In Memoriam: Philippe Smets (1938-2005)

Hughes Bersini[1], Thierry Denœux[2], Didier Dubois[3], Henri Prade[3]

[1] IRIDIA - Université Libre de Buxelles
50 av. Roosevelt, CP 194-6, 1050 Bruxelles, Belgium

[2] Université de Technologie de Compiègne, CNRS
UMR Heudiasyc
BP 20529 - F-60205 Compiègne cedex, France

[3] I.R.I.T-CNRS, Universite Paul Sabatier,
118 route de Narbonne, 31062 Toulouse Cedex 4, France

January 11, 2006

Professor Philippe Smets passed away on Monday night November the 14th, at home with his family around. He had been suffering from a brain tumor for several months. For those interested in uncertainty modeling and handling, he was an outstanding researcher in this area, in some sense a guiding light.

Philippe Smets was born in Brussels (Belgium) on November 27, 1938. He first received a medical doctor degree in 1963 from the Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), then a Master degree in experimental statistics from North Carolina State University, and, finally, his PhD degree in medical statistics from ULB in 1978. His PhD dissertation [21], the starting point of his research work, already contained the seeds of many of the ideas and results on belief functions that Philippe Smets was going to develop in the next two decades. Philippe Smets was the founder in 1985 of the IRIDIA laboratory (Institut de Recherches Interdisciplinaires et de Développements en Intelligence Artificielle) at ULB, and its director until he retired in 1999. Under his leadership, IRIDIA became a major Belgian research institute in Artificial Intelligence and related topics, and an internationally renowned place. Due to the unusual personality of Philippe Smets, IRIDIA was also, in the words of his present director, a very unique place to work: it was Philippe's idea that in order to be a good place to work and think, an

institute should first be a good place to live. A place where people enjoy life, and a stimulating place where to share ideas, this was what Philippe Smets had turned IRIDIA into. All scientists who knew him and worked with him can testify about Philippe's knack for sharing his enthusiasm about unchartered territories of uncertainty modeling, especially if such scientific discussions could take place in a good restaurant. He was also a very open-minded person, caring for younger researchers, helping them endlessly. After his retirement in 1999, Philippe had more time to develop his own research works, visiting different academic institutions, and cooperating with many colleagues in the world.

His name is primarily associated with the "Transferable Belief Model" (TBM), a subjectivist and non probabilistic view of the Dempster-Shafer (DS) theory of evidence [49, 45]. Some of the main ideas underlying the TBM are:

- the interpretation of belief functions as representing weighted opinions held by an agent, irrespective of any underlying probabilistic model [32, 38];
- a clear separation between the *credal level*, where beliefs are entertained, and the *decision level* where standard utility theory applies, the belief functions being converted into probabilities using the *pignistic transformation* [28, 36, 18];
- the notions of unnormalized belief function and unnormalized conjunctive rule of combination, and the interpretation of the mass $m(\emptyset)$ assigned to the empty set, under the *open-world assumption*, as a degree of belief in the event that the frame of discernment does not contain the true value of the variable of interest [27, 31].

He contributed more than 100 papers to this theory, and to its comparison with alternative theories of uncertainty such as Bayesian probability theory [26], imprecise probabilities [19, 38], random sets [33], and possibility theory [29]. He also contributed to a better understanding of fundamental issues concerning the representation of uncertainty [30, 5, 6, 43, 44]. Among his key technical contributions, let us particularly mention

- the axiomatic justifications for the Dempster's rule of combination [27], for the use of belief functions [37, 34, 41] and the pignistic transformation [48];
- the study of the relative information content of belief functions via the notion of specialization matrices [13] ;

- the Generalized Bayesian Theorem [35], an extension of Bayes' theorem where conditional and a priori probabilities are replaced by (possibly vacuous) belief functions;

- the canonical decomposition of a belief function, which paves the way to the bipolar representation of knowledge [39];

- the development of algorithmic tools for the easy computational handling of belief functions, including the Fast Möbius Transform [11, 12], algorithms for reasoning in evidential networks [54, 56, 55], and a matrix calculus for belief functions [47].

In addition to these and other important theoretical contributions, Philippe Smets attached a great importance to practical applications [46] during all his life. His initial motivation for studying uncertain reasoning was the modeling of medical diagnosis [21, 20, 40, 42], but he later became increasingly interested by engineering applications and developed, with co-workers, methods for classification [10], sensor fusion [9], data association [1, 17], tracking [53, 16], target identification [4, 15], etc.

Although his main research focus was on belief functions, Philippe Smets also wrote noticeable papers in fuzzy logic and possibility theory. His first conference paper in 1977 relates belief functions and fuzzy sets [50], and was the basis for his definition of the degree of belief in a fuzzy event based on a Choquet integral [23, 22, 25]. Later with Paul Magrez, he provided an original axiomatic justification of Lukasiewicz implication in the setting of fuzzy if-then rule-based reasoning [51, 14]. He also very early (in 1982!) pointed out connections between likelihood functions and possibility measures [24], and recently (in 2002) provided the basis for an operational semantics of quantitative possibility theory [7, 8].

Philippe Smets was not only a visionary scientist, but also a highly efficient organizer. In particular, he was instrumental in the development of the research community dealing with uncertainty in artificial intelligence. He was indeed the main coordinator and the prime contractor of a series of European workshops or projects (DRUMS - I and II), that gathered many researchers working on different uncertainty approaches. These projects resulted in a series of edited volumes on Non-Standard Logics for Automated Reasoning (with A. Mamdani, D. Dubois and H. Prade, Academic Press, New York,1988), on Uncertainty Management in Information Systems (with A. Motro, Kluwer Academic Publ., 1998), on Defeasible Reasoning and Uncertainty Management Systems (a Handbook series in 7 volumes, with D.

Gabbay, Kluwer Acad. Publ., 1998.), or on special issues of Journals on Uncertainty, Conditionals and Non-Monotonicity (J. of Applied Non-Classical Logics, 1(2),1991), or on Data and Knowledge Fusion (Int. Journal of Intelligent Systems, vol. 16(10-11), 2001). Especially worth mentioning is Vol. 1 in the DRUMS series, that he edited himself (Quantified Representation of Uncertainty and Imprecision, Kluwer Acad. Publ., 1998), which gathers a wide range of contributions from classical and non-classical probability theories to multi-valued and fuzzy logics. It is particularly characteristic of Philippe's concern for a unified view of uncertainty theories that may reconcile logic and probability. In the same spirit, Philippe Smets is also the father of the European Conference on Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning with Uncertainty (ECSQARU), which has taken place every two years since 1991. He was also an active participant of the annual Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI) Conference in the nineties and was the first European UAI co-program chair in 1991. He served on the editorial boards of many journals including the *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, the *Journal of Logic and Computation*, *Information Sciences*, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, the *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, the *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, the *Journal of Applied Non Classical Logics*, and *Mathware and Soft Computing*.

Philippe Smets was a highly recognized and respected researcher in the Artificial Intelligence community. His innovative work on the treatment of belief functions is well known and appreciated by everyone in the field. He was primarily a researcher combining a vast culture and interest on classical and non-classical approaches to uncertainty (ranging from statistics to non standard logics), with a will to develop original lines of research that significantly depart from traditional views. For many of his colleagues, and us in particular, he was much more than that, he was the friend, the careful adviser, the companion of so many beautiful research projects. Thanks to his keen work, his open-mindedness and his great human qualities, he had succeeded in creating and federating a whole community of researchers in Europe, through a series of projects and conferences of which he had been the principal carrier. His sudden illness and his death while he was still in full creative activity came as a terrible shock, for us, for all his friends and colleagues, and many of us feel like orphans. He will be deeply missed for a long time. But one may venture to predict that his published works will continue to be read by future researchers in statistics and uncertainty, as being seminal contributions written by a XXth century major scholar in the formal representation of belief.

References

[1] A. Ayoun and Ph. Smets. Data association in multi-target detection using the transferable belief model. *Int. J. Intell. Systems*, 16:1167–1182, 2001.

[2] B. Ben Yaghlane, Ph. Smets, and K. Mellouli. Belief function independence: I. the marginal case. *Int. J. Approximate Reasoning*, 29(1):47–70, 2002.

[3] B. Ben Yaghlane, Ph. Smets, and K. Mellouli. Belief function independence: II. the conditional case. *Int. J. Approximate Reasoning*, 31(1–2):31–75, 2002.

[4] F. Delmotte and Ph. Smets. Target identification based on the transferable belief model interpretation of Dempster-Shafer model. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics A*, 34(4):457–471, 2004.

[5] D. Dubois, P. Garbolino, H. E. Kyburg, H. Prade, and Ph. Smets. Quantified uncertainty. *J. Applied Non-Classical Logics*, 1:105–197, 1991.

[6] D. Dubois, H. Prade, and Ph. Smets. Representing partial ignorance. *IEEE Transactions on System, Man and Cybernetic*, 26(3):361–377, 1996.

[7] D. Dubois, H. Prade, and Ph. Smets. New semantics for quantitative possibility theory. In *Proc. 6th. Europ. Conf. on Symb. and Quantitat. Appr. to Reasoning under Uncertainty (ECSQARU 2001)*, number 2143 in LNAI, pages 410–421, Toulouse, France, 2001. Springer-Verlag.

[8] D. Dubois, H. Prade, and Ph. Smets. A definition of subjective possibility. *Operations Research and Decisions*, 4:7–22, 2003.

[9] Z. Elouedi, K. Mellouli, and P. Smets. Assessing sensor reliability for multisensor data fusion with the transferable belief model. *IEEE Trans. SMC B*, 34:782–787, 2004.

[10] Z. Elouedi, K. Mellouli, and Ph. Smets. Belief decision trees: theoretical foundations. *Int. J. Approximate Reasoning*, 28:91–124, 2001.

[11] R. Kennes and Ph. Smets. Fast algorithms for Dempster-Shafer theory. In B. Bouchon-Meunier, R. R. Yager, and L. A. Zadeh, editors, *Uncertainty in Knowledge Bases*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 14–23, Berlin. Springer-Verlag.

[12] R. Kennes and Ph. Smets. Computational aspects of the Möbius transformation. In P. P. Bonissone, M. Henrion, L. N. Kanal, and J. F. Lemmer, editors, *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence 6*, pages 401–416, Amsterdam, 1991. North Holland.

[13] F. Klawonn and Ph. Smets. The dynamic of belief in the transferable belief model and specialization - generalization matrices. In D. Dubois, M. P. Wellman, B. D'Ambrosio, and Ph. Smets, editors, *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence 92*, pages 130–137, San Mateo, Ca, 1992. Morgan Kaufman.

[14] P. Magrez and Ph. Smets. Fuzzy modus ponens: a new model suitable for applications in knowledge-based systems. *Int. J. Intelligent Systems*, 4:181–200, 1989.

[15] B. Ristic and Ph. Smets. Target identification using belief functions and implication rules. *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, 41:1097–1103, 2005.

[16] B. Ristic and Ph. Smets. Kalman filter and joint tracking and classification based on belief functions in the TBM framework. *Information Fusion (in press)*, 2006.

[17] B. Ristic and Ph. Smets. The TBM global distance measure for the association of uncertain combat ID declarations. *Information Fusion (in press)*, 2006.

[18] Ph. Smets. Decision making in a context where uncertainty is represented by belief functions. In R. P. Srivastava and T.J. Mock, editors, *Belief Functions in Business Decisions*. Physica-Verlag.

[19] Ph. Smets. The transferable belief model and other interpretations of Dempster-Shafer's model. In P. P. Bonissone, M. Henrion, L. N. Kanal, and J. F. Lemmer, editors, *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence 6*, pages 375–384. North Holland.

[20] Ph. Smets. Theory of evidence and medical diagnostic. In J. Anderson, editor, *Medical Informatics Europe 78*, pages 285–291, 1978.

[21] Ph. Smets. *Un modèle mathématico-statistique simulant le processus du diagnostic médical*. Ph.d. thesis, Université Libre de Bruxelles, (available through University Microfilm International, 30-32 Mortimer street, London W1N 7RA, thesis 80-70,003), 1978.

[22] Ph. Smets. The degree of belief in a fuzzy event. *Information Sciences*, 25:1–19, 1981.

[23] Ph. Smets. Medical diagnosis: Fuzzy sets and degrees of belief. *Int. J. Fuzzy Sets and systems*, 5:259–266, 1981.

[24] Ph. Smets. Possibilistic inference from statistical data. In A. Ballester, D. Cardus, and E. Trillas, editors, *Second World Conference on Mathematics at the Service of Man*, pages 611–613. Universidad Politecnica de Las Palmas, Spain, 1982.

[25] Ph. Smets. Probability of a fuzzy event: an axiomatic approach. *Int. J. Fuzzy Sets and systems*, 7:153–164, 1982.

[26] Ph. Smets. Transferable belief model versus Bayesian model. In Y. Kodratoff, editor, *Proc.ECAI-88*, pages 495–500, 1988.

[27] Ph. Smets. The combination of evidence in the transferable belief model. *IEEE Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 12:447–458, 1990.

[28] Ph. Smets. Constructing the pignistic probability function in a context of uncertainty. In M. Henrion, R. D. Shachter, L. N. Kanal, and J. F. Lemmer, editors, *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence 5*, pages 29–40, Amsterdam, 1990. North Holland.

[29] Ph. Smets. The transferable belief model and possibility theory. In *Proc. of NAFIPS'90*. 1990.

[30] Ph. Smets. Varieties of ignorance and the need for well-founded theories. *Information Sciences*, 57:135–144, 1991.

[31] Ph. Smets. The nature of the unnormalized beliefs encountered in the transferable belief model. In D. Dubois, M. P. Wellman, B. D'Ambrosio, and Ph. Smets, editors, *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence 92*, pages 292–297, San Mateo, Ca, 1992. Morgan Kaufman.

[32] Ph. Smets. Resolving misunderstandings about belief functions: A response to the many criticisms raised by Judea Pearl. *Int. J. Approximate Reasoning*, 6:321–344, 1992.

[33] Ph. Smets. The transferable belief model and random sets. *Int. J. Intell. Systems*, 7:37–46, 1992.

[34] Ph. Smets. An axiomatic justification for the use of belief function to quantify beliefs. In *Int. Joint Conf. on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 598–603, San Mateo, Ca, 1993. Morgan Kaufman.

[35] Ph. Smets. Belief functions: the disjunctive rule of combination and the generalized Bayesian theorem. *Int. J. Approximate Reasoning*, 9:1–35, 1993.

[36] Ph. Smets. No Dutch book can be built against the TBM even though update is not obtained by Bayes rule of conditioning. In R. Scozzafava, editor, *Workshop on Probabilistic Expert Systems*, pages 181–204, Roma, 1993. Societa Italiana di Statistica.

[37] Ph. Smets. Quantifying beliefs by belief functions: an axiomatic justification. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 598–603, San Mateo, CA, 1993. Morgan Kaufmann.

[38] Ph. Smets. What is Dempster-Shafer's model? In R. R. Yager, J. Kacprzyk, and M. Fedrizzi, editors, *Advances in the Dempster-Shafer Theory of Evidence*, pages 5–34. Wiley, New York, 1994.

[39] Ph. Smets. The canonical decomposition of a weighted belief. In *Proc. of the 14th Inter. Joint Conf. on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-95)*, pages 1896–1901, San Mateo, Ca, 1995. Morgan Kaufman.

[40] Ph. Smets. Applying the transferable belief model to medical problems. In R. Da, P. D'Hondt, P. Govaerts, and E. Kerre, editors, *Intelligent Systems and Soft Computing for Nuclear Science and Industry*, pages 285–292. World Scientific, Singapore, 1996.

[41] Ph. Smets. The normative representation of quantified beliefs by belief functions. *Artificial Intelligence*, 92:229–242, 1997.

[42] Ph. Smets. The application of the transferable belief model to diagnostic problems. *Int. J. Intelligent Systems*, 13:127–157, 1998.

[43] Ph. Smets. Numerical representation of uncertainty. In D. M. Gabbay and Ph. Smets, editors, *Handbook of Defeasible Reasoning and Uncertainty Management Systems*, volume 3, pages 265–311, Doordrecht, The Netherlands, 1998. Kluwer.

[44] Ph. Smets. Probability, possibility, belief: Which and where? In D. M. Gabbay and Ph. Smets, editors, *Handbook of Defeasible Reasoning and Uncertainty Management Systems*, volume 1, pages 1–24. Kluwer, Doordrecht, The Netherlands, 1998.

[45] Ph. Smets. The transferable belief model for quantified belief representation. In D. M. Gabbay and Ph. Smets, editors, *Handbook of Defeasible Reasoning and Uncertainty Management Systems*, volume 1, pages 267–301, Doordrecht, The Netherlands, 1998. Kluwer.

[46] Ph. Smets. Practical uses of belief functions. In K. B. Laskey and H. Prade, editors, *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence 99*, pages 612–621, San Francisco, Ca, 1999. Morgan Kaufman.

[47] Ph. Smets. The application of the matrix calculus to belief functions. *Int. J. Approximate Reasoning*, 31:1–30, 2002.

[48] Ph. Smets. Decision making in the TBM: the necessity of the pignistic transformation. *Int. J. Approximate Reasoning*, 38:133–147, 2005.

[49] Ph. Smets and R. Kennes. The transferable belief model. *Artificial Intelligence*, 66:191–234, 1994.

[50] Ph. Smets, F. Kornreich, P. Block, R. Bernard, and H. Vainsel. Fuzzy diagnostic, degrees of belief and utility. In J.H. Van Bemel and J.L. Willems, editors, *Trends in computer processed ECG*, pages 257–259, 1977.

[51] Ph. Smets and P. Magrez. Implication in fuzzy logic. *Int. J. Approximate Reasoning*, 1:327–348, 1987.

[52] Ph. Smets and P. Magrez. The measure of the degree of truth and of the grade of membership. *Int. J. Fuzzy Sets and Systems.*, 25:67–72, 1988.

[53] Ph. Smets and B. Ristic. Kalman filters and joint tracking and classification in the TBM framework. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Information Fusion*, pages IF04–0046, Stockholm, Sweden, 2004.

[54] H. Xu, Y. T. Hsia, and Ph. Smets. A belief function based decision support system. In D. Heckerman and A. Mamdani, editors, *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence 93*, pages 535–542, San Mateo, Ca, 1993. Morgan Kaufmann.

[55] H. Xu and Ph. Smets. Reasoning in evidential networks with conditional belief functions. *Int. J. Approximate Reasoning*, 14:155–185, 1996.

[56] H. Xu and Ph. Smets. Some strategies for explanation in evidential reasoning. *IEEE Trans. SMC A*, 26:599–607, 1996.