



## Paper Type: Research Paper



# Some Similarity Measures of Spherical Fuzzy Sets Based on the Euclidean Distance and Their Application in Medical Diagnosis

Princy Rayappan<sup>1,\*</sup>, Mohana Krishnaswamy<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Mathematics, Research Scholar, Nirmala College for Women, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu, India; princy.pjs@gmail.com; riyaraju116@gmail.com.

### Citation:



Rayappan, P., & Krishnaswamy, M. (2020). Some similarity measures of spherical fuzzy sets based on the Euclidean distance and their application in medical diagnosis. *Journal of fuzzy extension and application*, 1 (3), 244-251.

Received: 06/03/2020

Reviewed: 22/04/2020

Revised: 13/07/2020

Accept: 01/09/2020

## Abstract

Similarity measure is an important tool in multiple criteria decision-making problems, which can be used to measure the difference between the alternatives. In this paper, some new similarity measures of Spherical Fuzzy Sets (SFS) are defined based on the Euclidean distance measure and the proposed similarity measures satisfy the axiom of the similarity measure. Furthermore, we apply the proposed similarity measures to medical diagnosis decision making problem; the numerical example is used to illustrate the feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed similarity measures of SFS, which are then compared to other existing similarity measures.

**Keywords:** Spherical fuzzy sets, Euclidean distance; Proposed similarity measures medical diagnosis.

## 1 | Introduction

The concept of Fuzzy Set (FS)  $A = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{A_{x_i}} \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$  in  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  was proposed by Zadeh [1], where the membership degree  $\mu_{A_{x_i}}$  is a single value between zero and one. The FS has been widely applied in many fields, such as medical diagnosis, image processing, supply decision-making [2]-[4], and so on. In some uncertain decision-making problems, the degree of membership is not exactly as a numerical value but as an interval. Hence, Zadeh [5] proposed the Interval-Valued Fuzzy Sets (IVFS). However, the FS and the IVFS only have the membership degree, and they cannot describe the non-membership degree of the element belonging to the set.

Licensee **Journal of Fuzzy Extension and Applications**. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>).

Then, Atanassov [6] proposed the Intuitionistic Fuzzy Set (IFS)  $E = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_E(x_i), \vartheta_E(x_i) \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$ , where  $\mu_E(x_i)$  ( $0 \leq \mu_E(x_i) \leq 1$ ) and  $\vartheta_E(x_i)$  ( $0 \leq \vartheta_E(x_i) \leq 1$ ) represent the membership and the non-membership degree, respectively, and the indeterminacy- membership degree  $\pi_E(x_i) = 1 - \mu_E(x_i) - \vartheta_E(x_i)$ . The IFS is more effective to deal with the vague information more than the FS and IVFS.

Yang and Chiclana [7] proposed a spherical representation, which allowed us to define a distance function between intuitionistic fuzzy sets. In the spherical representation, hesitancy can be calculated based on the given membership and non-membership values since they only consider the surface of the sphere. Besides, they measure the spherical arc distance between two IFSs. Furthermore, Gong et al. [8] introduced an approach generalizing Yang and Chiclana’s work.

The Spherical Fuzzy Sets (SFSs) are based on the fact that the hesitancy of a decision maker can be defined independently from membership and non-membership degrees, satisfying the following condition:

$$0 \leq \mu_{\tilde{A}}^{-2}(\mathbf{u}) + \vartheta_{\tilde{A}}^{-2}(\mathbf{u}) + \pi_{\tilde{A}}^{-2}(\mathbf{u}) \leq 1. \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{U}. \tag{1}$$

On the surface of the sphere, Eq. (1) becomes

$$\mu_{\tilde{A}}^{-2}(\mathbf{u}) + \vartheta_{\tilde{A}}^{-2}(\mathbf{u}) + \pi_{\tilde{A}}^{-2}(\mathbf{u}) = 1. \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{U}. \tag{2}$$

On the other hand, similarity measure is an important tool in multiple-criteria decision making problems, which can be used to measure the difference between the alternatives. Many studies about the similarity measures have been obtained. For example, Beg and Ashraf [9] proposed a similarity measure of fuzzy sets based on the concept of  $\epsilon$  – fuzzy transitivity and discussed the degree of transitivity of different similarity measures. Song et al. [4] considered the similarity measure and proposed corresponding distance measure between intuitionistic fuzzy belief functions. In addition, cosine similarity measure is also an important similarity measure, and it can be defined as the inner product of two vectors divided by the product of their lengths. There are some scholars who studied the cosine similarity measures [10]-[15]. Various forms of Spherical fuzzy sets which are applied in Multi-attribute decision making problems are developed in [16]-[18].

In this paper, we propose a new method to construct the similarity measure of SFSs. They play an important role in practical application, especially in pattern recognition, medical diagnosis, and so on. Furthermore, the proposed similarity measure can be applied more widely in the field of decision-making problems.

## 2 | Preliminaries

**Definition 1.** [19]. A SFS  $\tilde{A}_s$  of the universe of discourse  $\mathbf{U}$  is given by,

$$\tilde{A}_s = \{ \langle \mu_{\tilde{A}_s}(u), \vartheta_{\tilde{A}_s}(u), \pi_{\tilde{A}_s}(u) \mid u \in \mathbf{U} \rangle \}, \text{ where } \mu_{\tilde{A}_s}: \mathbf{U} \rightarrow [0,1], \vartheta_{\tilde{A}_s}: \mathbf{U} \rightarrow [0,1], \pi_{\tilde{A}_s}: \mathbf{U} \rightarrow [0,1] \text{ and } 0 \leq \mu_{\tilde{A}_s}^{-2}(u) + \vartheta_{\tilde{A}_s}^{-2}(u) + \pi_{\tilde{A}_s}^{-2}(u) \leq 1. \quad \forall u \in \mathbf{U}.$$

For each  $\mathbf{u}$ , the numbers  $\mu_{\tilde{A}_s}(\mathbf{u})$ ,  $\vartheta_{\tilde{A}_s}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $\pi_{\tilde{A}_s}(\mathbf{u})$  are the degree of membership, non-membership and hesitancy of  $\mathbf{u}$  to  $\tilde{A}_s$ , respectively.

**Definition 2.** [9]. Basic operators of spherical fuzzy sets:

**Union.**  $\tilde{A}_s \cup \tilde{B}_s = \{ \max\{ \mu_{\tilde{A}_s}, \mu_{\tilde{B}_s} \}, \min\{ \vartheta_{\tilde{A}_s}, \vartheta_{\tilde{B}_s} \}, \min\{ \pi_{\tilde{A}_s}, \pi_{\tilde{B}_s} \} \}.$

**Intersection.**  $\tilde{A}_s \cap \tilde{B}_s = \left\{ \min\{\mu_{\tilde{A}_s}, \mu_{\tilde{B}_s}\}, \max\{\vartheta_{\tilde{A}_s}, \vartheta_{\tilde{B}_s}\}, \max\{\pi_{\tilde{A}_s}, \pi_{\tilde{B}_s}\} \right\}$ .

**Addition.**  $\tilde{A}_s \oplus \tilde{B}_s = \left\{ \left( \mu_{\tilde{A}_s}^2 + \mu_{\tilde{B}_s}^2 - \mu_{\tilde{A}_s}^2 \mu_{\tilde{B}_s}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \vartheta_{\tilde{A}_s} \vartheta_{\tilde{B}_s}, \pi_{\tilde{A}_s} \pi_{\tilde{B}_s} \right\}$ .

**Multiplication.**  $\tilde{A}_s \otimes \tilde{B}_s = \left\{ \mu_{\tilde{A}_s} \mu_{\tilde{B}_s}, \left( \vartheta_{\tilde{A}_s}^2 + \vartheta_{\tilde{B}_s}^2 - \vartheta_{\tilde{A}_s}^2 \vartheta_{\tilde{B}_s}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \pi_{\tilde{A}_s} \pi_{\tilde{B}_s} \right\}$ .

**Multiplication by a scalar,  $\lambda > 0$ .**  $\lambda. \tilde{A}_s = \left\{ \left( 1 - \left( 1 - \mu_{\tilde{A}_s}^2 \right)^\lambda \right)^{1/2}, \vartheta_{\tilde{A}_s}^\lambda, \pi_{\tilde{A}_s}^\lambda \right\}$ .

**Power of  $\tilde{A}_s, \lambda > 0$ .**  $\tilde{A}_s^\lambda = \left\{ \mu_{\tilde{A}_s}^\lambda, \left( 1 - \left( 1 - \vartheta_{\tilde{A}_s}^2 \right)^\lambda \right)^{1/2}, \pi_{\tilde{A}_s}^\lambda \right\}$ .

### 3 | Several New Similarity Measures

The similarity measure is a most widely used tool to evaluate the relationship between two sets. The following axiom about the similarity measure of IVSFSs should be satisfied:

**Lemma 1.** Let  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  be the universal set [12] if the similarity measure  $S(A, B)$  between SFSs  $A$  and  $B$  satisfies the following properties:

$$0 \leq S(A, B) \leq 1;$$

$$S(A, B) = 1 \text{ if and only if } A = B;$$

$$S(A, B) = S(B, A).$$

Then, the similarity measure  $S(A, B)$  is a genuine similarity measure.

#### 3.1 | The New Similarity Measures between SFSs

**Definition 3.** Let  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  be the universal set for any two SFSs  $A = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{A_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{A_{x_i}}, \pi_{A_{x_i}} \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$  and  $B = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{B_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{B_{x_i}}, \pi_{B_{x_i}} \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$ ; then the Euclidean distance between SFSs  $A$  and  $B$  is defined as follows:

$$D_{\text{SFSs}}(A, B) = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \left( \mu_A^2(x_i) - \mu_B^2(x_i) \right)^2 + \left( \vartheta_A^2(x_i) - \vartheta_B^2(x_i) \right)^2 + \left( \pi_A^2(x_i) - \pi_B^2(x_i) \right)^2 \right]}{3n}} \quad (3)$$

Now, we construct new similarity measures of SFSs based on the Euclidean distance measures.

**Definition 4.** Let  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  be the universal set for any two SFSs  $A = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{A_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{A_{x_i}}, \pi_{A_{x_i}} \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$  and  $B = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{B_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{B_{x_i}}, \pi_{B_{x_i}} \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$ ; the similarity measure of SFSs between  $A$  and  $B$  is defined as follows:

$$S_{\text{1SFSs}}(A, B) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \left( \min(\mu_A^2(x_i), \mu_B^2(x_i)) + \min(\vartheta_A^2(x_i), \vartheta_B^2(x_i)) + \min(\pi_A^2(x_i), \pi_B^2(x_i)) \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \left( \max(\mu_A^2(x_i), \mu_B^2(x_i)) + \max(\vartheta_A^2(x_i), \vartheta_B^2(x_i)) + \max(\pi_A^2(x_i), \pi_B^2(x_i)) \right)} \quad (4)$$

The similarity measure  $S_{\text{1SFSs}}$  satisfies the properties in *Lemma 1*.

Next, we propose a new method to construct a new similarity measure of SFSs, and the Euclidean distance, it can be defined as follows:

**Definition 5.** Let  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  be the universal set for any two SFSs  $A = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{A_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{A_{x_i}}, \pi_{A_{x_i}} \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$  and  $B = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{B_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{B_{x_i}}, \pi_{B_{x_i}} \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$ ; a new similarity measure  $S^*_{1SFSs}(A, B)$  is defined as follows:

$$S^*_{1SFSs}(A, B) = \frac{1}{2} (S_{1SFSs}(A, B) + 1 - D_{SFSs}(A, B)). \tag{5}$$

The proposed similarity measure of SFSs satisfies the *Theorem 1*.

**Theorem 1.** The similarity measure  $S^*_{1SFSs}(A, B)$  between  $A = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{A_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{A_{x_i}}, \pi_{A_{x_i}} \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$  and  $B = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{B_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{B_{x_i}}, \pi_{B_{x_i}} \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$  satisfies the following properties:

$$0 \leq S^*_{1SFSs}(A, B) \leq 1$$

$$S^*_{1SFSs}(A, B) = 1 \text{ if and only if } A = B$$

$$S^*_{1SFSs}(A, B) = S^*_{1SFSs}(B, A).$$

**Proof.** Because  $D_{SFSs}(A, B)$  is an Euclidean distance measure, obviously,  $0 \leq D_{SFSs}(A, B) \leq 1$ . Furthermore, according to lemma 1, we know that  $0 \leq S_{1SFSs}(A, B) \leq 1$ . Then,  $0 \leq \frac{1}{2} (S_{1SFSs}(A, B) + 1 - D_{SFSs}(A, B)) \leq 1$ , i.e.,  $0 \leq S^*_{1SFSs}(A, B) \leq 1$ .

If  $S^*_{1SFSs}(A, B) = 1$ , we have  $S_{1SFSs}(A, B) + 1 - D_{SFSs}(A, B) = 2$ , that is  $S_{1SFSs}(A, B) = 1 + D_{SFSs}(A, B)$ . Because  $D_{SFSs}(A, B)$  is the Euclidean distance measure  $0 \leq D_{SFSs}(A, B) \leq 1$ . Furthermore,  $0 \leq S_{1SFSs}(A, B) \leq 1$ , then  $S_{1SFSs}(A, B) = 1$  and  $D_{SFSs}(A, B) = 0$  should be established at the same time. If the Euclidean distance measure  $D_{SFSs}(A, B) = 0, A = B$  is obvious. According to lemma 1, when  $S_{1SFSs}(A, B) = 1, A = B$ ; so if  $S^*_{1SFSs}(A, B) = 1, A = B$  is obtained.

On the other hand, when  $A = B$ , according to *Eqs. (3) and (4)*  $D_{SFSs}(A, B) = 0$  and  $S_{1SFSs}(A, B) = 1$  are obtained respectively. Furthermore, we can get  $S^*_{1SFSs}(A, B) = 1$ .  $S^*_{1SFSs}(A, B) = S^*_{1SFSs}(B, A)$  is straightforward.

From *Theorem 1*, we know that the proposed new similarity measure  $S^*_{1SFSs}(A, B)$  is a genuine similarity measure. On the other hand, cosine similarity measure is also an important similarity measure. The cosine similarity measure between SFSs is as follows:

**Definition 6.** Let  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  be the universal set for any two SFSs  $A = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{A_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{A_{x_i}}, \pi_{A_{x_i}} \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$  and  $B = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{B_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{B_{x_i}}, \pi_{B_{x_i}} \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$ ; the cosine similarity measure of SFSs between  $A$  and  $B$  is defined as follows:

$$S_{2SFSs}(A, B) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\left( (\mu_A^2(x_i) \mu_B^2(x_i)) + (\vartheta_A^2(x_i) \vartheta_B^2(x_i)) + (\pi_A^2(x_i) \pi_B^2(x_i)) \right)}{\sqrt{(\mu_A^2(x_i))^2 + (\vartheta_A^2(x_i))^2 + (\pi_A^2(x_i))^2} \sqrt{(\mu_B^2(x_i))^2 + (\vartheta_B^2(x_i))^2 + (\pi_B^2(x_i))^2}}. \tag{6}$$

Now, we are going to propose another similarity measure of SFSs based on the cosine similarity measure and the Euclidean distance  $D_{SFSs}$ . It considers the similarity measure not only from the point of view of algebra but also from the point of view of geometry, which can be defined as:

**Definition 7.** Let  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  be the universal set for any two SFSs

$A = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{A_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{A_{x_i}}, \pi_{A_{x_i}} \rangle | x_i \in X \}$  and  $B = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{B_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{B_{x_i}}, \pi_{B_{x_i}} \rangle | x_i \in X \}$ ; a new similarity measure  $S^*_{2SFSS}(A, B)$  is defined as follows:

$$S^*_{2SFSS}(A, B) = \frac{1}{2} (S_{2SFSS}(A, B) + 1 - D_{SFSS}(A, B)). \tag{7}$$

**Theorem 2.** The similarity measure  $S^*_{2SFSS}(A, B)$  between  $A = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{A_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{A_{x_i}}, \pi_{A_{x_i}} \rangle | x_i \in X \}$  and

$B = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{B_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{B_{x_i}}, \pi_{B_{x_i}} \rangle | x_i \in X \}$  satisfies the following properties:

$$0 \leq S^*_{2SFSS}(A, B) \leq 1;$$

$$S^*_{2SFSS}(A, B) = 1 \text{ if and only if } A = B;$$

$$S^*_{2SFSS}(A, B) = S^*_{2SFSS}(B, A).$$

**Proof.** Because  $D_{SFSS}(A, B)$  is an Euclidean distance measure, obviously,  $0 \leq D_{SFSS}(A, B) \leq 1$ . Furthermore, according to lemma 1, we know that  $0 \leq S_{SFSS}(A, B) \leq 1$ . Then,  $0 \leq \frac{1}{2} (S_{2SFSS}(A, B) + 1 - D_{SFSS}(A, B)) \leq 1$ , i.e.,  $0 \leq S^*_{1SFSS}(A, B) \leq 1$ .

If  $S^*_{2SFSS}(A, B) = 1$ , we have  $S_{2SFSS}(A, B) + 1 - D_{SFSS}(A, B) = 2$ , that is  $S_{2SFSS}(A, B) = 1 + D_{SFSS}(A, B)$ . Because  $D_{SFSS}(A, B)$  is the Euclidean distance measure  $0 \leq D_{SFSS}(A, B) \leq 1$ . Furthermore,  $0 \leq S_{2SFSS}(A, B) \leq 1$ , then  $S_{2SFSS}(A, B) = 1$  and  $D_{SFSS}(A, B) = 0$  should be established at the same time. When  $S_{2SFSS}(A, B) = 1$ , we have  $\mu_A(x_i) = k\mu_B(x_i)$ ,  $\vartheta_A(x_i) = k\vartheta_B(x_i)$ , and  $\pi_A(x_i) = k\pi_B(x_i)$  ( $k$  is a constant). When the Euclidean distance measure  $D_{SFSS}(A, B) = 0$ ,  $A = B$ . Then  $A = B$  is obtained.

On the other hand, when  $A = B$ , according to Eqs. (3) and (6) if  $A = B$ ,  $D_{SFSS}(A, B) = 0$  and  $S_{2SFSS}(A, B) = 1$  are obtained respectively. Furthermore, we can get  $S^*_{2SFSS}(A, B) = 1$ .  $S^*_{2SFSS}(A, B) = S^*_{2SFSS}(B, A)$  is straightforward.

Thus  $S^*_{2SFSS}(A, B)$  satisfies all the properties of the Theorem 2.

In the next section, we will apply the proposed new similarity measures to medical diagnosis decision problem; numerical examples are also given to illustrate the application and effectiveness of the proposed new similarity measures.

## 4 | Applications of the Proposed Similarity Measures

### 4.1 | The Proposed Similarity Measures between SFSSs for Medical Diagnosis

We first give a numerical example medical diagnosis to illustrate the feasibility of the proposed new similarity measure  $S^*_{1SFSS}(A, B)$  and  $S^*_{2SFSS}(A, B)$  between SFSSs.

**Example 1.** Consider a medical diagnosis decision problem; Suppose a set of diagnosis  $Q = \{Q_1(\text{viral fever}), Q_2(\text{malaria}), Q_3(\text{typhoid}), Q_4(\text{Gastritis}), Q_5(\text{stenocardia})\}$  and a set of symptoms  $S = \{S_1(\text{fever}), S_2(\text{headache}), S_3(\text{stomach}), S_4(\text{cough}), S_5(\text{chestpain})\}$ . Assume a patient  $P_1$  has all the symptoms in the process of diagnosis, the SFSS evaluate information about  $P_1$  is

$$P_1(\text{Patient}) = \{ \langle S_1, 0.8, 0.2, 0.1 \rangle, \langle S_2, 0.6, 0.3, 0.1 \rangle, \langle S_3, 0.2, 0.1, 0.8 \rangle, \langle S_4, 0.6, 0.5, 0.1 \rangle, \langle S_5, 0.1, 0.4, 0.6 \rangle \}.$$

The diagnosis information  $Q_i(i = 1,2, \dots,5)$  with respect to symptoms  $S_i(i = 1,2, \dots,5)$  also can be represented by the SFSs, which is shown in *Table 1*.

**Table 1. Diagnosis information.**

	$S_1$	$S_2$	$S_3$	$S_4$	$S_5$
$Q_1$	[0.4, 0.6,0.0]	[0.3, 0.2, 0.5]	[0.1, 0.3, 0.7]	[0.4, 0.3, 0.3]	[0.1, 0.2, 0.7]
$Q_2$	[0.7, 0.3, 0.0]	[0.2, 0.2, 0.6]	[0.0, 0.1, 0.9]	[0.7, 0.3, 0.0]	[0.1, 0.1, 0.8]
$Q_3$	[0.3, 0.4, 0.3]	[0.6, 0.3, 0.1]	[0.2, 0.1, 0.7]	[0.2, 0.2, 0.6]	[0.1, 0.0, 0.9]
$Q_4$	[0.1, 0.2, 0.7]	[0.2, 0.2, 0.4]	[0.8, 0.2, 0.0]	[0.2, 0.1, 0.7]	[0.2, 0.1, 0.7]
$Q_5$	[0.1, 0.1, 0.8]	[0.0, 0.2,0.8]	[0.2, 0.0, 0.8]	[0.3, 0.1, 0.8]	[0.8, 0.1, 0.1]

By applying *Eqs. (5) and (7)* we can obtain the similarity measure values  $S^*_{1SFSs}(P_1, Q_i)$  and  $S^*_{2SFSs}(P_1, Q_i)$ ; the results are shown in *Table 2*.

**Table 2. Similarity measures.**

	$Q_1$	$Q_2$	$Q_3$	$Q_4$	$Q_5$
$S^*_{1SFSs}(P_1, Q_i)$	0.5980	0.6801	0.5729	0.3919	0.3820
$S^*_{2SFSs}(P_1, Q_i)$	0.4277	0.4581	0.4024	0.3514	0.3155

From the above two similarity measures  $S^*_{1SFSs}$  and  $S^*_{2SFSs}$ , we can conclude that the diagnoses of the patient  $P_1$  are all malaria ( $Q_2$ ). The proposed two similarity measures are feasible and effective.

## 4.2| Comparative Analysis of Existing Similarity Measures

To illustrative the effectiveness of the proposed similarity measures for medical diagnosis, we change the existing similarity measures for SFS and thus will apply the existing similarity measures for comparative analyses.

At first, we introduce the existing similarity measures between SFSs as follows:

Let  $A = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{A_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{A_{x_i}}, \pi_{A_{x_i}} \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$  and  $B = \{ \langle x_i, \mu_{B_{x_i}}, \vartheta_{B_{x_i}}, \pi_{B_{x_i}} \rangle \mid x_i \in X \}$  be two SFSs in  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ , the existing measures between  $A$  and  $B$  are defined as follows:

Broumi et al. [20] proposed the similarity measure  $SM_{SFS}$ :

$$SM_{SFS}(A, B) = 1 - D_{SFS}(A, B). \tag{8}$$

Sahin and Küçük [21] proposed the similarity measure  $SD_{SFS}$ :

$$SD_{SFS} = \frac{1}{1 + D_{SFS}(A, B)}. \tag{9}$$

Ye [22] proposed the improved cosine similarity measure  $SC_{1SFS}$  and  $SC_{2SFS}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 & SC_{1SFS}(A, B) \\
 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \cos \left[ \frac{\pi \cdot \max(|\mu_A^2(x_i) - \mu_B^2(x_i)|, |\vartheta_A^2(x_i) - \vartheta_B^2(x_i)|, |\pi_A^2(x_i) - \pi_B^2(x_i)|)}{2} \right] \quad (10) \\
 & SC_{2SFS}(A, B) \\
 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \cos \left[ \frac{\pi \cdot (|\mu_A^2(x_i) - \mu_B^2(x_i)| + |\vartheta_A^2(x_i) - \vartheta_B^2(x_i)| + |\pi_A^2(x_i) - \pi_B^2(x_i)|)}{6} \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Yong-Wei et al. [23] proposed the similarity measure  $SY_{SFS}(A, B)$ :

$$SY_{SFS}(A, B) = \frac{SC_{SFS}(A, B)}{SC_{SFS}(A, B) + D_{SFS}(A, B)} \quad (12)$$

**Example 2.** We apply Eqs. (4), (6) and (8) – (12) to calculate Example 1 again; the similarity measure values between  $P_1$  and  $Q_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ ) are shown on Table 3.

As we can see from Table 3, the patient  $P_1$  is still assigned to malaria ( $Q_2$ ), and the results are same as the proposed similarity measures in this paper, which means the proposed similarity measures are feasible and effective.

**Table 3. Similarity values between patient and symptoms.**

	$Q_1$	$Q_2$	$Q_3$	$Q_4$	$Q_5$
$SM_{SFS}$	0.8003	0.8314	0.7449	0.6388	0.6007
$SD_{SFS}$	0.8335	0.8557	0.7967	0.7346	0.7146
$SC_{1SFS}$	0.8555	0.9325	0.6469	0.7324	0.6391
$SC_{2SFS}$	0.9648	0.9759	0.7531	0.885	0.8585
$SY_{SFS}$	0.8107	0.8468	0.7171	0.6697	0.6154
$S_{1SFS}$	0.3958	0.5289	0.4010	0.1451	0.1633
$S_{2SFS}$	0.0551	0.0849	0.0600	0.0191	0.0304

The proposed similarity measures in the paper have some advantages in solving multiple criteria decision making problems. They are constructed based on the existing similarity measures and Euclidean distance, which not only satisfy the axiom of the similarity measure but also consider the similarity measure from the points of view of algebra and geometry. Furthermore, they can be applied more widely in the field of decision making problems.

## 5 | Conclusion

The similarity measure is widely used in multiple criteria decision making problems. This paper proposed a new method to construct the similarity measures combining the existing cosine similarity measure and the Euclidean distance measure. And, the similarity measures are proposed not only from the points of view of algebra and geometry but also satisfy the axiom of the similarity measure. Furthermore, we apply the proposed similarities measures to the medical diagnosis decision problems, and the numerical example is used to illustrate the feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed similarity measure, which are then compared to other existing similarity measures.

## References

- [1] Zadeh, L. A. (1996). Fuzzy sets. In *Fuzzy sets, fuzzy logic, and fuzzy systems: selected papers by Lotfi A Zadeh* (pp. 394-432). [https://doi.org/10.1142/9789814261302\\_0021](https://doi.org/10.1142/9789814261302_0021)
- [2] De, S. K., Biswas, R., & Roy, A. R. (1998). Multicriteria decision making using intuitionistic fuzzy set theory. *Journal of fuzzy mathematics*, 6, 837-842.
- [3] Phuong, N. H., Thang, V. V., & Hirota, K. (2000). Case based reasoning for medical diagnosis using fuzzy set theory. *International journal of biomedical soft computing and human sciences: the official journal of the biomedical fuzzy systems association*, 5(2), 1-7.
- [4] Song, Y., Wang, X., & Zhang, H. (2015). A distance measure between intuitionistic fuzzy belief functions. *Knowledge-based systems*, 86, 288-298.
- [5] Zadeh, L. A. (1975). The concept of a linguistic variable and its application to approximate reasoning – I. *Information sciences*, 8(3), 199-249.
- [6] Atanassov, K. (2016). Intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *International journal bioautomation*, 20, 1-6.
- [7] Yang, Y., & Chiclana, F. (2009). Intuitionistic fuzzy sets: Spherical representation and distances. *International journal of intelligent systems*, 24(4), 399-420.
- [8] Gong, Z., Xu, X., Yang, Y., Zhou, Y., & Zhang, H. (2016). The spherical distance for intuitionistic fuzzy sets and its application in decision analysis. *Technological and economic development of economy*, 22(3), 393-415.
- [9] Beg, I., & Ashraf, S. (2009). Similarity measures for fuzzy sets. *Appl. Comput. Math*, 8(2), 192-202.
- [10] Jun, Y. E. (2016). Multicriteria decision-making method based on cosine similarity measures between intervalvalued fuzzy sets with risk preference. *Economic computation & economic cybernetics studies & research*, 50(4), 205-215.
- [11] Ye, J. (2011). Cosine similarity measures for intuitionistic fuzzy sets and their applications. *Mathematical and computer modelling*, 53(1-2), 91-97.
- [12] Ye, J. (2014). Vector Similarity measures of simplified neutrosophic sets and their application in multicriteria decision making. *International journal of fuzzy systems*, 16(2), 204-211.
- [13] Ye, J. (2015). Improved cosine similarity measures of simplified neutrosophic sets for medical diagnoses. *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, 63(3), 171-179.
- [14] Liu, D., Chen, X., & Peng, D. (2017). Interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy ordered weighted cosine similarity measure and its application in investment decision-making. *Complexity*. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/1891923>
- [15] Liu, D., Chen, X., & Peng, D. (2018). The intuitionistic fuzzy linguistic cosine similarity measure and its application in pattern recognition. *Complexity*, 2018. *Complexity*. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/9073597>
- [16] Ashraf, S., & Abdullah, S. (2019). Spherical aggregation operators and their application in multiattribute group decision-making. *International journal of intelligent systems*, 34(3), 493-523.
- [17] Ashraf, S., Abdullah, S., Mahmood, T., Ghani, F., & Mahmood, T. (2019). Spherical fuzzy sets and their applications in multi-attribute decision making problems. *Journal of intelligent & fuzzy systems*, 36(3), 2829-2844. 1–16. DOI: [10.3233/JIFS-172009](https://doi.org/10.3233/JIFS-172009)
- [18] Ashraf, S., Abdullah, S., & Mahmood, T. (2018). GRA method based on spherical linguistic fuzzy Choquet integral environment and its application in multi-attribute decision-making problems. *Mathematical sciences*, 12(4), 263-275.
- [19] Kutlu Gündoğdu, F., & Kahraman, C. (2019). Spherical fuzzy sets and spherical fuzzy TOPSIS method. *Journal of intelligent & fuzzy systems*, 36(1), 337-352.
- [20] Broumi, S., & Smarandache, F. (2013). Several similarity measures of neutrosophic sets. In *Neutrosophic sets and systems* (pp. 54-62). University of New Mexico
- [21] Şahin, R., & Küçük, A. (2014). On similarity and entropy of neutrosophic soft sets. *Journal of intelligent & fuzzy systems*, 27(5), 2417-2430.
- [22] Ye, J. (2015). Improved cosine similarity measures of simplified neutrosophic sets for medical diagnoses. *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, 63(3), 171-179.
- [23] Yong-Wei, Y. A. N. G., Zhang, R. L., & Jing, G. U. O. (2017). A multirattribute decision-making approach based on hesitantneutrosophic sets. *Fuzzy systems and mathematics*, 31(2), 114-123.