

Dempster, Shafer, and Aggregate Uncertainty

Mark J. Wierman

Creighton University

NAFIPS, 2014



Outline

- 1 Concepts
 - History
- 2 Aggregate Uncertainty
- 3 Harmonious
- 4 New Algorithm
 - Algorithm
 - Proof
- 5 A Problem
 - Back to Dempster
- 6 Conclusions

Outline

- 1 Concepts
 - History
- 2 Aggregate Uncertainty
- 3 Harmonious
- 4 New Algorithm
 - Algorithm
 - Proof
- 5 A Problem
 - Back to Dempster
- 6 Conclusions

Dempster

Evidence

- We are given the probabilities of some collection of subsets of a finite reference set X
- We want to determine the underlying probability distribution $\langle p_x \rangle$ that gave rise to the evidence.
- In general, the problem is underdetermined

Dempster

Upper and Lower Probabilities

- The lower probability (LP) of a set is the minimum probability of A that is consistent with the evidence.
- The upper probability (UP) of A is the maximum probability for A that is consistent with the data.

Definition (consistent)

A probability distribution $\langle p_x \rangle$ on a finite X is (Dempster) consistent with the evidence if, for every subset A of X we have that

$$LP(A) \leq P(A) \leq UP(A). \quad (1)$$

Shafer

Evidence Theory

- Shafer's development of Evidence Theory reinterprets Dempster.
- The lower probability is called the Belief measure (Bel)
- The upper probability is called the Plausibility (Pl)
- Shafer defines a function m , called a *basic probability assignment* or **bpa**.
- $m : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a function which is required to satisfy two conditions: $m(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}(X)} m(A) = 1$.

Shafer

basic probability assignment

- The Belief is given by the formula

$$\text{Bel}(A) = \sum_{B \subseteq A} m(B)$$

- The Plausibility by

$$\text{Pl}(A) = \sum_{B \cap A \neq \emptyset} m(B) .$$

Shafer

Definition (focal)

A *focal element* is a set $A \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ for which $m(A) \neq 0$ and \mathcal{F} denotes the set of all focal elements.

Definition (body of evidence)

A *body of evidence* is denoted $\mathcal{B} = \langle \mathcal{F}, m \rangle$.

Definition (consistent probability space)

Given a body of evidence $\mathcal{B} = \langle \mathcal{F}, m \rangle$ we define $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{B}}$ to be the set of all probability distributions on X that are consistent with \mathcal{B} (see Eq. (1)).



inf/sup strategy

Back and forth

- Many *formulas* in Shafer's Theory of Evidence can be derived by applying a simple back and forth strategy.
- Associate Beliefs/Plausibilities with Lower and Upper Probabilities
- Find the inf / sup of the *probabilistic formula* over the space of all consistent probabilities, $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{B}}$ (Dempsterize).
- Translate the inf / sup forward into Evidence theory to get the Belief/Plausibility formula that corresponds to the *probabilistic formula* (Shaferize).

Shannon Entropy

Entropy \Rightarrow AU

- If we apply the inf / sup strategy to the Shannon entropy[?]:

$$H(p) = - \sum_{x \in X} p(x) \log_2 p(x) \quad (2)$$

- We produce the Aggregate Uncertainty measures (AU)

$$\begin{aligned} AU(\mathcal{B}) &= \sup_{\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{B}}} \left[- \sum_{x \in X} p(x) \log_2 p(x) \right] \\ &= \sup_{p \in \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{B}}} H(p) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$



Equivalence

Evidential Equivalence

- Let \mathcal{F} be the focal set of of a body of evidence $\mathcal{B} = \langle \mathcal{F}, m \rangle$.
- Define the lower equivalence relation

$$a \approx b \text{ iff } \forall A \in \mathcal{F} \ a \in A \leftrightarrow b \in A \quad (4)$$

- a is equivalent to b iff every focal set that contains a contains b and vice versa.
- $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the partition induced by \approx , and

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{[a]_{\mathcal{F}} \mid a \in X\}. \quad (5)$$

Exact

Focal set A

- Every focal set $A \in \mathcal{F}$ is the union of elements of $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}}$
- In terms of rough set theory, we say that \mathcal{F} is $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}}$ -exact.
- In addition, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the *roughest* such partition.

Pignistic Distribution

Pignistic = Betting

- Divide the evidence equally across focal sets
- For a singleton set $A = \{x\}$, we have

$$\text{BetP}(\{x\}) = \sum_{B|x \in B} \frac{m(B)}{|B|}. \quad (6)$$

Outline

- 1 Concepts
 - History
- 2 Aggregate Uncertainty
- 3 Harmonious
- 4 **New Algorithm**
 - **Algorithm**
 - Proof
- 5 A Problem
 - Back to Dempster
- 6 Conclusions

Algorithm

AU Algorithm for Calculating AU from a body of evidence $\mathcal{B} = \langle \mathcal{F}, m \rangle$.

Step 1 Find a non-empty set $A \subseteq X$, such that $\frac{\text{Pl}(A)}{|A|}$ is minimal.

Step 2 Remove any B from \mathcal{F} if $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ and add A to create \mathcal{F}_A .

Step 3 Create $\mathcal{B}_A = \langle \mathcal{F}_A, m_A \rangle$ where $m_A(A) = \text{Pl}(A)$ and $m_A(B) = m(B)$ for all B in $\mathcal{F}_A - \{A\}$.

Step 4 Put $X = X - A$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_A$.

Step 5 If $X \neq \emptyset$ go to Step 1.

Step 6 $\mathcal{B}_{AU} = \mathcal{B}$.

Advantages

Each step

- eliminates anything that intersects with A
- produces a higher probability than the previous step
- generates a standard body of evidence

The resulting distribution \mathbf{p} is pignistic and harmonious.

Outline

- 1 Concepts
 - History
- 2 Aggregate Uncertainty
- 3 Harmonious
- 4 **New Algorithm**
 - Algorithm
 - **Proof**
- 5 A Problem
 - Back to Dempster
- 6 Conclusions

The proof

Outline of the proof

Assume there is a consistent distribution \mathbf{q} with higher entropy

- Every consistent distribution can be produced by arbitrarily dividing $m(A)$ over A
- From this fact we infer that we can go from \mathbf{p} to \mathbf{q} in a series of steps where we add α to probability p_x and subtract it from another p_y
- To increase the entropy $p_x < p_y$
- To maintain consistency $p_x > p_y$

Outline

- 1 Concepts
 - History
- 2 Aggregate Uncertainty
- 3 Harmonious
- 4 New Algorithm
 - Algorithm
 - Proof
- 5 **A Problem**
 - **Back to Dempster**
- 6 Conclusions

Oops

Example (Dempster)

- Let $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$ with evidence $P(\{a, b\}) = P(\{b, c\}) = \frac{2}{3}$.
- The distributions must be of the form $\langle \frac{2}{3} - \beta, \beta, \frac{2}{3} - \beta, \beta - \frac{1}{3} \rangle$ where $\beta \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]$.
- Calculated lower and upper probabilities and consider these as Bel and Pl.
- The algorithm gives $p_{AU} = \langle 1/3, 1/3, 1/6, 1/6 \rangle$ with $AU = 1.9183$.
- Unfortunately, the distribution is inconsistent with the evidence.
- And it does not maximize the Shannon entropy, $\beta = 4/9$ does.



Oops

Example (Dempster)

- Let $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$ with evidence $P(\{a, b\}) = P(\{b, c\}) = \frac{2}{3}$.
- The distributions must be of the form $\langle \frac{2}{3} - \beta, \beta, \frac{2}{3} - \beta, \beta - \frac{1}{3} \rangle$ where $\beta \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]$.
- Calculated lower and upper probabilities and consider these as Bel and Pl.
- The algorithm gives $p_{AU} = \langle 1/3, 1/3, 1/6, 1/6 \rangle$ with $AU = 1.9183$.
- Unfortunately, the distribution is inconsistent with the evidence.
- And it does not maximize the Shannon entropy, $\beta = 4/9$ does.



Dempster \neq Shafer

Caution

- Shafer is a subset of Dempster
- The *inf/sup method* assumes an equivalence
- In Dempster we can not arbitrarily distribute the **bpa** over the focal sets