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#### Abstract

In marketing, a real-world dilemma emerging between two rivals, McDonald's and Burger King, is investigated. Both firms use three strategies: discounted pricing, status quo, and aggressive commercial. In such cases, ambiguity is a determining factor. To deal with confusion in payoffs, octagonal fuzzy numbers are used. To rank fuzzy numbers, the average of odd positions, average of even positions, and quartile deviations are used. To solve the reduced modelled two competitors zero sum fuzzy matrix games, the proposed ranking methods are used. Finally, the findings are compared to current approaches that are quite similar to the proposed approach.
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## 1. Introduction

Uncertain parameters are known as fuzzy numerical data, and they can be expressed by a variety of fuzzy numbers. Zadeh (1965) developed this principle and applied it to real-world problems. McGvire and Staelin examined and established chain equilibrium principles (1983). Milgroom and Roberts (1986) conducted extensive research on pricing and advertisement signals of product quality. Mitchell and Hustad pioneered product screening techniques (1981). Nadia and Pishkoohi investigated traffic management issues in a fuzzy environment (2018). Bortolan and Degani (1985) developed a variety of methods for fuzzy set applications that can be used to rank different preferences developed by Watson, Yager, Chang, Adamo, Bass, Skwakernaak, Baldwins Giuld, Jain Dubois, and Prade. Butnariu (1978) defined N-person fuzzy games. Using a theoretical approach to fuzzy mathematics, Cevikel and Ahlataiuglu (2009) published some new solution procedures for fuzzy matrix games. They spoke about the case of linearity in fuzzy payoffs. Following the formulation of the linear programming problem, Sakawa's method was used to find the solution. Christi and Kalpana (2016) used trapezoidal fuzzy numbers as payoffs in fuzzy matrix games and obtained optimal value results using an average weighted approach. Delgado and Verdegay developed fuzzy ordered relations within fuzzy numbers (1988). In a fuzzy setting, Liou and Wang (1992) established some alternative approaches. Yuan (1991) developed a ranking system with integral value and evaluated it using four evolutionary criteria. These four requirements are fuzzy ordering rationality, robustness, fuzzy choice, representation, and distinguishability. Sharma and Kumar (2016) used the idea of fuzzy numbers in game theory to predict election outcomes. Malini and Kennedy also addressed OFN and their activities (2013). Malini and Anthanarajan (2016) used OFN to develop fuzzy transportation problems.

The current paper is structured as follows: section 2 contains some simple preliminaries. Section 3 discusses basic terminology for two-person zero-sum games in a fuzzy environment. Section 4 investigates current methods for ranking fuzzy numbers. Section 5 presents our proposed process. In section 6, suggested methods are applied to find optimal strategies for two firms, and numerical examples are given. Section 7 discusses graphical representations of performance, and Section 8 provides conclusions.

## 2.Preliminaries

Definition 2.1 "Let $X$ be the universe whose generic elements are denoted by $x$. A fuzzy set $\widetilde{A}$ in $X$ is characterized by its membership function $\mu_{\widetilde{A}}: X \rightarrow[0,1]$ and $\mu_{\widetilde{A}}(x)$ is interpreted as the degree of membership of element $x$ in the fuzzy set $\widetilde{A}$ for each $x \in X$. Thus a fuzzy set $\widetilde{A}$ in $X$ can also be represented as $\widetilde{A}=$ $\left\{\left(\mathrm{x}, \mu_{\widetilde{\mathrm{A}}}(\mathrm{x})\right)\right\}$. The value zero is used to represent complete non-membership, the value one is used to represent complete membership and the values between zero and one are used to represent intermediate degrees of membership."

Definition 2.2"A fuzzy set $\widetilde{\mathrm{A}}$ in R is called a fuzzy number if it satisfies the following axioms:
(i) There exist at least one $\mathrm{x}_{0} \in \mathrm{R}$ with $\mu_{\widetilde{\mathrm{A}}}\left(\mathrm{x}_{0}\right)=1$
(ii) $\mu_{\widetilde{\mathrm{A}}}(\mathrm{x})$ is piecewise continuous.
(iii) $\widetilde{A}$ must be normal and convex."

Definition 2.3 "A fuzzy number $\widetilde{\mathrm{A}}$ is a normal octagonal fuzzy number denoted by $\widetilde{A}=\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}, a_{4}, a_{5}, a_{6}, a_{7}, a_{8}\right)$ where $a_{1} \leq a_{2} \leq a_{3} \leq a_{4} \leq a_{5} \leq a_{6} \leq a_{7} \leq a_{8}$ are real numbers and its membership function $\mu_{\widetilde{A}}(\mathrm{x})$ is given by

$$
\mu_{\widetilde{A}}(x)=\left\{\right\}
$$

Definition 2.4 "Let $\widetilde{A}=\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}, a_{4}, a_{5}, a_{6}, a_{7}, a_{8}\right)$ be an octagonal fuzzy number, then the $\alpha$-cut is defined as

$$
\widetilde{\mathrm{A}}_{\alpha}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
{\left[\mathrm{a}_{1}+\frac{\alpha}{\mathrm{k}}\left(\mathrm{a}_{2}-\mathrm{a}_{1}\right), \mathrm{a}_{8}-\frac{\alpha}{\mathrm{k}}\left(\mathrm{a}_{8}-\mathrm{a}_{7}\right)\right]} & ; \alpha \in[0, \mathrm{k}] \\
{\left[\mathrm{a}_{3}+\left(\frac{\alpha-k}{1-\mathrm{k}}\right)\left(\mathrm{a}_{4}-\mathrm{a}_{3}\right), \mathrm{a}_{6}-\left(\frac{\alpha-\mathrm{k}}{1-\mathrm{k}}\right)\left(\mathrm{a}_{6}-\mathrm{a}_{5}\right)\right]} & ; \alpha \in(\mathrm{k}, 1]
\end{array}\right\}
$$

## 3.Two Person Zero Sum Fuzzy Game

- Two person (player) zero sum fuzzy game is denoted by $\mathrm{FG} \approx\left(\tilde{\mathrm{S}}_{1}, \tilde{\mathrm{~S}}_{2}, \widetilde{\mathrm{~K}}, \widetilde{\mathrm{~A}}\right)$ where
- $\tilde{S}_{1} \approx\left\{\widetilde{\mathrm{X}} \approx\left(\tilde{\mathrm{x}}_{1}, \tilde{\mathrm{x}}_{2}, \tilde{\mathrm{x}}_{3}, \ldots, \tilde{\mathrm{x}}_{\mathrm{m}}\right) \mid \tilde{\mathrm{x}}_{\mathrm{i}} \geq \tilde{0}, \forall \mathrm{i}=1,2,3, \ldots \mathrm{~m}, \sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{m}} \tilde{\mathrm{x}}_{\mathrm{i}} \approx \tilde{\mathrm{I}}\right\}$
- $\quad \tilde{S}_{2} \approx\left\{\widetilde{\mathrm{Y}} \approx\left(\tilde{\mathrm{y}}_{1}, \tilde{\mathrm{y}}_{2}, \tilde{\mathrm{y}}_{3}, \ldots ., \tilde{\mathrm{y}}_{\mathrm{n}}\right) \mid \tilde{\mathrm{y}}_{\mathrm{j}} \geq \tilde{0}, \forall \mathrm{j}=1,2,3, \ldots \mathrm{n}, \sum_{\mathrm{j}=1}^{\mathrm{n}} \tilde{\mathrm{y}}_{\mathrm{j}} \approx \tilde{\mathrm{I}}\right\}$
- Where $\tilde{S}_{1}$ and $\tilde{S}_{2}$ are strategic spaces available for both player I and II respectively. Then the fuzzy payoffs gained by maximizing player is defined as,
- $\widetilde{\mathrm{K}}(\widetilde{\mathrm{X}}, \widetilde{\mathrm{Y}})=\sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{m}} \sum_{\mathrm{j}=1}^{\mathrm{n}} \tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{\mathrm{ij}} \cdot \tilde{\mathrm{x}}_{\mathrm{i}} \cdot \tilde{\mathrm{y}}_{\mathrm{j}} \approx \widetilde{\mathrm{X}}^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot \widetilde{\mathrm{A}} \cdot \widetilde{\mathrm{Y}}$


## 4. Existing Ranking Methods to Convert OFN into Crisp Value

Let $\tilde{A}$ be an octagonal fuzzy number then different kinds of ranking methods or techniques are used for defuzzification are tabled as:

Table: 4.1 Existing Ranking Methods

| Ranking Method | Formula to Obtain Crisp Value of OFN |
| :--- | :--- |
| Measure of an OFN (Magnitude <br> ranking method) | $M_{0}^{\text {oct }}(\widetilde{A})=\frac{1}{4}\left[k\left(a_{1}+a_{2}+a_{7}+a_{8}\right)+(1-k)\left(a_{3}+a_{4}+a_{5}+\right.\right.$ <br> $a 6 ; k \in[0,1]$ |
| Pascal's triangular graded mean <br> method | $P(\widetilde{A})=\frac{\left(a_{1}+a_{8}\right)+7\left(a_{2}+a_{7}\right)+21\left(a_{3}+a_{6}\right)+35\left(a_{4}+a_{5}\right)}{128}$ |
| Simple average method | $P(\widetilde{A})=\frac{a_{1}+a_{2}+a_{3}+a_{4}+a_{5}+a_{6}+a_{7}+a_{8}}{8}$ |
| Mean-max membership principle | P $(\widetilde{A})=\frac{a_{4}+a_{5}}{2}$ |
| Centroid method | $P(\widetilde{A})=\frac{\int_{a_{1}}^{a_{1} x \mu_{\tilde{A}}(x) d x}}{\int_{a_{1}}^{8} \mu_{\widetilde{A}}(x) d x}$ |


| First of maxima (FOM) method | $P(\widetilde{A})=a_{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Last of maxima (LOM) method | $P(\widetilde{A})=a_{5}$ |

## 5. Proposed Ranking Methods to Convert an OFN into Crisp Value

Let $\widetilde{A}$ be an octagonal fuzzy number then we propose some defuzzified ranking methods namely average of odd positional values in OFN, average of even positional values in OFN, Quartile deviations methods, average of the smallest possible $\alpha$-cut approach for an OFN and average of the largest possible $\alpha$-cut approach for an OFN to obtain a crisp value as defined as follows

### 5.1 Average of Odd Positional Values in OFN

This defuzzification can be expressed as $P(\widetilde{A})=\frac{\left(a_{1}+a_{3}+a_{5}+a_{7}\right)}{4}$
5.2 Average of Even Positional Values in OFN

This defuzzification can be expressed as $P(\widetilde{A})=\frac{\left(a_{2}+a_{4}+a_{6}+a_{8}\right)}{4}$

### 5.3 Quartile Deviations

First quartile deviation $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{Q}_{1}}(\widetilde{\mathrm{~A}})=\left(\frac{\mathrm{n}+1}{4}\right)^{\text {th }}$ observational value in OFN
Second quartile deviation $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{Q}_{2}}(\widetilde{\mathrm{~A}})=2\left(\frac{\mathrm{n}+1}{4}\right)^{\text {th }}$ observational value in OFN
Third quartile deviation $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{Q}_{3}}(\widetilde{\mathrm{~A}})=3\left(\frac{\mathrm{n}+1}{4}\right)^{\text {th }}$ observational value in OFN
5.4 Average of the Smallest Possible $\alpha$-Cut Approach for an OFN

The crisp value can be approximated by the average of $\alpha$-Cut of bounded left continuous non-decreasing and non-increasing functions over the interval $[0, k]$ i.e.

$$
P(\widetilde{\mathrm{~A}})=\frac{1}{2}\left\{\left(\mathrm{a}_{1}+\frac{\alpha}{\mathrm{k}}\left(\mathrm{a}_{2}-\mathrm{a}_{1}\right)\right)+\left(\mathrm{a}_{8}-\frac{\alpha}{\mathrm{k}}\left(\mathrm{a}_{8}-\mathrm{a}_{7}\right)\right)\right\} \text { over } \alpha \in[0, \mathrm{k}] .
$$

5.5 Average of the Largest Possible $\alpha$-Cut Approach for an OFN

The crisp value can be approximated by the average of $\alpha$-Cut of bounded left continuous non-decreasing and non-increasing functions over the interval $[\mathrm{k}, 1]$ i.e.
$\mathrm{P}(\widetilde{\mathrm{A}})=\frac{1}{2}\left\{\left(\mathrm{a}_{3}+\left(\frac{\alpha-\mathrm{k}}{1-\mathrm{k}}\right)\left(\mathrm{a}_{4}-\mathrm{a}_{3}\right)\right)+\left(\mathrm{a}_{6}-\left(\frac{\alpha-\mathrm{k}}{1-\mathrm{k}}\right)\left(\mathrm{a}_{6}-\mathrm{a}_{5}\right)\right)\right\}$ over $\alpha \in[\mathrm{k}, 1]$.

## 6. Application in Marketing

There are two companies namely, McDonald's and Burger King in market. Both the companies have three strategies viz. Discounted price, status quo and Aggressive commercial. In such situations uncertainty is measure factor. These situations can be modeled efficiently by using ranking functions. In this particular problem we are taking octagonal fuzzy numbers as payoffs of both the companies. Verbal phrases for octagonal fuzzy numbers in terms of profit are,
VVL-Very Very Low,
VL-Very Low, L-Low,
LM-Low Mean,
HM-High Mean,
H-High,
VH-Very High,
VVH-Very Very High

Table: 6.1 Verbal Phrases for Octagonal Fuzzy Numbers

|  | Discounted price | status quo | Aggressive commercial |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Discounted <br> price | $(\mathrm{VVL}, \mathrm{VL}, \mathrm{L}, \mathrm{LM}, \mathrm{HM}, \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{VH}, \mathrm{VVH})$ |  |  |$\quad$ (VVL,VL,L,LM,HM,H,VH,VVH) $\quad$ (VVL,VL,L,LM,HM,H,VH,VVH)

Table: 6.2 Payoff matrix for McDonald's and Burger King

|  | Discounted price | status quo | Aggressive commercial |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Discounted <br> price | $(5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12)$ | $(0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7)$ | $(0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7)$ |
| status quo | $(3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10)$ | $(4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11)$ | $(4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11)$ |
| Aggressive <br> commercial | $(-11,-10,-9,-8,-7,-6,-5,-4)$ | $(1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8)$ | $(-2,-1,0,1,2,3,4,5)$ |

## Burger King

McDonald's

$$
(5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12)
$$

$(-1,0,1,2,3,4,5,6) \quad,(0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7)$
$(2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9) \quad(4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11)$
$(1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8) \quad(-2,-1,0,1,2,3,4,5)$
Where
$\tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{11}=(5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12) ; \tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{12}=(-1,0,1,2,3,4,5,6,) ; \tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{13}=(0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7)$;
$\tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{21}=(3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10) ; \tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{22}=(2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9) ; \tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{23}=(4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11)$;
$\tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{31}=(-11,-10,-9,-8,-7,-6,-5,-4) ; \tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{32}=(1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8) ; \tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{33}=(-2,-1,0,1,2,3,4,5)$

Table: 6.3 Best strategies and value of game

| Defuzzification Method | Optimal Strategy McDonald's | Optimal  <br> Strategy  <br> King  | Value of the Game |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Measure of an OFN (Magnitude ranking method) | II | II | 5.5 |
| Pascal's triangular graded mean method | II | II | 5.5 |
| Simple average method | II | II | 5.5 |
| Mean-max membership <br> (MOM Method) | II | II | 5.5 |
| Centroid method | II | II | 5.5 |
| First of maxima (FOM) method | II | II | 5.0 |
| Last of maxima (LOM) method | II | II | 6.0 |
| Average of Odd Positional Values in OFN | II | II | 5.0 |
| Average of Even Positional Values in OFN | II | II | 6.0 |
| First Quartile Deviation | II | II | 3.25 |
| Second Quartile Deviation | II | II | 5.5 |
| Third Quartile Deviation | II | II | 7.75 |
| Average of the Smallest Possible $\alpha$ Cut Approach for an OFN | II | II | 5.5 |
| Average of the Largest Possible $\alpha$ Cut Approach for an OFN | II | II | 5.5 |

If payoff matrix is given by,

## Burger King

McDonald's $\left[\begin{array}{ccc}(-2,-1,0,1,2,3,4,5) & (0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7) & (2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9) \\ (1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8) & (9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16) & (6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13) \\ (8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15) & (-1,0,1,2,3,4,5,6) & (11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18)\end{array}\right]$

Where
$\tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{11}=(-2,-1,0,1,2,3,4,5) ; \tilde{a}_{12}=(0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7) ; \tilde{a}_{13}=(2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9) ; \tilde{a}_{21}=(1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8) ;$
$\tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{22}=(9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16) ; \tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{23}=(6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13) ; \tilde{\mathrm{a}}_{31}=(8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15)$;
$\tilde{a}_{32}=(-1,0,1,2,3,4,5,6) ; \tilde{a}_{33}=(11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18)$
Table: 6.4 Best strategies and value of game

| Defuzzification Method | Optimal Strategy <br> McDonald's | Optimal Strategy <br> Burger King | Value of the <br> Game |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Measure of an OFN <br> (Magnitude ranking <br> method) | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 7.794 |
| Pascal's triangular <br> graded mean method | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 7.794 |
| Simple average method | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 7.794 |
| Mean-max membership <br> principle (MOM Method) | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 7.794 |
| Centroid method | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 7.794 |
| First of maxima (FOM) <br> method | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 7.294 |
| Last of maxima (LOM) <br> method | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 8.294 |


| Average of Odd <br> Positional Values in OFN | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 7.294 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average of Even <br> Positional Values in OFN | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 8.294 |
| First Quartile Deviation | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 5.544 |
| Second <br> Deviation | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 7.794 |
| Third Quartile Deviation | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 10.044 |
| Average of the Smallest <br> Possible $\alpha$-Cut Approach <br> for an OFN | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 7.794 |
| Average of the Largest <br> Possible $\alpha$-Cut Approach <br> for an OFN | $(0,0.529,0.470)$ | $(0.588,0.411,0)$ | 7.794 |

## 7.Graphical Representation



Figure: 7.1 Best strategies and value of game


Figure: 7.2 Best strategies and value of game

## 8.Conclusion

It is established that competitive situations of marketing can be modeled in form of fuzzy matrix games. By solving matrix games, best strategies and optimal value can be obtained. In the present paper, an approach for solving octagonal fuzzy matrix game problem is proposed. It is established that our results are same as by using different kinds of techniques like as ranking for a fuzzy number, Pascal's triangular graded mean formula, simple average method, centroid method, FOM, LOM, MOM methods, odd, and even positional values methods, quartile deviation methods, and $\alpha$-cut approach. Decision maker can suitably modify the parameter k to get the desired result. Different fuzzy game values yields for the same fuzzy game corresponding to distinct values of the parameter k.
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