# **An Expert System Algorithm for Computer System Diagnostics**

**Aaron Don M. Africa** aaronafrica@yahoo.com

Faculty of Engineering Electronics and Communications Engineering Department De La Salle University Manila 2401 Taft Avenue Manila Philippines

#### **Abstract**

In troubleshooting Computer Systems the two most common causes of delay are Trial and Error and having Incomplete Information. The problems in Computer Systems will be fixed faster if the Possible Cause of the Problem is already known. A solution to this is to use an Expert System. This system can reproduce the ability of an expert to diagnose by giving an accurate recommendation on the possible cause of the problem for effective troubleshooting.

To know the Possible Cause of a problem there must be a complete set of information. These data will be the one to be inputted in the Expert System to give an accurate recommendation. A problem is that in reality a complete set of data will not always be obtained. There will be instances when the information gathered will be incomplete.

This research solved the two most causes of delay which are Trial and Error and having Incomplete Information. This is done by developing an Expert System Algorithm that creates the rules of an Expert System. The rules created from the algorithm are nominal in terms that only the necessary information needs to be inputted. In instances that the data gathered are incomplete the correct Possible Cause can still be suggested. A theorem is also presented in this research about and the Information Dependency of Data which can be used with Incomplete Information Systems and unknown data. Formal Proof of the theorem is provided and its correctness was verified with actual data.

**Keywords:** Computer Systems, Expert Systems, Real time systems, Database Engineering, Information Management.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

An Expert System is an Artificial Intelligence Based System that performs task that otherwise is performed by a human expert [1]. This type of system usually has a knowledge base containing accumulated experience and a set of rules for applying the knowledge base to each particular solution.

The most common cause of delay in solving a problem is trial and error [2]. The problem can be solved earlier if the person diagnosing it already knows the cause of the problem rather than resorting to trial and error. There are instances that because of this trial and error, the problem gets worse rather than being solved. Some problems can be solved quickly; there are situations when it only takes a few minutes to solve a problem but because the person diagnosing it does not know the cause of the problem, troubleshooting takes days or months causing much inconvenience.

An example in Computer Systems, a technician encountered an error of "MOM Alerts on Server: SVREBPPDBS01" and this is the first time he has encountered this problem. He will attempt several troubleshooting techniques in finding the Possible Cause (PC). It is often rigorous and time consuming requiring the mobilization of resources. He may guess that it is a Computer Virus Problem and reinstall new Anti Viral programs or a Hardware problem and replace the Database

server causing huge amounts of money. But the real Possible Cause of that symptom is "Microsoft Office Manager (MOM) Alerts on Server" which means that the server is already full. The solution to this PC is to shrink the Database, which only takes less than 5 minutes. Knowing this problem before hand will save time and resources. This is the primary use of Expert Systems - it reduces trial and error in problems on a specific domain.

Data on Information Systems is important in any type of enterprise. The data is often used to interpret information and make decisions [3]. An example is in an Expert System enough information must be inputted in order to give the correct conclusion. In reality, you will not be able to obtain all the data that you need. Data will be vague and incomplete, thus, it will be difficult to produce any conclusion [4]. Knowing the right and necessary attributes to obtain is important especially if you have limited time and resources [5]. Coming up with the correct conclusion even with minimal information is a great advantage [6].

## **2. OVERVIEW**

## **2.1. Example Symptoms and Possible Causes**

Consider this Example Information System:



**TABLE 1:** Symptoms and Possible Cause (PC)

Table 1 list some network and internetwork problems or trouble which may be encountered by Computer Systems. It presents us some possible causes, symptoms and solutions which we could undertake so to resolve particular errors.



#### **TABLE 2:** List of Possible causes

The Table 2 presents list of possible causes of network failure. It states that FTP Software Trouble may arise if there's a conflict on the software that we are using. FTP Software Trouble might hinder the user from transferring information or data from one computer to the other. Another possible causes is the Server Connection Failure, this may arise if there's a problem on the physical connection of the server. Accessing the server from the client workstation may be unreachable. Lastly, the Email Queues Increasing may arise if there's a problem on the Internet or intranet connection which leads to the increase on the amount of email messages on the queue.



## **TABLE 3:** List Symptoms

Table 3 presents the List of Symptoms of network connection failure presented on the other table of Possible Causes. This table summarizes the symptoms that we should know so that we could be able to anticipate network errors. Symptom S1 tells about the Error Connection Appears, this might prompt us on some error messages on our screen. Symptom S2 states that the network drives cannot be access. Symptom S3 tells about Destination unreachable error appears on the screen. This symptom simply states that the particular workstation cannot be reached by a particular connecting workstation. The last one which is symptom S4 presents about page cannot be accessed error appears. This error pertains to the Internet or intranet Connection Error wherein it has no capability to access the particular page due to no connection.



**TABLE 4**: Information System of Table 1

Table 4 shows the Data in Table 1 converted to an Information System.

## **2.2. List of Mathematical Symbols**

The following are the list of Mathematical Symbols used in this research and their explanations:





## **TABLE 5:** List of Mathematical Symbols

## **2.3. Incomplete Information System and Information Dependency of Data.**

In Computer Systems, Data is important. Data is often used to interpret and make decisions [9]. In Expert Systems for example, Data gathered is used as a Knowledge Base. The rules of Expert Systems are from the Knowledge Base Data. The more Data in the system, the better it can interpret information [10]. However, in reality you will be able to gather the Data that you need. There will be situations that due to limited time and resources, you will have to prioritize your Information Gathering [11].

An Incomplete Information System (IIS) is a 4-tuple  $S = \langle D, Q, V, \rho \rangle$  (1), In this tuple D is a set of Possible causes, Q is a set of Symptoms and  $\rho$  is the relation from  $D\times Q$  to V (2) which assigns at least one value for  $(i, j) \in (E \times Q)$ . F is the value of a symptom which may contain an unknown value represented by the symbol "\*" [12].

To further explain the concepts of Incomplete Information System consider the following example in System Network Performance:



**TABLE 6:** An Incomplete Information System

In Table 6:

S1: Error Connection Appears

S2: Cannot Access Network Drives

S3: Destination unreachable error appears

S4: Page cannot be accessed Error Appears

PC1: FTP Software Trouble

PC2: Server connection failure PC3: Email Queues Increasing

1: Symptom exist

0: Symptom does not exist

\* : Cannot obtain the data

S1, S2, S3 and S4 are the Symptoms and D is the Possible cause. This is for a total of 6 cases.

 $Q = \{S1, S2, S3, S4\}$  (3)  $D = \{PC1, PC2, PC3\}$ (4)  $E = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$  (5)  $V = \{1, 0, *\}$  (6)

Table 6 gives an example of an Incomplete Information System. Equation 3 shows the Symptoms used which are S1, S2, S3 and S4. Equation 4 shows the Possible causes which can either be PC1, PC2 or PC3.

Equation 5 shows the cases which are from 1 to 6. Equation 2 showed that the relation  $\rho$  is the product set of D and Q mapped into V which assigns at least one value for (*i*, *j*)∈(*C*×*Q*) and can have a value of either 1,0 or \* as shown in equation 6.

In Case 1 and 2 of Table 6 for example  $S1 = PC1$  is needed for D to be PC1. Let  $S1 = PC1$  be defined as essential information needed to satisfy the D to be PC1. It can be said that value of D being PC1 is dependent on  $S1 = PC1$ . The Possible cause "PC1" has many data conditions and some of them are unknown. For example in Case 2 where S3 and S4 are unknown and S1 = 1, the other data is unimportant as long as the value of  $S1 = 1$  it can be said that  $D = PC1$ . The concept of dependent is important in Incomplete Information Systems. For Example in Table 6 where  $D = PC1$  is dependent on S1 = 1, the only information needed to be obtain is if S1 = 1 and not the other information in S3 and S4 which are incomplete.

## **2.4. Nominality of a Rule**

Initially to make the rules each case will be checked. One rule is for one case. For example in Table 4 Case 1 will produce the following Rule:

Rule 1:  $(S1 = 1)$  &  $(S2 = 1)$  &  $(S3 = 1)$  &  $(S4 = 1)$  =>  $(D = PC1)$ 

The Symptoms will have a value of 1 if it exists in the case and a value of 0 if it does not. For Rule 1 S1, S2, S3 and S4 must exist for D to be PC1. All 5 cases will have the following Rules:

Rule 1:  $(S1 = 1)$  &  $(S2 = 1)$  &  $(S3 = 1)$  &  $(S4 = 1)$  =>  $(D = PC1)$ Rule 2:  $(S1 = 0)$  &  $(S2 = 1)$  &  $(S3 = 1)$  &  $(S4 = 1)$  =>  $(D = PC2)$ Rule 3:  $(S1 = 0)$  &  $(S2 = 1)$  &  $(S3 = 0)$  &  $(S4 = 1)$  =>  $(D = PC2)$ Rule 4:  $(S1 = 0)$  &  $(S2 = 1)$  &  $(S3 = 0)$  &  $(S4 = 1)$  =>  $(D = PC2)$ Rule 5:  $(S1 = 0)$  &  $(S2 = 1)$  &  $(S3 = 1)$  &  $(S4 = 1)$  =>  $(D = PC3)$ 

In a typical process of troubleshooting, the technician will check all the symptoms needed to satisfy the possible cause in order to conclude that it is the actual Cause. Verifying the existence of the symptom takes time and resources. For example in Rule 1 the technician must verify if Error Connection Appears, Network Drives cannot be accessed, Destination unreachable error appears and Page Cannot be accessed Error Appears. Verifying just one of the symptoms takes time like Destination Unreachable Error Appears. To verify this symptom the technician will have to ping the computers in the network. If there are many computers in the network doing this verification takes time.

The rules of the Information System can still be reduced. For example in Table 4  $D = PC1$  is dependent on the value of S1 being 1. Therefore to satisfy  $D = PC1$  verification needs to be done only in S1, not needing S2, S3 and S4. So even if S2, S3 or S4 are incomplete it can still be concluded as  $D = PC1$ . The rules that are reduced are called in nominal form.

## **2.5. Theorem**

**Theorem 1:** Consider an Information System  $S = \langle D, Q, V, \rho \rangle$ . Let p be a selected Possible Cause and let q be a selected Symptom. Assume  $(y)(q) \neq^*$  for all  $y \in D$ . If  $(p)(q)$  is a singleton and is not a subset or equal to the value of  $(p')(q)$  then the selected Possible Cause is dependent on the value of the selected Symptom f.

Observe that in the above theorem an Information System maybe incomplete. However the condition  $(y)(q) \neq^*$  for all  $y \in D$  requires that column q of the Information System be complete.

## **Proof:**

Consider the sample Information System:

С	D \ Q	$\mathsf{Q}_1$	$\mathsf{Q}_2$	$\mathsf{Q}_3$	$\mathsf{Q}_4$	$\ldots Q_b$
		С,	$C_2$	$\mathcal{C}_3$	C4	$ C_{ab}$
2	D,	$C_2$	$\mathit{C}_3$	$\mathcal{C}_4$	$\mathcal{C}_4$	$\dots C_{ab}$
3	$D_2$	$C_2$	$\mathit{C}_2$	$\mathit{C}_2$	С,	$\dots C_{ab}$
4	D3	C4	$C_3$	$\mathit{C}_2$	С1	$C_{ab}$
٠	$\blacksquare$	$\blacksquare$	٠	٠	$\blacksquare$	
	$\blacksquare$	٠	٠			
а	$D_{ab}$	$C_{ab}$	$C_{ab}$	$C_{ab}$	$C_{ab}$	$C_{ab}$

**TABLE 7:** Information System of Data

In this example Information System

$$
Q = \{Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4, \dots Q_b\}
$$
  
\n
$$
C = \{1, 2, 3, 4, \dots a\}
$$
  
\n
$$
V = \{C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, \dots C_{ab}\}
$$

Attributes  $Q_1$  to  $Q_b$  are Symptoms D is the Possible cause.

$$
Q = Q_4\np = D_1\np' =: D_2, D_3, ... D_{ab}\nf = {C_4}\nq^f = Q_4C_4
$$

In the Information System  $(p)(q)$  is a singleton and is not a subset or equal to the value of  $(p')(q)$ .

The Information System will then be translated from tabular form to logical form.

$$
[(Q_{1} = C_{1}) \wedge (Q_{2} = C_{2}) \wedge (Q_{3} = C_{3}) \wedge (Q_{4} = C_{4}) ... \wedge (Q_{b} = C_{ab}) \wedge (D = D_{1})] \vee
$$
  
\n
$$
[(Q_{1} = C_{2}) \wedge (Q_{2} = C_{3}) \wedge (Q_{3} = C_{4}) \wedge (Q_{4} = C_{4}) ... \wedge (Q_{b} = C_{ab}) \wedge (D = D_{1})] \vee
$$
  
\n
$$
[(Q_{1} = C_{2}) \wedge (Q_{2} = C_{2}) \wedge (Q_{3} = C_{2}) \wedge (Q_{4} = C_{1}) ... \wedge (Q_{b} = C_{ab}) \wedge (D = D_{2})] \vee
$$
  
\n
$$
[(Q_{1} = C_{4}) \wedge (Q_{2} = C_{3}) \wedge (Q_{3} = C_{2}) \wedge (Q_{4} = C_{1}) ... \wedge (Q_{b} = C_{ab}) \wedge (D = D_{3})] \vee ...
$$
  
\n
$$
[(Q_{1} = C_{ab}) \wedge (Q_{2} = C_{ab}) \wedge (Q_{3} = C_{ab}) \wedge (Q_{4} = C_{ab}) ... \wedge (Q_{b} = C_{ab}) \wedge (D = D_{ab})]
$$

Rewriting the equation in a simplified format:

$$
\frac{\left(Q_1^{C_1}Q_2^{C_2}Q_3^{C_3}Q_4^{C_4}...Q_b^{C_{ab}}D^{D_1}\right)\vee\left(Q_1^{C_2}Q_2^{C_3}Q_3^{C_4}Q_4^{C_4}...Q_b^{C_{ab}}D^{D_1}\right)\vee\left(Q_1^{C_2}Q_2^{C_2}Q_3^{C_2}Q_4^{C_1}...Q_b^{C_{ab}}D^{D_2}\right)\vee\cdots\left(Q_1^{C_4}Q_2^{C_3}Q_3^{C_2}Q_4^{C_1}...Q_b^{C_{ab}}D^{D_3}\right)\vee\cdots\cdots Q_b^{C_{ab}}Q_1^{C_{ab}}Q_2^{C_{ab}}...Q_b^{C_{ab}}D^{D_{ab}})
$$

Writing the Decision Matrix for the Selected Possible Cause  $p$  which is  $D_1$ 



#### **TABLE 8:** Decision Matrix

Since the  $q^f$  will always be present in all the intersections of the decision matrix in  $p$  then we can conclude that  $(q = f) \Rightarrow p$ .

## **3. DATA TAGGING ALGORITHM**

## **3.1. Flow Chart of the Algorithm**

The information can be organized in a Problem Symptom relationship pattern where different Problems can be associated with different Symptoms. Also the same type of symptoms can be present in different problems. The same Possible Cause (PC) can also have a different set of symptoms. These data relationships can be organized in an Information System. Given a dataset the attributes can be dicretize and find a subset from the original value therefore simplifying it. The resulting information will be used as the rules of the Expert System. The rules created in the algorithm are nominal in where only the minimal information is needed. It is very useful in actual applications where it will not be possible to obtain all the information that you need. Knowing the right information to obtain and confirm is helpful especially with limited time and resources. The Data Tagging algorithm for Expert System rule creation is presented in Figure 1.



## **3.2. Illustrative Example of the Algorithm**

The following shows an illustrative example showing all the steps necessary to implement the algorithm:

1. Data is retrieved from the Database



**FIGURE 2:** Retrieval of Data

2. Data is classified as either a Possible Cause or Symptom

Possible Causes: FTP Software Trouble, Server connection failure, Email Queues Increasing, FTP Program Problem and Server cannot connect. Symptoms: Error Connection Appears, Cannot Access Network Drives, Destination unreachable error appears Page cannot be accessed Error Appears, Network Drive Error and Destination Cannot be reached.

3. Data is given a unique ID. Possible Cause and Symptoms with the same connotation will have the same ID.

There are Possible Cause and Symptoms with the same connotation meaning they have the same meaning. For example in the Symptom: Error Connection Appears is the same as Network Drive Error. They will have the same ID.



**FIGURE 3:** Assigning of unique ID

4. The ID of the Possible Cause and Symptoms are matched

The Problems and Symptoms are matched with their corresponding ID. For example S1 will be the ID for the Symptom "Error Connection Appears". The structure of the technical data will be in a Possible Cause, Symptom and solution relationship.

In Table 1 a new technique to input the technical data if an ICT organization is presented. The information that will be inputted are for the cases that have already been resolved.

- 5. The Data is converted into an Information System. The technical data can then be converted into an Information System as shown in Table 4.
- 6. The Information System is turned from a tabular form to logical form. The Information must correspond to the Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF) of propositional logic.

The next step is to turn the Information System from tabular form to logical form by expressing the set of objects as the following disjunction, which corresponds to the disjunctive normal form (DNF) of propositional logic.

$$
[(S1 = 1) \land (S2 = 1) \land (S3 = 1) \land (S4 = 1) \land (D = PC1)] \lor
$$
  
\n
$$
[(S1 = 0) \land (S2 = 1) \land (S3 = 1) \land (S4 = 1) \land (D = PC2)] \lor
$$
  
\n
$$
[(S1 = 0) \land (S2 = 1) \land (S3 = 0) \land (S4 = 1) \land (D = PC2)] \lor
$$
  
\n
$$
[(S1 = 0) \land (S2 = 1) \land (S3 = 0) \land (S4 = 1) \land (D = PC2)] \lor
$$
  
\n
$$
[(S1 = 0) \land (S2 = 1) \land (S3 = 1) \land (S4 = 1) \land (D = PC3)]
$$

7. The Conjuctions are simplified.

$$
\begin{array}{l} \left(S_1^1S_2^1S_3^1S_4^1D^{PC1}\right) \vee \left(S_1^0S_2^1S_3^1S_4^1D^{PC2}\right) \vee \left(S_1^0S_2^1S_3^0S_4^1D^{PC2}\right) \vee\\ \left(S_1^0S_2^1S_3^0S_4^1D^{PC2}\right) \vee \left(S_1^0S_2^1S_3^1S_4^1D^{PC3}\right)\end{array}
$$

8. The Information is written as a Decision Matrix for each Possible Cause (PC). The rows will contain the values where the symptoms have a positive value and the columns will contain the symptoms that are not present.

The Target Possible Cause is chosen. For this example the Possible Cause PC1 is chosen. The upper and lower approximation of the System Attribute is now chosen.



**TABLE 9: Decision Matrix for D = PC1** 

9. Each Decision Matrix will form a set of Boolean Expressions. There will be one expression for each row of the matrix. The items that are in each cell are disjunctively accumulated. The individual cells are also conjunctively accumulated.

Boolean Expressions from the boundaries:  $(S_1^{-1}){\wedge}\, \big(S_1^{-1}\vee S_3^{-1}\big) {\wedge}\, \big(S_1^{-1}\vee S_3^{-1}\big) {\wedge}\, \big(S_1^{-1}\big)$ 1 1 3 1 1 1 3 1 1 1  $(S_1^{-1}) \wedge (S_1^{-1} \vee S_3^{-1}) \wedge (S_1^{-1} \vee S_3^{-1}) \wedge (S_1^{-1})$ 

10. The output parameters will be simplified using Boolean algebra.

Using Boolean algebra the expression is simplified to:  $\left. S_{1}^{\phantom{1}1}\right.$ 

- 11. Nominal Set of Rules is formed for the chosen Possible Cause. Rule 1.  $(S1 = 1) \Rightarrow (PC = 1)$
- 12. Repeat the process for each Possible Cause.

The Algorithm produced a nominal set of rules. It is capable of handling Different Possible causes with unique set of symptoms.

Rule 1.  $(S1 = 1) \Rightarrow (PC = 1)$ Rule 2.  $(S3 = 0) \Rightarrow (PC = 2)$ Rule 3.  $(S1 = 0)$  &  $(S3 = 1)$  => (PC = 2) OR (PC = 3)

## **4. DATA AND RESULTS**

## **4.1. Presentation of Actual Data**

The Theorem and the algorithm will be tested and validated using actual Data. They are the problems encountered by a Computer System division of a telecommunication company. The following are the Data with the Possible Cause and its Symptoms:















## **TABLE 10:** Symptoms in Computer System with their Possible Cause (PC)





















#### **TABLE 12:** Table of Symptoms

Table 10, 11 and 12 showed the Symptoms in Computer System Diagnostics with their Possible Cause (PC), Information System of the Data and a Table of symptoms respectively.

## **4.2. Decision Rules by Applying the Algorithm**

The Information system is inputted into the test platform Program. Hypertext Preprocessor (PHP), integrated with Rough Sets Data Explorer was used as a test platform [13]. This PHP Test Platform applies the Data Tagging Algorithm.

Applying the complete Algorithm described in Section 3, a nominal set of rules are produced these are:







## **TABLE 13:** Decision rules applying the algorithm

The results of Theorem applied in actual data are evident. Information Dependency is apparent for PC45 and PC54. Their Symptoms S27 and S28 respectively is the essential information needed in order to satisfy the Possible Cause.

## **4.3. Test With Previous Live Data**

The Expert System will be inputted with previous live data. It will be used as the Validating data. These data are obtained through retrieval of the information in a live scenario and the Possible Cause is known. It will be inputted in the Expert System. For this research there is a total of 50 live cases.

a.) Enter Previous live Data



**FIGURE 4:** Entering of Previous Live Data

b.) Check if the Possible Cause outputted of the Expert System equals to the Possible Cause of the Validating Data



**Expert System** 



Example in Case 6 which has S8, S9, S10 and S15 as the symptoms, the expected output is PC7. When inputted in the system it gave PC7 as the output same as the expected.



**FIGURE 6:** Checking of the output of the Expert System in Case 6

c.) Repeat the process for each validating Data. The number of Possible Cause that are outputted correctly out of the total previous live cases will be the score for this test.



**TABLE 14:** Test with previous live data

Table 14 shows the test done when tested with previous live data. This test gave 46 / 50 or a 92% result and showed the algorithm's competence in previous live data.

## **4.4. Test With the Experts**

The next test is the validation with the experts. Experts in the field of Computer Systems will perform their assessment on the developed Expert System. These experts will suggest and verify the validating data. These data are information on which they already know the Possible Cause from the field of Information and Communications Technology (ICT), Computers and their networking, hardware, firmware, software applications. There are 3 experts and each expert will provide 20 validating Data. In total there will be 60 validating Data. The qualifications of Experts the fields of Computer Systems are:

**Expert 1:** A Service Engineer from with 3 years experience in the field of Computer Systems. His expertise is Computer Assembly, Software Installations and Operating System diagnostics. His research interests are Computer Hardware and Software upgrades.

**Expert 2**: A Technical Support Engineer with 4 years experience in the field of Computer Systems. His expertise are Hardware troubleshooting and server farming. His research interests are software development and programming.

**Expert 3:** A Senior Client System Engineer from a reputable ICT organization. He has 33 years experience in the field of Computer Systems. His expertises are computer operations, facilities management and provisioning. His research interests are Facilities and Section development.

The following is an example on how this process is accomplished.

a.) Expert will enter the validating Data. These Data are cases where they already know the Possible Cause based on previous experience.





b.) Check if the Possible Cause outputted of the Expert System equals to the Possible Cause of the Validating Data of the Experts.



#### **FIGURE 8:** Checking of the Expert System's Output to the Possible Cause of the Expert's Validating Data

An Example is in Case 3 which has S18 and S21 as the symptoms. The expected output is PC14. When the Expert inputted those symptoms based on experience the system's output is PC14.



**FIGURE 9:** Checking of the output of the Expert System in Case 3

c.) Repeat the process for each of the expert's validating Data. The score for the test will be the number of correct answers given by the Expert System out of the total questions asked by the experts.







Table 15 shows the test with the validating data by the experts. This test gave 56 / 60 or a 93.3% result and showed the algorithm's competence when tested with the experts.

## **5. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS**

The research has presented, analyzed and tested a new Expert System Algorithm. The algorithm shows a novel technique to input, tag, and properly structure technical so they can be converted into the rules of an Expert System. The rules created from the algorithm are nominal in terms that only the necessary information needs to be inputted to satisfy the Possible Cause. In cases where the Data gathered is incomplete, the proper conclusion may still be suggested. A theorem is proposed on Information Dependency of data, the essential information needed in order to obtain the correct Possible Cause. A formal proof of the theorem was presented and its correctness was tested on live data. It is very vital and useful in large Information Systems. Knowing which Data is needed will not only save time in the processing of information but also conserve resources.

A future recommendation for this research is for it to be tested in other fields. This research's scope is only for Computer Systems. In theory the theorems and algorithms can be applied in several Production Systems like in Medical diagnosis.

## **6. REFERENCES**

- [1] G. Jeon, M. Anisetti, D. Kim, V. Bellandi, E. Damiani, J. Jeong. "Fuzzy rough sets hybrid scheme for motion and scene complexity adaptive de interlacing". Image and Vision Computing Journal, 27(4) 452-436, 2009.
- [2] S. Patchararungruang, K. Halgamune, N. Shenoy. "Optimized rule-based delay proportion adjustment for proportional differentiated services". IEEE Journal on selected areas of Communication. 23(2) 261-276, 2005.
- [3] Y. Chang, C. Yang. "A complementary approach to data broadcasting in mobile Information Systems". Data and knowledge Engineering. 40(2) 181-184, 2002.
- [4] S. Wang. "Conceptual construction incomplete survey data". Data and Knowledge Engineering. 49(3) 311-323, 2004.
- [5] H. Akcan, A. Astasyn, H. Bronnimann. "Deterministic algorithms for sampling count data". Data and knowledge Engineeriing. 64(2) 405-418, 2008.
- [6] M. Winget, J. Baron, M. Spitz, D. Brenner, D. Kincaid, M. Thornquist, Z. Feng. "Development of common data elements: the experience and recommendations from the early detection research network". International Journal of Medical Informatics. 70(1) 41- 48, 2003.
- [7] E. Borrowski, J. Borwein. Collins Dictionary of Mathematics. Springer Verlag. 1989.
- [8] W. Ziarko, N. Wojciech. "Rough Set methodology for Data Mining". Discovery 1: Methodology and applications. 554-576. 1998.
- [9] I. Gelman. "Setting priorities for data accuracy improvements in satisfying decision making scenarios". Decision Support Systems. 48(4) 507-520, 2010.
- [10] S. Wong, S. Hamouda "The development of online knowledge-based expert system for machinability data selection". Knowlede BasedSystems. 16(4) 215-229, 2003.
- [11] J. Sheu, P. Sahoo, C. Su, W. Hu. "Efficient path planning and gathering protocols for wireless sensor network" Computer Communications. 33(3) 398-408, 2010.
- [12] C. Wu, X. Wu, L. Wang, Y. Pan. "Knowledge Dependency Relationships in Incomplete Information System Based on Tolerance Relations". IEEE International Journal on Systems and Cybernetics Conference, 2006.
- [13] ROSE 2.0, http://www.idss.cs.put.poznan.pl/rose ,1999.