

# Common Sense Addition Explained by Hurwicz Optimism-Pessimism Criterion

Bibek Aryal, Laxman Bokati, Karla Godinez, Shammir Ibarra Heyi Liu, Bofei Wang, Vladik Kreinovich\*

University of Texas at El Paso, 500 W. University, El Paso, Texas 79968, USA

Received 12 April 2019; Revised 7 May 2019

#### Abstract

If we place a can of coke that weighs 0.35 kg into a car that weighs 1 ton = 1000 kg, what will be the resulting weight of the car? Mathematics says 1000.35 kg, but common sense says 1 ton. In this paper, we show that this common sense answer can be explained by the Hurwicz optimism-pessimism criterion of decision making under interval uncertainty.

©2019 World Academic Press, UK. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** commonsense reasoning, Hurwicz optimism-pessimism criterion, decision making under uncertainty

### 1 Common Sense Addition

Suppose that we have two factors that affect the accuracy of a measuring instrument. One factor leads to errors  $\pm 10\%$  – meaning that the resulting error component can take any value from -10% to +10%. The second factor leads to errors of  $\pm 0.1\%$ . What is the overall error?

From the purely mathematical viewpoint, the largest possible error is 10.1%. However, from the common sense viewpoint, an engineer would say: 10%.

A similar common sense addition occurs in other situations as well. For example, if we have a car that weights 1 ton = 1000 kg, and we place a coke can that weighs 0.35 kg in the car, what will be now the weight of the car? Mathematics says 1000.35 kg, but common sense clearly says: still 1 ton.

How can we explain this common sense addition?

#### 2 Towards Precise Formulation of the Problem

We know that the overall measurement error  $\Delta x$  is equal to  $\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_2$ , where:

- the value  $\Delta x_1$  can take all possible values from the interval  $[-\Delta_1, \Delta_1]$ , and
- the value  $\Delta x_2$  can take all possible values from the interval  $[-\Delta_2, \Delta_2]$ .

What can we say about the largest possible value  $\Delta$  of the absolute value  $|\Delta|$  of the sum

$$\Delta x = \Delta x_1 + \Delta x_2$$
?

Let us describe this problem in precise terms. For every pair  $(x_1, x_2)$ :

- let  $\pi_1(x_1, x_2)$  denote  $x_1$  and
- let  $\pi_2(x_1, x_2)$  stand for  $x_2$ .

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author

Emails: baryal@miners.utep.edu (B. Aryal), lbokati@miners.utep.edu (L. Bokati), kpgodinezma@miners.utep.edu (K. Godinez), saibarra@miners.utep.edu (S. Ibarra), hliu2@miners.utep.edu (H. Liu), bwang2@miners.utep.edu (B. Wang), vladik@utep.edu (V. Kreinovich).

Let  $\Delta_1 > 0$  and  $\Delta_2 > 0$  be two numbers. Without losing generality, we can assume that

$$\Delta_1 > \Delta_2$$
.

By  $\mathcal{S}$ , let us denote the class of all possible sets

$$S \subseteq [-\Delta_1, \Delta_1] \times [-\Delta_2, \Delta_2]$$

for which

$$\pi_1(S) = [-\Delta_1, \Delta_1] \text{ and } \pi_2(S) = [-\Delta_2, \Delta_2].$$

We are interested in the value

$$\Delta(S) = \max\{|\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_2| : (\Delta x_1, \Delta_2) \in S\}$$

corresponding to the actual (unknown) set S.

We do not know what is the actual set S, we only know that  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ . For different sets  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ , we may get different values  $\Delta(S)$ . The only thing we know about  $\Delta(S)$  is that it belongs to the interval  $[\underline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta}]$  formed by the smallest and the largest possible values of  $\Delta(S)$  when  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ :

$$\underline{\underline{\Delta}} = \min_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \underline{\Delta}(S), \quad \overline{\underline{\Delta}} = \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \underline{\Delta}(S).$$

Which value  $\Delta$  from this interval should we choose?

## 3 Hurwicz Optimism-Pessimism Criterion: Reminder

Situations when we do not know the value of a quantity, we only know the interval of its possible values, are ubiquitous. In such situations, decision theory recommends using *Hurwicz optimism-pessimism criterion*: selecting the value

$$\alpha \cdot \underline{\Delta} + (1 - \alpha) \cdot \overline{\Delta}$$

for some  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . A usual recommendation is to use  $\alpha = 0.5$ ; see, e.g., [2, 3, 4]. Let us see what will be the result of applying this criterion to our problem.

# 4 Analysis of the Problem and the Resulting Explanation of Common Sense Addition

Computing  $\overline{\Delta}$ . For every set  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ , from  $|\Delta x_1| \leq \Delta_1$  and  $|\Delta x_2| \leq \Delta_2$ , we conclude that

$$|\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_1| \le \Delta_1 + \Delta_2.$$

Thus always

$$\Delta(S) < \Delta_1 + \Delta_2$$

and hence,

$$\overline{\Delta} = \max \Delta(S) \le \Delta_1 + \Delta_2.$$

On the other hand, for the set

$$S_0 = \{v, (\Delta_2/\Delta_1) \cdot v\} : v \in [-\Delta_1, \Delta_1]\} \in \mathcal{S},$$

we have

$$\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_2 = \Delta x_1 \cdot (1 + \Delta_2/\Delta_1).$$

Thus in this case, the largest possible value  $\Delta(S_0)$  of  $\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_2$  is equal to

$$\Delta(S_0) = \Delta_1 \cdot (1 + \Delta_2/\Delta_1) = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2.$$

So,

$$\overline{\Delta} = \max \Delta(S) > \Delta(S_0) = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2.$$

Hence,

$$\overline{\Delta} = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2$$
.

#### Computing $\underline{\Delta}$ . For every $S \in \mathcal{S}$ , since

$$\pi_1(S) = [-\Delta_1, \Delta_1],$$

we have

$$\Delta_1 \in \pi_1(S)$$
.

Thus, there exists a pair

$$(\Delta_1, \Delta x_2) \in S$$

corresponding to

$$\Delta x_1 = \Delta_1$$
.

For this pair, we have

$$|\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_2| \ge |\Delta x_1| - |\Delta x_2| = \Delta_1 - |\Delta x_2|.$$

Here,  $|\Delta x_2| \leq \Delta_2$ , so

$$|\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_2| \ge \Delta_1 - \Delta_2.$$

Thus, for each set  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ , the largest possible value  $\Delta(S)$  of the expression

$$|\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_2|$$

cannot be smaller than  $\Delta_1 - \Delta_2$ :

$$\Delta(S) \geq \Delta_1 - \Delta_2$$
.

Hence,

$$\underline{\Delta} = \min_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \Delta(S) \ge \Delta_1 - \Delta_2.$$

On the other hand, for the set

$$S_0 = \{v, -(\Delta_2/\Delta_1) \cdot v\} : v \in [-\Delta_1, \Delta_1]\} \in \mathcal{S},$$

we have

$$\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_2 = \Delta x_1 \cdot (1 - \Delta_2/\Delta_1).$$

Thus in this case, the largest possible value  $\Delta(S_0)$  of  $\Delta x_1 + \Delta x_2$  is equal to

$$\Delta(S_0) = \Delta_1 \cdot (1 - \Delta_2/\Delta_1) = \Delta_1 - \Delta_2.$$

So,

$$\underline{\Delta} = \min_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \Delta(S) \le \Delta(S_0) = \Delta_1 - \Delta_2.$$

Thus,

$$\Delta < \Delta_1 - \Delta_2$$
.

Hence,

$$\Delta = \Delta_1 - \Delta_2.$$

Let us apply Hurwicz optimism-pessimism criterion. So, if we apply Hurwicz optimism-pessimism criterion with  $\alpha = 0.5$  to the interval

$$[\underline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta}] = [\Delta_1 - \Delta_2, \Delta_1 + \Delta_2],$$

we end up with the value

$$\Delta = 0.5 \cdot \Delta + 0.5 \cdot \overline{\Delta} = \Delta_1.$$

For example, for  $\Delta_1 = 10\%$  and  $\Delta_2 = 0.1\%$ , we get  $\Delta = 10\%$  – in full accordance with common sense. In other words, Hurwicz criterion explains the above-described common-sense addition.

Comment. This result was previously announced in [1].

# Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the US National Science Foundation via grants 1623190 (A Model of Change for Preparing a New Generation for Professional Practice in Computer Science) and HRD-1242122 (Cyber-ShARE Center of Excellence).

### References

- [1] Aryal, B., Bokati, L., Godinez, K., Ibarra, S., Liu, H., Wang, B., and V. Kreinovich, Common sense addition explained by Hurwicz optimism-pessimism criterion, *Abstracts of the 23rd Joint UTEP/NMSU Workshop on Mathematics, Computer Science, and Computational Sciences*, El Paso, Texas, November 3, 2018.
- [2] Hurwicz, L., Optimality Criteria for Decision Making Under Ignorance, Cowles Commission Discussion Paper, Statistics, no.370, 1951.
- [3] Kreinovich, V., Decision making under interval uncertainty (and beyond), edited by Guo, P., and W. Pedrycz, Human-Centric Decision-Making Models for Social Sciences, pp.163–193, 2014.
- [4] Luce, R.D., and R. Raiffa, Games and Decisions: Introduction and Critical Survey, Dover, New York, 1989.