

# Decision Making Under Uncertainty: Case When We Only Know an Upper Bound or a Lower Bound

Toshiki Kamio, Gavin Baechle, and Vladik Kreinovich

Department of Computer Science, University of Texas at El Paso  
El Paso, TX 79968, USA, {tkamio,gpbaechle}@miners.utep.edu, vladik@utep.edu

## 1. Formulation of the problem

- In investment:
  - when a person knows the exact monetary consequence of each action,
  - he/she naturally selects an action with the largest possible gain.
- In practice, we usually know the consequences only with some uncertainty.
- For example, instead of the exact gain value, the whole set  $S$  of different possible gain values are consistent with our knowledge.
- How should we then make a decision?
- What is the equivalent price  $v(S)$  that we are willing to pay to participate in the corresponding action?

## 2. Formulation of the problem (cont-d)

- For example, we may know the lower bound  $a$  and the upper bound on the gain.
- In this case, the set  $S$  is the interval  $[a, b]$ .
- Alternatively, we may know:
  - only the lower bound, in which case  $S = [a, \infty)$  or
  - only the upper bound, in which case  $S = (-\infty, b]$ .

### 3. How this problem is solved if we know both bounds

- Suppose that we are willing to pay  $v(S)$  for the set  $S$ .
- Then for set  $S$  and a fixed amount  $c$ , we are willing to pay  $v(S) + c$ .
- In this joint offer, the set of possible outcomes is

$$S + c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{s + c : s \in S\}.$$

- Thus, we should have  $v(S + c) = v(S) + c$ .
- This is called *shift-invariance*.
- Another idea is that the transformation  $S \mapsto v(S)$  should not depend on the choice of the monetary unit:
  - if we select pesos instead of dollars,
  - we should get the same equivalent value.

#### 4. What if we know both bounds (cont-d)

- In precise terms, this means  $v(\lambda \cdot S) = \lambda \cdot v(S)$ , where

$$\lambda \cdot S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\lambda \cdot s : s \in S\}.$$

- This property is known as *scale-invariance*.
- The third idea is that:
  - participation in two independence actions, with sets  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , is equivalent to
  - participation in a single action with the result

$$S_1 + S_2 = \{s_1 + s_2 : s_1 \in S_1 \ \& \ s_2 \in S_2\}.$$

- These are two ways of representing the same situation.
- So we should have  $v(S_1 + S_2) = v(S_1) + v(S_2)$ .
- This property is known as *additivity*.

## 5. What if we know both bounds (cont-d)

- For interval uncertainty, additivity implies Hurwicz formula  $v([a, b]) = \alpha \cdot b + (1 - \alpha) \cdot a$  for some  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ .
- The same formula emerges if we assume shift- and scale-invariance.

## 6. Case of infinite intervals: new results

- It turns out that additivity implies that  $f(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} v([a, \infty)) = k \cdot a$  for some  $k \geq 1$ .
- Indeed, additivity means that  $f(a + b) = f(a) + f(b)$ , for  $f(a) \geq a$ .
- It is known that this functional equation implies  $f(a) = k \cdot a$ .
- A similar formula emerges if we assume scale-invariance.
- Indeed, scale-invariance means  $f(\lambda \cdot a) = \lambda \cdot f(a)$  for all  $\lambda > 0$  and  $a$ .
- In particular, for  $a = 1$ , we get  $f(\lambda) = k_+ \cdot \lambda$ , where  $k_+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(1)$ .
- For  $a = -1$ , we similarly get  $f(-\lambda) = k_- \cdot \lambda$ , i.e.,  $f(x) = (-k_-) \cdot x$ .
- If we assume shift-invariance, then we get  $f(a) = v([a, \infty)) = a + a_0$  for some  $a_0 \geq 0$ .
- Indeed, here, shift-invariance means  $f(a + c) = f(a) + c$ .
- For  $a = 0$ , we get  $f(c) = c + a_0$ , where  $a_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(0)$ .

## 7. Case of infinite intervals: new results (cont-d)

- Similar results emerge for  $S = (-\infty, b]$ .
- Here, additivity implies that  $g(b) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=}} v((-\infty, b]) = k \cdot b$  for some  $0 \leq k \leq 1$ .
- If we assume scale-invariance, then:
  - we get  $g(b) = k_+ \cdot b$  for  $b \geq 0$ , and
  - we get  $g(b) = k_- \cdot b$  for  $b \leq 0$ .
- If we assume shift-invariance, then we get  $v((-\infty, b]) = b - b_0$  for some  $b_0 \geq 0$ .



## 8. Acknowledgments

- This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation grants:
  - 1623190 (A Model of Change for Preparing a New Generation for Professional Practice in Computer Science), and
  - HRD-1834620 and HRD-2034030 (CAHSI Includes).
- It was also supported by the AT&T Fellowship in Information Technology.
- It was also supported by the program of the development of the Scientific-Educational Mathematical Center of Volga Federal District No. 075-02-2020-1478.