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#### Abstract

In this study, we provide a further examination for partitioning a network into communities by intersection-union operation and group action on sets. We point out that the similarity measure proposed by a previously published article contained questionable results and then we present our improvements. Our findings will help realize this research topic to obtain a reasonable division for a network to reveal the inner structure of related communities.
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## I. InTRODUCTION

TᄀHE motivation for this paper is to study Zhang et al. [1] and Lin et al. [2]. Zhang et al. [1] is the first paper that tried to use group operations to divide networks into communities. Zhang et al. [1] used "click" which is a completely connected sub-graph as a generator for group construction. Zhang et al. [1] applied elements in their generated group as functions from the domain of all nodes in the network to the range of all nodes in the network. They will separate nodes into two classes: (a) non-isolated nodes, and (b) isolated nodes. For those non-isolated nodes, Zhang et al. [1] developed cores as the bases for their communities and then added those isolated nodes to the cores, step by step. Five papers referred to Zhang et al. [1] in their references. In the following, we provide a brief review of these five papers. Lin et al. [2] examined the development of the finite group generation proposed by Zhang et al. [1], and then Lin et al. [2] claimed that the group operation will generate too many elements. For example, for the karate club problem, there are thirty-four nodes and seventy-eight links, and then Lin et al. [2] predicted that the group proposed by Zhang et al. [1] will contain more than four thousand elements. It indicates that applying it to any real-world application problems, they contain thousands of nodes. It reveals that the group operation proposed by Zhang et al. [1] is impossible to execute. Consequently, Lin et al. [2] invented a new operation, denoted as the "intersect-union operation" to replace the group operation. Li et al. [3] applied K-means and principal component analysis to examine a community

[^0]detection procedure. Ma et al. [4] considered traffic congestion problems with networks in community representations. For small-size communities, Li et al. [5] derived structural and functional properties. Ma et al. [6] studied community structure within networks by hidden metric space algorithm. According to the above brief discussion, we claim that only Lin et al. [2] provided a further examination of Zhang et al. [1].

## II. Review of Lin et al. [2]

Lin et al. [2] mentioned that the group action on sets developed by Zhang et al. [1] will cause too many cores, and then too many communities will be divided in the network. Lin et al. [2] used a well-known example constructed by Girvan and Newman [7] for a network of one hundred and twenty-eight nodes and four given communities to construct a network, and then nine communities were developed by the group action on sets studied by Zhang et al. [1]. It indicates that there are too many cores in the first step by the algorithm developed by Zhang et al. [1]. Moreover, Lin et al. [2] tried to construct a new approach to substitute the difficult group operation mentioned by Zhang et al. [1]. Consequently, Lin et al. [2] changed the function representation in Zhang et al. [1] by the range of the function except for those fixed points that are a set representation. Based on "set representation", Lin et al. [2] developed their new operation, and denoted it as an "intersect-union operation".

In this paper, we provide a further examination of the intersect-union operation of Lin et al. [2] to find that implicitly Zhang et al. [1] and Lin et al. [2] both assumed that within a given community, those clicks must intersect such that those clicks can produce only one core within the given community. However, we study the model of Girvan and Newman [7] to find that sometimes within a given community, those clicks do not intersect, and then the intersect-union operation proposed by Lin et al. [2] cannot merge those clicks. Hence, too many cores problems are still not improved by the intersect-union operation proposed by Lin et al. [2] for the network developed by Girvan and Newman [7].

We recall the results of Lin et al. [2] in the following that they tried to test the network one thousand times and to find that there are only one core 281 times, and on the other hand, there are two cores or more in the rest 719 times. Consequently, if Lin et al. [2] followed the procedure proposed by Zhang et al. [1] with the group action on sets, and then the percentage of there is just one core within each pre-designed community can be evaluated as $(0.281)^{4}=$ $0.62 \%$ which is a very low possibility to imply the desired four communities.

The above estimation points out that the procedure developed by Zhang et al. [1] is questionable to handle the network proposed by Girvan and Newman [7].

## III. Further comments on Lin et al. [2]

We can provide a hypothetical example with the number of cores in the four predesigned communities as $0,2,0$, and 2 where cores are expressed as

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\{33,34,35,36\},\{37,38,39,40\} \\
\{97,98,99,100\},\{101,102,103,104\} . \tag{3.1}
\end{array}
$$

Following the iterative merging process proposed by Lin et al. [2], we assume the final communities as

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\{1,2, \ldots, 36\}, & \{37,38, \ldots, 64\} \\
\{65,66, \ldots, 100\}, & \{101,102, \ldots, 128\} . \tag{3.2}
\end{array}
$$

We apply the performance formula proposed by Lin et al. [2] to find that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\max \sum_{j=1}^{4}\left|P_{j} \cap R_{i}\right| \\
=\left|P_{1} \cap R_{1}\right|+\left|P_{2} \cap R_{2}\right|+\left|P_{3} \cap R_{3}\right|+\left|P_{4} \cap R_{4}\right| \\
=32+28+32+28=120, \tag{3.3}
\end{gather*}
$$

with $P_{1}=\{1,2, \ldots, 32\} \quad, \quad R_{1}=\{1,2, \ldots, 36\}$
$P_{2}=\{33,34, \ldots, 64\} \quad, \quad R_{2}=\{37,38, \ldots, 64\}$
$P_{3}=\{65,66, \ldots, 96\} \quad, \quad R_{3}=\{65,66, \ldots, 100\}$
$P_{4}=\{97,98, \ldots, 128\}$ and $R_{4}=\{101,102, \ldots, 128\}$.
We find the performance ratio is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{120}{128}=93.75 \%, \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

that indicates the partition is very close to the predesigned construction proposed by Girvan and Newman [7].
The above hypothetical example with the special character that within each predesigned community, there is no one has just one core. However, the performance ratio can be very good. Hence, Lin et al. [2] only use one network to illustrate their prediction is questionable.

The above hypothetical example indicates that the probability of 0.281 proposed by Lin et al. [2] for only one core within the predesigned community with 32 nodes is only a partial finding which is not a sound criterion to criticize Zhang et al. [1].

## IV. EXAMINATION OF THE MEASURE PROPOSED BY LIN ETAL.

 [2]Girvan and Newman [7] developed a network with four given communities. Researchers applied different approaches to divide the network into communities and then they compared their findings with the original design of Girvan and Newman [7] to show the effectiveness of their approaches.

In the following, based on Song and Singh [8], we cite the Jaccard accuracy measure. We use $G_{1}, G_{2}, \ldots, G_{n}$, to express those obtained communities and $A_{1}, A_{2}, \ldots, A_{m}$, to indicate those originally designed communities.

There are three measures in Song and Singh [8]. We cite
their first measure that is expressed as $J_{G_{i}, A_{j}}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{G_{i}, A_{j}}=\frac{\left|G_{i} \cap A_{j}\right|}{\left|G_{i} \bigcup A_{j}\right|} \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Based on Equation (4.1), $\|$ is the number of how many nodes in the assigned region, to compute the ratio of overlaps between the obtained community $G_{i}$ and the originally assigned community $A_{j}$. The intersection operation is used in the numerator, and the union operation is used in the denominator.

The second measure is defined as obtaining community $G_{i}$, that is, expressed as $J a C_{G_{i}}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
J a c_{G_{i}}=\max _{1 \leq j \leq m} J_{G_{i}, A_{j}} \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, the third measure for the applied approach, which is expressed as the Jaccard accuracy is defined as follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
J a c=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|G_{i}\right| J a c_{G_{i}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|G_{i}\right|} \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Based on Equation (4.3), the value is between zero and one, and the higher the better to indicate that your partition is very close to the original design.

We point out that there is a computation error appeared in Lin et al. [2] and then we provide our improvement as follows,

$$
\begin{gather*}
\max \sum_{j=1}^{4}\left|P_{j} \cap R_{i}\right| \\
=\left|P_{3} \cap R_{1}\right|+\left|P_{4} \cap R_{2}\right|+\left|P_{1} \cap R_{3}\right|+\left|P_{2} \cap R_{4}\right| \\
=32+32+15+17=96 \tag{4.4}
\end{gather*}
$$

We compare the computation in Lin et al. [2] with the Jaccard accuracy measure to realize that Lin et al. [2] only considered the numerator of Equation (4.1), and overlooked the denominator of Equation (4.1). We begin to show that the similarity measure proposed by Lin et al. [2] contained questionable results.

We hypothetically construct a network related to Girvan and Newman [7] with the following four communities listed in the following Table 1.

Based on Table 1, we know that

$$
\begin{gather*}
J a c_{R_{1}}=J_{R_{1}, P_{4}}=\frac{1}{32},  \tag{4.5}\\
J a c_{R_{2}}=J_{R_{2}, P_{4}}=\frac{31}{32},  \tag{4.6}\\
J a c_{R_{3}}=J_{R_{3}, P_{1}}=J_{R_{3}, P_{2}}=J_{R_{3}, P_{3}}=\frac{15}{62}, \tag{4.7}
\end{gather*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
J a c_{R_{4}}=J_{R_{4}, P_{1}}=J_{R_{4}, P_{2}}=J_{R_{4}, P_{3}}=\frac{17}{66} \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Based on our findings of Equations (4.5-4.8), we obtain the Jaccard accuracy for the partition as follows,

Table 1. A hypothetical result for the network of Girvan and Newman [7].

|  | $P_{1}$ | $P_{2}$ | $P_{3}$ | $P_{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $R_{1}$ |  |  |  | 97 |
| $R_{2}$ |  |  | $98, \ldots, 128$ |  |
| $R_{3}$ | 123481012131819 | 333436383940454648 | 656667686970717273 |  |
|  | 2022272930 | 515455616364 | 747576777879 |  |
| $R_{4}$ | 56791114151617 | 353741424344474950 | 808182838485868788 |  |
|  | 2123242526283132 | 5253565758596062 | 8990919293949596 |  |

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{Jac}=\frac{1(1 / 32)+31(31 / 32)+45(15 / 62)+51(17 / 66)}{128} \\
=0.422547 \tag{4.9}
\end{gather*}
$$

On the other hand, we apply the similarity measure proposed by Lin et al. [2] to find that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|P_{1} \cap R_{3}\right|=\left|P_{2} \cap R_{3}\right|=\left|P_{3} \cap R_{3}\right|=15, \tag{4.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|P_{1} \cap R_{4}\right|=\left|P_{2} \cap R_{4}\right|=\left|P_{3} \cap R_{4}\right|=17 . \tag{4.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

To evaluate max $\sum_{j=1}^{4}\left|P_{j} \cap R_{i}\right|$, we know that $\left|P_{4} \cap R_{3}\right|=31$ is the best result. For the rest $P_{1}, P_{2}$ and $P_{3}$, there are six different possible outcomes:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|P_{1} \cap R_{4}\right|+\left|P_{2} \cap R_{3}\right|=17+15,  \tag{4.12}\\
& \left|P_{1} \cap R_{4}\right|+\left|P_{3} \cap R_{3}\right|=17+15,  \tag{4.13}\\
& \left|P_{2} \cap R_{4}\right|+\left|P_{1} \cap R_{3}\right|=17+15,  \tag{4.14}\\
& \left|P_{2} \cap R_{4}\right|+\left|P_{3} \cap R_{3}\right|=17+15,  \tag{4.15}\\
& \left|P_{3} \cap R_{4}\right|+\left|P_{1} \cap R_{3}\right|=17+15, \tag{4.16}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|P_{3} \cap R_{4}\right|+\left|P_{2} \cap R_{3}\right|=17+15 \tag{4.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Under the finding of Equation (16), researchers cannot further apply $\left|P_{3} \cap R_{4}\right|=17$, or $\left|P_{3} \cap R_{3}\right|=15$ such that researchers must use $\left|P_{3} \cap R_{1}\right|=\left|P_{3} \cap R_{2}\right|=0$ to imply that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max \sum_{j=1}^{4}\left|P_{j} \cap R_{i}\right|=17+15+0+31=63 \tag{4.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

and then we find the similarity measure proposed by Lin et al. [2] as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{63}{128}=0.492 . \tag{4.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, we compare the findings of Equations (4.9) and (4.19) to derive that Lin et al. [2] also overestimated the similarity values for this hypothetical network.

In the following, we construct our second example to demonstrate the similarity measure proposed by Lin et al. [2] contained questionable results.

We observe Table 2 to find that

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\left|P_{1} \cap R_{1}\right|=\left|P_{2} \cap R_{1}\right|= \\
\left|P_{3} \cap R_{1}\right|=\left|P_{4} \cap R_{1}\right|=15, \tag{4.20}
\end{array}
$$ and

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\left|P_{1} \cap R_{2}\right|=\left|P_{2} \cap R_{2}\right|= \\
\left|P_{3} \cap R_{2}\right|=\left|P_{4} \cap R_{2}\right|=17, \tag{4.21}
\end{array}
$$

Table 2. Our second example for the network of Girvan and Newman [7].

|  | $P_{1}$ | $P_{2}$ | $P_{3}$ | $P_{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $R_{1}$ | 1234810121318 | 333436383940 | 656667686970 | 979899100101102103 |
|  | 192022272930 | 454648515455 | 717273747576 | 104105106107108109 |
|  |  | 616364 | 777879 | 110111 |
| $R_{2}$ | 567911141516 | 353741424344 | 808182838485 | 112113114115116117 |
|  | 172123242526 | 474950525356 | 868788899091 | 118119120121122123 |
|  | 283132 | 5758596062 | 9293949596 | 124125126127128 |

such that when we compute max $\sum_{j=1}^{4}\left|P_{j} \cap R_{i}\right|$ if we decide $\left|P_{1} \cap R_{2}\right|=17$ and $\left|P_{2} \cap R_{1}\right|=15$, then we cannot further evaluate max $\sum_{j=3}^{4}\left|P_{j} \cap R_{i}\right|$ because we run out all possible $R_{i}$ for $\mathrm{i}=1,2$. Therefore, we construct a partition such that the similarity measure proposed by Lin et al. [2] failed to find its similarity measure. Hence, our second hypothetical example demonstrates the similarity measure proposed by Lin et al. [2] containing severe problems.

## V. Direction for future research

Newman [9] studied modularity and community structure in networks and Radicchi et al. [10] defined and identified communities in networks that are worthy to mention to provide possible directions for future research.

## VI. A Related Open Problem

In the second part of this paper, a solution to the open problem studied in the paper by Chang et al. [11] in which the algebraic method is applied to find the optimal solution for inventory models, published in the International Journal of Production Economics, is provided. The findings presented in this part will help practitioners accept the replenishment policy for inventory models without a background in calculus. Grubbström [12] applied the algebraic method to solve the EOQ model without referring to calculus so that more practitioners can realize inventory models without the knowledge of differential equations. Grubbström and Erdem [13] followed this trend to find the optimal solution for EOQ models with shortages. Cárdenas-Barrón [14] generalized to find the optimal solution for EPQ models. Ronald et al. [15] showed that the approaches of Grubbström and Erdem [13] and Cárdenas-Barrón [14] are too sophistic thus ordinary readers may not be able to follow their solution method and apply it to their research. Ronald et al. [15] provided a new approach, first to locate the minimum on each ray to construct a new minimum and then solve their new minimum problem. Chang et al. [11] pointed out that the two-stage algebraic procedure of Ronald et al. [15] is very difficult and presented a simplified method. We provided an outline of their method.
Based on Cárdenas-Barrón [14], Chang et al. [11] tried to solve the following inventory model,

$$
\begin{gather*}
C(Q, B)=-h B+B^{2} \frac{h+b}{2 Q \rho} \\
c D+\frac{K D}{Q}+Q \frac{\rho h}{2} \tag{6.1}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $Q$ is the economic production quantity; $B$ is the maximum shortage level; $D$ is demand rate per unit time; $P$ is production rate per unit time, with $P>D ; \rho$ is an abbreviation with $\rho=1-\frac{D}{P}$; $b$ is the backorder cost; $h$ is the holding cost per unit, per unit of time; $K$ is the setup cost; $C$ is the production cost per unit.

Chang et al. [11] rewrote Equation (6.1) as

$$
\begin{gather*}
C(Q, B)=\frac{h+b}{2 Q \rho}\left(\frac{Q \rho h}{h+b}-B\right)^{2} \\
\quad+c D+\frac{K D}{Q}+\frac{Q \rho h b}{2(h+b)}, \tag{6.2}
\end{gather*}
$$

to derive that

$$
\begin{equation*}
B=B(Q)=Q \frac{\rho h}{h+b}, \tag{6.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and then rewrote Equation (6.2) in one variable $Q$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(Q, B(Q))=c D+\frac{D K}{Q}+\frac{Q \rho h b}{2(h+b)} . \tag{6.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Chang et al. [11] derived that

$$
\begin{align*}
& C(Q, B(Q))=\left(\sqrt{\frac{K D}{Q}}-\sqrt{Q \frac{\rho h b}{2(h+b)}}\right)^{2} \\
& \quad+c D+\sqrt{\frac{2 K D \rho h b}{h+b}} \tag{6.5}
\end{align*}
$$

to locate the optimal production quantity,

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q^{*}=\sqrt{\frac{2 K D(h+b)}{\rho h b}}, \tag{6.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the optimal total cost,

$$
\begin{equation*}
C\left(Q, B\left(Q^{*}\right)\right)=c D+\sqrt{\frac{2 K D \rho h b}{h+b}} \tag{6.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and then the optimal maximum shortage level,

$$
\begin{equation*}
B^{*}=\sqrt{\frac{2 K D \rho h}{(h+b) b}} \tag{6.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Chang et al. [11] mentioned an alternate solution approach which was to rewrite Equation (6.1) as

$$
\begin{gather*}
C(Q, B)=\left(\sqrt{Q \frac{\rho h}{2}}-\sqrt{\left(B^{2} \frac{h+b}{2 \rho}+K D\right) \frac{1}{Q}}\right)^{2} \\
-h B+c D+\sqrt{B^{2}(h+b) h+2 K D \rho h}, \tag{6.9}
\end{gather*}
$$

to derive that

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q=Q(B)=\sqrt{\frac{2}{h \rho}\left(K D+B^{2} \frac{h+b}{2 \rho}\right)} \tag{6.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

and then rewrote Equation (6.9) as

$$
\begin{gather*}
C(Q(B), B)=-B h \\
c D+\sqrt{B^{2}(h+b) h+2 K D h \rho} . \tag{6.11}
\end{gather*}
$$

Chang et al. [11] raised an open question of how to handle an optimal solution of Equation (6.11) in the variable $B$ by algebraic methods. In the second part of this paper, a solution is provided for this open question proposed by Chang et al. [11].
This research problem is a hot topic for many papers because many practitioners are not familiar with the analytical skills to realize a system of partial differential
equations, Riemann integration in one variable, and transformation from double integration to iterative integrations. We list some related studies in the following.
Lin [16] showed the questionable results of Chung and Cárdenas-Barrón [17], Cárdenas-Barrón [18], and Omar et al. [19], and for their incomplete algebraic methods. Lin [20] pointed out that the dispute proposed by Leung [21] to Teng [22] is not valid. The amendment developed by Leung [21] to separate the domain into three different regions are unnecessary. To separate the domain into three different regions is the calculus procedure since calculus cannot deal with critical solutions occurring on boundaries.
Feng [23] showed that Sphicas [24] did not offer any reasonings to explain the motivations proposed mentioned by Sphicas [25]. Lin [26] showed that Cárdenas-Barrón [27] violated the criteria of Cárdenas-Barrón [28] to produce a simple solution process. Lin [29] showed that Teng [22] implicitly used the findings of Wee et al. [30] to produce a simplified solution method without clearly informing the readers of the source of Wee et al. [30].

Lin et al. [31] claimed that Cárdenas-Barrón [18] derived an excellent algebraic method through the famous Cauchy-Bunyakovsky-Schwarz inequality for EOQ models. However, Cárdenas-Barrón [18] repeatedly applied the same excellent algebraic method for EPQ models that were redundant.

Lin and Deng [32] constructed a compact process to avoid the tedious algebraic algorithm developed by Wee et al. [33].

Tuan and Himalaya [34] studied a supply chain inventory model proposed by Xiao et al. [35]. Lan et al. [36] derived a compact version to replace the tedious solution process used by Cárdenas-Barrón [37].
Yen [38] constructed a simple method that offered an intuitive approach to reduce those difficult computations presented by Ronald et al. [15], Chang et al. [11], Luo and Chou [39], and Grubbström and Erdem [13]. Luo and Chou [39] dealt with an open problem mentioned by Chiu et al. [40] and Lau et al. [41]. Chiu et al. [40] developed revisions for several questionable findings in Lau et al. [41].

Lau et al. [41] generalized the open problem mentioned in Chang et al. [11] to find the conditions to guarantee the existence of the optimal minimum solution.

## VII. Our Solution Approach

Based on Equation (6.11), we minimize $C(B)$, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(B)=-h B+c D+\sqrt{B^{2}(h+b) h+2 K D \rho h} \tag{7.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We rearrange Equation (7.1) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sqrt{2 K D \rho h+B^{2}(h+b) h}=B h-c D+C(B) \tag{7.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and then square both sides and simplify the expression to yield

$$
\begin{gather*}
B^{2} h b+2 B(c D-C(B)) h+2 h \rho K D \\
=(c D-C(B))^{2} . \tag{7.3}
\end{gather*}
$$

The square for the variable $B$ is then completed, to treat $C(B)$ as a constant, that is, overlooking that $C(B)$ contains the variable $B$ for the moment.
We derive that

$$
\begin{gather*}
h b\left(\left(\frac{C(B)-c D}{b}\right)^{2}-2 \frac{B}{b}(C(B)-c D)+B^{2}\right) \\
+2 K D h \rho=\frac{h+b}{b}(C(B)-c D)^{2} . \tag{7.4}
\end{gather*}
$$

From Equation (7.1) with $\sqrt{B^{2} h(h+b)} \geq B h$, it is known that $C(B)>c D$.

Based on Equation (7.4), if we take

$$
\begin{equation*}
B=\frac{C(B)-c D}{b} \tag{7.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

then the left-hand side of Equation (7.4) will attain its minimum. Under the condition of Equation (7.5), Equation (7.4) is rewritten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
(C(B)-c D)^{2}=2 K D \frac{\rho h b}{h+b} \tag{7.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Owing to the condition $C(B)>c D$, we obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(B)=c D+\sqrt{K D \frac{2 \rho h b}{h+b}}, \tag{7.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and then we rewrite Equation (7.5) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
B=\sqrt{K D \frac{2 \rho h}{(h+b) b}} \tag{7.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

By comparing the results of Equation (7.7) and Equation (6.6) it is found that the same optimal cost is derived from the solution proposed in this paper. Moreover, comparing the findings of Equation (7.8) and Equation (6.8), then we also derive the optimal maximum shortage level.

The above comparisons demonstrate that the algebraic method proposed in this paper has handled an open problem mentioned by Chang et al. [11].

## VIII. COMMENTS FOR OUR METHOD

Our approach provides an answer to an open problem raised by Chang et al. [11] concerning quadratic polynomials containing the square root. Our derivation has a special character such that we obtain the optimal cost first and then we find the optimal production quantity and optimal maximum shortage level.

This distinct feature should be useful for some traffic systems. Under that environment, researchers may overlook the optimal solutions for headway, optimal length, and optimal solution for width of the rectangular service area, but concentrate on the social benefit of the bus transit system.

Several related papers deserve to be mentioned: Kang et al. [42], Al-Sharu et al. [43], Yuan et al. [44], Canot et al. [45], Yen [46], Bu and Xu [47], Gaketem et al. [48], and Du and Sun [49] to help practitioners realize the current research trend.

## IX. Construction of Linear Independent Family

There is a series of papers by Yen et al. [50], Chu et al. [51], Hung et al. [52], and Chou [53] that tried to develop algorithms to solve pattern recognition problems under discrete environments. During their development, they needed to construct a family of linearly independent vectors.

In the following, we will try to construct a new family in which they are linearly independent of each other.

## X. Recall of Previous Results

First, we recall a theorem by Chu et al. [51] that mentioned that if $x+y+z=1$, and $w \neq 0$, according to

$$
\begin{gather*}
\operatorname{det}\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
x & y & z \\
x+2 w & y+w & z-3 w \\
x+w & y+2 w & z-3 w
\end{array}\right]=3 w^{2}(x+y+z) \\
=3 w^{2} \neq 0 \tag{10.1}
\end{gather*}
$$

Based on the findings of Equation (10.1), we know that three vectors $(x, y, z),(x+2 w, y+w, z-3 w)$, and $(x+w$, $y+2 w, z-3 w)$ are three independent vectors.

Following the above discussion of Chu et al. [51], we compute the following

$$
\begin{gather*}
\operatorname{det}\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
w_{1} & w_{2} & w_{3} \\
w_{1}+\alpha & w_{2}-\alpha & w_{3} \\
w_{1}+\alpha & w_{2} & w_{3}-\alpha
\end{array}\right] \\
=\operatorname{det}\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
w_{1} & w_{2} & w_{3} \\
\alpha & -\alpha & 0 \\
\alpha & 0 & -\alpha
\end{array}\right] \\
=w_{1} \alpha^{2}-w_{2}\left(-\alpha^{2}\right)+w_{3}\left(0-\left(-\alpha^{2}\right)\right) \\
=\left(w_{1}+w_{2}+w_{3}\right) \alpha^{2} \\
=\alpha^{2} . \tag{10.2}
\end{gather*}
$$

Based on Equation (10.2), we know that if $\mathrm{w}_{1}+\mathrm{w}_{2}+\mathrm{w}_{3}=$ 1 and $\alpha \neq 0$, then three vectors $\left(w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}\right)$, $\left(w_{1}+\alpha, w_{2}-\alpha, w_{3}\right)$, and $\left(w_{1}+\alpha, w_{2}, w_{3}-\alpha\right)$ are independent.

The pending problem is to generalize the above results to any finite-dimensional vector space.

## XI. OUR NEW RESUlTS

We will extend our results from three independent vectors to generalize to four independent vectors.
The determinant of four vectors, $\left(w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}, w_{4}\right)$, $\left(w_{1}+\alpha, w_{2}-\alpha, w_{3}, w_{4}\right),\left(w_{1}+\alpha, w_{2}, w_{3}-\alpha, w_{4}\right)$ and $\left(w_{1}+\alpha, w_{2}, w_{3}, w_{4}-\alpha\right)$ is evaluated as follows,

$$
\operatorname{det}\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
w_{1} & w_{2} & w_{3} & w_{4}  \tag{11.1}\\
w_{1}+\alpha & w_{2}-\alpha & w_{3} & w_{4} \\
w_{1}+\alpha & w_{2} & w_{3}-\alpha & w_{4} \\
w_{1}+\alpha & w_{2} & w_{3} & w_{4}-\alpha
\end{array}\right] .
$$

We apply the row operation to simplify Equation (11.1) to yield that

$$
\text { determinant }=\operatorname{det}\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
\mathrm{w}_{1} & \mathrm{w}_{2} & \mathrm{w}_{3} & \mathrm{w}_{4}  \tag{11.2}\\
\alpha & -\alpha & 0 & 0 \\
\alpha & 0 & -\alpha & 0 \\
\alpha & 0 & 0 & -\alpha
\end{array}\right] .
$$

We apply the first-row expansion of Equation (11.2) to derive that the determinant,

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{w}_{1}\left(-\alpha^{3}\right)-\mathrm{w}_{2} \alpha^{3}+\mathrm{w}_{3}\left(-\alpha^{3}\right)-\mathrm{w}_{4} \alpha^{3} \\
=\left(\mathrm{w}_{1}+\mathrm{w}_{2}+\mathrm{w}_{3}+\mathrm{w}_{4}\right)\left(-\alpha^{3}\right) \\
=-\alpha^{3}, \tag{11.3}
\end{gather*}
$$

under the condition of $\mathrm{w}_{1}+\mathrm{w}_{2}+\mathrm{w}_{3}+\mathrm{w}_{4}=1$.
Based on our above derivations, we will solve the following open question for the future researcher:
To show that the determinant of $\left(w_{1}, w_{2}, \ldots, w_{n}\right)$, $\left(w_{1}+\alpha, w_{2}-\alpha, \ldots, w_{4}\right),\left(w_{1}+\alpha, w_{2}, w_{3}-\alpha, \ldots, w_{4}\right)$
and $\quad\left(w_{1}+\alpha, w_{2}, w_{3}, \ldots, w_{n-1}, w_{4}-\alpha\right)$ is $(-1)^{n-1} \alpha^{n-1}\left(w_{1}+w_{2}+\ldots+w_{n}\right)$.

We assume that a matrix, $\left(a_{i j}\right)_{n \times n}$ with $a_{1 j}=w_{j}$, $w_{j} \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i}=1$ for $j=1, \ldots, n$ and for $i=2, \ldots, n, a_{i j}=w_{j}+\alpha \Delta_{i j}$ with $\alpha>0, \Delta_{i 1}=1$, $\Delta_{i i}=-1, \Delta_{i j}=0$ otherwise, and then we will prove $\operatorname{det}\left(a_{i j}\right)_{n \times n}=(-\alpha)^{n-1}$.

The third kind of elementary row operation will not change the value of a determinant so if we use $(-1) R_{1}+R_{i}$ to work on the $i$ th row for the matrix $\left(a_{i j}\right)_{n \times n}$, for $i=2, \ldots, n$, then $\operatorname{det}\left(a_{i j}\right)_{n \times n}=\operatorname{det}\left(b_{i j}\right)_{n \times n} \quad$ where $\quad b_{1 j}=w_{j} \quad$ for $j=1, \ldots, n$ and for $i=2, \ldots, n, b_{i j}=\alpha \Delta_{i j}$.

The second kind of elementary row operation will change the value of a determinant. If we multiply one row by $x$ that will result in $x$ multiple the original determinant to be the new determinant. Hence, $\operatorname{det}\left(a_{i j}\right)_{n \times n}=\alpha^{n-1} \operatorname{det}\left(c_{i j}\right)_{n \times n}$ where $c_{i j}=b_{i j} / \alpha$ for $i=2, \ldots, n$. We derive that $c_{1 j}=w_{j}$ for $j=1, \ldots, n, c_{i 1}=1$ and $c_{i i}=-1$, for $i=2, \ldots, n$.

For the determinant of the matrix $\left(c_{i j}\right)_{n \times n}$, we will use the first column expansion, such that we assume $\left(d_{i j}^{k}\right)_{(n-1) \times(n-1)}$ for $k=1, \ldots n$ such that $\left(d_{i j}^{k}\right)_{(n-1) \times(n-1)}$ is the remaining matrix of $\left(c_{i j}\right)_{n \times n}$ to delete the first column and the $k$ th row, and then we know that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\operatorname{det}\left(c_{i j}\right)_{n \times n}=(-1)^{1+1} w_{1} \operatorname{det}\left(d_{i j}^{1}\right)_{(n-1) \times(n-1)} \\
\quad+\sum_{k=2}^{n}(-1)^{1+k} \operatorname{det}\left(d_{i j}^{k}\right)_{(n-1) \times(n-1)} \tag{11.4}
\end{gather*}
$$

We know that $\left(d_{i j}^{1}\right)_{(n-1) \times(n-1)}=(-1) I_{(n-1) \times(n-1)}$ where $I_{(n-1) \times(n-1)}$ is the identity matrix then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{det}\left(d_{i j}^{1}\right)_{(n-1) \times(n-1)}=(-1)^{n-1} \tag{11.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $k=2, \ldots, n$,

$$
d_{i j}^{k}=\left\{\begin{array}{c}
c_{i(j+1)}: i<k  \tag{11.6}\\
c_{(i+1)(j+1)}: i \geq k
\end{array}\right.
$$

and then it results in $d_{1 j}^{k}=w_{j+1}$ for $j=1, \ldots, n-1$, and

$$
d_{i j}^{k}=\left\{\begin{array}{c}
-1: i=j+1<k  \tag{11.7}\\
-1: i=j \geq k \\
0: \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

for $i=2, \ldots, n-1$.
We know that

$$
d_{i(k-1)}^{k}=\left\{\begin{array}{c}
w_{k}: i=1  \tag{11.8}\\
0: \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

owing to $i=(k-1)+1<k$ and $i=k-1 \geq k$ both will not happen.

With $k=2, \ldots, n$, for the determinant of the matrix $\left(d_{i j}^{k}\right)_{(n-1) \times(n-1)}$, we use the $(k-1)$ th column expansion. Hence, we assume that $\left(e_{i j}^{k}\right)_{(n-2) \times(n-2)}$ as $\left(d_{i j}^{k}\right)_{(n-1) \times(n-1)}$ deleting the first row and the $(k-1)$ th column implies that

$$
e_{i j}^{k}=\left\{\begin{array}{c}
d_{(i+1)(j+1)}^{k}: j \geq k-1  \tag{11.9}\\
d_{(i+1) j}^{k}: j \leq k-2
\end{array}\right.
$$

We derive the following four cases:
(a) when $j \geq k-1$ then $e_{i j}^{k}=d_{(i+1)(j+1)}^{k}=-1$ and $i+1=j+1+1<k$ will not happen;
(b) when $j \geq k-1$ then $e_{i j}^{k}=d_{(i+1)(j+1)}^{k}=-1$ and $i+1=j+1 \geq k$ that is valid for $i=j=k-1, \ldots, n ;$
(c) when $j \leq k-2$ then $e_{i j}^{k}=d_{(i+1) j}^{k}=-1$ and $i+1=j+1<k$ that is valid for $i=j=1, \ldots, k-2 ;$
(d) when $j \leq k-2$ then $e_{i j}^{k}=d_{(i+1) j}^{k}=-1 \quad$ and $i+1=j \geq k$ will not happen. Therefore, we obtain that $\left(e_{i j}^{k}\right)_{(n-2) \times(n-2)}=(-1) I_{(n-2) \times(n-2)}$.

Consequently, we find that

$$
\begin{gather*}
\operatorname{det}\left(d_{i j}^{k}\right)_{(n-1) \times(n-1)}=(-1)^{1+k-1} w_{k} \operatorname{det}\left(e_{i j}^{k}\right)_{(n-2) \times(n-2)} \\
=(-1)^{k} w_{k}(-1)^{n-2} \tag{11.10}
\end{gather*}
$$

and then

$$
\begin{align*}
& \operatorname{det}\left(c_{i j}\right)_{n \times n}=w_{1}(-1)^{n-1}+ \\
& \sum_{k=2}^{n}(-1)^{k+1}(-1)^{k} w_{k}(-1)^{n-2} \\
& =(-1)^{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n} w_{k}=(-1)^{n-1} . \tag{11.11}
\end{align*}
$$

At last, we obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{det}\left(a_{i j}\right)_{n \times n}=(-\alpha)^{n-1} \tag{11.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Owing to $\operatorname{det}\left(a_{i j}\right)_{n \times n} \neq 0$, we know that $\left\{R_{1}, \ldots, R_{n}\right\}$ are linear independent where $R_{i}$ is the ith row of the matrix $\left(a_{i j}\right)_{n \times n}$.

## XII. Conclusion

In this paper, we point out several questionable results in Lin et al. [2] that will help researchers to realize (a) the group action on sets proposed by Zhang et al. [1], and (b) the intersection-union operation proposed by Lin et al. [2] to provide an improved partition of networks into communities. Moreover, we provide a positive answer to an open problem developed by Chang et al. [11]. Last, but not least, we construct a new family of independent vectors.
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