# A Comprehensive Exploration of Decision Science: The Concept of Set and the Foundation of Modern Mathematics

Shangheng Cai *

Vanke Meisha Academy, Shenzhen Guangdong Province, China

* Corresponding Author Email: caishangheng@stu.vma.edu.cn

**Abstract.** Set theory and finite sets are important mathematical tools in today's decision-making fields. This analysis will introduce and contrast Rough sets and game theory, two powerful mathematical tools. Set theory provides essential mathematical tools and conceptual frameworks for applications such as fuzzy sets or conventional sets utilised in Rough sets and decision matrices in contemporary game or decision science. By drawing parallels between the two, this study hopes to give a thorough examination of the challenges and opportunities that contemporary mathematics will soon face as it advances decision science. One significant theoretical effort in this research is an attempt to return the decision matrix issue to a set-theoretical framework.

**Keywords:** The Rough Set; Non-cooperative Game Theory; Decision Making.

## 1. Introduction

Modern decision-making typically makes use of the mathematical concepts of set theory and finite sets. Both of these processes are thought to have been developed quite recently. Two important mathematical tools, the rough set and game theory, will be compared and contrasted with one another during the course of this inquiry [1]. Clearly, the mathematical tools and conceptual notions utilised in rough sets, which may use fuzzy sets or conventional sets, and decision matrices, which may be employed in contemporary game or choice research [2-4], are offered by set theory. Fuzzy sets and regular sets may both be used in rough sets. Use of decision matrices is possible. Rough sets may be used in conjunction with either fuzzy sets or regular sets. Decision matrices may help researchers study contemporary games or choices [5].

The goals of this work are to (1) effectively analyse the challenges and opportunities that modern mathematics is likely to face in the development of decision science; (2) effectively analyse these barriers and possibilities; and (3) effectively analyse these obstacles and opportunities by drawing parallels between these two fields. As a result, researchers will be better able to predict the future of decision science in light of the aforementioned opportunities and challenges [6, 7]. Attempting a set-theoretic solution to the problem of choice matrices is also a fundamental theoretical endeavour covered in this inquiry. This is a crucial piece of the puzzle for the inquiry. This effort is crucial to the investigation as a whole. Starting with Euclid, the study of the logical and philosophical underpinnings of mathematics has been ongoing ever since. This includes checking to see whether the axioms of a particular system guarantee its completeness and consistency. The scale and complexity of this region are really staggering. Many mathematicians and logicians around the turn of the twentieth century helped finish the theorems in this field. D. Hilbert developed the theory of proof that is used to transform any mathematical statement into a formula that can be shown concretely and rigorously deduced [8]. There are many linkages between the foundations of mathematics and other branches of study including geometry, rough set theory, and statistics. Rough set theory, along with several other areas of contemporary mathematics, is the primary focus of this study.

Because a Nash equilibrium is a set of player tactics in which no player obtains an advantage by switching strategies, this article also delves into Game Theory. That grouping is characterised as a finite set and evaluated as such. This demonstrates that the idea of set depicts not only the mathematical solution to the issue, but also the equivalent of decision-making problems using rough set theory and game theory. Non-cooperative game theory is a major subfield of game theory that examines interactions between individuals who are not cooperating to attain a shared objective. The study of competitive strategy games in which participants do not share information or reach a consensus is the focus of non-cooperative game theory. Games featuring cooperative play are studied because the outcomes of individual players are dependent not just on their own play but also on the play of other players. Strategic behaviour, equilibrium solutions, and the most efficient means of selecting what actions to take are only few of the many issues that non-cooperative game theory explores.

## 2. The application of rough set theory

Rough set theory is a mathematical framework for analysing data and making decisions in the face of ambiguity and limited knowledge. Computer scientist Z. from Poland created it. The 1980s Pawlak. Rough set theory's central notion is to categorise things or arrive at choices with little or ambiguous data. For more robust and adaptable analysis, it offers a formal framework for dealing with data that contains missing or inaccurate values. Lower and higher approximations are used to depict the data. Upper approximation depicts the set of items that could or might not belong to the desired class, whereas lower approximation depicts the set of objects for which the available information is definite. The degree of ambiguity or inconsistency in the data may be gauged by comparing the difference between the lower and higher estimates.

**Table 1**. Pawlak's decision table, the study uses H for high, L for low [8]

| Pipe | T | W | K | Crack |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | H | H | L | Y |
| 2 | average. | H | L | N |
| 3 | average. | H | L | Y |
| 4 | L | L | L | N |
| 5 | average. | L | H | N |
| 6 | H | L | H | Y |

Pawlak's analysis is summarised in Table 1, which also serves as a decision table. Six cast-iron pipes were subjected to a high-pressure endurance test, and the results are listed in the table. The feature Cracks shows the test result, while the attributes Table C, S, and P disclose the percentage concentration of coal, sulphur, and phosphorus in the pig iron.

The primary concern is whether or whether the compounds C, S, and P found in pig iron have any effect on the pipes' durability, or if there is a functional relationship between the decision characteristic Cracks and the condition attributes C, S, and P [8]. If the set 2,4,5 of pipes without fractures can be defined in terms of condition attribute values, this is a question in rough set theory. Pipes 2 and 3 have the same characteristics in terms of attributes C, S, and P, but have different values for the attribute Cracks, making it difficult to solve this challenge. Then, we may apply rudimentary set theory to get to the bottom of it.

Attribute C indicates whether or not a pipe has cracks; if the value is high, the pipe has; if it is low, the pipe does not. As a result, we may use the C, S, and P qualities to state that Pipes 1 and 6 are definitely good, or that they belong to the set 1, 3, 6, and that Pipes 1, 2, 3, and 6 are probably good, or that they may belong to the set 1, 3, 6. This means that the sets 1,6, 1,2,3,6 and 2,3 are the lower approximation, the higher approximation, and the border area of the set 1,3,6. This implies that the coal, sulphur, and phosphorus levels in the pig iron can only be used as proxies for determining the quality of the pipes.

In reality, approximations establish the explicit link between the values of condition and choice characteristics. This might be a whole or partial reliance. As a rough measure, the number of rows in which the values of condition attributes uniquely influence the values of choice attributes divided by the total number of rows in the database is the degree of dependence between condition and decision attributes. For instance, 4/6=2/3 indicates a moderate degree of dependence between fractures and pig iron content. This suggests that the composition alone may classify as excellent four out of six pipes, or around 66% [9].

People may also want to know whether it is required to meet all of the requirements in this table in order to make the choices presented here. The reduct of condition characteristics is the novel concept that will be used. This idea helps us grasp the smallest collection of condition characteristics that yet maintains some kind of dependence between choice and condition attributes. Two reducts, C, S, and C, P, are readily apparent in Table 1. The core is the region where all reducts meet. Coal is the primary factor in creating cracks, as shown by the statistics, and so cannot be ignored; in contrast, sulphur and phosphorus play secondary roles and may be interchanged as crack-inducing factors.

## 3. Discussion

Rough set theory is a helpful tool for analysing data and making decisions in the face of ambiguity and missing information. It has accomplished a lot, but there are still certain theoretical and practical issues that need fixing. For big data sets in particular, the development of widely available, efficient software for rough set-based data analysis is of paramount relevance.

More study is required, especially when quantitative features are involved, despite the fact that numerous helpful techniques of efficient, optimum, decision rule generation from data have been established in recent years based on rough set theory. In this regard, there is an urgent need for novel discretization approaches for quantitative attribute values. Extensive research into a novel strategy for dealing with missing data is also crucial. Although significant progress has been made in this field, a comparison to other comparable methodologies still needs careful consideration.

## 4. Non-cooperative game Theory and the prediction of Decision-making

To analyse strategic interactions and decision-making, game theorists use mathematical models. It offers a structure for examining how rational actors make decisions and for making predictions about those choices based on the behaviours of others. In order to analyse strategic interactions, game theory employs mathematical notions like equilibrium, optimisation, probability, and statistics.

Applied mathematics is an interdisciplinary area that seeks to apply mathematical theory and practise to the solution of real-world issues in fields as diverse as economics, physics, engineering, and biology. Problem-solving and decision-making in the actual world often need the use of mathematical models, algorithms, and approaches. In conclusion, there is much overlap between the domains of applied mathematics and game theory.

### 4.1. Non-cooperative game theory

'Non-cooperative game theory' [10] is a significant subfield of 'game theory' that focuses on interactions between opponents. Strategic interactions in which participants do not coordinate their actions with one another fall within the purview of non-cooperative game theory. It is the study of games where the outcomes for each player rely on the actions of other players as well as their own. Strategic behaviour, equilibrium solutions, and the best course of action for making decisions under these conditions are all examined by non-cooperative game theory.

The central idea of 'Nash Equilibrium' will be the focus of this study because of its significance and representativeness. John Nash's seminal 1950 PNAS essay provides the first comprehensive definition and characterization of the concept of Nash equilibrium. In a multi-player game, a Nash equilibrium consists of a set of strategies, one for each player, such that no player can gain by unilaterally departing from their selected strategy, given the strategies chosen by the other players. All players are using their optimal replies, and nobody has any reason to alter strategies in a Nash equilibrium. A Nash equilibrium is a stable situation where no individual can increase their personal payout by altering their strategy alone, but it does not guarantee the greatest possible result for all players. It has also been adopted and used extensively in the fields of economics and other behavioural sciences. In fact, game theory—with the Nash equilibrium as its centerpiece—is rapidly rising to the status of the field's preeminent unifying theory [11].

### 4.2. Prisoner's dilemma

The Prisoner's Dilemma is a famous game-theoretic scenario depicting a dilemma between acting rationally as an individual and acting rationally as a group. Two people are arrested and placed in isolated cells where they are unable to contact one another. Here are some potential results and repercussions:

1. If both inmates agree to cooperate (by keeping quiet), their sentences will be reduced.

2. If one inmate betrays (confesses) and the other helps (cooperates), the betrayer gets off free while the helper gets a long term.

3. If both inmates betray (confess), they will both get a heavy punishment, albeit not as severe as if just one inmate had confessed.

The difficulty in making a decision stem from the fact that both prisoners are in the dark about the other's option. In this setting, betrayal is the most common tactic among the prisoners since it increases the likelihood of receiving a greater reward independent of the other prisoners' decisions. If both inmates choose to betray one another, however, they will be worse off than if they had worked together.

The prisoner's dilemma is a useful tool for analysing situations in which one or more parties must decide between working together and betraying one other. It emphasises the difficulties of achieving optimum results in the face of limited knowledge and conflicting incentives, as well as the conflict between individual self-interest and collective good.

The game shown in Figure 1 is a 22 version of the Prisoner's Dilemma, using ordinal values for the outcomes. The first block's payoffs indicate that both inmates will keep quiet. One prisoner betrays the group and receives a reward in the top right block, while another receives a reward for cooperation in the bottom left block. The last block's payoffs necessitate mutual betrayal amongst the inmates.

For our current needs, let's define strategy as just another option. If one approach consistently outperforms another in terms of payout, regardless of the other player's actions, then that strategy is dominant. Each player in Prisoner's Dilemma may be said to have a winning tactic. Imagine you are Row-Person, and your payouts are shown in the cells preceding the comma. If you anticipate that Column-Person would choose the left column, you'll benefit more by selecting the bottom row (4 vs. 3). Bottom-Row-Person still has an advantage if Column-Person chooses the right-hand column since 2 is more than 1. This means the bottom row is a primary target for the Row-Person's plan. Column-Person also employs a winning tactic. Therefore, any participant in Prisoner's Dilemma may use a winning approach [12].

So, in the 'two-person Prisoner's Dilemma' paradigm, if the reward for each action were equal, everyone would choose the same option (dominant strategy), and the choices each player would make while oblivious of the choices made by the other players are predictable. Assuming complete rationality on the part of all participants, we can readily anticipate the ultimate collective decision-making and compute the payout by looking at the situation from a high level of abstraction.

| | |
|---|---|
| 3, 3 | 1, 4 |
| 4, 1 | 2, 2 |

Matrix 1

**Fig. 1** Matrix of Prisoner's Dilemma

A plan is currently a viable choice. If one strategy is more profitable than another, it will win out no matter what the opposing side does. Each player in Prisoner's Dilemma has a dominant strategy. Just pretend the commas in each cell represent your payouts as Row-Person. If Column-Person choose the left column, then picking the bottom row (4 instead of 3) will boost your payout. Even though Column-Person selects the correct column, the bottom row remains the best option due to the superiority of 2 over 1. The Row-Person's strategy of focusing on the bottom row, then, is the most effective. The Column-Person Perspective is the Norm. Each player in the Prisoner's Dilemma game may win by using a different dominant tactic [12].

## 5. Conclusion

The purpose of this research is to give a comprehensive analysis of the underlying ideas in modern mathematics. When the set of possible actions is constrained, it may be claimed that a mixed-strategy Nash equilibrium is guaranteed to exist in the setting of zero-sum games. Modern mathematics now includes non-cooperative games as a major subfield and useful tool. However, a thorough understanding of elementary matrix or set operations, as well as a review of the underlying principles, is required. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the development of methods in the study of Nash games and simple set theory through time. Intricate models incorporating non-finite sets of actions are what this work aims to showcase as a fertile ground for the application of these fundamental mathematical methods. Modern mathematical analytical methods should provide enough preparation for such discussion.

## References

[1] Pawlak Z, Polkowski L, Skowron A. Rough set theory. KI. 2001, 15(3): 38-9.

[2] Zhang Q, Xie Q, Wang G. A survey on rough set theory and its applications. CAAI Transactions on Intelligence Technology. 2016, 1(4): 323-33.

[3] Pawlak Z. Rough set theory and its applications to data analysis. Cybernetics & Systems. 1998, 29(7): 661-88.

[4] Azam N, Yao J. Analyzing uncertainties of probabilistic rough set regions with game-theoretic rough sets. International journal of approximate reasoning. 2014, 55(1): 142-55.

[5] Bashir Z, Mahnaz S, Abbas Malik MG. Conflict resolution using game theory and rough sets. International Journal of Intelligent Systems. 2021, 36(1): 237-59.

[6] Yao J, Herbert JP. A game-theoretic perspective on rough set analysis. Journal of Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications (Natural Science Edition). 2008, 20(3): 291-8.

[7] Hilbert D, Ackermann W. Principles of mathematical logic. American Mathematical Society; 2022.

[8] Ewald W, Sieg W. David Hilbert's Lectures on the Foundations of Arithmetic and Logic 1917-1933. Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2013.

[9] Mancosu P. Between Russell and Hilbert: Behmann on the foundations of mathematics. Bulletin of Symbolic Logic. 1999, 5(3): 303-30.

[10] Holt CA, Roth AE. The Nash equilibrium: A perspective. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2004, 101(12): 3999-4002.

[11] Hamburger H. N-person prisoner's dilemma. Journal of Mathematical Sociology. 1973, 3(1): 27-48.

[12] Myerson RB. Refinements of the Nash equilibrium concept. International journal of game theory. 1978, 73-80.