarities in the pattern recognition application problems.

Keywords: Plithogenic Set, Plithogenic Cubic Vague Set, Pattern Recognition, Similarity Measure.

1. Introduction

Zadeh introduced fuzzy set a mathematical theory to deal with uncertainties [1]. It is characterized by the membership value and sometimes it is difficult to assign the value for a fuzzy set. Interval-valued fuzzy set was introduced by Zadeh to overcome this problem. Intuitionistic fuzzy sets (IF) and interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy sets introduced by Atanassov et al. [2,3] are appropriate to handle this situation. However, it is not enough to handle the unreliable information existing in the belief system. Zulkifli et al. [4] proposed the interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy vague sets (IVIFVS). Florentin Smarandache [5] introduced a neutrosophic set and provided a mathematical tool to handle difficulties involving inconsistent and indeterminate data. New ideas on neutrosophic sets are introduced by Anitha et al. [6-8]. The interval-valued neutrosophic set was introduced by Jun Ye [9]. Hazwani Hashimcet et al. [10] proposed Interval Neutrosophic Vague Sets. Banik et al. [11,12] studied the MCGDM problem in a pentagonal neutrosophic environment and a novel integrated neutrosophic cosine operator-based linear programming. Haque et al. [13-15] elevated decision-making ideas in interval neutrosophic environment, generalized spherical fuzzy environment, and linguistic generalized spherical fuzzy environment.

The vague set was developed by Gau and Buehrer [16]. The idea of similarity measure of fuzzy sets was introduced by Wang [17] and gave a computational formula. Since then it has attracted many researchers. Fei et al. [18] introduced the similarity between two intuitionistic fuzzy sets. Similarity measures of neutrosophic sets were given by Broumi et al. [19]. Ali et al. [20] introduced neutrosophic cubic set-based decision-making. Shawkat Alkhazaleh [21] studied neutrosophic vague set in 2015. Similarities between vague sets were introduced by Chen S.M [22]. The idea of a cubic set was introduced by Jun [23]. The idea of a cubic vague set was introduced by Khaleed et al. [24] by

incorporating a cubic set and a vague set. He also presented a decision-making method based on the similarity measure of cubic vague set.

Smarandache introduced plithogenic set and it may have elements characterized by four or more attributes [25]. A plithogenic multi-criteria decision-making approach to estimate the sustainable supply chain risk management based on order preference and criteria importance through the correlation method is proposed by Abdel and Rehab [26]. Alkhazaleh introduced plithogenic soft set and measured the similarity between two plithogenic soft sets using a set-theoretic approach [27]. Anitha et al. [28] introduced the idea of plithogenic cubic vague set.

In this paper, we introduce the concept of similarity measure between two Plithogenic Cubic Vague sets (PCVSs) $((z \equiv F), (z \equiv IF), (z \equiv N))$. It has the novelty to precisely characterize and model data for real-life occurrences. Since cubic set fails to capture the false membership part to measure the alternative in the decision making method. PCVS has the ability to handle uncertainties and vague information considering the truth and false membership values as the elements are characterized by one or more attributes therefore it is possible to describe the problem. One of the best tool to solve it is similarity measure. Similarity measure of PCVS is a vital concept for measuring entropy in the data. The flow of this paper is as follows. An algorithm to determine the similarities between two PCVS $((z \equiv F), (z \equiv IF), (z \equiv N))$ for a pattern recognition problem is proposed. To illuminate the proposed measure numerical examples are provided.

The organization of the paper is as follows: Section 2 provides some preliminaries for the proposed concept. Section 3 covers the application of the plithogenic cubic vague set and it is divided into three subsections. In 3.1 algorithm and examples of the plithogenic fuzzy cubic vague set, in 3.2 plithogenic intuitionistic fuzzy cubic vague set and in 3.3 plithogenic neutrosophic cubic vague set were presented. In Section 4 discussion is made for the proposed measure. Finally, Section 5 concludes this paper and provides the direction for future studies.

2. Preliminaries

Definition 2.1: [23] A neutrosophic vague set A_{NV} (NVS in short) on the universe of discourse X written as $A_{NV} = \{(x, \hat{T}_{A_{NV}}, \hat{I}_{A_{NV}}, \hat{F}_{A_{NV}}) | x \in X\}$ whose truth membership, indeterminacy membership and falsity membership functions are defined as $\hat{T}_{A_{NV}}(x) = [T^-, T^+]$, $\hat{I}_{A_{NV}}(x) = [I^-, I^+]$, $\hat{F}_{A_{NV}}(x) = [F^-, F^+]$, where $T^+ = 1 - F^-$, $F^+ = 1 - T^-$ and $0^- \leq T^- + I^- + F^- \leq 2^+$.

Definition 2.2: [16] An interval valued neutrosophic vague set A_{INV} also known as INVS in the universe of discourse E . An IVNVS is characterized by truth membership, indeterminacy membership and falsity membership functions is defined as:

$$A_{INV} = \{ \langle e, [\hat{V}_A^L(e), \hat{V}_A^U(e)], [\hat{W}_A^L(e), \hat{W}_A^U(e)], [\hat{X}_A^L(e), \hat{X}_A^U(e)] \rangle | e \in E \},$$

$$\hat{V}_A^L(e) = [V^{L-}, V^{L+}], \hat{V}_A^U(e) = [V^{U-}, V^{U+}], \hat{W}_A^L(e) = [W^{L-}, W^{L+}], \hat{W}_A^U(e) = [W^{U-}, W^{U+}], \hat{X}_A^L(e) = [X^{L-}, X^{L+}], \hat{X}_A^U(e) = [X^{U-}, X^{U+}]$$

where $V^{L+} = 1 - X^{L-}$, $X^{L+} = 1 - V^{L-}$, $V^{U+} = 1 - X^{U-}$, $X^{U+} = 1 - V^{U-}$ and $0^- \leq V^{L-} + V^{U-} + W^{L-} + W^{U-} + X^{L-} + X^{U-} \leq 4^+$, $0^- \leq V^{L+} + V^{U+} + W^{L+} + W^{U+} + X^{L+} + X^{U+} \leq 4^+$.

Definition 2.3: [2] Let U be a universal set. The set $A_p^v = \{(x, A_v(x), \lambda_v(x)) : x \in X\}$ is called plithogenic fuzzy cubic vague set in which A_v is an interval valued plithogenic fuzzy vague set in X and λ_v is the fuzzy vague set in X .

Definition 2.4: [2] Let U be a universal set. The set $A_p^v = \{(x, A_v(x), \lambda_v(x)) : x \in X\}$ is called plithogenic intuitionistic fuzzy cubic vague set in which A_v is an interval valued plithogenic intuitionistic fuzzy vague set in X and λ_v is the intuitionistic fuzzy vague set in X .

Definition 2.5: [2] Let U be a universal set. The set $A_p^v = \{(x, A_v(x), \lambda_v(x)) : x \in X\}$ is called plithogenic neutrosophic cubic vague set in which A_v is an interval valued plithogenic neutrosophic vague set in X and λ_v is the neutrosophic vague set in X .

3. Application of Plithogenic Cubic Vague sets in Pattern Recognition Problem

This section may be divided by subheadings. It should provide a concise and precise description of the experimental results, their interpretation as well as the experimental conclusions that can be drawn.

Here, we introduce the concept of similarity measure between two Plithogenic Cubic Vague sets (PFCVSs) ($z \equiv F$), PIFCVSs ($z \equiv IF$), (PNCVSs ($z \equiv N$)) and further results on similarity measure. An example is given to exhibit the effectiveness of the proposed method.

3.1 Plithogenic Fuzzy Cubic Vague Set

Definition 3.1.1: Let $A_{p_1}^v$ and $A_{p_2}^v$ be any two Plithogenic Fuzzy Cubic Vague sets (PFCVSs). Then,

- (1) $0 \leq |S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v)| \leq 1$,
- (2) $S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v) = S(A_{p_2}^v, A_{p_1}^v)$,
- (3) $S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v) = 1 \Leftrightarrow A_{p_1}^v = A_{p_2}^v$,
- (4) $A_{p_1}^v \subseteq A_{p_2}^v \subseteq A_{p_3}^v \Rightarrow S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_3}^v) \leq S(A_{p_2}^v, A_{p_3}^v)$

Definition 3.1.2: Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, $A_{p_1}^v = \langle A_v^1, \lambda_v^1 \rangle$ and $A_{p_2}^v = \langle A_v^2, \lambda_v^2 \rangle$ be two Plithogenic Fuzzy Cubic Vague Sets (PFCVSs) in X . The similarity measure between $A_{p_1}^v$ and $A_{p_2}^v$ is given by $S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v)$, where

$$S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v) = \frac{1}{6n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\left| T_{A_{p_1}^v}^{L-}(x_i) - T_{A_{p_2}^v}^{L-}(x_i) \right| + \left| T_{A_{p_1}^v}^{U-}(x_i) - T_{A_{p_2}^v}^{U-}(x_i) \right| + \left| T_{A_{p_1}^v}^{L+}(x_i) - T_{A_{p_2}^v}^{L+}(x_i) \right| + \left| T_{A_{p_1}^v}^{U+}(x_i) - T_{A_{p_2}^v}^{U+}(x_i) \right| + \left| T_{\lambda_{p_1}^v}^-(x_i) - T_{\lambda_{p_2}^v}^-(x_i) \right| + \left| T_{\lambda_{p_1}^v}^+(x_i) - T_{\lambda_{p_2}^v}^+(x_i) \right| \right)$$

Algorithm:

Step 1. Construct PFCVS $A_p^v = \langle A_v, \lambda_v \rangle$ as ideal pattern.

Step 2. Then construct PFCVSs $A_{p_j}^v = \langle A_v^j, \lambda_v^j \rangle$, $j = 1, 2 \dots n$ for sample patterns which are to be known.

Step 3. Compute the similarities between ideal pattern $A_p^v = \langle A_v, \lambda_v \rangle$ and the sample pattern $A_{p_j}^v = \langle A_v^j, \lambda_v^j \rangle$ using definition 3.1.2.

Step 4. The sample pattern $A_{p_j}^v$ is considered to belong to ideal pattern A_p^v if $S(A_p^v, A_{p_j}^v) \leq 0.5$ and sample pattern $A_{p_j}^v$ is not to be known for an ideal pattern A_p^v if $S(A_p^v, A_{p_j}^v) > 0.5$.

Example 3.1.3: Consider a simple pattern recognition problem involving three sample patterns and an ideal pattern. Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$. The patterns indicated as pattern 1, pattern 2 and pattern 3 are the selected three sample patterns, whereas pattern 4 is the selected ideal pattern. Also, let A_p^v be PFCVS set of ideal pattern and pattern $A_{p_j}^v = \langle A_v^j, \lambda_v^j \rangle$ be the PFCVSs of three sample patterns.

Step 1. Create an ideal PFCVS $A_p^v = \langle A_v, \lambda_v \rangle$ on X as,

$$A_p^v = \left\langle \left\{ \frac{[0.4, 0.6], [0.5, 0.5]]}{x_1}, \frac{[0.3, 0.8], [0.5, 0.6]]}{x_2}, \frac{[0.2, 0.6], [0.3, 0.6]]}{x_3} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{[0.2, 0.5]}{x_1}, \frac{[0.4, 0.7]}{x_2}, \frac{[0.3, 0.6]}{x_3} \right\} \right\rangle$$

Step 2. Construct PFCVSs $A_{p_j}^v = \langle A_v^j, \lambda_v^j \rangle$, $j = 1, 2, 3$ for the sample patterns as;

$$A_{p_1}^v = \left\langle \left\{ \frac{[0.2, 0.6], [0.3, 0.6]]}{x_1}, \frac{[0.4, 0.6], [0.5, 0.5]]}{x_2}, \frac{[0.3, 0.8], [0.5, 0.6]]}{x_3} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{[0.1, 0.7]}{x_1}, \frac{[0.3, 0.7]}{x_2}, \frac{[0.1, 0.9]}{x_3} \right\} \right\rangle$$

$$A_{p_2}^v = \left\langle \left\{ \frac{[0.1, 0.7], [0.2, 0.4]]}{x_1}, \frac{[0.4, 0.6], [0.1, 0.2]]}{x_2}, \frac{[0.3, 0.8], [0.5, 0.6]]}{x_3} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{[0.5, 0.6]}{x_1}, \frac{[0.1, 0.7]}{x_2}, \frac{[0.1, 0.5]}{x_3} \right\} \right\rangle$$

$$A_{p_3}^v = \left\langle \left\{ \frac{[0.3, 0.8], [0.5, 0.6]]}{x_1}, \frac{[0.4, 0.6], [0.1, 0.2]]}{x_2}, \frac{[0.4, 0.6], [0.5, 0.5]]}{x_3} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{[0.1, 0.9]}{x_1}, \frac{[0.1, 0.7]}{x_2}, \frac{[0.3, 0.7]}{x_3} \right\} \right\rangle$$

Step 3. Compute S the degree of similarity between ideal pattern A_p^v and the sample pattern $A_{p_j}^v$, then the results obtained are:

$$\begin{aligned} S(A_p^v, A_{p_1}^v) &= 0.13 \\ S(A_p^v, A_{p_2}^v) &= 0.19 \\ S(A_p^v, A_{p_3}^v) &= 0.17 \end{aligned}$$

Step 4. $S(A_p^v, A_{p_1}^v) \leq 0.5$, $S(A_p^v, A_{p_2}^v) \leq 0.5$ and $S(A_p^v, A_{p_3}^v) \leq 0.5$, the sample pattern whose corresponding PFCVS sets are denoted as $A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v$ and $A_{p_3}^v$ are known as similar patterns of the family of ideal pattern whose PFCVS is represented by A_p^v .

3.2 Plithogenic Intuitionistic Fuzzy Cubic Vague Set

Definition 3.2.1: Let $A_{p_1}^v$ and $A_{p_2}^v$ be two Plithogenic Intuitionistic Fuzzy Cubic Vague Set (PIFCVSs). Then,

- (1) $0 \leq |S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v)| \leq 1$,
- (2) $S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v) = S(A_{p_2}^v, A_{p_1}^v)$,
- (3) $S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v) = 1 \Leftrightarrow A_{p_1}^v = A_{p_2}^v$,
- (4) $A_{p_1}^v \subseteq A_{p_2}^v \subseteq A_{p_3}^v \Rightarrow S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_3}^v) \leq S(A_{p_2}^v, A_{p_3}^v)$

Definition 3.2.2: Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, $A_{p_1}^v = \langle A_V^1, \lambda_V^1 \rangle$ and $A_{p_2}^v = \langle A_V^2, \lambda_V^2 \rangle$ be two Plithogenic Intuitionistic Fuzzy Cubic Vague Sets (PIFCVSs) in X. The similarities between $A_{p_1}^v$ and $A_{p_2}^v$ is given as $S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v) &= \frac{1}{12n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\left| T_{A_{p_1}^v}^{L-}(x_i) - T_{A_{p_2}^v}^{L-}(x_i) \right| + \left| T_{A_{p_1}^v}^{U-}(x_i) - T_{A_{p_2}^v}^{U-}(x_i) \right| + \left| F_{A_{p_1}^v}^{L-}(x_i) - F_{A_{p_2}^v}^{L-}(x_i) \right| + \right. \\ &\left. \left| F_{A_{p_1}^v}^{U-}(x_i) - F_{A_{p_2}^v}^{U-}(x_i) \right| + \left| T_{A_{p_1}^v}^{L+}(x_i) - T_{A_{p_2}^v}^{L+}(x_i) \right| + \left| T_{A_{p_1}^v}^{U+}(x_i) - T_{A_{p_2}^v}^{U+}(x_i) \right| + \left| F_{A_{p_1}^v}^{L+}(x_i) - F_{A_{p_2}^v}^{L+}(x_i) \right| + \right. \\ &\left. \left| F_{A_{p_1}^v}^{U+}(x_i) - F_{A_{p_2}^v}^{U+}(x_i) \right| + \left| T_{\lambda_{p_1}^v}^-(x_i) - T_{\lambda_{p_2}^v}^-(x_i) \right| + \left| F_{\lambda_{p_1}^v}^-(x_i) - F_{\lambda_{p_2}^v}^-(x_i) \right| + \left| T_{\lambda_{p_1}^v}^+(x_i) - T_{\lambda_{p_2}^v}^+(x_i) \right| + \right. \\ &\left. \left| F_{\lambda_{p_1}^v}^+(x_i) - F_{\lambda_{p_2}^v}^+(x_i) \right| \right) \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm:

Step 1. Construct an ideal PIFCVS $A_p^v = \langle A_V, \lambda_V \rangle$.

Step 2. Then construct PIFCVSs $A_{p_j}^v = \langle A_V^j, \lambda_V^j \rangle$, $j = 1, 2 \dots n$ for sample patterns.

Step 3. Calculate the similarities between ideal pattern $A_p^v = \langle A_V, \lambda_V \rangle$ and sample pattern $A_{p_j}^v = \langle A_V^j, \lambda_V^j \rangle$ using definition 3.2.2.

Step 4. The sample pattern $A_{p_j}^v$ is considered to belong to ideal pattern A_p^v if $S(A_p^v, A_{p_j}^v) \leq 0.5$ and sample pattern $A_{p_j}^v$ is not to be known for ideal pattern A_p^v if $S(A_p^v, A_{p_j}^v) > 0.5$.

Example 3.3.3: Let us consider three simple pattern which are to be known. Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$. Similarly let A_p^v be PIFCVS set of ideal pattern and pattern $A_{p_j}^v = \langle A_V^j, \lambda_V^j \rangle$ be the PIFCVSs of sample patterns.

Step 1. Create ideal PIFCVS $A_p^v = \langle A_V, \lambda_V \rangle$ on X as,

$$\begin{aligned} A_p^v &= \langle \left\{ \frac{([0.4,0.6],[0.5,0.5]),([0.4,0.6],[0.5,0.5])}{x_1}, \frac{([0.3,0.8],[0.5,0.6]),([0.2,0.7],[0.4,0.5])}{x_2}, \frac{([0.2,0.6],[0.3,0.6]),([0.4,0.8],[0.4,0.7])}{x_3} \right\}, \\ &\quad \left\{ \frac{[0.2,0.5],[0.5,0.8]}{x_1}, \frac{[0.4,0.7],[0.3,0.6]}{x_2}, \frac{[0.3,0.6],[0.4,0.7]}{x_3} \right\} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. Construct PIFCVSs $A_{p_j}^v = \langle A_V^j, \lambda_V^j \rangle$

$$A_{p_1}^v = \langle \left\{ \frac{\langle [0.2,0.6],[0.3,0.6] \rangle, \langle [0.4,0.8],[0.4,0.7] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.5,0.5] \rangle, \langle [0.4,0.6],[0.5,0.5] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.3,0.8],[0.5,0.6] \rangle, \langle [0.2,0.7],[0.4,0.5] \rangle}{x_3} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{[0.1,0.7],[0.2,0.8]}{x_1}, \frac{[0.3,0.7],[0.3,0.6]}{x_2}, \frac{[0.1,0.9],[0.1,0.6]}{x_3} \right\} \rangle$$

$$A_{p_2}^v = \langle \left\{ \frac{\langle [0.1,0.7],[0.2,0.4] \rangle, \langle [0.3,0.9],[0.6,0.8] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.1,0.2] \rangle, \langle [0.4,0.6],[0.8,0.9] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.3,0.8],[0.5,0.6] \rangle, \langle [0.2,0.7],[0.4,0.5] \rangle}{x_3} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{[0.5,0.6],[0.4,0.5]}{x_1}, \frac{[0.1,0.7],[0.2,0.8]}{x_2}, \frac{[0.1,0.5],[0.2,0.5]}{x_3} \right\} \rangle$$

$$A_{p_3}^v = \langle \left\{ \frac{\langle [0.3,0.8],[0.5,0.6] \rangle, \langle [0.2,0.7],[0.4,0.5] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.1,0.2] \rangle, \langle [0.4,0.6],[0.8,0.9] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.5,0.5] \rangle, \langle [0.4,0.6],[0.5,0.5] \rangle}{x_3} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{[0.1,0.9],[0.1,0.6]}{x_1}, \frac{[0.1,0.7],[0.2,0.8]}{x_2}, \frac{[0.3,0.7],[0.3,0.6]}{x_3} \right\} \rangle$$

Step 3. Calculate the degree of similarity S between the ideal pattern A_p^v and the sample pattern $A_{p_j}^v$, then the results obtained are

$$S(A_p^v, A_{p_1}^v) = 0.13$$

$$S(A_p^v, A_{p_2}^v) = 0.19$$

$$S(A_p^v, A_{p_3}^v) = 0.17$$

Step 4. $S(A_p^v, A_{p_1}^v) \leq 0.5$, $S(A_p^v, A_{p_2}^v) \leq 0.5$ and $S(A_p^v, A_{p_3}^v) \leq 0.5$, the sample pattern whose corresponding PIFCVS sets are denoted as $A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v$ and $A_{p_3}^v$ are known as similar patterns of the family of ideal pattern whose PIFCVS is denoted as A_p^v .

3.3 Plithogenic Neutrosophic Fuzzy Cubic Vague Set

In this part, we will observe the similarities of two Plithogenic Neutrosophic Cubic Vague Set (PNCVSs) of pattern recognition problem.

Definition 3.3.1: Let $A_{p_1}^v$ and $A_{p_2}^v$ be any two Plithogenic Neutrosophic Cubic Vague Set (PNCVSs). Then,

- (1) $0 \leq |S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v)| \leq 1$,
- (2) $S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v) = S(A_{p_2}^v, A_{p_1}^v)$,
- (3) $S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v) = 1 \Leftrightarrow A_{p_1}^v = A_{p_2}^v$,
- (4) $A_{p_1}^v \subseteq A_{p_2}^v \subseteq A_{p_3}^v \Rightarrow S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_3}^v) \leq S(A_{p_2}^v, A_{p_3}^v)$

Definition: 3.3.2 Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, $A_{p_1}^v = \langle A_V^1, \lambda_V^1 \rangle$ and $A_{p_2}^v = \langle A_V^2, \lambda_V^2 \rangle$ be two Plithogenic Neutrosophic Cubic Vague Set (PNCVSs). The similarity measure between $A_{p_1}^v$ and $A_{p_2}^v$ is given by $S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v)$, where

$$S(A_{p_1}^v, A_{p_2}^v) = \frac{1}{18n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\left| T_{A_{p_1}^v}^{L-}(x_i) - T_{A_{p_2}^v}^{L-}(x_i) \right| + \left| T_{A_{p_1}^v}^{U-}(x_i) - T_{A_{p_2}^v}^{U-}(x_i) \right| + \left| I_{A_{p_1}^v}^{L-}(x_i) - I_{A_{p_2}^v}^{L-}(x_i) \right| + \right.$$

$$\left. \left| I_{A_{p_1}^v}^{U-}(x_i) - I_{A_{p_2}^v}^{U-}(x_i) \right| + \left| F_{A_{p_1}^v}^{L-}(x_i) - F_{A_{p_2}^v}^{L-}(x_i) \right| + \left| F_{A_{p_1}^v}^{U-}(x_i) - F_{A_{p_2}^v}^{U-}(x_i) \right| + \left| T_{A_{p_1}^v}^{L+}(x_i) - T_{A_{p_2}^v}^{L+}(x_i) \right| + \right.$$

$$\left. \left| T_{A_{p_1}^v}^{U+}(x_i) - T_{A_{p_2}^v}^{U+}(x_i) \right| + \left| I_{A_{p_1}^v}^{L+}(x_i) - I_{A_{p_2}^v}^{L+}(x_i) \right| + \left| I_{A_{p_1}^v}^{U+}(x_i) - I_{A_{p_2}^v}^{U+}(x_i) \right| + \left| F_{A_{p_1}^v}^{L+}(x_i) - F_{A_{p_2}^v}^{L+}(x_i) \right| + \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| F_{A_{\lambda^1_V}^{U^+}}(x_i) - F_{A_{\lambda^2_V}^{U^+}}(x_i) \right| + \left| T_{\lambda^1_V}(x_i) - T_{\lambda^2_V}(x_i) \right| + \left| I_{\lambda^1_V}(x_i) - I_{\lambda^2_V}(x_i) \right| + \left| F_{\lambda^1_V}(x_i) - F_{\lambda^2_V}(x_i) \right| + \\ & \left| T_{\lambda^1_V}(x_i) - T_{\lambda^2_V}(x_i) \right| + \left| I_{\lambda^1_V}(x_i) - I_{\lambda^2_V}(x_i) \right| + \left| F_{\lambda^1_V}(x_i) - F_{\lambda^2_V}(x_i) \right| \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm:

Step 1. Construct the ideal PNCVS $A_p^v = \langle A_v, \lambda_v \rangle$.

Step 2. Then construct PNCVSs $A_{p_j}^v = \langle A_v^j, \lambda_v^j \rangle$

Step 3. Calculate the similarities between ideal pattern $A_p^v = \langle A_v, \lambda_v \rangle$ and the sample pattern $A_{p_j}^v = \langle A_v^j, \lambda_v^j \rangle$ using definition 3.3.2.

Step 4. The sample pattern $A_{p_j}^v$ is considered to belong to the ideal pattern A_p^v if $S(A_p^v, A_{p_j}^v) \leq 0.5$ and sample pattern $A_{p_j}^v$ is not to be known for an ideal pattern A_p^v if $S(A_p^v, A_{p_j}^v) > 0.5$.

Example 3.3.3: Here we consider the example (3.1.3) for PNCVSs.

Step 1. Construct an ideal PNCVS $A_p^v = \langle A_v, \lambda_v \rangle$ on X as,

$$\begin{aligned} & A_p^v = \\ & \left\langle \left\{ \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.5,0.5] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.1,0.8],[0.2,0.6] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.5,0.5] \rangle}{x_3}, \frac{\langle [0.3,0.8],[0.5,0.6] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.3,0.5],[0.4,0.6] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.2,0.7],[0.4,0.5] \rangle}{x_3} \right\}, \right. \\ & \left. \frac{\langle [0.2,0.6],[0.3,0.6] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.8],[0.2,0.5] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.8],[0.4,0.7] \rangle}{x_3} \right\rangle, \\ & \left\{ \frac{\langle [0.2,0.5],[0.3,0.4],[0.5,0.8] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.7],[0.2,0.3],[0.3,0.6] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.3,0.6],[0.4,0.5],[0.4,0.7] \rangle}{x_3} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. Construct PNCVSs $A_{p_j}^v = \langle A_v^j, \lambda_v^j \rangle$

$$\begin{aligned} & A_{p_1}^v = \\ & \left\langle \left\{ \frac{\langle [0.2,0.6],[0.3,0.6] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.8],[0.2,0.5] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.8],[0.4,0.7] \rangle}{x_3}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.5,0.5] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.3,0.8],[0.2,0.6] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.5,0.5] \rangle}{x_3} \right\}, \right. \\ & \left. \frac{\langle [0.3,0.8],[0.5,0.6] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.3,0.5],[0.4,0.6] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.2,0.7],[0.4,0.5] \rangle}{x_3} \right\rangle, \\ & \left\{ \frac{\langle [0.1,0.7],[0.3,0.8],[0.2,0.8] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.3,0.7],[0.2,0.9],[0.3,0.6] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.1,0.9],[0.2,0.7],[0.1,0.6] \rangle}{x_3} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & A_{p_2}^v = \\ & \left\langle \left\{ \frac{\langle [0.1,0.7],[0.2,0.4] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.5],[0.3,0.6] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.3,0.9],[0.6,0.8] \rangle}{x_3}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.1,0.2] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.5],[0.3,0.6] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.8,0.9] \rangle}{x_3} \right\}, \right. \\ & \left. \frac{\langle [0.3,0.8],[0.5,0.6] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.3,0.5],[0.4,0.6] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.2,0.7],[0.4,0.5] \rangle}{x_3} \right\rangle, \\ & \left\{ \frac{\langle [0.5,0.6],[0.5,0.6],[0.4,0.5] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.1,0.7],[0.3,0.8],[0.2,0.8] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.1,0.5],[0.2,0.8],[0.2,0.5] \rangle}{x_3} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & A_{p_3}^v = \\ & \left\langle \left\{ \frac{\langle [0.3,0.8],[0.5,0.6] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.3,0.5],[0.4,0.6] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.2,0.7],[0.4,0.5] \rangle}{x_3}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.1,0.2] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.5],[0.3,0.6] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.8,0.9] \rangle}{x_3} \right\}, \right. \\ & \left. \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.5,0.5] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.3,0.8],[0.2,0.6] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.4,0.6],[0.5,0.5] \rangle}{x_3} \right\rangle, \\ & \left\{ \frac{\langle [0.1,0.9],[0.2,0.7],[0.1,0.6] \rangle}{x_1}, \frac{\langle [0.1,0.7],[0.3,0.8],[0.2,0.8] \rangle}{x_2}, \frac{\langle [0.3,0.7],[0.2,0.9],[0.3,0.6] \rangle}{x_3} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Step 3. Calculate S , the degree of similarity between the ideal pattern A_p^v and the sample pattern $A_{p_j}^v$, then the results obtained are

$$S(A_p^v, A_{p_1}^v) = 0.14$$

$$S(A_p^v, A_{p_2}^v) = 0.19$$

$$S(A_p^v, A_{p_3}^v) = 0.16$$

Step 4. $S(A_p^v, A_{p_1}^v) \leq 0.5$, $S(A_p^v, A_{p_2}^v) \leq 0.5$ and $S(A_p^v, A_{p_3}^v) \leq 0.5$, the sample pattern whose corresponding PNCVS sets are denoted by $A_{p_1}^v$, $A_{p_2}^v$ and $A_{p_3}^v$ are known as the similar patterns of the family of ideal pattern whose PNCVS is denoted by A_p^v .

4. Discussion

Consider the problem given above to demonstrate the advantage of our projected method of Plithogenic Cubic Vague Set (PCVs) comparing to the set proposed by Jun et al. [17]. Cubic set fails to capture the false membership part to measure the alternative in the decision making method, therefore it is not possible to describe the problem. The elements of PCVS are characterized by one or more attributes and it has the ability to handle uncertainties and vague information considering the truth and false membership values. We have considered a simple pattern recognition problem with three sample patterns and an ideal pattern. We assume that $S(A_p^v, A_{p_j}^v) \geq 0.5$ is the ideal pattern and the aim is to find which one among the three sample belongs to the ideal pattern. All three sample pattern of Plithogenic Cubic Vague sets (PFCVSs) ($z \equiv F$), PIFCVSs ($z \equiv IF$), (PNCVSs ($z \equiv N$) is recognized as similar patterns of the family of ideal pattern in the above examples.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we projected a method to measure the similarities between two PCVSs ($z \equiv F$, $z \equiv IF$, $z \equiv N$) and studied some of its properties. Examples are provided to prove the application of similarity measure of Plithogenic Fuzzy Cubic Vague Set (PFCVS), Plithogenic Intuitionistic Fuzzy Cubic Vague Set (PIFCVS) and Plithogenic Neutrosophic Cubic Vague Set (PNCVS) separately in pattern recognition problem. In consecutive research, investigation of AND and OR operations, PCVS to groups, rings and its application in other fields will be carried out.

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to the editorial and reviewers, as well as the correspondent author, who offered assistance in the form of advice, assessment, and checking during the study period.

Data availability

The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due to the privacy-preserving nature of the data but are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest in the research.

Ethical approval

This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

References

1. Zadeh, L.A. Fuzzy sets. *Information and Control* **1965**, 8, 338-353.

2. Atanassov, K.T. Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets. *Fuzzy sets and systems* **1986**, 20, 87-96. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0114\(86\)80034-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0114(86)80034-3)
3. Atanassov, K.T; Gargov, G. Interval Valued Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets. *Fuzzy sets and systems* **1989**, 31, 343-349. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-0114\(89\)90205-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-0114(89)90205-4).
4. Zulkifli, N.; Abdullah, L. & Garg, H. An Integrated Interval-Valued Intuitionistic Fuzzy Vague Set and Their Linguistic Variables. *Int. J. Fuzzy Syst.* **2021**, 23, 182–193. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40815-020-01011-8>
5. Florentin Smarandache, Neutrosophic set, a Generalization of the Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics* **2005**, 24, 287-297.
6. Anitha, S.; Francina Shalini, A. On NGSR Closed Sets in Neutrosophic Topological Spaces. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems* **2019**, 28, 171-178. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3382534>
7. Anitha, S.; Francina Shalini, A. Bipolar Pythagorean Neutrosophic Soft Generalized Pre-Closed & Open Sets. *Indian Journal of Natural Science* **2023**, Vol. 14, Issue 79, 60199-60206.
8. Anitha, S.; Francina Shalini, A. Bipolar Pythagorean Neutrosophic Soft Extension of the MULTIMOORA Method for Solving Decision Making Problems. *European Chemical Bulletin* **2023**, Vol. 12, Issue 12, 2372-2382. DOI: 10.48047/ecb/2023.12.12.157
9. Jun Ye, Similarity Measure Between Interval Neutrosophic Sets and Their Multicriteria Decision Making Method. *Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems* **2013**, 26, 165-172. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3233/IFS-120724>
10. Hazwani Hashim; Lazim Abdullah and Ashraf Al-Quran. Interval Neutrosophic Vague Sets. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems* **2019**, 25, 66-75. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2631504>
11. Banik, B., Alam, S., & Chakraborty, A. Comparative study between GRA and MEREC technique on an agricultural-based MCGDM problem in pentagonal neutrosophic environment. *Int. J. of Environ. Sci. and Technol.* **2023**, 1-16. DOI:10.1007/s13762-023-04768-1
12. Banik, B., Alam, S., & Chakraborty, A. A novel integrated neutrosophic cosine operator based linear programming ANP-EDAS MCGDM strategy to select anti-pegasus software. *Int. J. of Information Technology & Decision Making* **2023**, 1-37. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219622023500529>
13. Haque, T. S., Chakraborty, A., Alrabaiah, H., & Alam, S. Multiattribute decision-making by logarithmic operational laws in interval neutrosophic environments. *Granular Computing* **2022**, 7(4), 837- 860.
14. Haque, T. S., Chakraborty, A., Mondal, S. P., & Alam, S. Approach to solve multi-criteria group decision-making problems by exponential operational law in generalized spherical fuzzy environment. *CAAI Transactions on Intelligence Technology* **2022**, 5(2), 106-114.
15. Haque, T. S., Alam, S., & Chakraborty, A. Selection of most effective COVID-19 virus protector using a novel MCGDM technique under linguistic generalized spherical fuzzy environment. *Computational and Applied Mathematics* **2022**, 41(2), 84.
16. Gau, W.L., Buehrer, D.J. Vague sets. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics* **1993**, 23-2, 610–614. <https://doi.org/10.1109/21.229476>
17. Wang, P.Z. *Fuzzy sets and its applications*, Shanghai Science and Technology Press, shanghai **1983** in Chinese.
18. Fei, L., Wang, H., Chen, L., Deng, Y. A new vector valued similarity measure for intuitionistic fuzzy sets based on OWA operators. *Iran. J. Fuzzy System* **2019**, 16(3), 113-126. <https://doi.org/10.22111/ijfs.2019.4649>
19. Said Broumi., F.Smarandache. Several Similarity Measure of Neutrosophic Sets. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems* **2013**, 1, 54-65.
20. Mumtaz Ali., Irfan Deli., F.Smarandache. The Theory of Neutrosophic Cubic Sets and their Application in Pattern Recognition, *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems* **2016**, 30, 1957-1963. <https://doi.org/10.3233/IFS-151906>
21. Shawkat Alkhazaleh., Neutrosophic Vague Set Theory. *Critical Review* **2015**, Vol.10, 29-39.
22. Chen S.M., Measures of similarity between vague sets. *Fuzzy sets and systems* **1995**, 74, 217-223. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-0114\(94\)00339-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-0114(94)00339-9)
23. Jun, Y.B.; Kim, C.S.; Yang, K.O. Cubic set. *Ann. Fuzzy Math. Inform* **2012**, 4, 83–98.
24. Khaleed Alhazaymeh., Yousef Al-Qudah., Nasruddin Hassan and Abdul Muhaimin Nasruddin. Cubic Vague Set and its Application in Decision Making. *Entropy* **2020**, 22, 963.

25. Florentin Smarandache. Plithogeny, Plithogenic Set, Logic, Probability and Statistics, Pons Editions.; Brussels, Belgium, 2017, 141, arXiv.org (Cornell University), Computer Science-Artificial Intelligence.
26. Abdel-Basset; Rehab Mohamed. A novel plithogenic topsis-critic model for sustainable supply chain risk management. Journal of Cleaner Production **2020**, 247, 119586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119586>.
27. Shawkat Alkhazaleh. Plithogenic Soft Set. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems **2020**, 3, 256-274.
28. Anitha, S.; Francina Shalini, A. Plithogenic Cubic Vague Set. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems **2023**, 58, 109-124.

Received: 05 Jun 2023, **Revised:** 24 Sep 2023,

Accepted: 16 Oct 2023, **Available online:** 21 Oct 2023.



© 2023 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).