

IFCRL: Interval-Intent Fuzzy Concept Re-Cognition Learning Model

Yi Ding , Weihua Xu , Weiping Ding , *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Yuhua Qian , *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—The fuzzy concept serves as a crucial tool for describing phenomena and constitutes the fundamental unit of human cognition. Fuzzy concepts are characterized by their extent and intent, with the latter being comprised of continuous membership degrees. Given that human cognition often progresses from vagueness to precision, it is imperative that the form of intent not be confined to a singular continuous value; rather, an interval possesses superior flexibility in this regard. Initial cognitive processes lack comprehensiveness in acquiring knowledge, necessitating subsequent cognitions to more accurately delineate the intended scope of a concept. Motivated by this insight, we proposed an interval-intent fuzzy concept re-cognition learning model (IFCRL). First, this model transforms fuzzy concept intent from a single continuous value into an interval-based representation, which describes the range of attribute values for all objects within the given interval. Second, in order to simulate secondary cognitive processes akin to those exhibited by humans toward phenomena, we present a concept re-cognition learning method capable of effectively scaling intervals within reasonable bounds. Third, aiming to overcome cognitive barriers and emulate imaginative processes observed in human brains, we introduce a concept clustering approach based on intent similarity which significantly reduces concept complexity while enhancing cognitive efficiency. Finally, we evaluate our classification performance using 12 datasets and experimental results demonstrate that IFCRL outperforms 14 other classification algorithms both feasibly and effectively.

Index Terms—Concept clustering, concept-cognitive learning, granular computing, interval-intent, object classification.

I. INTRODUCTION

COGNITIVE informatics is an emerging interdisciplinary research field that integrates various domains, including modern informatics, artificial intelligence, cybernetics, cognitive science, neuropsychology, medical science, philosophy, linguistics, life sciences, etc [1]. In the realm of cognitive informatics, relations are recognized as information. The connections

Manuscript received 10 January 2024; revised 26 February 2024; accepted 6 March 2024. Date of publication 18 March 2024; date of current version 4 June 2024. This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62376229, and Grant 61976120; in part by the Natural Science Foundation of Chongqing under Grant CSTB2023NSCQ-LZX0027; in part by the Natural Science Key Foundation of Jiangsu Education Department under Grant 21KJA510004. Recommended by Associate Editor J. Wang. (Corresponding author: Weihua Xu.)

Yi Ding and Weihua Xu are with the College of Artificial Intelligence, Southwest University, Chongqing 400715, China (e-mail: drying20@163.com; chxuwh@gmail.com).

Weiping Ding is with the School of Information Science and Technology, Nantong University, Nantong 226019, China (e-mail: dwp9988@163.com).

Yuhua Qian is with the Institute of Big Data Science and Industry, Shanxi University, Taiyuan 030006, China (e-mail: jinchengqyh@126.com).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TFUZZ.2024.3376569

between objects can be established through object–object relationships, attribute–object relationships or attribute–attribute relationships [2]. As the fundamental unit of human cognition, concepts encompass the relationship between objects and attributes. The extent of a concept refers to the set of all objects or instances that the concept represents, while the intent of a concept pertains to the set of attributes or properties that it implies [3]. Investigating the relationship between entities through the integration of concepts with mathematical, psychological, and other methodologies has emerged as a prominent research direction. Moreover, concept learning has expanded into various interconnected research domains including granular computing [4], [5], [6], [7], rough set [8], [9], [10], formal concept analysis [11], [12], [13], [14], among others.

The field of concept-cognitive learning encompasses the study of cognition and the acquisition of knowledge through conceptual frameworks [15]. In recent years, many different types of concept learning models have been proposed, such as abstract concept [16], Wille’s formal concept [17], object-oriented concept [18], fuzzy concept [19], [20], [21], [22], three-way concept [23], [24], two-way concept [25], [26], [27]. In terms of basic theory, the framework of concept learning was investigated by Yao [28], taking into account both cognitive science and granular computing. Zhang et al. [29] analyzed the sufficient and necessary between attributes and objects, and combined intuition and reasoning to establish a rigorous mathematical model to simulate human cognitive processes. Based on this, Xu et al. [30] extensively discussed the theory of transforming arbitrary information granules into necessary and sufficient information granules. Zhang et al. [31] proposed a two-way concept-cognitive learning model based on three-way decision under fuzzy context, which can directly learn sufficient and necessary concepts from arbitrary information granules. In addition, Xu et al. [25] proposed a two-way dynamic concept-cognitive learning model within a fuzzy context.

The theoretical system of two-way concept-cognitive learning has been gradually complete. At the same time, the model combining concept-cognitive with machine learning has developed rapidly in recent years. A perspective on machine learning was presented by Mi et al. [32], introducing a comprehensive approach to cognitive learning. For application to classification problems, many concept-cognitive learning models [22] [33], [34], [35] have been proposed. Shi et al. [33] proposed a concept cognitive learning model that is good at incremental learning to implement static and dynamic classification tasks. Mi et al. [22] proposed a concept clustering method considering

object information in fuzzy context and applied it to the problem of concept generation. Niu et al. [36] proposed a classification model based on fuzzy rules, which realizes granularity reduction and dynamic update in fuzzy environment. Liu et al. [37] proposed a stochastic incremental incomplete concept-cognitive learning method that is not influenced by the cognitive sequence of attributes, and employed a stochastic strategy for cognition. Hu et al. [38] explored concept learning models in the interval-valued context. Zhang et al. [39] proposed a incremental weight concept-cognitive learning algorithm based on fuzzy entropy to solve individual cognitive limitation.

The existing concept-cognitive learning still holds immense potential for development. However, the current classification learning models fail to consider interval-valued formal concepts in a fuzzy context. Each granular concept is learned only once, resulting in relatively shallow acquired knowledge. In addition, the existing concept cognitive learning models restrict cognitive thinking and create cognitive barriers by considering object information as the basis for participation in clustering processes (concepts can only be clustered if their extent intersect). To delve deeper into knowledge, obtain more accurate concepts, and break down cognitive barriers, we propose an interval-intent fuzzy concept re-cognition learning (IFCRL) model under a fuzzy context. The primary contributions of this article are as follows:

- 1) We introduce new mapping operators that form the basis of a novel concept definition method called interval-intent fuzzy concept. We also discuss the fundamental properties of interval-intent fuzzy concepts and define two types of interval-intent fuzzy granular concepts based on granular computing to represent data from different perspectives.
- 2) Building upon these new granular concepts, we propose a concept re-cognition process that effectively reduces cognitive errors caused by noise data (mainly refers to extreme value cases) and closely mimics human secondary cognition.
- 3) Furthermore, the proposed clustering algorithm is based on intent similarity, effectively overcoming the cognitive barrier (concepts can only be clustered if their extent intersect). This approach significantly reduces the concept space and enhances classification efficiency.
- 4) Finally, we compare IFCRL with 14 different classification algorithms using 12 datasets from UCI and KEEL databases. Moreover, we analyze how parameters influence both the size and accuracy of the clustering space. Our results demonstrate that IFCRL achieves superior average accuracy compared to other methods.

Compared to precise fuzzy values, interval values offer greater flexibility and comprehensibility in our cognitive process. The concept's intent shifts from fuzzy values to interval values, allowing for a reasonable summarization of the attribute membership degrees of all objects within the scope. The re-cognition process emulates humans' second understanding of things, eliminating cognitive errors caused by noise and enabling a more accurate comprehension of the concept's intent. Clustering based on intent similarity transcends cognitive boundaries and presents

new possibilities for cognition (even extent-disjoint concepts can be clustered).

The rest of this article is organized as follows. Section II introduces the interval set correlation operations used in this study along with basic definitions of fuzzy concepts while discussing the motivation behind this research. Section III proposes a model for IFCRL. Extensive experiments are conducted in Section IV to validate the feasibility of the proposed model. Finally, Section V concludes this article.

II. RELATED WORK

This section mainly introduces the related operations of interval sets and the relevant knowledge of fuzzy concept-cognitive learning.

A. Interval Set

Let U stands for the unit closed interval from 0 to 1, and $[U]$ denote the set of all closed intervals on the interval $[0,1]$. If M be a nonempty set, we call the mapping $\tilde{B} : M \rightarrow [U]$ an interval set on M . And all interval sets on M are denoted as $I(M)$.

For $\forall \tilde{B} \in I(M)$, let $\tilde{B}^\pm(c) = [\tilde{B}^-(c), \tilde{B}^+(c)]$, $c \in M$. We define ordinary fuzzy sets $\tilde{B}^-, \tilde{B}^+ : M \rightarrow U$ as lower-interval sets and upper-interval sets of M , respectively. For convenience, \tilde{B}^\pm is used to represent an interval set $[\tilde{B}^-, \tilde{B}^+]_{\forall c}$ in this article. \tilde{B}^- and \tilde{B}^+ denote the ordered set consisting of all lower and upper bounds of the interval set \tilde{B}^\pm .

The four representations of interval sets in this article are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}^\pm &= [\tilde{B}^-, \tilde{B}^+]_{\forall c} \\ &= \left[\left\{ \tilde{B}^-(c_1), \dots, \tilde{B}^-(c_{|M|}) \right\}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left\{ \tilde{B}^+(c_1), \dots, \tilde{B}^+(c_{|M|}) \right\} \right]_{\forall c} \\ &= \left\{ \left[\tilde{B}^-(c_1), \tilde{B}^+(c_1) \right], \dots, \left[\tilde{B}^-(c_{|M|}), \tilde{B}^+(c_{|M|}) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The interval inclusion relationship consistent with human cognition is defined as $\tilde{B}_1^\pm \subseteq \tilde{B}_2^\pm$ if $\forall c \in M$, $\tilde{B}_1^-(c) \geq \tilde{B}_2^-(c)$ and $\tilde{B}_1^+(c) \leq \tilde{B}_2^+(c)$. We call two interval sets \tilde{B}_1^\pm and \tilde{B}_2^\pm are intersected if the following conditions are satisfied: $\exists a_i \in U$, $\tilde{B}_1^-(c_i) \leq a_i \leq \tilde{B}_1^+(c_i)$ and $\tilde{B}_2^-(c_i) \leq a_i \leq \tilde{B}_2^+(c_i)$, $i=1, 2, \dots, |M|$.

Definition 1: Given two interval sets \tilde{B}_1^\pm and \tilde{B}_2^\pm which are intersected, their intersection, and union operations are described as the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_1^\pm \cap \tilde{B}_2^\pm &= \{ \{ \max(\tilde{B}_1^-(c_i), \tilde{B}_2^-(c_i)) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, |M| \} \\ &\quad \{ \min(\tilde{B}_1^+(c_i), \tilde{B}_2^+(c_i)) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, |M| \} \}_{\forall c} \\ \tilde{B}_1^\pm \cup \tilde{B}_2^\pm &= \{ \{ \min(\tilde{B}_1^-(c_i), \tilde{B}_2^-(c_i)) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, |M| \} \\ &\quad \{ \max(\tilde{B}_1^+(c_i), \tilde{B}_2^+(c_i)) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, |M| \} \}_{\forall c}. \end{aligned}$$

We define the number multiplication and addition operations of the interval set as follows:

$$a \cdot \tilde{B}_1^\pm(c) = \left[a \cdot \tilde{B}_1^-(c), a \cdot \tilde{B}_1^+(c) \right]_{\forall c}$$

$$\tilde{B}_1^\pm(c) + \tilde{B}_2^\pm(c) = \left[\tilde{B}_1^-(c) + \tilde{B}_2^-(c), \tilde{B}_1^+(c) + \tilde{B}_2^+(c) \right]_{\forall c}$$

B. Fuzzy Concept-Cognitive Learning

Fuzzy formal context (G, M, \tilde{I}) is a triple, where G represents the object set, M represents the attribute set, and \tilde{I} represents the fuzzy relationship between the object and the attribute. The membership degree $\tilde{I}(x, c)$ between object x and attribute c in \tilde{I} satisfied $\tilde{I}(x, c) \in [0, 1]$. We call the quintuple (G, M, \tilde{I}, D, J) fuzzy-classical decision formal context, where $\tilde{I} : G \times M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $J : G \times D \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$.

Let (G, M, \tilde{I}) be a fuzzy formal context. For $X \subseteq G$ and $\tilde{B} \in I(M)$, the two mapping operators \tilde{L} and N are defined as follows [19], [40]:

$$\tilde{L}(X) = \left\{ \bigwedge_{x \in X} \tilde{I}(x, c_i) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, |M| \right\}$$

$$N(\tilde{B}) = \left\{ x \in G \mid \forall c_i \in M, \tilde{B}(c_i) \leq \tilde{I}(x, c_i) \right\}.$$

We call a pair (X, \tilde{B}) the fuzzy concept if $\tilde{L}(X) = \tilde{B}$ and $N(\tilde{B}) = X$. And we call X the extent of the concept and \tilde{B} the intent of the concept. Generally speaking, the learning process is complicated due to the large number of fuzzy concepts. Therefore, the idea of particle computing is introduced to simplify it into fuzzy granular concept. The fuzzy conditional granular concept derived from any object x is defined as $(N\tilde{L}(x), \tilde{L}(x))$.

Example 1: The Table I represents a fuzzy formal decision context consisting of twelve objects and two condition attributes, where $X_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6\}$ and $X_2 = \{x_7, x_8, x_9, x_{10}, x_{11}, x_{12}\}$. For the case of decision $d = 1$, the classical fuzzy conditional granular concepts are $(\{x_1, x_3, x_6\}, \{0.32, 0.63\})$, $(\{x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6\}, \{0.36, 0.52\})$, $(\{x_3\}, \{0.48, 0.83\})$, $(\{x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6\}, \{0.38, 0.48\})$, $(\{x_3, x_5, x_6\}, \{0.4, 0.6\})$, $(\{x_3, x_6\}, \{0.41, 0.76\})$.

C. Motivation

The classical formal concepts primarily pertains to the depiction of the association between discrete data objects and their attributes. However, many real-world datasets are not binary or discrete, resulting in significant information loss during processing. Fuzzy concepts offer a viable solution to these issues. Nevertheless, existing fuzzy concepts typically represent a single value that accurately describes the lower bound of a concept's membership degree. Human perception often relies on a two-way scope for defining things rather than a one-way approach. For instance, gray is considered as being between black and white without being darker than white or whiter than black.

The unidirectional nature of fuzzy concepts fails to adequately describe objects with membership degrees close to the intent (slightly higher or slightly lower). To address this limitation, this article proposes an interval-intent fuzzy concept that expands

upon the intent of fuzzy concepts by adopting an interval form. This effectively characterizes concepts with two boundaries instead of just one boundary as seen in traditional fuzzy concepts. An interval inherently possesses upper and lower bounds, which aligns with the notion of considering concepts from both directions simultaneously. Moreover, intervals correspond well with human cognitive habits since attribute values tend to cluster among similar entities.

III. IFCRL MODEL

In this section, we introduce the definition and related properties of a new interval-intent fuzzy concept, and propose the process of concept re-cognition and a new method of concept clustering.

A. Interval-Intent Fuzzy Concept

Definition 2: For a fuzzy formal context (G, M, \tilde{I}) , we define four mapping operators $\tilde{F}^-, \tilde{F}^+ : 2^G \rightarrow [L^M]$ and $H^-, H^+ : [L^M] \rightarrow 2^G$ as follows:

$$\tilde{F}^-(X) = \left\{ \left[\bigwedge_{x \in X} \tilde{I}(x, c_i), 1 \right] \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, |M| \right\}$$

$$\tilde{F}^+(X) = \left\{ \left[0, \bigvee_{x \in X} \tilde{I}(x, c_i) \right] \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, |M| \right\}$$

$$H^-(\tilde{B}^\pm) = \left\{ x \in G \mid \tilde{B}^-(c) \leq \tilde{I}(x, c), \forall c \in M \right\}$$

$$H^+(\tilde{B}^\pm) = \left\{ x \in G \mid \tilde{B}^+(c) \geq \tilde{I}(x, c), \forall c \in M \right\}$$

where 2^G represents the power set of the object set and $[L^M]$ represents the power set of the attribute interval set.

According to the theory of the previous section, it is easy to prove $\tilde{F}^-(X)$ and $\tilde{F}^+(X)$ are intersected. It is feasible and concise to merge the four mapping operators defined above into two.

Definition 3: Given the four mapping operators in Definition 2, we define the two merged mapping operators $\tilde{F}^\pm : 2^G \rightarrow [L^M]$, $H^\pm : [L^M] \rightarrow 2^G$ as follows:

$$\tilde{F}^\pm(X) = \tilde{F}^-(X) \cap \tilde{F}^+(X)$$

$$= \left\{ \left[\bigwedge_{x \in X} \tilde{I}(x, c_i), \bigvee_{x \in X} \tilde{I}(x, c_i) \right] \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, |M| \right\}$$

$$H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm) = H^+(\tilde{B}^\pm) \cap H^-(\tilde{B}^\pm)$$

$$= \left\{ x \in G \mid \tilde{B}^-(c) \leq \tilde{I}(x, c) \leq \tilde{B}^+(c), \forall c \in M \right\}.$$

If $\tilde{F}^\pm(X) = \tilde{B}^\pm$ and $H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm) = X$, we call an ordered pair (X, \tilde{B}^\pm) an interval-intent fuzzy concept. We call a super-concept (X_2, \tilde{B}_2^\pm) and a subconcept (X_1, \tilde{B}_1^\pm) have the order relation $(X_1, \tilde{B}_1^\pm) \leq (X_2, \tilde{B}_2^\pm)$ if $X_1 \subseteq X_2$ (or $\tilde{B}_1^\pm \subseteq \tilde{B}_2^\pm$). If there is no confusion, we will rewrite the first merged mapping to form $\tilde{F}^\pm(X) = [\bigwedge_{x \in X} \tilde{I}(x, c), \bigvee_{x \in X} \tilde{I}(x, c)]_{\forall c}$.

Property 1: Let $X, X_1, X_2 \subseteq G$, $\tilde{B}^\pm, \tilde{B}_1^\pm, \tilde{B}_2^\pm \subseteq [L^M]$, then we have:

- 1) $\tilde{F}^\pm(X_1) \subseteq \tilde{F}^\pm(X_2)$ if $X_1 \subseteq X_2$, $H^\pm(\tilde{B}_1^\pm) \subseteq H^\pm(\tilde{B}_2^\pm)$ if $\tilde{B}_1^\pm \subseteq \tilde{B}_2^\pm$;
- 2) $X \subseteq H^\pm \tilde{F}^\pm(X)$, $\tilde{B}^\pm \supseteq \tilde{F}^\pm H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm)$;
- 3) $\tilde{F}^\pm(X) = \tilde{F}^\pm H^\pm \tilde{F}^\pm(X)$ and $H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm) = H^\pm \tilde{F}^\pm H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm)$.

Proof:

- 1) According to the definition of the object to property mapping operator, we have $\tilde{F}^\pm(X_1) = [\bigwedge_{x \in X_1} \tilde{I}(x, c), \bigvee_{x \in X_1} \tilde{I}(x, c)]_{\forall c}$ and $\tilde{F}^\pm(X_2) = [\bigwedge_{x \in X_2} \tilde{I}(x, c), \bigvee_{x \in X_2} \tilde{I}(x, c)]_{\forall c}$. Because $X_1 \subseteq X_2$, $\bigwedge_{x \in X_1} \tilde{I}(x, c) \geq \bigwedge_{x \in X_2} \tilde{I}(x, c)$ and $\bigvee_{x \in X_1} \tilde{I}(x, c) \leq \bigvee_{x \in X_2} \tilde{I}(x, c)$, then $\tilde{F}^\pm(X_1) \subseteq \tilde{F}^\pm(X_2)$ holds. In addition, for $\tilde{B}_1^\pm \subseteq \tilde{B}_2^\pm$, $H^\pm(\tilde{B}_1^\pm) = \{x \in G | \tilde{B}_1^-(c) \leq \tilde{I}(x, c) \leq \tilde{B}_1^+(c), \forall c \in M\}$ and $H^\pm(\tilde{B}_2^\pm) = \{x \in G | \tilde{B}_2^-(c) \leq \tilde{I}(x, c) \leq \tilde{B}_2^+(c), \forall c \in M\}$, then we have $H^\pm(\tilde{B}_1^\pm) \subseteq H^\pm(\tilde{B}_2^\pm)$ since $\tilde{B}_1^-(c) \geq \tilde{B}_2^-(c)$ and $\tilde{B}_1^+(c) \leq \tilde{B}_2^+(c)$ for each $c \in M$.
- 2) For any $x_a \in X$, there must be $\bigwedge_{x \in X} \tilde{I}(x, c) \leq \tilde{I}(x_a, c) \leq \bigvee_{x \in X} \tilde{I}(x, c)$ ($\forall c \in M$). Then, we have $x_a \in H^\pm \tilde{F}^\pm(X)$. Thus, $X \subseteq H^\pm \tilde{F}^\pm(X)$. Also, for any $\tilde{B}_a^\pm \subseteq \tilde{F}^\pm H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm)$, which is equal to $\tilde{B}_a^\pm \subseteq [\bigwedge_{x \in H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm)} \tilde{I}(x, c), \bigvee_{x \in H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm)} \tilde{I}(x, c)]$. Then, we have $\tilde{B}_a^-(c) \geq \bigwedge_{x \in H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm)} \tilde{I}(x, c)$ and $\tilde{B}_a^+(c) \leq \bigvee_{x \in H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm)} \tilde{I}(x, c)$ for any $c \in M$. Because $\bigwedge_{x \in H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm)} \tilde{I}(x, c) \geq \tilde{B}^-(c)$ and $\bigvee_{x \in H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm)} \tilde{I}(x, c) \leq \tilde{B}^+(c)$, we get $\tilde{B}_a^-(c) \geq \tilde{B}^-(c)$ and $\tilde{B}_a^+(c) \leq \tilde{B}^+(c)$ for any $c \in M$. Thus, $\tilde{B}^\pm \supseteq \tilde{F}^\pm H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm)$ is obtained.
- 3) According to (2), we know $X \subseteq H^\pm \tilde{F}^\pm(X)$. Then, we have $\tilde{F}^\pm(X) \subseteq \tilde{F}^\pm H^\pm \tilde{F}^\pm(X)$ by (1). Since $\tilde{F}^\pm(X) = \tilde{B}^\pm$, and $\tilde{B}^\pm \supseteq \tilde{F}^\pm H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm)$. Further, we obtain $\tilde{F}^\pm(X) \supseteq \tilde{F}^\pm H^\pm \tilde{F}^\pm(X)$. Meanwhile, $\tilde{F}^\pm(X) = \tilde{F}^\pm H^\pm \tilde{F}^\pm(X)$ holds. And it is easy to prove that $H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm) = H^\pm \tilde{F}^\pm H^\pm(\tilde{B}^\pm)$ as above. ■

The above mapping clearly satisfies the order-preserving Galois connection relation. In classical fuzzy concept-cognitive learning, the reverse order Galois link is convenient to represent the properties common to all objects. The sequence-preserving Galois link in this article shows that more objects have a larger range of properties. When considering multiple objects, the boundaries between them are better understood and exploring similarities among them becomes easier.

Property 2: Given a regular fuzzy-classical formal decision context (G, M, \tilde{I}, D, J) and four mappings in Definition 2. For any object x , $(H^- \tilde{F}^-(x), \tilde{F}^-(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+ H^- \tilde{F}^-(x))$ and $(H^+ \tilde{F}^+(x), \tilde{F}^- H^+ \tilde{F}^+(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+(x))$ are both interval-intent fuzzy concepts.

Proof: We only need to demonstrate (1) $\tilde{F}^\pm(H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)) = \tilde{F}^-(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+ H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)$ and (2) $H^\pm(\tilde{F}^\pm(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+ H^\pm \tilde{F}^\pm(x)) = H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)$. The same goes for another concept.

- 1) Note that $\tilde{F}^\pm(H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)) = \tilde{F}^-(H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)) \cap \tilde{F}^+(H^- \tilde{F}^-(x))$ by Definition 3. According to Property 1, it is easy to obtain $\tilde{F}^- H^- \tilde{F}^-(x) = \tilde{F}^-(x)$. Thus, $\tilde{F}^\pm(H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)) = \tilde{F}^-(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+ H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)$.
- 2) According to Definition 2, we can get $\tilde{F}^-(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+ H^- \tilde{F}^-(x) = [\tilde{I}(x, c), \bigvee_{x_i \in H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)} \tilde{I}(x_i, c)]_{\forall c}$. And $H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)$

Algorithm 1: Construction of Interval-Intent Fuzzy Concept Space.

Input: A quintuple (G, M, \tilde{I}, J, D) .

Output: The interval-intent fuzzy granular concept spaces $GCS^{d,u}$ and $GCS^{d,l}$.

- 1 According to the label, the object set G is divided and denoted as $G/D = \{G^{d_1}, G^{d_2}, \dots, G^{d_{|D|}}\}$;
 - 2 **for** each $G^{d_k} \in G/D$ **do**
 - 3 **for** each $x_j \in G^{d_k}$ **do**
 - 4 Construct an UFGC $(X^+, \tilde{B}^{\pm,u})$;
 - 5 $GCS^{d_k,u} \leftarrow (X^+, \tilde{B}^{\pm,u})$;
 - 6 Construct a LFGC $(X^-, \tilde{B}^{\pm,l})$;
 - 7 $GCS^{d_k,l} \leftarrow (X^-, \tilde{B}^{\pm,l})$;
 - 8 **end**
 - 9 $GCS^{d,u} \leftarrow GCS^{d_k,u}$, $GCS^{d,l} \leftarrow GCS^{d_k,l}$;
 - 10 **end**
 - 11 **return** $GCS^{d,u}$ and $GCS^{d,l}$
-

$(x) = \{x_t \in G | \tilde{I}(x_t, c) \geq \tilde{I}(x, c), \forall c \in M\}$. Obviously, we have $H^\pm(\tilde{F}^-(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+ H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)) = H^\pm([\tilde{I}(x, c), \bigvee_{x_i \in H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)} \tilde{I}(x_i, c)]_{\forall c} = \{x_m \in G | \tilde{I}(x, c) \leq \tilde{I}(x_m, c) \leq \bigvee_{x_i \in H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)} \tilde{I}(x_i, c), \forall c \in M\} = \{x_t \in G | \tilde{I}(x_t, c) \geq \tilde{I}(x, c), \forall c \in M\} = H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)$.

In conclusion, there are $\tilde{F}^\pm(H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)) = \tilde{F}^-(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+ H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)$ and $H^\pm(\tilde{F}^-(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+ H^\pm \tilde{F}^\pm(x)) = H^- \tilde{F}^-(x)$, thus $(H^- \tilde{F}^-(x), \tilde{F}^-(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+ H^- \tilde{F}^-(x))$ is an interval-intent fuzzy concept. ■

Definition 4: Let $G/D = \{G^{d_k} | k = 1, 2, \dots, |D|\}$ represent the partition of the object set based on their respective labels. For any object $x \in G^{d_k}$, $(H^- \tilde{F}^-(x), \tilde{F}^-(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+ H^- \tilde{F}^-(x))$ and $(H^+ \tilde{F}^+(x), \tilde{F}^- H^+ \tilde{F}^+(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+(x))$ are upper-interval-intent fuzzy granular concept (short for UFGC and denote it by $(X^+, \tilde{B}^{\pm,u})$) and lower-interval-intent fuzzy granular concept (short for LFGC and denote it by $(X^-, \tilde{B}^{\pm,l})$), respectively. The interval-intent fuzzy granular concept spaces (under decision d_k) introduced by UFGC and LFGC are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 GCS^{d_k,u} &= \left\{ \left(H^- \tilde{F}^-(x), \tilde{F}^-(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+ H^- \tilde{F}^-(x) \right) \mid x \in G^{d_k} \right\} \\
 GCS^{d_k,l} &= \left\{ \left(H^+ \tilde{F}^+(x), \tilde{F}^- H^+ \tilde{F}^+(x) \cap \tilde{F}^+(x) \right) \mid x \in G^{d_k} \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, UFGC and LFGC both are granular concepts derived from the same object whose attribute membership serves as the lower and upper bounds of the two interval-intent concepts, respectively. The concept space under each decision is combined into the overall concept space, which are defined as $GCS^{d,u} = \{GCS^{d_1,u}, GCS^{d_2,u}, \dots, GCS^{d_{|D|},u}\}$ and $GCS^{d,l} = \{GCS^{d_1,l}, GCS^{d_2,l}, \dots, GCS^{d_{|D|},l}\}$.

Example 2: According to Definition 4, the four interval-intent fuzzy granular concept spaces in Table I can be derived as

TABLE I
FUZZY FORMAL DECISION CONTEXT

G	c_1	c_2	d	G	c_1	c_2	d
x_1	0.32	0.63	1	x_7	0.80	0.70	2
x_2	0.36	0.52	1	x_8	0.81	0.66	2
x_3	0.48	0.83	1	x_9	0.77	0.60	2
x_4	0.38	0.48	1	x_{10}	0.91	0.55	2
x_5	0.40	0.60	1	x_{11}	0.72	0.45	2
x_6	0.41	0.76	1	x_{12}	0.58	0.61	2

follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
GCS^{d_1,u} &= \{(\{x_1, x_3, x_6\}, \{[0.32, 0.48], [0.63, 0.83]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6\}, \{[0.36, 0.48], [0.52, 0.83]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_3\}, \{[0.48, 0.48], [0.83, 0.83]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6\}, \{[0.38, 0.48], [0.48, 0.83]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_3, x_5, x_6\}, \{[0.4, 0.48], [0.6, 0.83]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_3, x_6\}, \{[0.41, 0.48], [0.76, 0.83]\})\} \\
GCS^{d_1,l} &= \{(\{x_1\}, \{[0.32, 0.32], [0.63, 0.63]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_2\}, \{[0.36, 0.36], [0.52, 0.52]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6\}, \\
&\quad \{[0.32, 0.48], [0.48, 0.83]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_4\}, \{[0.38, 0.38], [0.48, 0.48]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_2, x_4, x_5\}, \{[0.36, 0.4], [0.48, 0.6]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_1, x_2, x_4, x_5, x_6\}, \{[0.32, 0.41], [0.48, 0.76]\})\} \\
GCS^{d_2,u} &= \{(\{x_7\}, \{[0.8, 0.8], [0.7, 0.7]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_8\}, \{[0.81, 0.81], [0.66, 0.66]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_7, x_8, x_9\}, \{[0.77, 0.81], [0.6, 0.7]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_{10}\}, \{[0.91, 0.91], [0.55, 0.55]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_7, x_8, x_9, x_{10}, x_{11}\}, \{[0.72, 0.91], [0.45, 0.7]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_7, x_8, x_{12}\}, \{[0.58, 0.81], [0.61, 0.7]\})\} \\
GCS^{d_2,l} &= \{(\{x_7, x_9, x_{11}, x_{12}\}, \{[0.58, 0.8], [0.45, 0.7]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_8, x_9, x_{11}, x_{12}\}, \{[0.58, 0.81], [0.45, 0.66]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_9, x_{11}\}, \{[0.72, 0.77], [0.45, 0.6]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_{10}, x_{11}\}, \{[0.72, 0.91], [0.45, 0.55]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_{11}\}, \{[0.72, 0.72], [0.45, 0.45]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_{12}\}, \{[0.58, 0.58], [0.61, 0.61]\})\}.
\end{aligned}$$

B. Concept Re-Cognition Process

Concept cognition is a process of starting from an object to find attributes and returning to find objects again. In the process of human cognition, there are often deviations or inaccuracies in the first cognition. Therefore, it is necessary to constantly update knowledge (concepts). The re-cognition process proposed in this article can simulate the human thinking process to a certain extent, and find more accurate concept representation in complex and variable data.

Definition 5: Given the two interval-intent fuzzy concepts $(X_j^+, \tilde{B}_j^{\pm,u}) = (X_j^+, [\tilde{B}_j^{-,u}, \tilde{B}_j^{+,u}]_{\vee c})$ and $(X_j^-, \tilde{B}_j^{\pm,l}) =$

$(X_j^-, [\tilde{B}_j^{-,l}, \tilde{B}_j^{+,l}]_{\vee c})$ induced by x_j , the definition of pseudointent in the re-cognition concept (RC) is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{B}_j^{\pm,p} &= \left\{ \left[\tilde{B}_j^{\pm,l}(c_i) - (1 - er(x_j)) \cdot (\tilde{B}_j^{+,l}(c_i) - \tilde{B}_j^{-,l}(c_i)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \tilde{B}_j^{-,u}(c_i) + er(x_j) \cdot (\tilde{B}_j^{+,u}(c_i) - \tilde{B}_j^{-,u}(c_i)) \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. |i = 1, 2, \dots, |M| \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

where $er(x_j) = \frac{|X_j^+|}{|X_j^+| + |X_j^-|}$.

The parameter $er(x_j)$ in the above definition is defined in terms of the extent ratio of UFGC and LFGC. Essentially to measure the magnitude of the fluctuation of the attribute value based on the number of objects in the extent. For example, if UFGC has a large number of extent, it means that for object x_j , there are more objects in the dataset that are larger than its attribute value. Therefore, in the process of re-cognition, we give more tolerance to the larger attribute values, allowing the larger attribute values to be more retained.

The concept re-cognition process is divided into the following steps:

- 1) Find the two interval-intent fuzzy concepts induced by x_j , and compute the extent ratio $er(x_j)$.
- 2) Get the pseudointent $\tilde{B}_j^{\pm,p}$ of the RC by Definition 5.
- 3) The pseudointent is used as the clue in the process of re-cognition, and the new concept $(H^\pm(B_j^{\pm,p}), F^\pm H^\pm(B_j^{\pm,p}))$ is obtained by Definition 3.
- 4) Repeat the above steps until every object in the space is re-recognized.

We call the concept newly learned from x_j the RC, which denoted by $(X_j^r, \tilde{B}_j^{\pm,r}) = (H^\pm(B_j^{\pm,p}), F^\pm H^\pm(B_j^{\pm,p}))$. And newly obtained concept space a RC space, denoted by RCS. According to Definition 3, it is easy to prove that the RC is also an interval-intent fuzzy concept. At this time, the intent of the RC is a subset of the pseudointent generated in the cognitive process, and the concept is more accurately depicted. We call other objects other than the primary original object in the extent of the RC as approximate objects, and they have higher similarity with the original object.

Example 3: Object x_5 is taken as an example to illustrate the process of concept re-cognition. First, we obtain the ratio $er(x_5) = \frac{|\{x_3, x_5, x_6\}|}{|\{x_3, x_5, x_6\}| + |\{x_2, x_4, x_5\}|} = 0.5$ with the number of extent of the upper-interval-intent fuzzy granular concept and lower-interval-intent fuzzy granular concept. According to Definition 5, the pseudointent is $\tilde{B}_5^{\pm,p} = \{[0.38, 0.44], [0.54, 0.715]\}$. The RC $(X_5^r, \tilde{B}_5^{\pm,r}) = (H^\pm(B_5^{\pm,p}), F^\pm H^\pm(B_5^{\pm,p})) = (\{x_5\}, \{[0.4, 0.4], [0.6, 0.6]\})$ is learned from the learning operator in Definition 3. After re-cognition of each object, we have the following RC space:

$$\begin{aligned}
RCS^{d_1} &= \{(\{x_1, x_6\}, \{[0.32, 0.41], [0.63, 0.76]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_2, x_5, x_6\}, \{[0.36, 0.41], [0.52, 0.76]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_3, x_5, x_6\}, \{[0.4, 0.48], [0.6, 0.83]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_4, x_5, x_6\}, \{[0.38, 0.41], [0.48, 0.76]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_5\}, \{[0.4, 0.4], [0.6, 0.6]\}) \\
&\quad (\{x_5, x_6\}, \{[0.4, 0.41], [0.6, 0.76]\})\}
\end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 2: Concept Re-Cognition Process.

Input: The set $G/D = \{G^{d_1}, G^{d_2}, \dots, G^{d_{|D|}}\}$ of objects partitioned by labels, the set of extent ratio $ER = \{er(x_1), er(x_2), \dots, er(x_{|G|})\}$, the concept spaces under each decision $GCS^{d,l}$ and $GCS^{d,u}$.

Output: Re-cognition concept space RCS .

```

1 for each  $G^{d_k} \in G/D$  do
2   for each  $x_j \in G^{d_k}$  do
3     Find the two interval-intent fuzzy concepts
       $(X_j^+, \tilde{B}_j^{\pm,u}) = (X_j^+, [\tilde{B}_j^{-,u}, \tilde{B}_j^{+,u}]_{\forall c})$  and
       $(X_j^-, \tilde{B}_j^{\pm,l}) = (X_j^-, [\tilde{B}_j^{-,l}, \tilde{B}_j^{+,l}]_{\forall c})$  induced
      by  $x_j$  in  $GCS^{d_k,u}$  and  $GCS^{d_k,l}$ ;
4      $\tilde{B}_j^{\pm,p} = \{[\tilde{B}_j^{+,l}(c_i) - (1 - er(x_j)) \cdot (\tilde{B}_j^{+,l}(c_i) - \tilde{B}_j^{-,l}(c_i)), \tilde{B}_j^{-,u}(c_i) + er(x_j) \cdot (\tilde{B}_j^{+,u}(c_i) - \tilde{B}_j^{-,u}(c_i))]\mid i = 1, 2, \dots, |M|\}$ ;
5     Get a re-cognition concept
       $(X_j^r, \tilde{B}_j^{\pm,r}) = (H^\pm(B_j^{\pm,p}), F^\pm H^\pm(B_j^{\pm,p}))$ 
      according to the mapping in Definition 3;
6      $RCS^{d_k} \leftarrow (X_j^r, \tilde{B}_j^{\pm,r})$ 
7   end
8    $RCS \leftarrow RCS^{d_k}$ 
9 end
10 return  $RCS$ 

```

$$\begin{aligned}
RCS^{d_2} = & \{(\{x_7, x_9\}, \{[0.77, 0.8], [0.6, 0.7]\}) \\
& (\{x_8, x_9\}, \{[0.77, 0.81], [0.6, 0.66]\}) \\
& (\{x_9\}, \{[0.77, 0.77], [0.6, 0.6]\}) \\
& (\{x_{10}\}, \{[0.91, 0.91], [0.55, 0.55]\}) \\
& (\{x_9, x_{11}\}, \{[0.72, 0.77], [0.45, 0.6]\}) \\
& (\{x_{12}\}, \{[0.58, 0.58], [0.61, 0.61]\})\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The process of concept re-cognition can be considered as the endeavor to identify objects based on their attributes, which essentially involves a rational expansion of the range of attribute values associated with a single object. In comparison to the preceding two interval granular concepts, RC possesses the ability to mitigate the impact of noise to some extent. Simultaneously, it aligns with humans' second cognitive logic that individuals tend to associate with others who share similar characteristics.

C. Concept Clustering

In the previous section, we explored the RCs, which are typically numerous in quantity. Human memory is limited and can only retain the more significant concepts, necessitating compression, and prioritization. During concept learning, a multitude of similar concepts with slight variations in attribute values may arise. However, precision at this level is not always essential; for instance, identifying a duck in a river without specifying its exact species suffices. In other words, people often treat such highly similar entities as belonging to the same concept. Building upon these notions, we introduce concept clustering into our proposed model.

Concept clustering is different from unsupervised clustering in machine learning. It aims to aggregate two or more supervised concepts into pseudoconcepts and reduce the size of concept space to improve classification efficiency. Concept clustering can be viewed as a compressed processing technique for labeled concepts.

1) *Clustering Related Parameters.* *Definition 6:* Let (X_i, \tilde{B}_i^\pm) and (X_j, \tilde{B}_j^\pm) be two interval-intent fuzzy concepts, then the extent similarity is defined as follows:

$$\delta(X_i, X_j) = \frac{|X_i \cap X_j|}{|X_i \cup X_j|}. \quad (1)$$

Definition 7: Let (X_i, \tilde{B}_i^\pm) and (X_j, \tilde{B}_j^\pm) be two interval-intent fuzzy concepts, then the intent similarity is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(\tilde{B}_i^\pm, \tilde{B}_j^\pm) = & 1 \\
& - \frac{\sum_c (|\tilde{B}_i^-(c) - \tilde{B}_j^-(c)| + |\tilde{B}_i^+(c) - \tilde{B}_j^+(c)|)}{2|M| + \sum_c (|\tilde{B}_i^+(c) - \tilde{B}_i^-(c)| + |\tilde{B}_j^+(c) - \tilde{B}_j^-(c)|)} \quad (2)
\end{aligned}$$

where $|M|$ represents the number of attributes.

Property 3: For two concepts (X_i, \tilde{B}_i^\pm) and (X_j, \tilde{B}_j^\pm) , we have:

- 1) $0 \leq \delta(X_i, X_j) \leq 1$;
- 2) $0 \leq \varphi(\tilde{B}_i^\pm, \tilde{B}_j^\pm) \leq 1$.

Proof: (1) It is immediate from Definition 6.

(2) Obviously, $0 \leq |\tilde{B}_i^-(c) - \tilde{B}_j^-(c)| \leq 1$, $0 \leq |\tilde{B}_i^+(c) - \tilde{B}_j^+(c)| \leq 1$. We get $0 \leq \sum_c (|\tilde{B}_i^-(c) - \tilde{B}_j^-(c)| + |\tilde{B}_i^+(c) - \tilde{B}_j^+(c)|) \leq 2 \cdot |M|$. Then we have $0 < \varphi(\tilde{B}_i^\pm, \tilde{B}_j^\pm) \leq 1$. Notice that $\varphi(\tilde{B}_i^\pm, \tilde{B}_j^\pm) = 0$ if and only if for $\forall c \in M$, $\tilde{B}_i^+(c) = \tilde{B}_i^-(c) = 0$ and $\tilde{B}_j^+(c) = \tilde{B}_j^-(c) = 1$ (or the two sets of values are reversed). Thus, $0 \leq \varphi(\tilde{B}_i^\pm, \tilde{B}_j^\pm) \leq 1$. ■

According to Definition 7, a higher degree of intent similarity indicates a greater level of similarity between two concepts. It is reasonable to assess this based on the distance between the boundaries of the concepts and the size of their respective intervals. A larger interval suggests that a concept has extensive intent coverage and is distinct from other concepts, thus indicating a high degree of similarity. However, existing concept-cognitive learning [22], [39] approaches only consider extent similarity (as defined in Definition 6) for clustering, overlooking the significance of attribute similarity. This approach fails to recognize that concepts with overlapping extents may not necessarily share similar intents. For instance, when making decisions about watermelons, large and small watermelons' concept extent are likely to intersect due to their inclusion relationship in terms of size. However, clustering them into the same concept would be misleading. Therefore, it is crucial to consider intent relationships when defining similarities.

2) *Clustering Process:* Based on the similarity of intent, this study integrates two or more concepts with high intent similarity to generate a novel concept. We refer to this new concept as a pseudoconcept, as its extent and intent are not strictly bound by the proposed mapping relationship. Within the concept space,

Algorithm 3: Concept Clustering.

Input: Re-cognition concept space
 $RCS = \{RCS^{d_1}, RCS^{d_2}, \dots, RCS^{d_{|D|}}\}$ and parameter γ .

Output: The pseudo-concept space
 $PC_\gamma = \{PC_\gamma^{d_1}, PC_\gamma^{d_2}, \dots, PC_\gamma^{d_{|D|}}\}$.

```

1 for  $RCS^{d_k} \in RCS$  do
2    $PC_\gamma^{d_k} = \emptyset$ ;
3   for a concept  $(X_i^r, \tilde{B}_i^{\pm,r}) \in RCS^{d_k}$  do
4      $C_i^{d_k} = \emptyset$ ;
5     Calculate the intent similarity between each
       concept by Definition 7;
6     Find the concept  $(X_j^r, \tilde{B}_j^{\pm,r}) \in RCS^{d_k}$  with
       the most intent similarity;
7     if  $\varphi(\tilde{B}_i^{\pm,r}, \tilde{B}_j^{\pm,r}) > \gamma$  then
8       |  $C_i^{d_k} \leftarrow (X_j^r, \tilde{B}_j^{\pm,r})$ 
9     end
10    if  $RCS^{d_k} = \emptyset$  then
11      | End the clustering process under this label;
12    end
13    Cluster  $C_i^{d_k}$  as pseudo-concept  $(X_i^p, \tilde{B}_i^{\pm,p})$ 
       according to definition 8;
14     $PC_\gamma^{d_k} \leftarrow (X_i^p, \tilde{B}_i^{\pm,p})$ ;
15    Remove all the clustered concepts from
        $RCS^{d_k}$ ;
16  end
17   $PC_\gamma \leftarrow PC_\gamma^{d_k}$ ;
18 end
19 return  $PC_\gamma$ 

```

we partition the blocks based on intent similarity. Concepts exhibiting an intent similarity exceeding the threshold γ are grouped together and referred to as cluster C . It is evident that the re-cognition conceptual space comprises numerous clusters denoted by $RCS^{d_k} = \{C_1^{d_k}, C_2^{d_k}, \dots, C_n^{d_k}\}$.

Definition 8: For a cluster origin $(X_{i_1}^r, \tilde{B}_{i_1}^{\pm,r})$ and all of its intent similarity in order from the largest to the smallest concept $(X_{i_2}^r, \tilde{B}_{i_2}^{\pm,r}), (X_{i_3}^r, \tilde{B}_{i_3}^{\pm,r}), \dots, (X_{i_m}^r, \tilde{B}_{i_m}^{\pm,r}) \in C_i^{d_k}$, the extent and intent of the pseudoconcept $(X_i^p, \tilde{B}_i^{\pm,p})$ derived from the cluster $C_i^{d_k}$ are defined as follows:

$$X_i^p = X_{i_1}^r \cup X_{i_2}^r \cup \dots \cup X_{i_m}^r$$

$$\tilde{B}_i^{\pm,p}(c) = \frac{1}{2^{m-1}} \left(\tilde{B}_{i_1}^{\pm,r}(c) + \tilde{B}_{i_2}^{\pm,r}(c) + 2 \cdot \tilde{B}_{i_3}^{\pm,r}(c) \right. \\ \left. + \dots + 2^{m-2} \cdot \tilde{B}_{i_m}^{\pm,r}(c) \right), c \in M.$$

The pseudoconcept intent in definition 8 shows that the RC that is clustered first will have more influence on the pseudoconcept. Therefore, we prioritize the participation of concepts with higher intent similarity in clustering, while concepts with lower intent similarity are involved later. Using pseudoconcepts can effectively reduce the size of the concept space. At the same time, the limitation of individual cognition is eliminated to a certain extent. Algorithm 3 shows the concrete process of concept clustering.

Algorithm 4: New Object Label Prediction.

Input: The pseudo-concept space PC_γ and new object Δx in the test set.

Output: The predict label d_m of Δx .

```

1  $H = \emptyset$ ;
2 for each  $PC_\gamma^{d_k} \in PC_\gamma$  do
3   for each  $(X^p, \tilde{B}^{\pm,p}) \in PC_\gamma^{d_k}$  do
4     Compute  $S(\Delta x, X^p)$  according to fomula (3);
5      $H \leftarrow S(\Delta x, X^p)$ 
6   end
7 end
8 Get the minimum distance  $s = \min(H)$  and
   corresponding minimum distance concept;
9 Find the label  $d_m$  for the minimum distance concept;
10 return Predict label  $d_m$ 

```

D. Object Classification Based on Intent Similarity

Since the new object to be classified will not be in the extent of any existing concept, the label judgment can only be made by the distance between the intent. Intent similarity in definition 7 can be seen as a distance measure. The object to be classified is regarded as an interval-intent fuzzy concept, whose interval-intent is composed of a single value of the membership degree of each attribute. Therefore, the formula in definition 7 is deformed to obtain the following distance definition.

Definition 9: Given a concept $(\{x_{\text{new}}\}, \tilde{B}_{\text{new}}^{\pm})$ to be classified derived from a new object x_{new} , its similarity distance with the pseudoconcept $(X^p, \tilde{B}^{\pm,p})$ is defined as follows:

$$S(x_{\text{new}}, X^p) = \frac{\sum_c \left(\left| \tilde{B}_{\text{new}}^-(c) - \tilde{B}_j^{-,p}(c) \right| + \left| \tilde{B}_{\text{new}}^+(c) - \tilde{B}_j^{+,p}(c) \right| \right)}{2 \cdot |M| + \sum_c \left(\left| \tilde{B}_j^{+,p}(c) - \tilde{B}_j^{-,p}(c) \right| \right)} \quad (3)$$

where $|M|$ represents the number of attributes.

It can be seen that similarity distance and intent similarity are inversely proportional. The greater the intent similarity, the smaller the similarity distance. We obtain the pseudoconcept of the minimum similarity distance to determine the decision of the new object. The specific steps are represented in Algorithm 4.

E. Overall Procedure and Complexity Analysis

The overall flowchart of IFCRL is shown in Fig. 1. The model consists of three stages: 1) concept-cognitive process; 2) concept re-cognition process; 3) concept clustering and classification. For a fuzzy formal context with three decisions, the first concept learning is performed according to the mapping proposed in Definition 2, and two related concept spaces are obtained. Then, for each object, the extent ratio of their concepts in different concept spaces is calculated, so as to obtain the pseudointent used for re-cognition according to Definition 5. The pseudointent is learned to obtain the RC. Finally, the pseudoconcept space is obtained by concept clustering. According to Formula 3, the nearest concept to the newly added object is obtained to determine the label.




Fig. 1. General flow chart of IFCRL (1st and 2nd in the legend represent the concept-cognitive process and the concept re-cognition process, respectively).

According to the aforementioned discussion, the time complexity of Algorithm 1 for constructing the initial concept space is $O(|G|^2|M|)$. The time complexity of re-cognition process is related to the number of objects. In the process of re-cognition of each object, it does not need to go through all the objects again, only need to search the objects in the extent union of UFGC and LFGC derived from the corresponding object. Assuming that the average number of objects in the extent union of two concepts (UFGC and LFGC) in two concept spaces is a , the time complexity of Algorithm 2 is $O(a|G||M|)$. In the process of clustering, the complexity of computing intent similarity is $O(|M|)$. Concepts that have already been clustered will not participate in the subsequent clustering process, so the number of concepts that need to be considered for clustering concepts will be gradually reduced each time. The choice of threshold γ is positively related to the complexity: a higher threshold will make the space more refined, thus increasing the total number of comparisons for intent similarity. The best case is that every concept in the space is clustered together at once, and the worst case is that no concept can be clustered with the others. Therefore, the time complexities of Algorithm 3 in the best and worst cases are $O(|G||M|)$, $O(|G|^2|M|)$, respectively. Obviously, when predicting the label, it is necessary to compare the new object with each pseudoconcepts. Therefore, Algorithm 4 takes $O(|PC_\gamma||M|)$. The overall complexity of IFCRL is $O(|G|^2|M|)$.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we examine the rationality and effectiveness of the IFCRL algorithm proposed in a fuzzy context. We compare its classification accuracy with 14 algorithms and verify

TABLE II
DETAILS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL DATASETS

ID	Dataset	Object	Attribute	Class
1	Appendicitis	100	7	2
2	Parkinsons	197	22	2
3	Wine	198	33	3
4	Wpbc	200	33	2
5	Glass	214	9	6
6	Heart	270	13	2
7	Tic_tac_toe	958	9	2
8	Wine_red	1518	11	3
9	Segmentation	2310	19	7
10	Phoneme	5404	5	2
11	Mushroom	8124	22	2
12	Magic	19020	10	2

the effectiveness of the re-cognition method through ablation experiments. In addition, we assess the importance of clustering by evaluating the rate at which space is compressed, and further explore how parameter γ affects clustering. The datasets utilized in this experiment are sourced from UCI and KEEL, with detailed information provided in Table II.

A. Experimental Setting

In order to adapt to the fuzzy environment in this article, all datasets are normalized according to the following formula:

$$\tilde{I}(x_i, c_j) = \frac{v(x_i, c_j) - \min(v(c_j))}{\max(v(c_j)) - \min(v(c_j))} \quad (4)$$

where $v(x_i, c_j)$ represents the value of x_i under attribute c_j in the original dataset, $\min(v(c_j))$ and $\max(v(c_j))$ represents, respectively, the minimum and maximum value of attribute c_j

TABLE III
COMPARISON OF ACCURACY (MEAN \pm STANDARD DEVIATION%) AMONG IFCRL AND SEVEN CLASSIC CLASSIFICATION ALGORITHMS

ID	γ	IFCRL	KNN	SVM	DT	NB	LR	LDA	Bagging
1	0.99	90.50 \pm 4.71	82.00 \pm 4.00	84.50 \pm 5.22	77.50 \pm 6.42	83.50 \pm 5.02	83.50 \pm 7.08	84.50 \pm 6.50	78.50 \pm 5.50
2	1.00	94.87 \pm 3.44	90.77 \pm 4.47	86.15 \pm 2.61	84.10 \pm 4.70	70.51 \pm 4.62	82.82 \pm 3.25	87.18 \pm 3.24	79.74 \pm 8.22
3	0.92	97.94 \pm 1.88	95.58 \pm 2.37	95.59 \pm 3.01	90.29 \pm 4.37	97.65 \pm 2.88	96.18 \pm 3.49	97.65 \pm 2.88	93.82 \pm 3.59
4	0.96	78.00 \pm 5.67	75.25 \pm 6.84	77.75 \pm 7.20	69.75 \pm 5.75	67.75 \pm 6.56	78.00 \pm 7.42	76.50 \pm 6.91	64.75 \pm 7.25
5	1.00	73.49 \pm 5.00	66.98 \pm 8.43	58.37 \pm 7.16	66.51 \pm 5.52	47.67 \pm 8.27	54.88 \pm 5.81	61.16 \pm 3.46	24.42 \pm 5.01
6	0.92	85.37 \pm 4.17	80.83 \pm 5.65	82.92 \pm 4.82	72.08 \pm 5.03	83.95 \pm 5.67	82.50 \pm 5.53	81.04 \pm 3.11	72.41 \pm 5.94
7	0.89	100.00 \pm 0.00	100.00 \pm 0.00	97.97 \pm 0.59	94.64 \pm 1.38	70.21 \pm 1.85	95.10 \pm 0.94	97.97 \pm 0.59	90.83 \pm 2.56
8	1.00	64.84 \pm 3.52	61.87 \pm 2.08	60.82 \pm 2.66	66.41 \pm 2.75	60.39 \pm 2.64	62.43 \pm 2.88	63.72 \pm 2.39	52.11 \pm 2.41
9	0.99	95.86 \pm 1.19	94.55 \pm 1.45	91.98 \pm 1.42	96.24 \pm 0.77	70.71 \pm 1.60	90.45 \pm 1.35	89.33 \pm 1.59	85.79 \pm 1.86
10	1.00	85.03 \pm 0.45	87.75 \pm 1.24	77.01 \pm 1.28	87.20 \pm 0.85	76.04 \pm 1.39	75.04 \pm 1.04	75.44 \pm 0.71	72.53 \pm 1.05
11	0.98	100.00 \pm 0.00	99.98 \pm 0.03	94.83 \pm 1.13	100.00 \pm 0.00	91.72 \pm 0.31	94.70 \pm 0.26	94.39 \pm 0.34	93.67 \pm 0.63
12	0.99	84.34 \pm 0.69	82.92 \pm 0.49	79.35 \pm 0.57	81.31 \pm 0.58	72.62 \pm 0.52	79.07 \pm 0.35	78.61 \pm 0.56	77.83 \pm 0.35
Average		87.5200	84.8733	82.2700	82.1692	74.3933	81.2225	82.2908	73.8667

The best results are highlighted in bold entities.

TABLE IV
COMPARISON OF ACCURACY (MEAN \pm STANDARD DEVIATION%) AMONG IFCRL AND SEVEN FUZZY-BASED CLASSIFICATION ALGORITHMS

ID	γ	IFCRL	FCLM	FRNN	PFKNN	GAFuzzyKNN	IF-KNN	CFKNN	FuzzyKNN
1	0.99	90.50 \pm 4.71	85.00 \pm 6.12	76.00 \pm 7.00	84.50 \pm 4.15	84.50 \pm 5.22	87.00 \pm 5.57	72.00 \pm 12.08	84.00 \pm 7.68
2	1.00	94.87 \pm 3.44	94.62 \pm 3.53	76.67 \pm 4.36	73.08 \pm 6.90	89.23 \pm 3.94	93.33 \pm 2.05	88.72 \pm 6.90	90.77 \pm 5.15
3	0.92	97.94 \pm 1.88	96.47 \pm 2.20	95.88 \pm 2.35	93.82 \pm 3.59	93.53 \pm 3.67	96.18 \pm 3.96	94.71 \pm 3.90	95.59 \pm 2.71
4	0.96	78.00 \pm 5.65	70.00 \pm 6.80	73.00 \pm 8.05	69.25 \pm 6.62	72.75 \pm 4.10	75.00 \pm 7.83	56.50 \pm 8.89	74.50 \pm 7.57
5	1.00	73.49 \pm 5.00	67.44 \pm 3.82	53.26 \pm 8.02	41.86 \pm 5.60	61.40 \pm 8.20	65.58 \pm 7.77	62.79 \pm 5.88	66.51 \pm 4.67
6	0.92	85.37 \pm 4.17	76.67 \pm 3.81	80.83 \pm 4.35	77.92 \pm 4.08	79.58 \pm 4.82	78.70 \pm 4.92	70.00 \pm 6.13	80.00 \pm 6.19
7	0.89	100.00 \pm 0.00	100.00 \pm 0.00	66.61 \pm 3.85	63.65 \pm 2.04	99.84 \pm 0.33	100.00 \pm 0.00	92.29 \pm 1.54	100.00 \pm 0.00
8	1.00	64.84 \pm 3.52	59.63 \pm 1.55	56.63 \pm 2.93	52.34 \pm 2.33	61.15 \pm 3.55	63.78 \pm 2.53	56.18 \pm 2.14	62.24 \pm 4.44
9	0.99	95.86 \pm 1.19	94.76 \pm 1.28	82.86 \pm 1.29	82.98 \pm 0.92	93.98 \pm 0.84	94.71 \pm 0.77	92.57 \pm 1.20	95.24 \pm 0.72
10	1.00	85.03 \pm 0.45	85.77 \pm 1.01	70.61 \pm 0.97	73.18 \pm 1.41	86.93 \pm 1.08	87.76 \pm 1.12	82.54 \pm 0.95	88.27 \pm 0.63
11	0.98	100.00 \pm 0.00	98.95 \pm 1.02	94.09 \pm 0.65	87.93 \pm 0.48	100.00 \pm 0.00	99.99 \pm 0.02	99.95 \pm 0.08	99.98 \pm 0.03
12	0.99	84.34 \pm 0.69	80.28 \pm 0.88	64.97 \pm 0.74	76.57 \pm 1.05	83.04 \pm 0.45	83.09 \pm 0.75	76.23 \pm 0.54	82.44 \pm 0.41
Average		87.5200	84.1325	73.9508	73.0900	83.8275	85.4267	78.7067	84.9617

The best results are highlighted in bold entities.

in the original data. The normalized value $\tilde{I}(x_i, c_j)$ is regarded as the fuzzy membership degree of object x_i under c_j .

In this article, the experiment compares IFCRL with seven classical machine learning classification algorithms (KNN [41], SVM [42], DT [43], NB [44], LR [45], LDA [46], Bagging [47]) and seven fuzzy-based classification algorithms (FCLM [22], FRNN [48], PFKNN [49], GAFuzzyKNN [50], IF-KNN [51], CFKNN [52], FuzzyKNN [53]), where FCLM is a fuzzy concept-cognitive learning algorithm. 80 % and 20 % of each dataset serve as the training set and the test set, respectively. The dataset was executed 10 times with randomized data partitions and the results were averaged to assess each classification method. To ensure fairness, the aforementioned experiments were conducted using Python 3.10 on a personal computer equipped with an Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-10300H CPU @ 2.50 GHz and 16 GB of memory.

B. Comparative Experimental Analysis

The accuracy of classic machine learning classification algorithms and the selected parameter γ by IFCRL are recorded in Table III. The average accuracy of IFCRL on 12 datasets is observed to be 87.52%. As depicted in Table III, it can be observed that LR performs well on one dataset, KNN performs well on two datasets, DT outperforms other algorithms on three datasets, while IFCRL demonstrates superior performance

on nine datasets. Notably, IFCRL achieves the highest accuracy for both dataset 7 and dataset 11. In addition, it exhibits lower standard deviation compared to other algorithms in four datasets (Wine, Tic_tac_toe, Phoneme, Mushroom).

Table IV shows the comparison of classification efficiency with fuzzy-based classification algorithm. The results show that IFCRL performs well on 11 datasets. It shows that we have the best classification performance and exhibits strong generalization capabilities among the selected fuzzy classifiers. Compared with FCLM algorithm based on fuzzy concept cognitive learning, IFCRL has better classification performance. The gap can be visualized more intuitively by creating a bar chart, as shown in Fig. 2.

C. Ablation Experiment

The proposed re-cognition process in this article aims to acquire more precise knowledge. To validate the effectiveness of re-cognition, we initially learn UFGC and LGFC separately and conduct cognitive learning on them to obtain RC. The aforementioned three types of concepts are individually tested through clustering experiments and classification accuracy assessments. In the experiment, clustering parameter γ was set as 1.00, 0.99, and 0.95 respectively, for RC, UFGC, and LGFC, which were each run ten times to calculate the average classification accuracy. The results are presented in Table V with the last column indicating the optimal accuracy score ratio for each




Fig. 2. Bar chart comparison of classification accuracy. (a) Comparison with seven classical classification algorithms. (b) Comparison with seven fuzzy-based classification algorithms.

TABLE V
RE-COGNITION LEARNING ABLATION EXPERIMENT

ID	γ	RC	UFGC	LFGC	Score
1	1.00	91.50 ± 6.34	90.00 ± 5.47	89.50 ± 4.71	3:0:0
	0.99	90.00 ± 6.32	87.50 ± 6.42	87.50 ± 7.15	
	0.95	89.00 ± 5.39	88.00 ± 6.00	87.00 ± 6.00	
2	1.00	94.61 ± 2.12	94.61 ± 2.12	95.12 ± 1.38	0:0:3
	0.99	92.30 ± 5.25	92.30 ± 5.25	93.07 ± 5.38	
	0.95	87.69 ± 3.20	87.69 ± 3.20	87.95 ± 3.98	
3	1.00	95.88 ± 3.27	95.58 ± 3.28	95.58 ± 3.28	3:2:1
	0.99	97.06 ± 1.86	97.06 ± 1.86	97.06 ± 2.27	
	0.95	96.17 ± 3.49	96.17 ± 3.49	95.58 ± 3.17	
4	1.00	76.75 ± 4.75	76.75 ± 4.75	72.00 ± 6.10	3:3:0
	0.99	77.75 ± 7.02	77.75 ± 7.02	69.00 ± 6.53	
	0.95	78.00 ± 5.67	78.00 ± 5.67	66.49 ± 5.38	
5	1.00	69.30 ± 3.86	69.30 ± 3.86	69.30 ± 3.86	3:3:3
	0.99	71.16 ± 4.43	71.16 ± 4.43	71.16 ± 4.43	
	0.95	58.83 ± 10.13	58.83 ± 10.13	58.83 ± 10.13	
6	1.00	82.22 ± 4.98	82.22 ± 4.98	80.92 ± 6.85	2:2:1
	0.99	78.89 ± 3.87	78.89 ± 3.87	79.44 ± 2.22	
	0.95	80.37 ± 5.69	80.37 ± 5.69	80.19 ± 4.30	
7	1.00	100.00 ± 0.00	100.00 ± 0.00	100.00 ± 0.00	3:2:2
	0.99	100.00 ± 0.00	100.00 ± 0.00	100.00 ± 0.00	
	0.95	100.00 ± 0.00	99.90 ± 0.31	99.90 ± 0.31	
8	1.00	64.47 ± 1.35	62.28 ± 1.35	61.95 ± 0.94	3:0:0
	0.99	63.92 ± 0.86	63.59 ± 1.78	60.20 ± 0.97	
	0.95	59.32 ± 0.94	57.64 ± 0.82	57.01 ± 1.02	
9	1.00	95.44 ± 1.07	94.20 ± 0.88	92.62 ± 0.70	3:0:0
	0.99	96.35 ± 0.40	96.11 ± 0.62	93.70 ± 0.96	
	0.95	88.25 ± 1.46	87.86 ± 0.19	86.98 ± 1.48	
10	1.00	84.21 ± 1.15	88.47 ± 0.43	77.06 ± 2.11	1:2:0
	0.99	82.91 ± 0.68	87.29 ± 1.49	75.67 ± 2.81	
	0.95	80.20 ± 0.63	79.12 ± 1.20	74.56 ± 3.09	
11	1.00	100.00 ± 0.00	100.00 ± 0.00	99.87 ± 0.23	3:3:0
	0.99	100.00 ± 0.00	100.00 ± 0.00	99.81 ± 0.25	
	0.95	100.00 ± 0.00	100.00 ± 0.00	99.79 ± 0.30	
12	1.00	83.51 ± 0.66	83.86 ± 0.74	80.39 ± 0.90	1:2:0
	0.99	84.17 ± 0.61	83.68 ± 0.60	80.76 ± 0.83	
	0.95	83.29 ± 0.77	83.45 ± 0.43	80.11 ± 1.01	

The best results are highlighted in bold entities.

round of experiments. And the experimental results demonstrate a strong resemblance between the classification effect of RC and UFGC on certain datasets (Wpbc, Glass, Mushroom). It can be observed that the final composite score ratio of these three concepts is 28:19:10. The overall impact of re-cognition is generally positive on the classification performance of most datasets, thus rendering the re-cognition process highly effective.

D. Theoretical Discussion and Parametric Analysis

In order to evaluate the clustering effect, the space compression rate is used to characterize the reduction degree of the spatial size after clustering, which is denoted by

$$\text{scr} = \frac{|\text{RCS}| - |\text{PC}|}{|\text{RCS}|} \quad (5)$$

where $|\text{RCS}|$ denotes the cardinality of concepts in the re-cognition space, and $|\text{PC}|$ denotes the cardinality of concepts in the clustered space. The purpose of concept clustering is to reduce the concept space. Fig. 3 shows the relationship between the space compression rate and parameter γ . Obviously, the relationship between the two is inversely proportional. The smaller the γ , the greater the space compression rate. For datasets with a small number of objects, the space compression rate decreases evenly with the increase of γ . For datasets with a large number of objects, the image drops off a cliff when $\gamma \in [0.95, 1]$. The image of dataset 7 plummets around $\gamma = 0.88$, indicating that the intent similarity between concepts is relatively concentrated. Therefore, concept clustering is reasonable and efficient.

Combined with Algorithm 3, we know that the classification accuracy of IFCRL is closely related to parameter γ . Therefore, it is necessary to discuss the effect of parameter γ on classification accuracy. For different datasets, it is necessary to choose the appropriate threshold γ in order to achieve the optimal accuracy. According to Fig. 3, when $\gamma = 0.81$, the compression ratio in

TABLE VI
RANKING OF THE FOURTEEN CLASSIFICATION ALGORITHMS

ID	IFCRL	KNN	SVM	DT	NB	LR	LDA	Bagging	FCLM	FRNN	PFKNN	GAFuzzyKNN	IF-KNN	CFKN	FuzzyKNN
1	1.0	10.0	4.5	12.0	8.5	8.5	4.5	11.0	12.0	13.0	4.5	4.5	2.0	14.0	7.0
2	1.0	4.5	9.0	10.0	15.0	11.0	8.0	12.0	2.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	3.0	7.0	4.5
3	1.0	10.0	8.5	15.0	2.5	5.5	2.5	12.5	4.0	7.0	12.5	14.0	5.5	11.0	8.5
4	1.5	5.0	3.0	10.0	12.0	1.5	4.0	13.0	10.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	6.0	14.0	7.0
5	1.0	2.0	9.0	3.5	12.0	10.0	8.0	14.0	2.0	11.0	13.0	7.0	5.0	6.0	3.5
6	1.0	6.5	3.0	13.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	12.0	12.0	6.5	11.0	9.0	10.0	14.0	8.0
7	3.0	3.0	7.5	10.0	13.0	9.0	7.5	12.0	3.0	14.0	15.0	6.0	3.0	11.0	3.0
8	2.0	7.0	9.0	1.0	10.0	5.0	4.0	14.0	11.0	12.0	13.0	8.0	3.0	11.0	6.0
9	2.0	6.0	9.0	1.0	15.0	10.0	11.0	12.0	4.0	14.0	13.0	7.0	5.0	8.0	3.0
10	6.0	3.0	8.0	4.0	9.0	11.0	10.0	13.0	6.0	14.0	12.0	5.0	2.0	7.0	1.0
11	2.0	5.5	8.0	2.0	13.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	8.0	11.0	14.0	2.0	4.0	7.0	5.5
12	1.0	4.0	7.0	6.0	13.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	7.0	14.0	11.0	3.0	2.0	12.0	5.0
Average	1.96	4.96	8.00	7.00	11.21	8.13	7.71	12.42	6.75	10.96	13.29	6.88	4.58	10.83	5.33




Fig. 3. Relationship between the space compression rate and the parameter γ on 12 datasets.




Fig. 4. Relationship between the parameter γ and classification accuracy of IFCRL on 12 datasets.

space is all higher than 80%, and some even reach 95%. Thus, the discussion of the parameter γ is in the range [0.81, 1]. We set the step size to 0.01 and test the parameter within the range [0.81, 1], that is, $\gamma \in \{0.81, 0.82, \dots, 1\}$. And for the same parameter, 10 experiments were conducted and the average accuracy was calculated. The specific change trend is shown in Fig. 4. We can observe that most classification accuracy presents a gradual upward trend, and individual datasets have a state of first increase

and then decrease. The validity of clustering is substantiated to a certain extent.

E. Statistical Significance Analysis

The Friedman test is a rank-based statistical method used to determine whether there are significant differences in the average performance of multiple models across multiple datasets. The accuracy of all classification algorithms on the 12 datasets is ranked and represented in Table VI. The Friedman statistic is calculated as follows:

$$F_F = \frac{(N - 1)\chi_F^2}{N(k - 1) - \chi_F^2} \sim F(k - 1, (k - 1)(N - 1)) \quad (6)$$

where $\chi_F^2 = \frac{12N}{k(k+1)}(\sum_{i=1}^k R_i^2 - \frac{k(k+1)^2}{4})$, k and N are the number of different algorithms and datasets, respectively. $R_i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N r_j^i$ indicates the average rank of i th algorithm on all the datasets, and r_j^i indicates the rank of i th algorithm on j th dataset. We assume that there is no significant difference between all algorithms, and if $F_F > F(k - 1, (k - 1)(N - 1))$ then reject the null hypothesis. According to the number of datasets and the number of algorithms in this article, $\chi_F^2 = 68.93$ is obtained. We plug this into formula (6) to obtain $F_F = 8.71 > 1.79 = F(13, 143)$ in $\alpha = 0.05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis does not hold and there is a significant difference between all algorithms.

The Friedman test can only be used to determine whether there is a significant difference between the measurements of multiple models, but it cannot know whether there is a difference between any two models, which is what the Nemenyi test aims to solve. The critical range critical difference (CD) formula for the difference between the average order values is calculated from the Nemenyi test as follows:

$$CD = q_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{k(k + 1)}{6N}} \quad (7)$$

where q_α is the critical value corresponding to the significance level, k and N are the number of different algorithms and datasets, respectively. In this article, q_α is determined to be 3.383 based on the degrees of freedom and significance level of the test. We plot the average ranking and CD of the algorithms in Fig. 5. The results indicate that when $\alpha = 0.05$, there are statistically significant distinctions between IFCRL and CFKNN as well as the other four classification methods.




Fig. 5. CD plot of all classification methods used in the experiment.

V. CONCLUSION

In this article, we propose a novel IFCRL model called IFCRL. First, we provide the definition of an interval-intent fuzzy concept, where the intent of classical fuzzy concepts is transformed from single-valued to interval-valued form. Based on this, we introduce a concept re-cognition process that keeps the value of the property within a reasonable range. This process serves as a secondary learning mechanism on the data and effectively mitigates the impact of extreme value noise. Furthermore, the introduction of concept clustering based on intent similarity not only simplifies the concept space, but also overcomes the cognitive limitations encountered in previous clustering processes. Finally, extensive experiments are conducted on 12 datasets from UCI and KEEL databases to demonstrate our method's advanced classification ability.

This work presents a novel perspective on concept learning, expanding the boundaries of cognitive understanding beyond unidirectional limitations and providing more precise descriptions of cognitive outcomes. The issue of the high similarity between the RC and UFGC, however, still needs to be addressed. It is imperative to explore a more rational re-cognition process in order to tackle the problem of ineffective re-cognition. And it is important to acknowledge that human cognition is an intricate process, which goes beyond simple set intersection operations when considering secondary or multiple cognitions. In addition, there are deeper issues such as conceptual reasoning, associative memory, selective forgetting, etc., that warrant further investigation in future research.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Wang, "Cognitive informatics: A new transdisciplinary research field," *Brain Mind*, vol. 4, pp. 115–127, 2003.
- [2] Y. Wang and Y. Wang, "Cognitive informatics models of the brain," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern., Part C. (Appl. Rev.)*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 203–207, Mar. 2006.
- [3] R. Wille, "Restructuring lattice theory: An approach based on hierarchies of concepts," in *Formal Concept Anal.: 7th Int. Conf.*, 2009, pp. 314–339.
- [4] W. Wu, Y. Leung, and J. Mi, "Granular computing and knowledge reduction in formal contexts," *IEEE Trans. Knowl. data Eng.*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 1461–1474, Oct. 2009.
- [5] J. T. Yao, A. V. Vasilakos, and W. Pedrycz, "Granular computing: Perspectives and challenges," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 1977–1989, Dec. 2013.
- [6] A. Bargiela and W. Pedrycz, "Granular computing," in *Handbook on Computer Learning and Intelligence: Volume 2: Deep Learning, Intelligent Control and Evolutionary Computation.*, Singapore: World Scientific, 2022, pp. 97–132.
- [7] A. Skowron, J. Stepaniuk, and R. Swiniarski, "Modeling rough granular computing based on approximation spaces," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 184, no. 1, pp. 20–43, 2012.
- [8] Z. Pawlak, L. Polkowski, and A. Skowron, "Rough set theory," *KI*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 38–39, 2001.
- [9] W. Wei and J. Liang, "Information fusion in rough set theory: An overview," *Inf. Fusion*, vol. 48, pp. 107–118, 2019.
- [10] L. S. Riza et al., "Implementing algorithms of rough set theory and fuzzy rough set theory in the r package "roughsets"," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 287, pp. 68–89, 2014.
- [11] B. Ganter and R. Wille, *Formal concept analysis: Mathematical foundations*. Berlin, Germany: Springer, 2012.
- [12] R. Belohlavek and M. Trnecka, "Basic level of concepts in formal concept analysis," in *Formal Concept Anal.: 10th Int. Conf.*, Leuven, Belgium, 2012, pp. 28–44.
- [13] P. Valtchev, R. Missaoui, and R. Godin, "Formal concept analysis for knowledge discovery and data mining: The new challenges," in *Concept Lattices: 2nd Int. Conf. Formal Concept Anal.*, 2004, Sydney, Australia, pp. 352–371.
- [14] P. Cimiano, A. Hotho, G. Stumme, and J. Tane, "Conceptual knowledge processing with formal concept analysis and ontologies," in *Concept Lattices: 2nd Int. Conf. Formal Concept Anal.*, 2004, Sydney, Australia, pp. 189–207.
- [15] D. Guo and W. Xu, "Fuzzy-based concept-cognitive learning: An investigation of novel approach to tumor diagnosis analysis," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 639, 2023, Art. no. 118998.
- [16] Y. Wang, "On concept algebra: A denotational mathematical structure for knowledge and software modeling," *Int. J. Cogn. Informat. Natural Intell.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1–19, 2008.
- [17] R. Wille, "Concept lattices and conceptual knowledge systems," *Comput. Math. with Appl.*, vol. 23, no. 6–9, pp. 493–515, 1992.
- [18] Y. Yao, "A comparative study of formal concept analysis and rough set theory in data analysis," in *Rough Sets Curr. Trends Computing: 4th Int. Conf.*, 2004, Uppsala, Sweden, pp. 59–68.
- [19] R. Bělohlávek, V. Sklenář, and J. Zaczal, "Crisply generated fuzzy concepts," in *Int. Conf. Formal Concept Anal.*, 2005, pp. 269–284.
- [20] X. Kang, D. Li, S. Wang, and K. Qu, "Formal concept analysis based on fuzzy granularity base for different granulations," *Fuzzy Sets Syst.*, vol. 203, pp. 33–48, 2012.
- [21] V. Cross and M. Kandasamy, "Fuzzy concept lattice construction: A basis for building fuzzy ontologies," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Fuzzy Syst.*, 2011, pp. 1743–1750.
- [22] Y. Mi, Y. Shi, J. Li, W. Liu, and M. Yan, "Fuzzy-based concept learning method: Exploiting data with fuzzy conceptual clustering," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 582–593, Jan. 2022.
- [23] C. Huang, J. Li, C. Mei, and W. Wu, "Three-way concept learning based on cognitive operators: An information fusion viewpoint," *Int. J. Approx. Reasoning*, vol. 83, pp. 218–242, 2017.
- [24] J. Qi, L. Wei, and Y. Yao, "Three-way formal concept analysis," in *Rough Sets Knowl. Technol.: 9th Int. Conf.*, 2014, Shanghai, China, pp. 732–741.
- [25] W. Xu, D. Guo, Y. Qian, and W. Ding, "Two-way concept-cognitive learning method: A fuzzy-based progressive learning," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, Jun. 2023.
- [26] W. Xu, D. Guo, J. Mi, Y. Qian, K. Zheng, and W. Ding, "Two-way concept-cognitive learning via concept movement viewpoint," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 6798–6812, Oct. 2023.
- [27] X. Zhang, D. Guo, and W. Xu, "Two-way concept-cognitive learning with multi-source fuzzy context," *Cogn. Computation*, vol. 15, pp. 1526–1548, 2023.
- [28] Y. Yao, "Interpreting concept learning in cognitive informatics and granular computing," *IEEE Trans. Systems, Man, Cybern. Part B (Cybern.)*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 855–866, Aug. 2009.
- [29] W. Zhang and W. Xu, "Cognitive model based on granular computing," *Chin. J. Eng. Math.*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 957–971, 2007.
- [30] W. Xu, J. Pang, and S. Luo, "A novel cognitive system model and approach to transformation of information granules," *Int. J. Approx. Reasoning*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 853–866, 2014.
- [31] C. Zhang, E. C. Tsang, W. Xu, Y. Lin, L. Yang, and J. Wu, "Dynamic updating variable precision three-way concept method based on two-way concept-cognitive learning in fuzzy formal contexts," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 655, 2024, Art. no. 119818.
- [32] Y. Mi, Y. Shi, and J. Li, "A generalized concept-cognitive learning: A machine learning viewpoint," 2018, *arXiv:1801.02334*.

- [33] Y. Shi, Y. Mi, J. Li, and W. Liu, "Concept-cognitive learning model for incremental concept learning," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern. Syst.*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 809–821, Feb. 2021.
- [34] Y. Shi, Y. Mi, J. Li, and W. Liu, "Concurrent concept-cognitive learning model for classification," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 496, pp. 65–81, 2019.
- [35] Y. Mi, P. Quan, Y. Shi, and Z. Wang, "Concept-cognitive computing system for dynamic classification," *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 301, no. 1, pp. 287–299, 2022.
- [36] J. Niu, D. Chen, J. Li, and H. Wang, "Fuzzy rule-based classification method for incremental rule learning," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 30, no. 9, pp. 3748–3761, Sep. 2022.
- [37] Z. Liu, J. Li, X. Zhang, and X. Wang, "Incremental incomplete concept-cognitive learning model: A stochastic strategy," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, 2023, early access, doi: [10.1109/TNNLS.2023.3333537](https://doi.org/10.1109/TNNLS.2023.3333537).
- [38] M. Hu, E. C. Tsang, Y. Guo, Q. Zhang, D. Chen, and W. Xu, "A novel approach to concept-cognitive learning in interval-valued formal contexts: A granular computing viewpoint," *Int. J. Mach. Learn. Cybern.*, vol. 13, pp. 1049–1064, 2022.
- [39] C. Zhang, E. C. Tsang, W. Xu, Y. Lin, and L. Yang, "Incremental concept-cognitive learning approach for concept classification oriented to weighted fuzzy concepts," *Knowl.-Based Syst.*, vol. 260, 2023, Art. no. 110093.
- [40] S. B. Yahia and A. Jaoua, "Discovering knowledge from fuzzy concept lattice," in *Data Mining and Computational Intelligence*. Berlin, Germany: Springer, pp. 167–190, 2001.
- [41] G. Guo, H. Wang, D. Bell, Y. Bi, and K. Greer, "Knn Model-Based Approach in Classification," in *OTM Confederated Int. Conf. Move to Meaningful Internet Syst.*, 2003, Catania, Sicily, Italy, pp. 986–996.
- [42] S. Huang, N. Cai, P. P. Pacheco, S. Narrandes, Y. Wang, and W. Xu, "Applications of support vector machine (SVM) learning in cancer genomics," *Cancer Genomic. Proteomic.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 41–51, 2018.
- [43] Y. Song and L. Ying, "Decision tree methods: Applications for classification and prediction," *Shanghai Arch. Psychiatry*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2015, Art. no. 130.
- [44] K. P. Murphy et al., "Naive Bayes classifiers," *University of British Columbia*, vol. 18, no. 60, pp. 1–8, 2006.
- [45] D. W. Hosmer Jr, S. Lemeshow, and R. X. Sturdivant, *Applied Logistic Regression*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley, 2013, vol. 398.
- [46] G. J. McLachlan, *Discriminant Analysis and Statistical Pattern Recognition*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley, 2005.
- [47] L. Breiman, "Bagging predictors," *Mach. Learn.*, vol. 24, pp. 123–140, 1996.
- [48] M. Sarkar, "Fuzzy-rough nearest neighbor algorithms in classification," *Fuzzy Sets Syst.*, vol. 158, no. 19, pp. 2134–2152, 2007.
- [49] M. Arif et al., "Pruned fuzzy k-nearest neighbor classifier for beat classification," *J. Biomed. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 3, no. 04, 2010, Art. no. 380.
- [50] X. Hu and C. Xie, "Improving fuzzy k-NN by using genetic algorithm," *J. Comput. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 203–213, 2005.
- [51] L. Kuncheva, "An intuitionistic fuzzy k-nearest neighbors rule," *Notes Intuit Fuzzy Sets*, vol. 1, 1995.
- [52] J. Zhai, N. Li, and M. Zhai, "The condensed fuzzy k-nearest neighbor rule based on sample fuzzy entropy," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Mach. Learn. Cybern.*, 2011, pp. 282–286.
- [53] J. M. Keller, M. R. Gray, and J. A. Givens, "A fuzzy K-nearest neighbor algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern.*, no. 4, pp. 580–585, Jul./Aug. 1985.



Yi Ding received the B.Sc. degree in electronic information engineering from the Westa College of Southwest University of Engineering, Chongqing, China, in 2021. He is currently working toward the M.Sc. degree in computer science and technology with the School of Artificial Intelligence, Southwest University, Chongqing, China.

His research interests cover concept-cognitive learning, granular computing, and knowledge discovery.



Weihua Xu received the M.Sc. degree in Mathematics from the School of Mathematics and Information Sciences, Guangxi University, Nanning, China, in 2004, and the Ph.D. degree in Mathematics from the School of Sciences, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, China, in 2007.

He is currently a Professor with the College of Artificial Intelligence, Southwest University, Chongqing, China. He serves on the editorial boards of several international journals and has published four monographs and more than 220 articles in international journals. His current research interests include granular computing, cognitive computing, and information fusion.



Weiping Ding (Senior Member, IEEE) received the Ph.D. degree in computer science from the Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics (NUAA), Nanjing, China, in 2013.

He was a Visiting Scholar with the University of Lethbridge (UL), Lethbridge, AB, Canada, in 2011. From 2014 to 2015, he was a Post-Doctoral Researcher with the Brain Research Center, National Chiao Tung University (NCTU), Hsinchu, Taiwan. In 2016, he was a Visiting Scholar with the National University of Singapore (NUS), Singapore. From 2017

to 2018, he was a Visiting Professor with the University of Technology Sydney (UTS), Ultimo, NSW, Australia. He has authored or coauthored more than 250 scientific articles in refereed international journals, including over 100 IEEE Transactions. He has held 23 approved invention patents. He has coauthored two books. His 18 authored/coauthored papers have been selected as ESI highly cited papers. His main research directions involve deep neural networks, multimodal machine learning, granular data mining, and medical image analysis.

Dr. Ding served/serves on the Editorial Board for *Knowledge-Based Systems*, *Information Fusion*, *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, and *Applied Soft Computing*. He serves as an Associate Editor for IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON NEURAL NETWORKS AND LEARNING SYSTEMS, IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON FUZZY SYSTEMS, IEEE/CAA JOURNAL OF AUTOMATICA SINICA, IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS, IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON EMERGING TOPICS IN COMPUTATIONAL INTELLIGENCE, IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON INTELLIGENT VEHICLES, IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, *Information Sciences*, *Neurocomputing*, and *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation*.



Yuhua Qian (Member, IEEE) received the M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in computers with applications from Shanxi University, Taiyuan, China, in 2005 and 2011, respectively.

He is currently the Director with the Institute of Big Data Science and Industry, Shanxi University, where he is also a Professor with the Key Laboratory of Computational Intelligence and Chinese Information Processing, Ministry of Education. He is best known for artificial intelligence, machine learning, and machine vision. He has authored more than 100 articles

on these topics in international journals.