The Choquet-like operator with respect to an admissible order as a tool for aggregating multivalued data

Michał Boczek^{a,*}, Tomasz Józefiak^a, Marek Kaluszka^a, Andrzej Okolewski^a

^aInstitute of Mathematics, Lodz University of Technology, 93-590 Lodz, Poland

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a new generalization of the classical discrete Choquet integral to the multivalued framework in terms of an admissible order that refines the natural partial order on the considered value set. The new Choquet-like operator takes as input a finite number of values of a given type, in particular real numbers, intervals, and vectors, and returns a single output value of the same type as the input values. We give necessary and sufficient conditions for the operator to be monotone with respect to the admissible order. We then provide a complete characterization of the Choquet-like operator as an aggregation function with respect to the admissible order and study its selected special cases.

Keywords: Admissible order, Admissible permutation, Aggregation function, Choquet-like operator, Monotone measure, Partial order

1. Introduction

Information fusion is central to both theoretical and applied research. In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the application of fuzzy integrals to data fusion, with a particular focus on the discrete Choquet integral. The integral has proven to be extremely useful in various machine learning problems [1, 17, 22]. This has led to several generalizations of the Choquet integral in the real number setting being proposed in the literature, resulting in concepts such as the CQO-integrals [2], C_T-integrals [19], CC-integrals [28], d-Choquet integrals [14], and C_{F1F2}-integrals [27]. A detailed survey of many of these integrals can be found in [19]. A unified approach to integration in the Choquet sense in the real number setting was presented in [5, 9], introducing the concept of an operator based on conditional aggregation and relation operators.

^{*}michal.boczek.1@p.lodz.pl

Email addresses: michal.boczek.1@p.lodz.pl (Michał Boczek), tomasz.jozefiak@dokt.p.lodz.pl (Tomasz Józefiak), marek.kaluszka@p.lodz.pl (Marek Kaluszka), andrzej.okolewski@p.lodz.pl (Andrzej Okolewski)

This operator includes many Choquet-like integrals known in the literature, in particular those in [2, 19, 28, 14, 27].

Recent research has increasingly focused on the generalization of classical fuzzy set theory [40] to include interval-valued fuzzy sets [36] and *n*-dimensional fuzzy sets [3]. The degrees of membership for such extensions are certain sets that consist of two or more real numbers. Several generalizations of the Choquet integral in multivalued settings have been proposed, in particular for the interval setting [13], the *n*-dimensional vector setting [20, 24], and the *n*-dimensional interval setting [33]. The construction of such extensions requires, among other things, overcoming problems arising from the fact that the natural product order on a set of vectors with real coordinates is not a linear order. Bustince et al. [12] tackled this problem in the interval-valued setting by introducing the concept of admissible orders, i.e., total orders that refine the product order.

The main reason for using the standard Choquet integral [16] for data aggregation is its native properties. It is desirable that the functionals that are extensions of the Choquet integral inherit its original properties. Monotonicity, the fundamental axiom of the aggregation function, is one of these properties. Its verification is a major challenge in determining whether an operator qualifies as an aggregation function. Among the various generalized Choquet integrals proposed in the literature, only some satisfy the monotonicity condition, while some others fulfill a weakened monotonicity condition, such as the directional monotonicity or ordered directional monotonicity [19]. A full characterization of the monotonicity condition for two important variants of the extended Choquet-like operator in the real number framework, which as special cases include the operators studied in [11, 23, 32], along with the necessary and sufficient conditions that determine when the analyzed operators qualify as aggregation functions, are presented in [8].

In this paper we focus on the aggregation of a finite number of data of a given type, e.g., real-valued, interval-valued, or *n*-dimensional-valued, from the perspective of Choquet integral theory. We introduce the notion of a Choquet-like operator with respect to an admissible order, which refines the natural order on the considered data set [12, 33]. This operator extends the discrete Choquet integral to the multivalued framework, replacing subtraction and multiplication by a general function, and addition by an operation compatible with the admissible order. We characterize the classes of all functions for which the Choquet-like operator is: (a) well defined, i.e., invariant with respect to permutations of the input data, (b) monotone with respect to the admissible order. Finally, we give a complete characterization of the Choquet-like operator as

an aggregation function with respect to the admissible order, and study some special cases in detail.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we present some preliminary definitions and results which are necessary for the rest of the paper. In Section 3 we introduce a Choquet-like operator with respect to an admissible order and study its well-definedness and monotonicity. In Section 4 we provide necessary and sufficient conditions for the operator to be an aggregation function, and analyze these conditions in detail for two important particular variants of the operator. To improve readability, we move the well-definedness proof and all related monotonicity proofs to Appendix.

2. Preliminaries

Let \mathbb{R}_+ and \mathbb{N} be the sets of non-negative real numbers and positive integers, respectively. By [n] we denote the set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let U be a non-empty universal set, sometimes called a reference set or universe of discourse.

2.1. Ordered sets

A partial order \leq_p on U is a binary relation on U, which is:

- $\bullet \ {\rm reflexive:} \ {\bf x} \preceq_{\rm p} {\bf x} \ {\rm for \ any} \ {\bf x} \in U,$
- antisymmetric: for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in U$, $\mathbf{x} \preceq_p \mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{z} \preceq_p \mathbf{x}$ implies $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{z}$,
- transitive: for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in U$, if $\mathbf{x} \preceq_p \mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{y} \preceq_p \mathbf{z}$, then $\mathbf{x} \preceq_p \mathbf{z}$.

In the rest of the paper, we will write "partial order" instead of "partial order on U" when the form of the universal set U is clear from the context.

Using the partial order \leq_{p} , we establish the relation \prec_{p} as follows: for any elements \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{z} of the set U, the statement $\mathbf{x} \prec_{p} \mathbf{z}$ holds true if and only if $\mathbf{x} \preceq_{p} \mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{z}$. By the reflexivity and antisymmetry of the partial order \leq_{p} , it follows that for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in U$, $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{z}$ if and only if $\mathbf{x} \preceq_{p} \mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{z} \preceq_{p} \mathbf{x}$. Hence, for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in U$, $\mathbf{x} \preceq_{p} \mathbf{z}$ if and only if $\mathbf{x} \prec_{p} \mathbf{z}$ or $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{z}$.

A non-empty set $\mathsf{K} \subseteq \mathsf{U}$ is said to be *bounded w.r.t. a partial order* \preceq_p if it has both the least element **0** and the greatest element **1** w.r.t. \preceq_p , that is, **0**, **1** $\in \mathsf{K}$ and **0** $\preceq_p \mathbf{x} \preceq_p \mathbf{1}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathsf{K}$. A partial order \preceq for which every two elements are comparable, i.e., $\mathbf{x} \preceq \mathbf{z}$ or $\mathbf{z} \preceq \mathbf{x}$ for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathsf{U}$, is called a *total order*.

We will now present some examples of restricted subsets for certain universal sets with usual partial orders, which will be used later in the paper.

- **Example 2.1.** (a) For $U = \mathbb{R}_+$, the set K = [0, 1] is bounded w.r.t. the usual order \leq with the least element 0 and the greatest element 1. Hereafter, the symbol [a, b] with $a \leq b$ represents an interval in \mathbb{R}_+ .
 - (b) Let $U = Int_{\mathbb{R}_+}$ be the family of all closed subintervals of \mathbb{R}_+ . The natural partial order is the *interval order* \leq_{Int} defined as follows

$$\mathbf{x} \preceq_{\text{Int}} \mathbf{z} \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad x^l \leqslant z^l \text{ and } x^u \leqslant z^u$$

for any $\mathbf{x} = [x^l, x^u] \in \operatorname{Int}_{\mathbb{R}_+}$ and $\mathbf{z} = [z^l, z^u] \in \operatorname{Int}_{\mathbb{R}_+}$. Then $\mathsf{K} = \operatorname{Int}_{[0,1]}$, where $\operatorname{Int}_{[0,1]} = \{\mathbf{x} = [x^l, x^u] \mid 0 \leqslant x^l \leqslant x^u \leqslant 1\}$, is a bounded set w.r.t. $\preceq_{\operatorname{Int}}$ with the least element [0, 0] and the greatest element [1, 1].

(c) Let $U = \mathbb{R}^k_+$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The usual partial order \preceq_V is defined as follows

$$\mathbf{x} \preceq_{\mathrm{V}} \mathbf{z} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x_i \leqslant z_i \text{ for all } i \in [k],$$

for any $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)^T \in \mathbb{R}^k_+$ and $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_k)^T \in \mathbb{R}^k_+$, where \mathbf{x}^T denotes the transpose of a vector \mathbf{x} . Then $\mathsf{K} = [0, 1]^k$ is a bounded set w.r.t. \preceq_{V} with the least element $(0, \ldots, 0)^T$ and the greatest element $(1, \ldots, 1)^T$.

Definition 2.2. Let \leq_{p} be a partial order. A total order \leq is called an *admissible order w.r.t.* \leq_{p} if for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{U}$, it holds $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{z}$ whenever $\mathbf{x} \leq_{p} \mathbf{z}$.

The notion of the admissible order was introduced in [12] in the context of comparing two intervals. One of the most significant admissible orders w.r.t. \leq_{Int} is the (α, β) -order defined as follows: for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \text{Int}_{\mathbb{R}_+}$

$$\mathbf{x} \preceq_{(\alpha,\beta)} \mathbf{z} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}) < K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}) \text{ or} \\ \\ K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}) = K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}) \text{ and } K_{\beta}(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant K_{\beta}(\mathbf{z}), \end{cases}$$

where $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]$, $\alpha \neq \beta$, and $K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{y}) = (1 - \alpha)y^{l} + \alpha y^{u}$ for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \operatorname{Int}_{\mathbb{R}_{+}}$. The (α, β) -order generalizes three well-known admissible orders: (i) the lexicographical order for $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 1)$, (ii) the antilexicographical order for $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 0)$, (iii) the Xu-Yager order for $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 1)$. In [6] it is proved that in a certain class of orders, the only admissible order w.r.t. $\preceq_{\operatorname{Int}}$ is the (α, β) -order.

2.2. Addition operation on U

A binary operation $\oplus: U \times U \to U$ is called *addition* if it satisfies the following properties:

- (a) commutativity: $\mathbf{x} \oplus \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z} \oplus \mathbf{x}$ for any \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} ,
- (b) associativity: $(\mathbf{x} \oplus \mathbf{y}) \oplus \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} \oplus (\mathbf{y} \oplus \mathbf{z})$ for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$.

Note that (U, \oplus) is a commutative semigroup. In particular, ([0, 1], T) and ([0, 1], S) are commutative semigroups for any *t*-norm T and *t*-conorm S [21]. For more examples of semigroups, we refer to [37]. Examples of addition operations \oplus for the special cases of U described in Example 2.1 are given in Table 1.

U	\oplus	$\mathbf{x} \oplus \mathbf{z}$
\mathbb{R}_+	+	x + z (standard addition)
$Int_{\mathbb{R}_+}$	\oplus_{iv}	$[x^l, x^u] \oplus_{\mathrm{iv}} [z^l, z^u] = [x^l + z^l, x^u + z^u]$
\mathbb{R}^k_+	\oplus_{vv}	$(x_1, \dots, x_k)^T \oplus_{vv} (z_1, \dots, z_k)^T = (x_1 + z_1, \dots, x_k + z_k)^T$

Table 1: Examples of addition operations for selected cases of $\mathsf{U}.$

Definition 2.3. A partial order \leq_{p} is said to be *compatible with* \oplus if for any $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{v} \in U$ we have

$$\mathbf{x}_1 \preceq_p \mathbf{x}_2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v} \preceq_p \mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v}.$$

Replacing \leq_{p} with \prec_{p} , we get the notion of *compatibility of* \prec_{p} with \oplus .

All partial orders from Example 2.1 are compatible with the corresponding operations \oplus from Table 1.

Definition 2.4. An addition operation \oplus has the *cancellation law*, whenever for any $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{v} \in U$ the following implication holds

$$\mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v} \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2.$$

All operations from Table 1 have the cancellation law. We now present some auxiliary results.

Lemma 2.5. Let \leq_{p} be a partial order. If \prec_{p} is compatible with \oplus , then \leq_{p} is compatible with \oplus .

PROOF. By assumption, we have $\mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v} \preceq_p \mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v}$ for any $\mathbf{x}_1 \prec_p \mathbf{x}_2$ and $\mathbf{v} \in U$. Clearly, if $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2$, then $\mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v} \preceq_p \mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v}$ as $\mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v}$.

The minimum operation on \mathbb{R}_+ is commutative and associative, and the usual order \leq is compatible with this operation. However, the relation < is not compatible with the minimum operation as $\min\{x_1, c\} = \min\{x_2, c\}$ for any $0 \leq c < x_1 < x_2$. To reverse the implication of Lemma 2.5, an additional assumption is necessary.

Lemma 2.6. Let \oplus satisfy the cancellation law and \leq_p be a partial order. If \leq_p is compatible with \oplus , then \prec_p is compatible with \oplus .

PROOF. By assumption, $\mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v} \leq_p \mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v}$ for any $\mathbf{x}_1 \prec_p \mathbf{x}_2$ and \mathbf{v} . Suppose there exists $\mathbf{x}_1 \prec_p \mathbf{x}_2$ and \mathbf{v} such that $\mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v}$. Then by the cancellation law, we have $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2$, a contradiction. The proof is complete.

Lemma 2.7. Assume that \preceq is an admissible order w.r.t. \preceq_p such that \prec is compatible with \oplus . Then:

- (a) \oplus has the cancellation law,
- (b) for any $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{v} \in \mathsf{U}$, if $\mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v} \preceq \mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v}$, then $\mathbf{x}_1 \preceq \mathbf{x}_2$,
- (c) for any $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathsf{K}$, if $\mathbf{0}$ is the least element of K w.r.t. \leq_{p} , $\mathbf{0} \oplus \mathbf{0} \in \mathsf{K}$ and $\mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$.

PROOF. (a) Suppose that $\mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v}$ for some \mathbf{v} and $\mathbf{x}_1 \neq \mathbf{x}_2$. Since \leq is a total order, any two elements are comparable, i.e., for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathsf{U}$ we have either $\mathbf{x} \prec \mathbf{y}$ or $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$ or $\mathbf{y} \prec \mathbf{x}$. In our case, we get either $\mathbf{x}_1 \prec \mathbf{x}_2$ or $\mathbf{x}_2 \prec \mathbf{x}_1$, as $\mathbf{x}_1 \neq \mathbf{x}_2$. If $\mathbf{x}_1 \prec \mathbf{x}_2$, then by the compatibility of \prec we obtain $\mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v} \prec \mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v}$, so it is not true that $\mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v}$, a contradiction. The case $\mathbf{x}_2 \prec \mathbf{x}_1$ can be examined in a similar way.

(b) Suppose that $\mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v} \preceq \mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{x}_2 \prec \mathbf{x}_1$ for some $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{v}$. By the compatibility of \prec , we get $\mathbf{x}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v} \prec \mathbf{x}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v}$, a contradiction.

(c) Since $\mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{0} \oplus \mathbf{0} \in \mathsf{K}$, and $\mathbf{0}$ is the least element of K , we have $\mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0} \preceq \mathbf{0} \oplus \mathbf{0}$. From Lemma 2.5, we get $\mathbf{0} \oplus \mathbf{0} \preceq \mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{0}$. Thus, by the transitivity of \preceq , $\mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v} \preceq \mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{0}$. Point (b) now gives $\mathbf{v} \preceq \mathbf{0}$. Hence, $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$. Similarly, it can be shown that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$.

2.3. K-valued aggregation function

Let \leq be an admissible order w.r.t. \leq_p . Fix $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathsf{U}^n$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n) \in \mathsf{U}^n$. We define a binary relation on U^n , say $\leq_{(n)}$, as

$$\mathbf{X} \preceq_{(n)} \mathbf{Z} \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad \mathbf{x}_i \preceq \mathbf{z}_i \text{ for any } i \in [n].$$

Definition 2.8. Let $n \ge 2, \preceq$ be an admissible order w.r.t. \preceq_p , and K be a bounded set w.r.t. \preceq_p with the least element **0** and the greatest element **1**. A mapping Ag: $\mathsf{K}^n \to \mathsf{K}$ is called an (n-ary) K-valued aggregation function w.r.t. \leq if it satisfies the following monotonicity condition:

$$\operatorname{Ag}(\mathbf{X}) \preceq \operatorname{Ag}(\mathbf{Z})$$
 if $\mathbf{X} \preceq_{(n)} \mathbf{Z}$,

and meets the boundary conditions:

$$Ag(\mathbf{0},\ldots,\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{and} \quad Ag(\mathbf{1},\ldots,\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}.$$
 (1)

Putting $\mathsf{K} = [0,1]$ and \leq in place of \leq in Definition 2.8, we get the well-known definition of the real-valued aggregation function (see [15]). If we consider the set $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$ with the partial order \leq_{Int} we recover the concept of an interval-valued (IV, for short) aggregation function (see [4]). In the case of $\mathsf{K} = [0,1]^k$, to the best of our knowledge, the definition of the vectorvalued (VV, for short) aggregation function as a special form of Definition 2.8 has not yet been considered in the literature (although a definition of the monotonicity w.r.t. the admissible order \leq has been introduced in [38, Def. 4.5]). On the other hand, in the case of the k-dimensional upper simplex $\mathsf{K} = \{(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \mid 0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \ldots \leq x_k \leq 1\}$ such a definition has been implemented in the context of k-dimensional fuzzy sets (see [33, Def. 7]).

2.4. K-valued dissimilarity function

Definition 2.9. Let \leq be an admissible order w.r.t. \leq_p and K be a bounded set w.r.t. \leq_p with the least element **0** and the greatest element **1**. A function d: $K^2 \rightarrow K$ is said to be a K-valued dissimilarity function w.r.t. \leq if for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in K$, it satisfies the following conditions:

- (a) $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = d(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}),$
- (b) d(0, 1) = 1,
- (c) $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$,
- (d) if $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{z}$, then $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ and $d(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \leq d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$.

For $\mathsf{K} = [0, 1]$ we get the definition of the *real-valued dissimilarity function* proposed in [10], while for $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$ we recover the definition of the *IV dissimilarity function* introduced in [39]. These functions are designed to quantify the dissimilarity between two input values in various settings where the difference causes problems [14].

3. Main results

From now on, we assume that a set $K \subseteq U$ is bounded w.r.t. a partial order \leq_p with the least element **0** and the greatest element **1** such that $\mathbf{0} \prec_p \mathbf{1}$ and that \leq is an admissible order w.r.t. \leq_p .

By **M** we denote the set of all *capacities* on [n], i.e., the set functions $\mu: 2^{[n]} \to [0, 1]$ satisfying $\mu(C) \leq \mu(D)$ whenever $C \subset D \subseteq [n]$ with $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\mu([n]) = 1$. A permutation σ of [n] is called *admissible w.r.t.* \preceq for $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ if $\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(1)} \preceq \ldots \preceq \mathbf{x}_{\sigma(n)}$. For a fixed $\mathbf{X} \in \mathsf{K}^n$, by $\Pi_{\mathbf{X}}$ we denote the set of all admissible permutations w.r.t. \preceq . Clearly, $\Pi_{\mathbf{X}} \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 3.1. Let L: $\mathsf{K}^2 \times [0,1]^2 \to \mathsf{K}$. The *Choquet-like operator* w.r.t. $\preceq (\mathcal{C}_{\preceq} \text{-} operator, in short)$ of $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ and $\mu \in \mathbf{M}$ is defined as follows

$$\mathcal{C}_{\preceq,\sigma,\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{X},\mu) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i)}, \mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i-1)}, \mu(B_{\sigma(i)}), \mu(B_{\sigma(i+1)})),$$
(2)

where $\sigma \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}$, $\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(0)} = \mathbf{0}$, $B_{\sigma(i)} = \{\sigma(i), \dots, \sigma(n)\}$ for $i \in [n]$, and $B_{\sigma(n+1)} = \emptyset$. Hereafter, $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{z}_{i} = \mathbf{z}_{1} \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbf{z}_{n}$.

For $U = \mathbb{R}_+$, K = [0, 1], and $\oplus = +$, the \mathcal{C}_{\leq} -operator is called the fuzzy extended Choquet-like operator in [9].

Remark 3.2. For a fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if \leq_{p} is compatible with \oplus , we have

$$\underbrace{\underbrace{\mathbf{0}\oplus\ldots\oplus\mathbf{0}}_{n}}_{n} \preceq_{\mathrm{p}} \mathcal{C}_{\preceq,\sigma,\mathrm{L}}(\mathbf{X},\mu) \preceq_{\mathrm{p}} \underbrace{\mathbf{1}\oplus\ldots\oplus\mathbf{1}}_{n}$$

for any $\mathbf{X}, \mu, \sigma, \mathbf{L}$.

Notable examples of the C_{\leq} - operator, as explored in the literature [9, 13, 28, 39], arise for:

- (a) $L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, b_1, b_2) = G(\mathbf{x}_1, b_1, b_2),$
- (b) $L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, b_1, b_2) = G(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, b_1).$

In these cases we obtain $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{I}}_{\preceq}$ - operator and $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{II}}_{\preceq}$ - operator, respectively,

$$\mathcal{C}_{\preceq,\sigma,\mathrm{G}}^{\mathrm{I}}(\mathbf{X},\mu) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{G}(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i)},\mu(B_{\sigma(i)}),\mu(B_{\sigma(i+1)})),$$
$$\mathcal{C}_{\preceq,\sigma,\mathrm{G}}^{\mathrm{II}}(\mathbf{X},\mu) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{G}(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i)},\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i-1)},\mu(B_{\sigma(i)})).$$

For the sake of brevity, when considering $\mathsf{K} = [0, 1]$, $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$, or $\mathsf{K} = [0,1]^k$, we will assume the natural partial orders given in Example 2.1, as well as U with \oplus given in Table 1. For example, if $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$, then $\mathsf{U} = \mathsf{Int}_{\mathbb{R}_+}$, $\preceq_{\mathsf{p}} = \preceq_{\mathrm{Int}}$, and $\oplus = \oplus_{\mathrm{iv}}$.

Remark 3.3. We will now give a brief overview of what has been done for the $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{I}}_{\leq}$ -operator and the $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{II}}_{\leq}$ -operator from the perspective of K-valued aggregation functions, along with some applications.

- (a) Consider K = [0, 1]. The properties of the C^I_≤ and C^{II}_≤ operators, such as well-definedness and monotonicity, have been investigated in [8, 9]. In [8], the authors characterized all functions G for which these operators qualify as real-valued aggregation functions. In particular, they provided characterizations for certain cases: (i) for the C^I_≤ operator with G(a, b₁, b₂) = F(a, b₁ b₂) for b₁ ≥ b₂ (as examined in [23]), and (ii) for the C^{II}_≤ operator with G(a₁, a₂, b) = F(a₁ a₂, b) for a₁ ≥ a₂ (as studied in [30, 32]). Characterizations have also been developed for other special cases of the C^{II}_≤ operator, including the CQO-integral [2], n-ary discrete Choquet integral [14], C_T-integral [19], CC-integral [28], and CO-integral [29]. These operators can be used for example in: multi-layer classifier ensembles [2], image reduction [18], multimodal fuzzy fusion decision [26], fuzzy rule-based classification systems [29, 30], and the classification of reflectance measurements from hyperspectral images of grapes [31].
- (b) For $L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, b_1, b_2) = P(d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2), b_1)$ with $P: \mathsf{K} \times [0, 1] \to \mathsf{K}$, $d: \mathsf{K}^2 \to \mathsf{K}$ such that $P(\mathbf{0}, c) = \mathbf{0}$ and $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ for any \mathbf{x}, c , we get a special case of the *n*-ary discrete d_G -Choquet integral defined in [39, Def. 3.1]. For $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$ and d being an IV dissimilarity function, the authors in [39] provided the condition under which the *n*-ary discrete d_G -Choquet integral qualifies as an *n*-ary IV aggregation function w.r.t. $\leq_{(\alpha,\beta)}$, cf. Section 4.2.1. This approach is applied to aggregate the decisions made by multiple classifiers.
- (c) Let $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$ and $\mathsf{G}(\mathbf{x}, b_1, b_2) = (b_1 b_2)_+ \odot_{iv} \mathbf{x}$, where \odot_{iv} is defined in Table 2 (see Section 4.1.1) and $b_+ = \max\{b, 0\}$. The $\mathcal{C}_{\preceq_{A,B}}^{\mathsf{I}}$ -operator is the $\preceq_{A,B}$ -Choquet integral [13, 35], where the admissible order $\preceq_{A,B}$ w.r.t. \preceq_{Int} on $\mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$ is defined in [12, Prop. 3.2]. In [7, Ex. 3.11] it was shown, that the $\mathcal{C}_{\preceq}^{\mathsf{I}}$ -operator with an admissible order \preceq w.r.t. \preceq_{Int} is the special case of IVCSO \preceq .
- (d) If we assume that $\mathsf{K} = [0,1]^k$ with $k \ge 2$ and $\mathsf{L}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, b_1, b_2) = (b_1 b_2)_+ \odot_{vv} \mathbf{x}_1$, where \odot_{vv} is defined in Table 2 (see Section 4.1.1), we get a vector-valued Choquet-like operator that has not been considered in the literature. Another type of Choquet-like operator for vector-valued data has been studied in [20].

We will now characterize the conditions under which the \mathcal{C}_{\preceq} -operator is well defined. This property will be crucial in determining the conditions for the monotonicity of the operator. Applying the above results, in the next section we will give necessary and sufficient conditions for the \mathcal{C}_{\preceq} -operator to be a K-valued aggregation function w.r.t. \preceq .

3.1. Well-definedness

The \mathcal{C}_{\preceq} -operator is said to be *well defined* if, for any fixed $\mathbf{X} \in \mathsf{K}^n$ and $\mu \in \mathbf{M}$ formula (2) yields the same value for all $\sigma \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}$.

Theorem 3.4. Assume that \oplus satisfies the cancellation law.

• The C_{\prec} - operator with n = 2 is well defined if and only if

(WD2) $[0,1] \ni c \mapsto L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}, 1, c) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, c, 0)$ is a constant function for any $\mathbf{x} \in K$.

- The C_{\preceq} operator with n = 3 is well defined if and only if
 - $(WD3) \ [b,1] \ni c \mapsto L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}, 1, c) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, c, b) \ and \ [0,b] \ni c \mapsto L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, b, c) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1, c, 0)$ $are \ constant \ functions \ for \ any \ \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathsf{K}, \ \mathbf{x}_2 \preceq \mathbf{x}_1, \ and \ b \in [0,1].$
- The \mathcal{C}_{\preceq} operator with $n \ge 4$ is well defined if and only if
 - (WDn) $[b_2, b_1] \ni c \mapsto L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, b_1, c) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1, c, b_2)$ is a constant function for any $\mathbf{x}_2 \preceq \mathbf{x}_1$ and $b_2 \leqslant b_1$.

The proof of Theorem 3.4 is postponed to Appendix A.

3.2. Monotonicity

In this part we provide a complete characterization of the following monotonicity condition for the C_{\preceq} - operator

(M) if $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} \in \mathsf{K}^n$ and $\mathbf{X} \preceq_{(n)} \mathbf{Z}$, then $\mathcal{C}_{\preceq,\sigma,\mathsf{L}}(\mathbf{X},\mu) \preceq \mathcal{C}_{\preceq,\tau,\mathsf{L}}(\mathbf{Z},\mu)$ for any $\sigma \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}, \tau \in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$, and $\mu \in \mathbf{M}$.

Definition 3.5. We say that a function $H: K_0 \to U$, where $K_0 \subseteq K$, is *non-decreasing w.r.t.* \preceq if $H(\mathbf{x}_1) \preceq H(\mathbf{x}_2)$ for $\mathbf{x}_1 \preceq \mathbf{x}_2$.

 $\mathrm{Let}\ [\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}]=\{\mathbf{x}\in U\colon \mathbf{u}\preceq \mathbf{x}\preceq \mathbf{v}\}\ \mathrm{with}\ \mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\in U.\ \mathrm{Denote}\ \mathrm{by}\ [\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}}=[\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}]\cap\mathsf{K}.$

We distinguish three cases: n = 2, n = 3, and $n \ge 4$. Proofs of the corresponding theorems are given in Appendix B.

Theorem 3.6. Let n = 2. Assume that \prec is compatible with \oplus . The monotonicity condition (M) holds if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (a) the C_{\prec} operator is well defined,
- (b) $[\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}, 1, b) \oplus \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, b, 0)$ is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. \preceq for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathsf{K}$ and $b \in [0, 1]$,
- (c) $[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{K}} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, b, 0)$ is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. \preceq for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathsf{K}$ and $b \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem 3.7. Let n = 3. Assume that \prec is compatible with \oplus . The monotonicity condition (M) is true if and only if

- (a) the C_{\prec} operator is well defined,
- (b) [0, v]_K ∋ x → L(x, 0, 1, b₁) ⊕ L(v, x, b₁, b₂) is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. ≤ for any
 v ∈ K and b₂ ≤ b₁,
- (c) $[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, b_1, b_2) \oplus \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, b_2, 0)$ is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. \preceq for any $\mathbf{u} \preceq \mathbf{v}$ and $b_2 \leqslant b_1$,
- (d) $[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{K}} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, b, 0)$ is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. \preceq for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathsf{K}$ and $b \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem 3.8. Let $n \ge 4$. Assume that \prec is compatible with \oplus . The monotonicity condition (M) is true if and only if

- (a) the \mathcal{C}_{\preceq} operator is well defined,
- (b) $[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, b_1, b_2) \oplus \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, b_2, b_3)$ is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. \preceq for any $\mathbf{u} \preceq \mathbf{v}$ and $b_3 \leqslant b_2 \leqslant b_1$,
- (c) $[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{K}} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, b, 0)$ is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. \preceq for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathsf{K}$ and $b \in [0, 1]$.

Remark 3.9. By Lemma 2.7 (a), condition (a) of Theorems 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8, respectively, is equivalent to (WD2), (WD3), and (WDn).

4. Relationship to the K-valued aggregation function

According to Definition 2.8, the C_{\leq} -operator is a K-valued aggregation function if it satisfies the monotonicity condition (M), which is characterized in Theorems 3.6-3.8, and the boundary conditions (1).

Theorem 4.1. Let $n \in \{2, 3, ...\}$. Assume that \prec is compatible with \oplus . The C_{\preceq} - operator is an n-ary K-valued aggregation function w.r.t. \preceq if and only if the following conditions hold:

(a) for n = 2, n = 3, and $n \ge 4$, respectively, the conditions of Theorems 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8 characterizing the monotonicity of the C_{\prec} - operator are satisfied,

(b) $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} L(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, b_{i}, b_{i+1}) = \mathbf{0}$ for any $0 = b_{n+1} \leq b_n \leq \ldots \leq b_2 \leq b_1 = 1$, (c) $L(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{0}, b_1, b_2) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=2}^{n} L(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, b_i, b_{i+1}) = \mathbf{1}$ for any $0 = b_{n+1} \leq b_n \leq \ldots \leq b_2 \leq b_1 = 1$.

Remark 4.2. If we additionally assume that $\mathbf{0} \oplus \mathbf{0} \in \mathsf{K}$, then it follows from Lemma 2.7 (c) that condition (b) of Theorem 4.1 can be simplified to the condition: $L(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, b_1, b_2) = \mathbf{0}$ for any $b_2 \leq b_1$.

In Sections 4.1 and 4.2, we will present specific results regarding two significant operators: the C_{\leq}^{I} -operator and the C_{\leq}^{II} -operator.

4.1. $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{I}}_{\prec}$ - operator

Recall that the $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{I}}_{\preceq}$ - operator has the form

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{I}}_{\preceq,\sigma,\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{X},\mu) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i)},\mu(B_{\sigma(i)}),\mu(B_{\sigma(i+1)})),$$

where G: $\mathsf{K} \times [0,1]^2 \to \mathsf{K}$ and $\sigma \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}$.

Corollary 4.3. Assume that \prec is compatible with \oplus . The $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{I}}_{\preceq}$ - operator is an n-ary K-valued aggregation function w.r.t. \preceq if and only if the following conditions hold:

- for n=2:
 - (a) $[0,1] \ni c \mapsto G(\mathbf{x},1,c) \oplus G(\mathbf{x},c,0)$ is a constant function for any $\mathbf{x} \in K$,
 - (b) $\mathsf{K} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathsf{G}(\mathbf{x}, 1, b)$ and $\mathsf{K} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathsf{G}(\mathbf{x}, b, 0)$ are non-decreasing functions w.r.t. \preceq for any $b \in [0, 1]$,
 - (c) $G(0,1,b) \oplus G(0,b,0) = 0$ for any $b \in [0,1]$,
 - (d) $G(1,1,b) \oplus G(1,b,0) = 1$ for any $b \in [0,1]$.
- for n = 3:
 - (a) $[b,1] \ni c \mapsto G(\mathbf{x},1,c) \oplus G(\mathbf{x},c,b)$ and $[0,b] \ni c \mapsto G(\mathbf{x},b,c) \oplus G(\mathbf{x},c,0)$ are constant functions for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathsf{K}$ and $b \in [0,1]$,
 - (b) $\mathsf{K} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathrm{G}(\mathbf{x}, b_1, b_2)$ is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. \preceq for any $b_2 \leqslant b_1$,
 - (c) $G(\mathbf{0}, 1, b_1) \oplus G(\mathbf{0}, b_1, b_2) \oplus G(\mathbf{0}, b_2, 0) = \mathbf{0}$ for any $b_2 \leq b_1$,
 - (d) $G(1,1,b_1) \oplus G(1,b_1,b_2) \oplus G(1,b_2,0) = 1$ for any $b_2 \leq b_1$.
- for $n \ge 4$:
 - (a) $[b_2, b_1] \ni c \mapsto G(\mathbf{x}, b_1, c) \oplus G(\mathbf{x}, c, b_2)$ is a constant function for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathsf{K}$ and $b_2 \leq b_1$,

(b) $\mathsf{K} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathsf{G}(\mathbf{x}, b_1, b_2)$ is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. \preceq for any $b_2 \leqslant b_1$, (c) $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathsf{G}(\mathbf{0}, b_i, b_{i+1}) = \mathbf{0}$ for any $0 = b_{n+1} \leqslant b_n \leqslant \ldots \leqslant b_2 \leqslant b_1 = 1$, (d) $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathsf{G}(\mathbf{1}, b_i, b_{i+1}) = \mathbf{1}$ for any $0 = b_{n+1} \leqslant b_n \leqslant \ldots \leqslant b_2 \leqslant b_1 = 1$.

PROOF. Consider the case n = 2. Obviously, conditions (c) and (d) are equivalent to (b) and (c) of Theorem 4.1. In view of Remark 3.9, condition (a) is equivalent to condition (WD2) of Theorem 3.4. From Definition 2.3 and Lemma 2.7 (b) it follows that condition (b) corresponds to conditions (b) and (c) of Theorem 3.6. The statements for n = 3 and $n \ge 4$ can be proved similarly.

Putting K = [0, 1] in Corollary 4.3, we get a refinement for n = 3 of Theorem 2.4 from [8]. In the next two sections, namely 4.1.2 and 4.1.1, we will look at two special forms of the function G.

4.1.1. $G(\mathbf{x}, b_1, b_2) = \delta(b_1, b_2) \odot \mathbf{x}$

In this section, we assume that $G(\mathbf{x}, b_1, b_2) = \delta(b_1, b_2) \odot \mathbf{x}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathsf{K}$ and $b_2 \leq b_1$, where δ is a real-valued dissimilarity function (see Definition 2.9) and $\odot : [0, 1] \times \mathsf{K} \to \mathsf{U}$ is an operation, called the *multiplication*, satisfying the following conditions:

- (a) $1 \odot \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$ for any \mathbf{x} ,
- (b) $c \odot \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$ for any c.

Examples of multiplication operations for the universal sets discussed in Example 2.1 are given in Table 2.

U	К	\odot	$c\odot {f z}$
\mathbb{R}_+	[0,1]		$c \cdot z = cz$ (standard multiplication)
$Int_{\mathbb{R}_+}$	$Int_{[0,1]}$	\odot_{iv}	$c \odot_{\mathrm{iv}} [z^l, z^u] = [cz^l, cz^u]$
\mathbb{R}^k_+	$[0, 1]^k$	$\odot_{\rm vv}$	$c \odot_{\mathrm{vv}} (z_1, \ldots, z_k)^T = (cz_1, \ldots, cz_k)^T$

Table 2: Examples of multiplication operations for selected cases of U.

Before we present a characterization of all real-valued dissimilarity functions for which the C_{\prec}^{I} -operator is a K-valued aggregation function, let us introduce some auxiliary concepts.

Definition 4.4. Let \odot be a multiplication operation.

• A partial order $\leq_{\mathbf{p}}$ is said to be *compatible with* \odot if for all $c \in [0,1]$, $c \odot \mathbf{x} \leq_{\mathbf{p}} c \odot \mathbf{y}$ whenever $\mathbf{x} \leq_{\mathbf{p}} \mathbf{y}$.

- The operation \odot has the *cancellation law*, whenever for any $c_1, c_2 \in [0, 1]$ the condition $c_1 \odot \mathbf{1} = c_2 \odot \mathbf{1}$ implies $c_1 = c_2$.
- The operation ⊙ is right-distributive over ⊕ if (c₁ + c₂) ⊙ x = (c₁ ⊙ x) ⊕ (c₂ ⊙ x) for any x ∈ K and c₁, c₂ ∈ [0, 1].

Corollary 4.5. Let $n \ge 3$, and a multiplication operation \odot is right-distributive over \oplus and has the cancellation law. Assume that \prec is compatible with \oplus and \preceq is compatible with \odot . The $\mathcal{C}^{I}_{\preceq}$ - operator is an n-ary K-valued aggregation function w.r.t. \preceq if and only if

$$\delta(b_1, b_2) = \delta(b_1, 0) - \delta(b_2, 0) \quad \text{for any } b_2 \le b_1.$$
(3)

PROOF. Let us begin with the case $n \ge 4$. The condition (b) of Corollary 4.3 follows from the fact that \preceq is compatible with \odot .

Due to the right-distributivity of \odot , condition (a) of Corollary 4.3 takes the form

$$(\delta(b_1, c) + \delta(c, b_2)) \odot \mathbf{x} = (\delta(b_1, d) + \delta(d, b_2)) \odot \mathbf{x}$$
(4)

for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathsf{K}$, $b_2 \leq c \leq b_1$, and $b_2 \leq d \leq b_1$. Putting $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{1}$ in (4) and using the cancellation law of \odot , we can rewrite condition (a) of Corollary 4.3 as

$$\delta(b_1, c) + \delta(c, b_2) = \delta(b_1, d) + \delta(d, b_2) \quad \text{for any } b_2 \leqslant c \leqslant b_1 \text{ and } b_2 \leqslant d \leqslant b_1.$$
(5)

Taking $b_2 = 0 = c$ yields

$$\delta(b,d) = \delta(b,0) - \delta(d,0) \quad \text{for any } d \le b.$$
(6)

It is clear that (6) implies (5), so these conditions are equivalent to each other.

Because of the right-distributivity of \odot , condition (c) of Corollary 4.3 has form

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta(b_i, b_{i+1})\right) \odot \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$$
 for any $0 = b_{n+1} \leq b_n \leq \ldots \leq b_2 \leq b_1 = 1$.

By (6) and Definition 2.9, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta(b_i, b_{i+1}) = \delta(1, 0) = 1$. From the definition of \odot , it follows that $1 \odot \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$, so condition (c) of Corollary 4.3 is valid. Similarly, it can be shown that condition (d) of Corollary 4.3 also holds. The proof for n = 3 is similar, so we will omit it.

As a direct consequence of Corollary 4.5 we get the following result for $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$.

Corollary 4.6. Let $n \ge 3$ and $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$. Assume that \prec is compatible with \oplus_{iv} and \preceq is compatible with \odot_{iv} . The $\mathcal{C}^{I}_{\preceq}$ -operator

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{I}}_{\preceq,\sigma,\delta}(\mathbf{X},\mu) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{iv} \big(\delta(\mu(B_{\sigma(i)}),\mu(B_{\sigma(i+1)})) \odot_{\mathrm{iv}} \mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i)} \big),$$

where $\mathbf{X}, \mu, \sigma, B_{\sigma(i)}$ are as in (2), is an n-ary IV aggregation function w.r.t. \leq if and only if (3) holds.

Remark 4.7. Clearly, $\prec_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ is compatible with \oplus_{iv} and $\preceq_{(\alpha,\beta)}$ is compatible with \odot_{iv} . Since \oplus_{iv} has the cancellation law, due to Lemmas 2.5 - 2.6, \preceq is compatible with \oplus_{iv} , and \prec is compatible with \oplus_{iv} and \neg is compatible with \oplus_{iv} and \odot_{iv} is the only admissible order that is compatible with \oplus_{iv} and \odot_{iv} is the (α,β) -order. Hence, if $\delta(b_1,b_2) = b_1 - b_2$ for $b_2 \leq b_1$, then the only functions $A, B \colon [0,1]^2 \to [0,1]$ for which the $\preceq_{A,B}$ -Choquet integral¹ is an IV aggregation function w.r.t. $\preceq_{A,B}$ within the class of admissible orders $\preceq_{A,B}$ compatible with \oplus_{iv} and \odot_{iv} are $A(x,y) = (1-\alpha)x + \alpha y$ and $B(x,y) = (1-\beta)x + \beta y$ with $\alpha, \beta \in [0,1]$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$.

We conclude this section with the following direct consequence of Corollary 4.5 for $\mathsf{K} = [0, 1]^k$.

Corollary 4.8. Let $n \ge 3$ and $\mathsf{K} = [0,1]^k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that \prec is compatible with \oplus_{vv} and \preceq is compatible with $\odot = \odot_{vv}$. The $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{I}}_{\preceq}$ -operator is an n-ary VV aggregation function w.r.t. \preceq if and only if (3) holds.

For k = 1 we get Corollary 2.7 from [8].

4.1.2. $G(\mathbf{x}, b_1, b_2) = F(\mathbf{x}, b_1 - b_2)$

In this part, we assume that $G(\mathbf{x}, b_1, b_2) = F(\mathbf{x}, b_1 - b_2)$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in K$ and $b_1 \ge b_2$ with $F: K \times [0, 1] \to K$. From Corollary 4.3 for $n \ge 3$ and Remark 4.2 we obtain the following result.

Corollary 4.9. Assume that $n \ge 3$, $\mathbf{0} \oplus \mathbf{0} \in \mathsf{K}$, and \prec is compatible with \oplus . The $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{I}}_{\preceq}$ -operator is an n-ary K-valued aggregation function w.r.t. \preceq if and only if the following conditions hold:

- (a) $F(\mathbf{x}, a) \oplus F(\mathbf{x}, b) = F(\mathbf{x}, 0.5(a+b)) \oplus F(\mathbf{x}, 0.5(a+b))$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in K$ and $a, b \in [0, 1]$,
- (b) $\mathsf{K} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathsf{F}(\mathbf{x}, b)$ is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. \preceq for any $b \in [0, 1]$,
- (c) $F(\mathbf{0}, b) = \mathbf{0}$ for any $b \in [0, 1]$,
- (d) $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} F(\mathbf{1}, b_i) = \mathbf{1}$ for all $b_1, \ldots, b_n \in [0, 1]$ such that $b_1 + \ldots + b_n = 1$.

Let $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$. Then there exist $\mathsf{F}^l, \mathsf{F}^u \colon \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]} \times [0,1] \to [0,1]$ such that $\mathsf{F}^l \leqslant \mathsf{F}^u$ and $\mathsf{F}(\mathbf{x},b) = [\mathsf{F}^l(\mathbf{x},b), \mathsf{F}^u(\mathbf{x},b)]$. Thus Corollary 4.9 (a) takes the form of two Jensen equations:

$$F^{i}(\mathbf{x}, a) + F^{i}(\mathbf{x}, b) = 2F^{i}(\mathbf{x}, 0.5(a+b)), \quad i \in \{l, u\},\$$

¹see [13, Def. 4]

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$ and $a, b \in [0,1]$. Since $c \mapsto F^i(\mathbf{x}, c)$ is bounded for each \mathbf{x} , by [25, Sec. 1], we have

$$\mathbf{F}^{i}(\mathbf{x}, a) = aC^{i}(\mathbf{x}) + D^{i}(\mathbf{x}), \qquad i \in \{l, u\},$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$, $a \in [0,1]$, and some $C^i, D^i \colon \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]} \to [0,1]$ such that $aC^l(\mathbf{x}) + D^l(\mathbf{x}) \leq aC^u(\mathbf{x}) + D^u(\mathbf{x})$. Combining the above with points (b)-(d) of Corollary 4.9, we get the following result.

Corollary 4.10. Let $n \ge 3$ and $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$. Assume that \prec is compatible with \oplus_{iv} . The $\mathcal{C}^{I}_{\preceq}$ -operator is an n-ary IV aggregation function w.r.t. \preceq if and only if

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, a) = [aC^{l}(\mathbf{x}) + D^{l}(\mathbf{x}), aC^{u}(\mathbf{x}) + D^{u}(\mathbf{x})]$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$ and $a \in [0,1]$ with some functions $C^i, D^i \colon \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]} \to [0,1]$ for $i \in \{l, u\}$ such that:

- $aC^{l}(\mathbf{x}) + D^{l}(\mathbf{x}) \leq aC^{u}(\mathbf{x}) + D^{u}(\mathbf{x})$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$ and $a \in [0,1]$,
- $\operatorname{Int}_{[0,1]} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto aC^{i}(\mathbf{x}) + D^{i}(\mathbf{x}), i \in \{l, u\}, are non-decreasing functions w.r.t. \preceq$
- $C^{i}(\mathbf{0}) = D^{i}(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ and $C^{i}(\mathbf{1}) + nD^{i}(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ for $i \in \{l, u\}$, where $\mathbf{0} = [0, 0]$ and $\mathbf{1} = [1, 1]$.

Using the same arguments as for $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$, we obtain from Corollary 4.9 the result for $\mathsf{K} = [0,1]^k$.

Corollary 4.11. Let $n \ge 3$ and $\mathsf{K} = [0,1]^k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that \prec is compatible with \oplus_{vv} . The $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{I}}_{\prec}$ -operator is an n-ary VV aggregation function w.r.t. \preceq if and only if

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, a) = (aC_1(\mathbf{x}) + D_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, aC_k(\mathbf{x}) + D_k(\mathbf{x}))^T$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in [0,1]^k$ and $a \in [0,1]$ with some functions $C_i, D_i: [0,1]^k \to [0,1]$ such that:

- $[0,1]^k \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto aC_i(\mathbf{x}) + D_i(\mathbf{x}), \ i \in [k], \ are \ non-decreasing \ functions \ w.r.t. \preceq,$
- $C_i(\mathbf{0}) = D_i(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ and $C_i(\mathbf{1}) + nD_i(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ for $i \in [k]$ with $\mathbf{0} = (0, \dots, 0)^T$ and $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^T$.

Note that for k = 1 we recover Corollary 2.6 from [8].

4.2. $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{II}}_{\preceq}$ - operator

We will now examine the conditions that characterize the C^{II}_{\leq} - operator as a K-valued aggregation function. Recall that the C^{II}_{\leq} - operator is of the form

$$\mathcal{C}_{\preceq,\sigma,\mathbf{G}}^{\mathrm{II}}(\mathbf{X},\mu) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i)},\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i-1)},\mu(B_{\sigma(i)})),$$

where $G: \mathsf{K}^2 \times [0,1] \to \mathsf{K}$ and $\sigma \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}$.

Corollary 4.12. Assume that \prec is compatible with \oplus . The $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{II}}_{\preceq}$ - operator is an n-ary K-valued aggregation function w.r.t. \preceq if and only if the following conditions are met:

- for n = 2:
 - (a) $G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, b) = G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, 0)$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in K$ and $b \in [0, 1]$,
 - (b) $[\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathrm{G}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}, 1) \oplus \mathrm{G}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, b)$ is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. \preceq for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathsf{K}$ and $b \in [0, 1]$,
 - (c) $[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{K}} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, b)$ is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. \preceq for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathsf{K}$ and $b \in [0, 1]$,
 - (d) $G(0, 0, 0) \oplus G(0, 0, 0) = 0$,
 - (e) $G(1,0,1) \oplus G(1,1,0) = 1$.
- for $n \ge 3$:
 - (a) $G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, b) = G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, 0)$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in K$ and $b \in [0, 1]$,
 - (b) $[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathrm{G}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, b_1) \oplus \mathrm{G}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}, b_2)$ is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. \preceq for any $\mathbf{u} \preceq \mathbf{v}$ and $b_2 \leqslant b_1$,
 - (c) $[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{K}} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, b)$ is a non-decreasing function w.r.t. \preceq for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathsf{K}$ and $b \in [0, 1]$,
 - (d) $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0},0) = \mathbf{0},$
 - (e) $G(1,0,1) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=2}^{n} G(1,1,0) = 1.$

PROOF. To prove these statements, we use Theorem 4.1 with $L(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, b_1, b_2) = G(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, b_1)$. Let n = 2. It follows from Remark 3.9 that condition (a) is equivalent to condition (a) of Theorem 3.6. Conditions (b) and (c) represent conditions (b) and (c) of Theorem 3.6, while, by (a), conditions (d) and (e) are equivalent to conditions (b) and (c) of Theorem 4.1. Similarly, one can prove the statements for n = 3 and $n \ge 4$, and observe that they are identical. 4.2.1. $G(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, b) = b \odot d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$

We now consider $G(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, b) = b \odot d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$ for $\mathbf{x}_2 \leq \mathbf{x}_1$, where d is a K-valued dissimilarity function (see Definition 2.9) and \odot is a multiplication operation (see Section 4.1.1). We will need the following assumption

(C1)
$$(b_1 \odot \mathbf{u}_1) \oplus (b_2 \odot \mathbf{v}_2) \preceq (b_1 \odot \mathbf{u}_2) \oplus (b_2 \odot \mathbf{v}_1)$$
 for any $b_i \in [0, 1]$ and $\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{v}_i \in \mathsf{K}$ such that $b_2 \leq b_1, \mathbf{u}_1 \preceq \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_1 \preceq \mathbf{v}_2$, and $\mathbf{u}_1 \oplus \mathbf{v}_2 = \mathbf{u}_2 \oplus \mathbf{v}_1 \in \mathsf{K}$.

We say that a multiplication operation \odot is *left-distributive over* \oplus if $c \odot (\mathbf{x} \oplus \mathbf{z}) = (c \odot \mathbf{x}) \oplus (c \odot \mathbf{z})$ for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathsf{K}$ and $c \in [0, 1]$ such that $\mathbf{x} \oplus \mathbf{z} \in \mathsf{K}$.

Corollary 4.13. Let $n \ge 3$, \odot be left-distributive over \oplus , and $\mathbf{0} \oplus \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathsf{K}$. Assume that (C1) holds, \prec is compatible with \oplus and \preceq is compatible with \odot . The $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{II}}_{\preceq}$ - operator is an n-ary K-valued aggregation function w.r.t. \preceq if and only if

$$d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{0}) \oplus d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1) = d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{0}) \qquad \text{for any } \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathsf{K} \text{ such that } \mathbf{x}_1 \preceq \mathbf{x}_2. \tag{7}$$

PROOF. Conditions (a), (d), and (e) of Corollary 4.12 are satisfied in view of definitions of the K-valued dissimilarity function and the operation \odot . Point (c) of Corollary 4.12 follows from Definition 2.9 (d) and the fact that \preceq is compatible with \odot . Point (b) of Corollary 4.12 takes the form

$$(b_1 \odot d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{u})) \oplus (b_2 \odot d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_1)) \preceq (b_1 \odot d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{u})) \oplus (b_2 \odot d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_2))$$
(8)

for any $b_2 \leq b_1$ and $\mathbf{x}_1 \leq \mathbf{x}_2$ such that $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in [\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}}$. We now show that (8) is equivalent to (7).

" \Rightarrow " Putting $b_1 = b_2 = 1$ in (8) and using the fact that $1 \odot \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$ for any \mathbf{x} we have

$$d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{u}) \oplus d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_1) \preceq d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{u}) \oplus d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_2)$$
(9)

for any $\mathbf{x}_1 \leq \mathbf{x}_2$ such that $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in [\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}}$. Putting $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{0}$ in (9) gives $d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{0}) \leq d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{0}) \oplus d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_2)$ for any $\mathbf{x}_2 \in [\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}}$, as $\mathbf{0} \oplus \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathsf{K}$. Setting $\mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ in (9) yields $d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{0}) \oplus d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_1) \leq d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{0})$ for any $\mathbf{x}_1 \in [\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}}$, as $\mathbf{x} \oplus \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{x}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathsf{K}$. So by the transitivity of \leq , we get (7).

" \Leftarrow " From (7) we have

$$d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{0}) \oplus d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_1) = d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{0}) \oplus d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_2)$$
(10)

for any $\mathbf{x}_1 \leq \mathbf{x}_2$ such that $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in [\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}}$. Additionally, from (7) we know that the left and right hand side of (10) is an element of K . Since $d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{0}) \leq d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{0})$ and $d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_2) \leq d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_1)$ for any $\mathbf{x}_1 \leq \mathbf{x}_2 \leq \mathbf{v}$, so by (C1) and (10), we have $L \leq P$, where $L = (b_1 \odot d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{0})) \oplus (b_2 \odot d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_1))$ and $P = (b_1 \odot d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{0})) \oplus (b_2 \odot d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_2))$ for any $b_2 \leq b_1$ and $\mathbf{x}_1 \leq \mathbf{x}_2$ such that $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in [\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}}$. Applying (7), we obtain

$$d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{0}) = d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{0}) \oplus d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{u}), \qquad d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{0}) = d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{0}) \oplus d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{u})$$
(11)

for any $\mathbf{x}_1 \leq \mathbf{x}_2$ such that $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in [\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{1}]_{\mathsf{K}}$. Using (11) and the left-distributivity of \odot , we get

$$L = (b_1 \odot d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{0})) \oplus (b_1 \odot d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{u})) \oplus (b_2 \odot d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_1)),$$
(12)

$$P = (b_1 \odot d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{0})) \oplus (b_1 \odot d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{u})) \oplus (b_2 \odot d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_2))$$
(13)

for any $b_2 \leq b_1$ and $\mathbf{x}_1 \leq \mathbf{x}_2$ such that $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in [\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}}$. Combining (12) - (13) with Lemma 2.7 (b) we obtain (8) for any $b_2 \leq b_1$ and $\mathbf{x}_1 \leq \mathbf{x}_2$ such that $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in [\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]_{\mathsf{K}}$.

If $\mathsf{K} = [0, 1]$, then we recover Corollary 3.9 from [8]. The case when $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$ and the admissible order is the (α, β) -order (see Remark 4.7) is summarized below.

Corollary 4.14. Let $n \ge 3$ and $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$. The following conditions are equivalent.

- (a) The $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{II}}_{\preceq_{(\alpha,\beta)}}$ operator is an n-ary IV aggregation function w.r.t. $\preceq_{(\alpha,\beta)}$.
- (b) $d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{0}) \oplus_{iv} d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1) = d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{0})$ for any $\mathbf{x}_1 \preceq_{(\alpha, \beta)} \mathbf{x}_2$.
- (c) For each $k \in [n]$ it holds

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{k} \mathrm{d}(\mathbf{x}_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_{i}) \preceq_{(\alpha, \beta)} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{k} \mathrm{d}(\mathbf{z}_{i-1}, \mathbf{z}_{i})$$

for all $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ such that $\mathbf{x}_1 \preceq_{(\alpha,\beta)} \dots \preceq_{(\alpha,\beta)} \mathbf{x}_k$, $\mathbf{z}_1 \preceq_{(\alpha,\beta)} \dots \preceq_{(\alpha,\beta)} \mathbf{z}_k$ and $\mathbf{x}_1 \preceq_{(\alpha,\beta)} \mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k \preceq_{(\alpha,\beta)} \mathbf{z}_k$ with $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{z}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, where here $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_1 \oplus_{\mathrm{iv}} \dots \oplus_{\mathrm{iv}} \mathbf{x}_k$.

PROOF. The equivalence of conditions (a) and (b) follows from Corollary 4.13 with $K = Int_{[0,1]}$. The equivalence of (a) and (c) can be established using Proposition 5.3 and Theorem 5.5 of [39].

The authors of [39] claim that it is a difficult task to find an IV dissimilarity function d that satisfies point (c) of Corollary 4.14. In Appendix C, we show that there is no such function in a certain subclass of IV dissimilarity functions considered in [39, Prop. 4.18].

5. Conclusion

In this article, we have introduced the Choquet-like operator, which is a generalization of the classical discrete Choquet integral to a multivalued setting in terms of a general function that replaces subtraction and multiplication, and an admissible order that refines the natural partial order on the data set under consideration. The new operator takes an input consisting of a finite number of values from the data set and returns a single output value belonging to that set. We have characterized the class of all functions for which the Choquet-like operator is invariant with respect to permutations of the input data, and then provided necessary and sufficient conditions for the operator to exhibit monotonicity with respect to the admissible order, as well as a complete characterization of the operator as an aggregation function with respect to the admissible order. We have also studied two important special types of the Choquet-like operator and a number of their particular forms, both considered and not considered in the literature, for data of general type as well as for scalar, interval, and vector data. In particular, we have shown that the only order in a certain class of admissible orders for which the $\preceq_{A,B}$ -Choquet integral defined in [13, Def. 4] is an interval-valued aggregation function with respect to $\preceq_{A,B}$, is the (α, β) -order.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

Appendix A

To shorten notation, from now on we will write $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma}(\mathbf{x},\mu)$ instead of $\mathcal{C}_{\preceq,\sigma,\mathrm{L}}(\mathbf{x},\mu)$.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.4. " \Rightarrow " Let $\mu \in \mathbf{M}$. Take $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ such that $\mathbf{x}_m = \mathbf{x}_l = \mathbf{x}$ for some distinct $m, l \in [n]$. Then there are two distinct admissible permutations w.r.t. \leq for \mathbf{X} , say σ_1 and σ_2 , which satisfy for some $k \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ the condition that $\mathbf{x}_{\sigma_1(k)} = \mathbf{x}_m$, $\mathbf{x}_{\sigma_1(k-1)} = \mathbf{x}_l, \mathbf{x}_{\sigma_2(k-1)} = \mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{x}_{\sigma_2(k)} = \mathbf{x}_l$ and $\sigma_1(i) = \sigma_2(i)$ for any $i \in [n] \setminus \{k - 1, k\}$. Clearly,

 $B_{\sigma_1(i)} = B_{\sigma_2(i)}$ for each $i \in [n] \setminus \{k\}$. Since, by the assumption, $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_1}(\mathbf{X}, \mu) = \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_2}(\mathbf{X}, \mu)$, applying Definition 3.1 and the cancellation law of \oplus , we get

$$\begin{split} & L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_{\sigma_1(k-2)}, \mu(B_{\sigma_1(k-1)}), \mu(B_{\sigma_1(k)})) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, \mu(B_{\sigma_1(k)}), \mu(B_{\sigma_1(k+1)})) \\ &= L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_{\sigma_1(k-2)}, \mu(B_{\sigma_1(k-1)}), \mu(B_{\sigma_2(k)})) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, \mu(B_{\sigma_2(k)}), \mu(B_{\sigma_1(k+1)})). \end{split}$$

Set $b_i = \mu(B_{\sigma_1(i)})$ and $d_i = \mu(B_{\sigma_2(i)})$ for any $i \in [n+1]$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{k-2} = \mathbf{x}_{\sigma_1(k-2)}$. Clearly, $b_i = d_i$ for any $i \in [n+1] \setminus \{k\}$, $b_{k+1} \leq b_k \leq b_{k-1}$, and $b_{k+1} \leq d_k \leq b_{k-1}$. Hence, for $k \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$,

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{k-2}, b_{k-1}, b_k) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, b_k, b_{k+1}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{k-2}, b_{k-1}, d_k) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, d_k, b_{k+1}),$$
(14)

and consequently $[b_{k+1}, b_{k-1}] \ni c \mapsto L(\mathbf{x}, \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{k-2}, b_{k-1}, c) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, c, b_{k+1})$ is a constant function. Due to the arbitrariness of μ , this leads us to (WD2) for n = 2, (WD3) for n = 3 and (WDn) for $n \ge 4$.

" \Leftarrow " Let $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ be such that there are two permutations $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}, \sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$. This means that there are at least two elements in \mathbf{X} that have the same value, and σ_2 is a permutation that swaps equal elements in the sequence $(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma_1(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{\sigma_1(n)})$. It is evident that σ_2 can be represented as the product of σ_1 and some adjacent transpositions (see [34, p. 631]), say, τ_1, \dots, τ_m with certain $m \ge 1$, that is, $\sigma_2 = \tau_m \circ \ldots \circ \tau_1 \circ \sigma_1$. So, for any $j \in [m], \tau_j$ is the adjacent transposition that exchanges the elements $\mathbf{x}_{\pi_{j-1}(k_j-1)}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{\pi_{j-1}(k_j)}$ equal to each other for some $k_j \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$ in the sequence $(\mathbf{x}_{\pi_{j-1}(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{\pi_{j-1}(n)})$, where $\pi_j = \tau_j \circ \pi_{j-1}$ with $\pi_0 = \sigma_1$. Clearly, $\pi_j \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}$ for $j \in [m]$. By (WD2), (WD3) or (WDn), we get (14) with $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_{\pi_j(k_j-1)}, \ \mathbf{x}_{k-2} = \mathbf{x}_{\pi_j(k_j-2)}, \ b_{k-1} = \mu(B_{\pi_j(k_j-1)}), \ b_k = \mu(B_{\pi_j(k_j)}), \ b_{k+1} = \mu(B_{\pi_j(k_j+1)}),$ and $d_k = \mu(B_{\pi_{j+1}(k_j)})$ for $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$, which implies that $\mathcal{C}_{\pi_j}(\mathbf{X}, \mu) = \mathcal{C}_{\pi_{j+1}}(\mathbf{X}, \mu)$ for $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$. Hence $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_1}(\mathbf{X}, \mu) = \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_2}(\mathbf{X}, \mu)$. This completes the proof.

Appendix B

Below, we will present a proof of the monotonicity characterization for the Choquet-like operator. We will use the convention outlined in Appendix A, and denote by id the identity function on [n]. We shall need an auxiliary result using the following condition:

(M') Assume that $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ are such that $\mathbf{x}_1 \leq \dots \leq \mathbf{x}_n$, $\mathbf{x}_p \prec \mathbf{z}_p$ for some $p \in [n]$ and $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{z}_i$ for any $i \in [n] \setminus \{p\}$. Then $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{X}, \mu) \leq \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z}, \mu)$ for any $\mu \in \mathbf{M}$ and some $\tau \in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$.

Lemma 5.1. Assume that the C_{\leq} - operator is well defined. If condition (M') is true, then condition (M) holds.

PROOF. Let $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ be such that $\mathbf{x}_p \prec \mathbf{z}_p$ for some $p \in [n]$ and $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{z}_i$ for any $i \in [n] \setminus \{p\}$, so $\mathbf{X} \preceq_{(n)} \mathbf{Z}$. Firstly, we show that

$$\mathcal{C}_{\sigma}(\mathbf{X},\mu) \preceq \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z},\mu) \quad \text{for any } \mu \in \mathbf{M}, \ \sigma \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}, \text{ and } \tau \in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}.$$
 (15)

Fix $\mu \in \mathbf{M}$, $\sigma \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}$, and $\tau \in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$. Define $\widehat{\mu} \in \mathbf{M}$ as $\widehat{\mu}(C) = \mu(\{\sigma(i) \mid i \in C\})$ for any $C \subseteq [n]$. Let $\widehat{\mathbf{X}} = (\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}} = (\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ with $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i = \mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i)}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_i = \mathbf{z}_{\sigma(i)}$ for any i. Clearly, $\mathrm{id} \in \Pi_{\widehat{\mathbf{X}}}$. Since $\widehat{\mu}(B_{\mathrm{id}(i)}) = \widehat{\mu}(\{i, \dots, n\}) = \mu(\{\sigma(i), \dots, \sigma(n)\}) = \mu(B_{\sigma(i)})$ for any $i \in [n]$ and $\widehat{\mu}(B_{\mathrm{id}(n+1)}) = \mu(B_{\sigma(n+1)})$, we have

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{id}}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}},\widehat{\mu}) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{L}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{i},\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{i-1},\widehat{\mu}(B_{\mathrm{id}(i)}),\widehat{\mu}(B_{\mathrm{id}(i+1)}))$$
$$= \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i)},\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(i-1)},\mu(B_{\sigma(i)}),\mu(B_{\sigma(i+1)})) = \mathcal{C}_{\sigma}(\mathbf{X},\mu).$$
(16)

Let $\hat{\tau} = \sigma^{-1} \circ \tau$ be the product of σ^{-1} and τ . Observe that $\hat{\tau} \in \Pi_{\hat{\mathbf{Z}}}$, as $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{\hat{\tau}(i)} = \mathbf{z}_{\tau(i)}$ and $\tau \in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$. Then

$$\mathcal{C}_{\widehat{\tau}}(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}},\widehat{\mu}) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{L}(\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\widehat{\tau}(i)}, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{\widehat{\tau}(i-1)}, \widehat{\mu}(B_{\widehat{\tau}(i)}), \widehat{\mu}(B_{\widehat{\tau}(i+1)}))$$
$$= \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(i)}, \mathbf{z}_{\tau(i-1)}, \mu(B_{\tau(i)}), \mu(B_{\tau(i+1)})) = \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z}, \mu).$$
(17)

By (M') and by the well-definedness of the \mathcal{C}_{\preceq} -operator, we get $\mathcal{C}_{id}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}, \widehat{\mu}) \preceq \mathcal{C}_{\widehat{\tau}}(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}, \widehat{\mu})$. In consequence, by (16)-(17) follows $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma}(\mathbf{X}, \mu) \preceq \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z}, \mu)$. To sum up, we obtain statement (15) for any $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z} \in \mathsf{K}^n$ that differ in only one coordinate and are such that $\mathbf{X} \preceq_{(n)} \mathbf{Z}$.

Put $\mathbf{Z}^{(i)} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$ for $i \in [n-1]$. Using *n*-times the above considerations, the monotonicity condition (M) can be derived as follows

$$\mathcal{C}_{\sigma}(\mathbf{X},\mu) \preceq \mathcal{C}_{\tau^{(1)}}(\mathbf{Z}^{(1)},\mu) \preceq \ldots \preceq \mathcal{C}_{\tau^{(n-1)}}(\mathbf{Z}^{(n-1)},\mu) \preceq \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z},\mu).$$

Here σ , τ , and $\tau^{(i)}$ are admissible permutations w.r.t. \leq for **X**, **Z**, and **Z**⁽ⁱ⁾, respectively. The proof is complete.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.6. To make the proof more transparent, we will write the explicit form of the C_{\prec} -operator,

$$\mathcal{C}_{\sigma}(\mathbf{X},\mu) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(1)}, \mathbf{0}, 1, \mu(\{\sigma(2)\})) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(2)}, \mathbf{x}_{\sigma(1)}, \mu(\{\sigma(2)\}), 0)$$

for any $\mathbf{X} \in \mathsf{K}^2$ and $\sigma \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}$.

"⇒" Firstly, we prove (a). Fix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathsf{K}^2$ and $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}$. Clearly, $\mathbf{X} \leq_{(2)} \mathbf{X}$, so by (M) we have $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_1}(\mathbf{X},\mu) \leq \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_2}(\mathbf{X},\mu)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_2}(\mathbf{X},\mu) \leq \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_1}(\mathbf{X},\mu)$ for any $\mu \in \mathbf{M}$. Thus, due to the antisymmetricity of \leq , we get $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_1}(\mathbf{X},\mu) = \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_2}(\mathbf{X},\mu)$ for any μ . By arbitrariness of $\mathbf{X}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2$, the \mathcal{C}_{\leq} -operator is well defined.

We now show (b). Set $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathsf{K}^2$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathsf{K}^2$ such that $\mathbf{x} \preceq \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \preceq \mathbf{v}$. Clearly, $\mathbf{X} \preceq_{(2)} \mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathrm{id} \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}} \cap \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$. It follows from (M) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{X},\mu) &= \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{0},1,\mu(\{2\})) \oplus \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{x},\mu(\{2\}),0) \\ & \leq \mathrm{L}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}},\mathbf{0},1,\mu(\{2\})) \oplus \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{v},\widehat{\mathbf{x}},\mu(\{2\}),0) = \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{Z},\mu) \end{aligned}$$

for any μ . By arbitrariness of $\mathbf{x} \leq \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \leq \mathbf{v}$, we get point (b).

Put $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathsf{K}^2$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{u}, \widehat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathsf{K}^2$ such that $\mathbf{u} \preceq \mathbf{x} \preceq \widehat{\mathbf{x}}$. Clearly, $\mathbf{X} \preceq_{(2)} \mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathrm{id} \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}} \cap \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$. From (M) we conclude that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{X}, \mu) \preceq \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{Z}, \mu)$ for any μ . Lemma 2.7 (b) yields

$$L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mu(\{2\}), 0) \preceq L(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{u}, \mu(\{2\}), 0)$$

for any μ . By arbitrariness of $\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \hat{\mathbf{x}}$, we obtain point (c).

" \Leftarrow " According to Lemma 5.1 and the well-definedness of the C_{\preceq} -operator, it suffices to show that condition (M') holds. Let $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \in \mathsf{K}^2$ with $\mathbf{x}_1 \preceq \mathbf{x}_2$. Assume that $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) \in \mathsf{K}^2$ is such that $\mathbf{x}_p \prec \mathbf{z}_p$ for some $p \in [2]$ and $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{z}_i$ for $i \neq p$. Clearly, $\mathbf{X} \preceq_{(2)} \mathbf{Z}$ and $\Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$ contains at most two elements. We will consider two cases: $\mathbf{z}_1 \preceq \mathbf{z}_2$ and $\mathbf{z}_2 \prec \mathbf{z}_1$. Let us start with $\mathbf{z}_1 \preceq \mathbf{z}_2$. Evidently, id $\in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$. If p = 1, we use point (b), and if p = 2, we use point (c) together with Lemma 2.5 to derive the following

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{id}(\mathbf{X},\mu) &= L(\mathbf{x}_1,\mathbf{0},1,\mu(\{2\})) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}_2,\mathbf{x}_1,\mu(\{2\}),0) \\ &\leq L(\mathbf{z}_1,\mathbf{0},1,\mu(\{2\})) \oplus L(\mathbf{z}_2,\mathbf{z}_1,\mu(\{2\}),0) = \mathcal{C}_{id}(\mathbf{Z},\mu), \end{aligned}$$

so (M') is true.

We now turn to the case $\mathbf{z}_2 \prec \mathbf{z}_1$. Then $\Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$ consists of a single element $\tau = (2, 1)$. We show that p = 1, that is, $\mathbf{x}_1 \prec \mathbf{z}_1$ and $\mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{z}_2$. Suppose, contrary to our claim, that p = 2, i.e., $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{z}_1$ and $\mathbf{x}_2 \prec \mathbf{z}_2$. Note that $\mathbf{x}_2 \prec \mathbf{z}_2 \prec \mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1 \preceq \mathbf{x}_2$. So by the transitivity of \prec we have $\mathbf{x}_2 \prec \mathbf{x}_2$, a contradiction. Therefore p = 1.

Define $\mathbf{X}^{(1)} = (\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2)$. Clearly, $\mathbf{X} \preceq_{(2)} \mathbf{X}^{(1)}$ and $\Pi_{\mathbf{X}^{(1)}} = \{ id, \tau \}$. By point (b),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{id}(\mathbf{X},\mu) &= L(\mathbf{x}_{1},\mathbf{0},1,\mu(\{2\})) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}_{2},\mathbf{x}_{1},\mu(\{2\}),0) \\ &\leq L(\mathbf{x}_{2},\mathbf{0},1,\mu(\{2\})) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}_{2},\mathbf{x}_{2},\mu(\{2\}),0) \\ &= \mathcal{C}_{id}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)},\mu). \end{aligned}$$
(18)

As the \mathcal{C}_{\preceq} -operator is well defined, we conclude that $\mathcal{C}_{id}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)}, \mu) = \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)}, \mu)$. Since $\tau(1) = 2$, we have $\mathbf{X}^{(1)} = (\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)}, \mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)})$. By point (c) and Lemma 2.5, we get

$$\mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)},\mu) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)},\mathbf{0},1,\mu(\{\tau(2)\})) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)},\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)},\mu(\{\tau(2)\}),0)$$

$$\leq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)},\mathbf{0},1,\mu(\{\tau(2)\})) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(2)},\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)},\mu(\{\tau(2)\}),0) = \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z},\mu).$$
(19)

In consequence, inequalities (18)-(19) and the transitivity of \leq imply $C_{id}(\mathbf{X}, \mu) \leq C_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z}, \mu)$, as desired.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.7. The C_{\preceq} - operator takes the form

 $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma}(\mathbf{X},\mu) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(1)}, \mathbf{0}, 1, \mu(B_{\sigma(2)})) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(2)}, \mathbf{x}_{\sigma(1)}, \mu(B_{\sigma(2)}), \mu(B_{\sigma(3)})) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(3)}, \mathbf{x}_{\sigma(2)}, \mu(B_{\sigma(3)}), 0)$ for any $\mathbf{X} \in \mathsf{K}^3$ and $\sigma \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}$.

" \Rightarrow " The proof that the \mathcal{C}_{\preceq} -operator is well defined is analogous to the proof of the same fact in Theorem 3.6, so we omit it. The validity of statements (b)-(d) can be established by arguments similar to those used in the proof of Theorem 3.6. To establish point (b), consider $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{1}) \in \mathsf{K}^3$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{1}) \in \mathsf{K}^3$, where $\mathbf{x} \preceq \hat{\mathbf{x}} \preceq \mathbf{v}$, and $\sigma = \tau = \mathrm{id} \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}} \cap \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$. To obtain point (c), take $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathsf{K}^3$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{u}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathsf{K}^3$, where $\mathbf{u} \preceq \mathbf{x} \preceq \hat{\mathbf{x}} \preceq \mathbf{v}$, and $\sigma = \tau = \mathrm{id} \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}} \cap \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$. Finally, to get point (d), set $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathsf{K}^3$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathsf{K}^3$, in which $\mathbf{u} \preceq \mathbf{x} \preceq \hat{\mathbf{x}}$, and $\sigma = \tau = \mathrm{id} \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}} \cap \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$.

" \Leftarrow " According to Lemma 5.1, it is sufficient to prove (M'), as the \mathcal{C}_{\preceq} -operator is well defined. Let $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3) \in \mathsf{K}^3$ with $\mathbf{x}_1 \preceq \mathbf{x}_2 \preceq \mathbf{x}_3$. Assume that $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{z}_3) \in \mathsf{K}^3$ is such that $\mathbf{x}_p \prec \mathbf{z}_p$ for some $p \in [3]$ and $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{z}_i$ for $i \neq p$. Evidently, id $\in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\mathbf{X} \preceq_{(3)} \mathbf{Z}$. To finish the proof, it is enough to show that

$$C_{\rm id}(\mathbf{X},\mu) \preceq C_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z},\mu) \quad \text{for some } \tau \in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}.$$
 (20)

Consider two cases: $\mathbf{x}_p \prec \mathbf{z}_p \preceq \mathbf{x}_{p+1}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{p+1} \prec \mathbf{z}_p$, where, by convention, $\mathbf{x}_4 = \mathbf{1}$. Let us start with the first case. Put $\tau = \mathrm{id} \in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$.

• For p = 1, using (b) we have

$$L(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \mathbf{0}, 1, \mu(B_{id(2)})) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}_{2}, \mathbf{x}_{1}, \mu(B_{id(2)}), \mu(B_{id(3)}))$$

$$\leq L(\mathbf{z}_{1}, \mathbf{0}, 1, \mu(B_{id(2)})) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}_{2}, \mathbf{z}_{1}, \mu(B_{id(2)}), \mu(B_{id(3)})).$$
(21)

• For p = 2, employing (c) we obtain

$$L(\mathbf{x}_{2}, \mathbf{x}_{1}, \mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(2)}), \mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(3)})) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}_{3}, \mathbf{x}_{2}, \mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(3)}), 0)$$

$$\leq L(\mathbf{z}_{2}, \mathbf{x}_{1}, \mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(2)}), \mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(3)})) \oplus L(\mathbf{x}_{3}, \mathbf{z}_{2}, \mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(3)}), 0).$$
(22)

• For p = 3, applying (d) we get

$$L(\mathbf{x}_{3}, \mathbf{x}_{2}, \mu(B_{id(3)}), 0) \leq L(\mathbf{z}_{3}, \mathbf{x}_{2}, \mu(B_{id(3)}), 0).$$
(23)

Combining (21) - (23) with Lemma 2.5 and point (a) yields $\mathcal{C}_{id}(\mathbf{X},\mu) \preceq \mathcal{C}_{id}(\mathbf{Z},\mu) = \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z},\mu)$.

Now we examine the case where $\mathbf{x}_{p+1} \prec \mathbf{z}_p$. Then $p \in \{1, 2\}$ and $id \notin \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$.

• Let p = 1. This means that $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{z}_i$ for $i \in \{2,3\}$, so there are two possibilities: $\mathbf{x}_2 \prec \mathbf{z}_1 \preceq \mathbf{x}_3$ and $\mathbf{x}_3 \prec \mathbf{z}_1$. Let us begin with the first. Since $\mathbf{z}_2 \prec \mathbf{z}_1 \preceq \mathbf{z}_3$, $\tau = (2, 1, 3) \in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$. Consider an auxiliary vector $\mathbf{X}^{(1)} = (\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3)$. Then $\mathrm{id}, \tau \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}^{(1)}}$ and $\mathbf{X} \preceq_{(3)} \mathbf{X}^{(1)}$. From point (b), Lemma 2.5, and point (a), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\rm id}(\mathbf{X},\mu) &= {\rm L}(\mathbf{x}_1,\mathbf{0},1,\mu(B_{\rm id(2)})) \oplus {\rm L}(\mathbf{x}_2,\mathbf{x}_1,\mu(B_{\rm id(2)}),\mu(B_{\rm id(3)})) \oplus {\rm L}(\mathbf{x}_3,\mathbf{x}_2,\mu(B_{\rm id(3)}),0) \\ & \leq {\rm L}(\mathbf{x}_2,\mathbf{0},1,\mu(B_{\rm id(2)})) \oplus {\rm L}(\mathbf{x}_2,\mathbf{x}_2,\mu(B_{\rm id(2)}),\mu(B_{\rm id(3)})) \oplus {\rm L}(\mathbf{x}_3,\mathbf{x}_2,\mu(B_{\rm id(3)}),0) \\ &= \mathcal{C}_{\rm id}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)},\mu) = \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)},\mu). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{X}^{(1)} = (\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)}, \mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)}, \mathbf{z}_{\tau(3)})$, due to point (c) and Lemma 2.5, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)},\mu) &= \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)},\mathbf{0},1,\mu(B_{\tau(2)})) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)},\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)},\mu(B_{\tau(2)}),\mu(B_{\tau(3)})) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(3)},\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)},\mu(B_{\tau(3)}),0) \\ &\leq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)},\mathbf{0},1,\mu(B_{\tau(2)})) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(2)},\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)},\mu(B_{\tau(2)}),\mu(B_{\tau(3)})) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(3)},\mathbf{z}_{\tau(2)},\mu(B_{\tau(3)}),0) \\ &= \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z},\mu), \end{aligned}$$

which leads us to $C_{id}(\mathbf{X}, \mu) \preceq C_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z}, \mu)$, so statement (20) is proved. Assume now that $\mathbf{x}_3 \prec \mathbf{z}_1$. Since $\mathbf{z}_2 \preceq \mathbf{z}_3 \prec \mathbf{z}_1$, $\tau = (2, 3, 1) \in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$. Applying the same reasoning as above results in

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{X},\mu) \preceq \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)},\mu) = \mathcal{C}_{\tau^{(1)}}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)},\mu) \preceq \mathcal{C}_{\tau^{(1)}}(\mathbf{X}^{(2)},\mu) = \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{(2)},\mu),$$

where $\mathbf{X}^{(1)} = (\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3), \ \mathbf{X}^{(2)} = (\mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3), \ \text{and} \ \tau^{(1)} = (2, 1, 3) \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}^{(1)}}, \ \text{as} \ \tau \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}^{(2)}}.$ From point (d) and Lemma 2.5 we get $\mathcal{C}_{id}(\mathbf{X}, \mu) \preceq \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z}, \mu)$. The statement (20) is valid.

• Let p = 2. Then $\mathbf{x}_3 \prec \mathbf{z}_2$. Since $\mathbf{z}_1 \preceq \mathbf{z}_3 \prec \mathbf{z}_2$, $\tau = (1, 3, 2) \in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$. Take an auxiliary vector $\mathbf{X}^{(1)} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_3)$ and observe that $\mathrm{id}, \tau \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}^{(1)}}$, and $\mathbf{X} \preceq_{(3)} \mathbf{X}^{(1)}$. Combining point (c) with Lemma 2.5 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\rm id}(\mathbf{X},\mu) &= {\rm L}(\mathbf{x}_1,\mathbf{0},1,\mu(B_{\rm id(2)})) \oplus {\rm L}(\mathbf{x}_2,\mathbf{x}_1,\mu(B_{\rm id(2)}),\mu(B_{\rm id(3)})) \oplus {\rm L}(\mathbf{x}_3,\mathbf{x}_2,\mu(B_{\rm id(3)}),0) \\ & \leq {\rm L}(\mathbf{x}_1,\mathbf{0},1,\mu(B_{\rm id(2)})) \oplus {\rm L}(\mathbf{x}_3,\mathbf{x}_1,\mu(B_{\rm id(2)}),\mu(B_{\rm id(3)})) \oplus {\rm L}(\mathbf{x}_3,\mathbf{x}_3,\mu(B_{\rm id(3)}),0) \\ &= \mathcal{C}_{\rm id}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)},\mu). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{X}^{(1)} = (\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)}, \mathbf{z}_{\tau(2)}, \mathbf{z}_{\tau(2)})$ and $\mathcal{C}_{id}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)}, \mu) = \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)}, \mu)$ by point (a), we have

$$\mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)},\mu) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)},\mathbf{0},1,\mu(B_{\tau(2)})) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(2)},\mathbf{z}_{\tau(1)},\mu(B_{\tau(2)}),\mu(B_{\tau(3)})) \oplus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(2)},\mathbf{z}_{\tau(2)},\mu(B_{\tau(3)}),0)$$

From point (d) we know that $L(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(2)}, \mathbf{z}_{\tau(2)}, \mu(B_{\tau(3)}), 0) \leq L(\mathbf{z}_{\tau(3)}, \mathbf{z}_{\tau(2)}, \mu(B_{\tau(3)}), 0)$. Using Lemma 2.5 we conclude that $\mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{(1)}, \mu) \leq \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z}, \mu)$, which leads us to $\mathcal{C}_{id}(\mathbf{X}, \mu) \leq \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z}, \mu)$. The proof is complete.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.8. " \Rightarrow " The proof that the \mathcal{C}_{\preceq} -operator is well defined is analogous to the proof of the same fact in Theorem 3.6, so we omit it. To establish point (b), consider $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{1}) \in \mathsf{K}^n$, $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{1}) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ with $\mathbf{u} \preceq \mathbf{x} \preceq \hat{\mathbf{x}} \preceq \mathbf{v}$ and $\sigma = \tau =$ id $\in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}} \cap \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$. To show point (c), set $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{u}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ with $\mathbf{u} \preceq \mathbf{x} \preceq \hat{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\sigma = \tau =$ id $\in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}} \cap \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$.

" \Leftarrow " According to Lemma 5.1, it is sufficient to prove that (M') is satisfied. Let $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ be such that $\mathbf{x}_1 \preceq \ldots \preceq \mathbf{x}_n$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ be such that $\mathbf{x}_p \prec \mathbf{z}_p$ for some $p \in [n]$ and $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{z}_i$ for any $i \neq p$. Clearly, id $\in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\mathbf{X} \preceq_{(n)} \mathbf{Z}$. Let q be the largest element of the set $\{p, p+1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $\mathbf{x}_q \prec \mathbf{z}_p \preceq \mathbf{x}_{q+1}$ under the convention $\mathbf{x}_{n+1} = \mathbf{1}$. We need to prove that

$$\mathcal{C}_{id}(\mathbf{X},\mu) \preceq \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z},\mu) \quad \text{for some } \tau \in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}.$$
 (24)

Assume that q = p. In this case we put $\tau = id \in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$. If $1 \leq p < n$, then by point (b) and Lemma 2.5

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{X},\mu) &= \bigoplus_{i=1}^{p-1} \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{z}_{i},\mathbf{z}_{i-1},\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i)}),\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i+1)})) \oplus \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{x}_{p},\mathbf{z}_{p-1},\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(p)}),\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(p+1)})) \\ &\oplus \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{z}_{p+1},\mathbf{x}_{p},\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(p+1)}),\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(p+2)})) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=p+2}^{n} \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{z}_{i},\mathbf{z}_{i-1},\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i)}),\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i+1)})) \\ &\leq \bigoplus_{i=1}^{p-1} \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{z}_{i},\mathbf{z}_{i-1},\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i)}),\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i+1)})) \oplus \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{z}_{p},\mathbf{z}_{p-1},\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(p)}),\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(p+1)})) \\ &\oplus \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{z}_{p+1},\mathbf{z}_{p},\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(p+1)}),\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(p+2)})) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=p+2}^{n} \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{z}_{i},\mathbf{z}_{i-1},\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i)}),\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i+1)})) \\ &\oplus \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{z}_{p+1},\mathbf{z}_{p},\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(p+1)}),\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(p+2)})) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=p+2}^{n} \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{z}_{i},\mathbf{z}_{i-1},\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i)}),\mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i+1)})) \\ &= \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{Z},\mu) = \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z},\mu) \end{aligned}$$

under the convention $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{0}(\cdot) \oplus \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y} \oplus \bigoplus_{i=n+1}^{n}(\cdot)$. If p = n, then by point (c) and

Lemma 2.5

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{X},\mu) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_{i-1}, \mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i)}), \mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i+1)})) \oplus \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{z}_{n-1}, \mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(n)}), 0)$$
$$\leq \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_{i-1}, \mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i)}), \mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(i+1)})) \oplus \mathrm{L}(\mathbf{z}_n, \mathbf{z}_{n-1}, \mu(B_{\mathrm{id}(n)}), 0)$$
$$= \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{id}}(\mathbf{Z}, \mu) = \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z}, \mu).$$

Assume now that $q \in \{p+1, \ldots, n\}$. Since $\mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{x}_i$ for any $i \neq p$ and $\mathbf{x}_q \prec \mathbf{z}_p \preceq \mathbf{x}_{q+1}$, we have

$$\mathbf{z}_{1} \preceq \ldots \preceq \mathbf{z}_{p-1} \preceq \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_{p+1} \preceq \ldots \preceq \mathbf{z}_{q} \prec \mathbf{z}_{p} \preceq \mathbf{z}_{q+1} \preceq \ldots \preceq \mathbf{z}_{n} & \text{for } q < n, \\ \mathbf{z}_{p+1} \preceq \ldots \preceq \mathbf{z}_{q} \prec \mathbf{z}_{p} & \text{for } q = n. \end{cases}$$

 Set

$$\tau(i) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } i q, \\ i+1 & \text{if } p \leqslant i \leqslant q-1, \\ p & \text{if } i = q. \end{cases}$$

Evidently, $\tau \in \Pi_{\mathbf{Z}}$.

Put $\tau^{(0)} = \text{id}$ and $\mathbf{X}^{(0)} = \mathbf{X}$. To simplify references, we will write $\mathbf{x}_{p+1} = \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{q-1} = \mathbf{v}_{N-1}, \mathbf{x}_q = \mathbf{v}_N$, where $N = q - p \ge 1$. Clearly, $\mathbf{v}_1 \preceq \dots \preceq \mathbf{v}_N$. We now perform N steps consecutively, in which the k-th step, $k \in [N]$, is as follows

Step k We define $\mathbf{X}^{(k)} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{p-1}, \mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{x}_{p+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathsf{K}^n$ in such a way that the *p*-th element of $\mathbf{X}^{(k-1)}$ is replaced with \mathbf{v}_k and other elements remain the same. Let $\tau^{(k)}$ be defined as follows

$$\tau^{(k)}(i) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } i p+k \\ i+1 & \text{if } p \leqslant i \leqslant p+k-1, \\ p & \text{if } i = p+k. \end{cases}$$

Then $\tau^{(k-1)} \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}^{(k-1)}} \cap \Pi_{\mathbf{X}^{(k)}}$ and $\tau^{(k)} \in \Pi_{\mathbf{X}^{(k)}}$. By points (a)-(b) and Lemma 2.5, we get

$$C_{\tau^{(k-1)}}(\mathbf{X}^{(k-1)},\mu) \preceq C_{\tau^{(k-1)}}(\mathbf{X}^{(k)},\mu) = C_{\tau^{(k)}}(\mathbf{X}^{(k)},\mu).$$
 (25)

After N steps, from (25) for $k \in [N]$ we obtain $C_{id}(\mathbf{X}, \mu) \preceq C_{\tau^{(N)}}(\mathbf{X}^{(N)}, \mu)$. Since p + N = q, $\mathbf{X}^{(N)} \preceq \mathbf{Z}$, and $\tau^{(N)} = \tau$, from point (c) and Lemma 2.5 if q = n, or from point (b) and Lemma 2.5 if q < n, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{C}_{\tau^{(N)}}(\mathbf{X}^{(N)},\mu) \preceq \mathcal{C}_{\tau}(\mathbf{Z},\mu).$$

Therefore statement (24) is valid.

Appendix C

Let us recall the construction of the IV dissimilarity function proposed in [39, Prop. 4.8]. To do this, we will first introduce the basic notions.

For $\mathbf{x} = [x^l, x^u] \in \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$, define $K_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = (1 - \alpha)x^l + \alpha x^u$ for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, $w(\mathbf{x}) = x^u - x^l$, and

$$\lambda_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{w(\mathbf{x})}{\frac{K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x})}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1 - K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x})}{1 - \alpha}}, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1)$$
(26)

under convention $\frac{0}{0} = 0$ [39, Eqs. (6) and (7)]. Hereafter, $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Proposition 5.2. [39, Prop. 4.18] Let $\alpha, \beta \in (0,1)$ be such that $\alpha \neq \beta$. Let $M_d \colon [0,1]^2 \to [0,1]$ be a symmetric aggregation function, $\delta_d \colon [0,1]^2 \to [0,1]$ be a strictly monotone dissimilarity function. Then the function $d \colon (\mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]})^2 \to \mathsf{Int}_{[0,1]}$ defined by

$$d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{z}, \qquad where \qquad \begin{cases} K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}) = \delta_{d}(K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}), K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{y})), \\ \\ \lambda_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}) = M_{d}(\lambda_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}), \lambda_{\alpha}(\mathbf{y})) \end{cases}$$

is IV dissimilarity function w.r.t. $\leq_{(\alpha,\beta)}$. Moreover,

$$\mathbf{z} = [K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}) - \alpha w(\mathbf{z}), \ K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}) + (1 - \alpha)w(\mathbf{z})],$$
(27)

where $w(\mathbf{z})$ is given by (26) with $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{z}$.

We will demonstrate that the IV dissimilarity function constructed according to Proposition 5.2 does not satisfy point (b) of Corollary 4.14 provided $\delta_d([0,1],0) = [0,1]$.

Let α , β , M_d , and δ_d be such as in Proposition 5.2. Assume additionally that $\delta_d([0,1],0) = [0,1]$. Put $\mathbf{x}_1 = [0, x_1]$ and $\mathbf{x}_2 = [0, x_2]$ with $x_1, x_2 \in (0,1]$ and $x_1 < x_2$. Hence $\mathbf{x}_1 \preceq_{(\alpha,\beta)} \mathbf{x}_2$ for any $x_1 < x_2$. Let $\mathbf{z}_1 = d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{0})$, $\mathbf{z}_2 = d(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{0})$, and $\mathbf{z}_{12} = d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$ take the form (27). Suppose that point (b) of Corollary 4.14 is true, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{z}_1 \oplus_{\mathrm{iv}} \mathbf{z}_{12} = \mathbf{z}_2 \tag{28}$$

for any $x_1 < x_2$. We establish $K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}_j)$ and $\lambda_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}_j)$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 12\}$:

- $K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}_i) = \delta_{\mathrm{d}}(K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}_i), 0) = \delta_{\mathrm{d}}(\alpha x_i, 0)$ for $i \in [2]$,
- $K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}_{12}) = \delta_{\mathrm{d}}(K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}_1), K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}_2)) = \delta_{\mathrm{d}}(\alpha x_1, \alpha x_2),$
- $\lambda_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}_i) = M_{\mathrm{d}}(\lambda_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}_i), \lambda_{\alpha}(\mathbf{0})) = M_{\mathrm{d}}(1, 0) \text{ for } i \in [2],$

• $\lambda_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}_{12}) = M_{\mathrm{d}}(\lambda_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}_1), \lambda_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}_2)) = M_{\mathrm{d}}(1, 1) = 1.$

Put $A_i = \delta_d(\alpha x_i, 0)$ for $i \in [2]$ and $A_{12} = \delta_d(\alpha x_1, \alpha x_2)$. Thus

$$\mathbf{z}_j = \begin{bmatrix} A_j - \alpha w(\mathbf{z}_j), & A_j + (1 - \alpha) w(\mathbf{z}_j) \end{bmatrix}, \quad j \in \{1, 2, 12\}.$$

By equating the left and right ends of the intervals in equation (28), we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \alpha(w(\mathbf{z}_1) + w(\mathbf{z}_{12}) - w(\mathbf{z}_{22})) = A_1 + A_{12} - A_2, \\ (1 - \alpha)(w(\mathbf{z}_1) + w(\mathbf{z}_{12}) - w(\mathbf{z}_{22})) = -(A_1 + A_{12} - A_2) \end{cases}$$

In consequence, we have $A_2 = A_1 + A_{12}$ and

$$w(\mathbf{z}_2) = w(\mathbf{z}_1) + w(\mathbf{z}_{12}) \tag{29}$$

for any $x_1 < x_2$. Let us now determine the values of $w(\mathbf{z}_i)$ using (26):

•
$$w(\mathbf{z}_i) = \lambda_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}_i) \cdot \left(\frac{K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}_i)}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1 - K_{\alpha}(\mathbf{z}_i)}{1 - \alpha}\right) = M_d(1, 0) \left(\frac{A_i}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1 - A_i}{1 - \alpha}\right) \text{ for } i \in [2],$$

• $w(\mathbf{z}_{12}) = \frac{A_{12}}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1 - A_{12}}{1 - \alpha}.$

Since $A_{12} = A_2 - A_1 > 0$, as δ_d is strictly monotone, (29) takes the form

$$M_{\rm d}(1,0) \left(\frac{A_2}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1-A_2}{1-\alpha}\right) = M_{\rm d}(1,0) \left(\frac{A_1}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1-A_1}{1-\alpha}\right) + \left(\frac{A_2-A_1}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1-A_2+A_1}{1-\alpha}\right)$$
(30)

for any $x_1 < x_2$. Note that

$$\begin{cases} \frac{A}{\alpha} \leqslant \frac{1-A}{1-\alpha} & \Leftrightarrow \quad A \leqslant \alpha, \\ \frac{A_2 - A_1}{\alpha} \leqslant \frac{1-A_2 + A_1}{1-\alpha} & \Leftrightarrow \quad A_2 - A_1 \leqslant \alpha. \end{cases}$$
(31)

Given that $\delta_d([0,1],0) = [0,1]$, there exist x_1 and x_2 such that $A_2 \leq \alpha$ or $A_1 \leq \alpha < A_2$. Assume that $A_2 \leq \alpha$ for some $x_1 < x_2$. Then $A_1 \leq \alpha$ and $A_2 - A_1 \leq \alpha$. By (31), (30) has the form

$$M_{\rm d}(1,0)\frac{A_2}{\alpha} = M_{\rm d}(1,0)\frac{A_1}{\alpha} + \frac{A_2 - A_1}{\alpha}.$$

Hence $M_d(1,0) = 1$. Assume that $A_1 \leq \alpha < A_2$ for some $x_1 < x_2$. If $A_2 - A_1 \leq \alpha$, then (30) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1-A_2}{1-\alpha} = \frac{A_1}{\alpha} + \frac{A_2 - A_1}{\alpha}$$

so $A_2 = \alpha$, as $M_d(1,0) = 1$, a contradiction. If $A_2 - A_1 > \alpha$, then (30) is of the form

$$\frac{1 - A_2}{1 - \alpha} = \frac{A_1}{\alpha} + \frac{1 - A_2 + A_1}{1 - \alpha}$$

and implies $A_1 = 0$, which contradicts $A_1 > 0$, as $x_1 > 0$.

References

- E. Barrenechea, H. Bustince, J. Fernandez, D. Paternain, J. Sanz, Using the Choquet integral in the fuzzy reasoning method of fuzzy rule based classification systems, Axioms 2 (2013) 208–223.
- T. Batista, B. Bedregal, R. Moraes, Constructing multi-layer classifier ensembles using the Choquet integral based on overlap and quasi-overlap functions, Neurocomputing 500 (2022) 413–421.
- [3] B. Bedregal, G. Beliakov, H. Bustince, T. Calvo, R. Mesiar, D. Paternain, A class of fuzzy multisets with a fixed number of memberships, Information Sciences 189 (2012) 1–17.
- [4] U. Bentkowska, Interval-Valued Methods in Classifications and Decisions, Springer, 2020.
- [5] M. Boczek, O. Hutník, M. Kaluszka, Choquet-Sugeno-like operator based on relation and conditional aggregation operators, Information Sciences 582 (2022) 1–21.
- [6] M. Boczek, L. Jin, M. Kaluszka, Interval-valued seminormed fuzzy operators based on admissible orders, Information Sciences 574 (2021) 96–110.
- [7] M. Boczek, L. Jin, M. Kaluszka, The interval-valued Choquet-Sugeno-like operator as a tool for aggregation of interval-valued functions, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 448 (2022) 35–48.
- [8] M. Boczek, T. Józefiak, M. Kaluszka, A. Okolewski, On the monotonicity of the discrete Choquet-like operators, International Journal of Approximate Reasoning 163 (2023) 109045.
- M. Boczek, M. Kaluszka, On the extended Choquet-Sugeno-like operator, International Journal of Approximate Reasoning 154 (2023) 48–55.
- [10] H. Bustince, E. Barrenechea, M. Pagola, Relationship between restricted dissimilarity functions, restricted equivalence functions and normal EN-functions: image thresholding invariant, Pattern Recognition Letters 29 (2008) 525–536.
- [11] H. Bustince, C. Marco-Detchart, J. Fernández, C. Wagner, J.M. Garibaldi, Z. Takáč, Similarity between interval-valued fuzzy sets taking into account the width of the intervals and admissible orders, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 390 (2020) 23–47.

- [12] H. Bustince, J. Fernandez, A. Kolesárová, R. Mesiar, Generation of linear orders for intervals by means of aggregation functions, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 220 (2013) 69–77.
- [13] H. Bustince, M. Galar, B. Bedregal, A. Kolesárová, R. Mesiar, A new approach to intervalvalued Choquet integrals and the problem of ordering in interval-valued fuzzy set applications, IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems 21 (2013) 1150–1162.
- [14] H. Bustince, R. Mesiar, J. Fernandez, M. Galar, D. Paternain, A. Altalhi, G.P. Dimuro, B. Bedregal, Z. Takáč, d-Choquet integrals: Choquet integrals based on dissimilarities, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 414 (2021) 1–27.
- [15] T. Calvo, A. Kolesárová, M. Komorníková, R. Mesiar, Aggregation operators: properties, classes and construction methods. In: Calvo, T., Mayor, G., Mesiar, R. (eds.): Aggregation operators. New trends and applications. Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg (2002), pp. 3–104.
- [16] G. Choquet, Theory of capacities, Annales de l'Institut Fourier 5 (1953) 131–295.
- [17] C. Dias, J. Bueno, E. Borges, S. Botelho, G. Dimuro, G. Lucca, J. Fernandez, H. Bustince,
 P. Junior, Using the Choquet integral in the pooling layer in deep learning networks, in:
 Fuzzy Information Processing, 2018, pp. 144–154.
- [18] C. Dias, J. Bueno, E. Borges, G. Lucca, H. Santos, G. Dimuro, H. Bustince, P. Drews Jr., S. Botelho, E. Palmeira, Simulating the behaviour of Choquet-like (pre) aggregation functions for image resizing in the pooling layer of deep learning networks, in: Proceedings of IFSA/NAFIPS 2019 2019 IFSA World Congress and NAFIPS Annual Conference June 18–21, 2019 - Lafayette, Louisiana, USA, Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 2019, pp. 1–13.
- [19] G.P. Dimuro, J. Fernández, B. Bedregal, R. Mesiar, J.A. Sanz, G. Lucca, H. Bustince, The state-of-art of the generalizations of the Choquet integral: From aggregation and preaggregation to ordered directionally monotone functions, Information Fusion 57 (2020) 27– 43.
- [20] M. Ferrero-Jaurrieta, L. Horanská, J. Lafuente, R. Mesiar, G.P. Dimuro, Z. Takáč, M. Gómez, J. Fernández, H. Bustince, Degree of totalness: How to choose the best admissible permutation for vector fuzzy integration, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 466 (2023) 108461.

- [21] J. Fodor, R.R. Yager, Fuzzy set-theoretic operators and quantifiers, In: Fundamentals of Fuzzy Sets. Boston, MA: Springer US, 2000, p. 125–193.
- [22] M. Grabisch, The application of fuzzy integrals in multicriteria decision making, European Journal of Operational Research 89 (2010) 445–456.
- [23] L. Horanská, A. Šipošová, A generalization of the discrete Choquet and Sugeno integrals based on a fusion function, Information Sciences 451 (2018) 83–99.
- [24] T. Józefiak, M. Kaluszka, A. Okolewski, On an extension of the Choquet integral for multivalued data, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 474 (2024) 108761.
- [25] Pl. Kannappan, Functional equations and inequalities with applications, Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- [26] L. Ko, Y. Lu, H. Bustince, Yu. Chang, Y. Chang, J. Fernández, Y. Wang, J.A. Sanz, G.P. Dimuro, C. Lin, Multimodal fuzzy fusion for enhancing the motor-imagery-based brain computer interface, IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine 14 (2019) 96–106.
- [27] G. Lucca, G.P. Dimuro, J. Fernández, H. Bustince, B. Bedregal, J.A. Sanz, Improving the performance of fuzzy rule-based classification systems based on a nonaveraging generalization of CC-integrals named $C_{F_1F_2}$ -integrals, IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems 27 (2019) 124–134.
- [28] G. Lucca, J.A. Sanz, G.P. Dimuro, B. Bedregal, M.J. Asiain, M. Elkano, H. Bustince, CC-integrals: Choquet-like copula-based aggregation functions and its application in fuzzy rule-based classification systems, Knowledge-Based Systems 119 (2017) 32–43.
- [29] G. Lucca, J.A. Sanz, G.P. Dimuro, B. Bedregal, H. Bustince, Pre-aggregation functions constructed by CO-integrals applied in classification problems, Proceedings of IV CBSF (2016) 1–11.
- [30] G. Lucca, J.A. Sanz, G.P. Dimuro, B. Bedregal, R. Mesiar, A. Kolesárová, H. Bustince, Pre-aggregation functions: Construction and an application, IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems 24 (2016) 260–272.
- [31] G. Lucca, J.A. Sanz, H. Bustince, G.P. Dimuro, V. Gomes, R.C.C. Madureira, P. Melo-Pinto, Applying aggregation and pre-aggregation functions in the classification of grape

berries, in: 2018 IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems (FUZZIEEE), IEEE, Los Alamitos, 2018, pp. 1–6.

- [32] R. Mesiar, A. Kolesárová, H. Bustince, G.P. Dimuro, B. Bedregal, Fusion functions based discrete Choquet-like integrals, European Journal of Operational Research 252 (2016) 601– 609.
- [33] T. Milfont, B. Bedregal, I. Mezzomo, Generation of admissible orders on *n*-dimensional fuzzy set $L_n([0,1])$, Information Sciences 581 (2021) 856–875.
- [34] F.W.J. Olver, D.W. Lozier, R.F. Boisvert, C.W. Clark, NIST Handbook of Mathematical Functions, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, 2010.
- [35] D. Paternain, L. De Miguel, G. Ochoa, I. Lizasoain, R. Mesiar, H. Bustince, The intervalvalued Choquet integral based on admissible permutations, IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems 27 (2019) 1638–1647.
- [36] B. Pękala, Uncertainty Data in Interval-Valued Fuzzy Set Theory: Properties, Algorithms and Applications, Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing, vol. 367, Springer, Berlin, 2019.
- [37] D.J. Robinson, An Introduction to Abstract Algebra, Walter de Gruyter, 2003.
- [38] M. Sesma-Sara, H. Bustince, R. Mesiar, Directional monotonicity of multidimensional fusion functions with respect to admissible orders, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 467 (2023) 108498.
- [39] Z. Takáč, M. Uriz, M. Galar, D. Paternain, H. Bustince, Discrete IV d_G -Choquet integrals with respect to admissible orders, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 441 (2022) 169–195.
- [40] L.A. Zadeh, Fuzzy sets, Information and Control 8 (1965) 338–353.
- [41] N. Zumelzu, B. Bedregal, E. Mansilla, H. Bustince, R. Díaz, Admissible orders on fuzzy numbers, IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems 30 (2022) 4788–4799.