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#### Abstract

$\boldsymbol{A b s t r a c t}$ : In this study, solutions to machine learning problems such as Monk's $2\left(\mathrm{M}_{2}\right)$, Balloon and Tic-Tac-Toe problems employing a single neuron dependent on rules which use either modified translated multiplicative ( $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ ) neuron or McCulloch-Pitts neuron model is proposed. Since $\mathrm{M}_{2}$ problem is similar to N -bit parity problem, translated multiplicative $\left(\pi_{\mathrm{t}}\right)$ neuron model is modified for $\mathrm{M}_{2}$ problem. Also, McCulloch-Pitts neuron model is used to increase classification performance. Then either $\pi \mathrm{m}$ or McCulloch-Pitts neuron model is applied to Balloon and Tic-Tac-Toe problems. When the result of proposed only one $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ neuron model that is not required any training stage and hidden layer is compared with the other approaches, it shows satisfactory performance.
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## 1. Introduction

Translated multiplicative neuron ( $\pi \mathrm{t}$ - neuron) is primarily used to the N -bit parity problem. N -bit parity problem is an approach to test neural network architectures and learning algorithms. The N bit parity problem is considered as a very hard problem to be solved by neural networks, because a single 'flip' of a bit in the input string requires a complementary classification. The N-bit parity problem is a generalization of the 'eXclusive-OR' (XOR) problem. N-bit parity problem can be explained as follows. Let x $=\left[\mathrm{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{N}}\right]^{\mathrm{T}}$ is N-bit binary vector and $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}} \in\{0,1\} \quad(\mathrm{i}=1, \ldots, \mathrm{~N})$. The parity generator function which is stated as shown in Eq.1, can be determined the parity as follows:
$p(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}0, \text { if } \sum_{i=1}^{\mathrm{N}} x_{i} \text { is even } \\ 1, \text { otherwise. }\end{array}\right.$
There are many neural network architectures applied in N -bit parity problem [1-8]. (Kim et al. 2005) proposed a method of improving the learning time and convergence rate to exploit the advantages of ANN and fuzzy theory to neuron structure. Their method is applied to the XOR and N-bit parity problems. But, (Iyoda et al. 2003) make a comparison between neural architectures for the N -bit parity problem. The comparison result shows that $\pi \mathrm{t}$ neuron model is not required any hidden neurons and learning algorithm. $\pi \mathrm{t}$ neuron model is called translated multiplicative neuron model. It uses threshold activation function.

[^0]Since $\pi_{\mathrm{t}}$ neuron model stems from multiplicative neuron model, then several multiplicative neurons which have been proposed [ 9 , $10,11]$ can be examined to comprehend $\pi_{\mathrm{t}}$ neuron model. The model is defined as follows:
$\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{b} \prod_{i=1}^{N}\left(x_{i}-t_{i}\right) \quad \mathrm{y}=\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{th}}(\mathrm{v})$
where, $b \in R$ and $t_{i} \in R(i=1, \ldots, N)$ which are the neuron's adjustable parameters, are bias and weights, respectively. The neuron's output is defined as $y$.

The threshold activation function $\mathrm{fth}: \mathrm{R} \rightarrow\{0,1\}$ is defined as follows:
$\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{th}}= \begin{cases}1, & \mathrm{v} \geq 0 \\ 0, & \mathrm{v}<0\end{cases}$
In fact, $\pi \mathrm{t}$ - neuron model which is shown in Figure 1 is inspired from McCulloch-Pitts. McCulloch-Pitts neuron model is given by the following equation:
$\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}=\mathrm{w}_{0}+\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_{i} w_{i} \cdot \mathrm{y}=\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{th}}\left(\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{m}}\right)$
where, w 0 is bias and wi are the weights.

Comparing Eq. 4 with Eq. 2, w0 is equivalent to b and wi are equivalent to ti parameters. The parameters of multiplicative $\pi t$ neuron, which uses threshold activation function, are defined as:
$0<\mathrm{t}^{\mathrm{i}}<1(\mathrm{i}=1, \ldots, \mathrm{~N})$;
If N is even then $\mathrm{b}<0$, If N is odd then $\mathrm{b}>0$.

If the same activation function is used in the Eq. 2 and Eq.4, the mathematical procedure's complexity is equivalent of these two models. Table 1 and Table 2 show the solutions of 2-bit XOR
parity problem and $10 \times 10$-bit parity problem's. b and $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}\left(\left[\mathrm{t}_{1}, \ldots\right.\right.$ , $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{N}}$ ]) are selected as constants: -24 and 0.8 , respectively. (Iyoda et al. 2003) proved that the translated multiplicative $\pi_{\mathrm{t}}$ neuron model can solve the N -bit parity problem for $\forall \mathrm{N} \geq 1$.


Figure 1. Translated multiplicative neuron model

An N-bit Parity problem can easily be solved by only one $\pi_{\mathrm{t}}$ neuron using threshold activation function and also parameters defined in certain intervals. This approach has the lowest process complexity, which is presented between neural network solutions so far [1]. Therefore, modified translated multiplicative $\left(\pi_{\mathrm{m}}\right)$ neuron or McCulloch-Pitts neuron model, is proposed for solution of Monk's $\mathrm{M}_{2}$ problem which has a nonlinear relationship similar to XOR problem. In Eq. 2 and Eq. 4, all biases and weights are chosen as constants with their optimum values. Since, they are chosen as constants; there is no need any learning stage for the both networks. The main contribution of the study that it presents modified translated multiplicative neuron model to solve Monk's M2 problem by expressing it as an N-bit parity problem.

Table 1. Solution of 2-bit XOR Parity Problem

| $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{y}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 |

In the following section, Monk's problem is presented. Previous studies in Monk's problem are given in Section 3. The $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ neuron model and results obtained from the application of either one $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ neuron model or one McCulloch-Pitts neuron model to Monk's

Table 2. Solution of 10x10-bit Parity Problem

| $\mathrm{x}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{x}_{3}$ | x 4 | $\mathrm{x}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{x}_{6}$ | $\mathbf{x}_{7}$ | $\mathrm{x}_{8}$ | X9 | $\mathrm{x}_{10}$ | y |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 680\| IJPSAE) 20^6, 47Special Issue), 6才-721 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

learning programs. Here is a brief description of the $A Q$ algorithm:

1. Select a seed example from the set of training examples for a given decision class.
2. Using the extend against operator, generate a set of alternative most general rules (a star) that cover the seed example, but do not cover any negative examples of the class.
3. Select the "best" rule from the star according to a multi-criteria rule quality function (called LEF - the Lexicographical Evaluation Function), and remove the examples covered by this rule from the set of positive examples yet to be covered.
4. If this set is not empty, select a new seed from it and go to step
5. Otherwise, if another decision class still requires rules to be

Table 3. The performance sorting for Monk's M2 problem of different methods

| Perfor | Method and Reference | System |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| mance | Perfor |  |
| Sequence |  | mance |
|  |  | $(\%)$ |
| 1 | AQ17-DCI / Bala et al. | 100.00 |
| 2 | Backpropagation / Thrun | 100.00 |
| 3 | Backpropagation with weight decay / Thrun | 100.00 |
| 4 | Cascade Correlation / Fahlman | 100.00 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ \& McC.-P. neuron models / our study | $\mathbf{9 6 . 4 5}$ |
| 6 | AQ17-HCI / Bala et al. | 93.10 |
| 7 | AQ17-FCLS / Bala et al. | 92.60 |
| 8 | AQ15-GA / Bala et al. | 86.80 |
| 9 | Assistant Professional /Cestnik et al. | 81.30 |
| 10 | AQR / Kreuziger et al. | 79.70 |
| 11 | Prism / Keller | 72.70 |
| 12 | Ecobweb l.p. \& information utility / Van de Welde | 71.30 |
| 13 | Mfoil / Dzeroski | 69.20 |
| 14 | ID5R / Kreuziger et al. | 69.20 |
| 15 | ID3, no windowing / Kreuziger et al. | 69.10 |
| 16 | CN2 / Kreuziger et al. | 69.00 |
| 17 | ID3 / Kreuziger et al. | 67.90 |
| 18 | Ecobweb leaf prediction / Reich et al. | 67.40 |
| 19 | TDIDT / Van de Welde | 66.70 |
| 20 | IDL / Van de Welde | 66.20 |
| 21 | ID5R-hat / Van de Welde | 65.70 |
| 22 | Classweb 0.10 / Kreuziger et al. | 64.80 |
| 23 | ID5R / Van de Welde | 61.80 |
| 24 | Classweb 0.15 / Kreuziger et al. | 61.60 |
| 25 | Classweb 0.20 / Kreuziger et al. | 57.20 |
|  |  |  |

learned, return to step 1 , and perform it for the other decision class.
AQ17-DCI uses 2 rules for Class 0 and 1 rule for Class 1.
Backpropagation and Backpropagation with weight decay. There were 17 input units, all having either value 0 or 1 corresponding to which attribute-value was set. All input units had a connection to 2 hidden units, which itself were fully connected to the output unit. An input was classified as class member if the output, which is naturally restricted to $(0 ; 1)$, was $\geq$ 0.5 . Training took between ten and thirty seconds on a SUN

Sparc Station. On a parallel computer, namely the Connection Machine CM-2, training time was further reduced to less than 5 seconds for each problem. The following results are obtained by the plain, unmodified backpropagation algorithm. After 90 training epochs, the system performance was reached to $100 \%$ accuracy. Weight decay widely used technique often prevents backpropagation nets from overfitting the training data and thus improves the generalization. With weight decay $\alpha=0.01$ Thrun improved the classification accuracy on this third set for $\mathrm{M}_{3}$ problem significantly and, moreover, the concept learned was the same for all architectures he tested (i,e, 2, 3, or 4 hidden units).

The Cascade Correlation Algorithm. Cascade Correlation is a supervised neural network learning architecture that builds a near-minimal multi-layer network topology in the course of training. Initially the network contains only inputs, output units, and the connections between them. This single layer of connections is trained (using the Quickprop algorithm) to minimize the error. When no further improvement is seen in the level of error, the network's performance is evaluated. If the error is small enough, training stage stops. Otherwise a new hidden unit is added to the network in an attempt to reduce the residual error. The result of the Cascade Correlation algorithm for M2 problem: After 82 epochs, 1 hidden unit: 0 Errors on training set and 0 Errors on test set. Elapsed real time: 7.75 seconds.

## 4. Modified Translated Multiplicative ( $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ ) Neuron Model

Only $\mathrm{M}_{2}$ problem is similar to parity problem among these three Monk's problems. So, $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ neuron model that is formed by the algorithm of $\pi_{\mathrm{t}}$ is applied to $\mathrm{M}_{2}$ problem. When $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ neuron model is used stand alone, no good classification performance is obtained. Therefore, $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ or McCulloch-Pitts neuron models alternatively are used according to the rules.
Data matrix that has size of $169 \times 7$ is obtained from ftp server of University of California, Irvine [13]. According to robot's attributes, 64 of the data produced the output 1 while the rest produced output 0 . The first experiment is done for examining the $\pi_{\mathrm{t}}$ neuron model using 169 data matrix. The b and $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}$ parameters of $\pi_{\mathrm{t}}$ neuron model are chosen -1 and 0.5 , respectively ( $\mathrm{b}=-1, \mathrm{t}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{N}}$ $=0.5$, where $\mathrm{N}=24$ ). Since the robot has 6 attributes and each of them is represented by 4-bit binary number, the model has 24 inputs. For the first classification, 105 of the data have been correctly classified with $62.130 \%$ success. While 115 out of 169 data are already 0 , the $62.130 \%$ system performance is not satisfying for the classification given above. If all the outputs of the model are assumed to be 0 , anyway $68.047 \%$ performance is obtained.
The input data are examined to get a better solution than above. When any of $x 1, x 2, x 4$, and $x 5$ has the value " 3 " in decimal number system, it is observed that $\pi_{t}$ neuron model is not good in classifying according to N -bit parity rule. So, some changes in algorithm are made by adding rules to multiplicative $\pi_{\mathrm{t}}$ neuron model. This neuron model is named as modified translated multiplicative $\left(\pi_{\mathrm{m}}\right)$ neuron model. Here, b parameter in $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ neuron model is chosen different from $\pi_{\mathrm{t}}$ that is used for N -bit parity problem.
The following rules and threshold activation function given in Eq. 3 are used for both $\pi \mathrm{m}$ and McCulloch-Pitts neuron models:
Rule 1: IF ( $\mathrm{x} 1=3$ or $\mathrm{x} 2=3$ or $\mathrm{x} 4=3$ or $\mathrm{x} 5=3$ ) THEN $\mathrm{b}=2$ use Eq. 2 ELSE b=-2 use Eq. 4
If only Rule 1 is used, the 125 of 169 data are correctly classified. The system performance is $73.964 \%$.

Rule 2: IF $\mathrm{x} 5=4$ THEN $\mathrm{b}=-2$ use Eq. 2
If Rule 1 and Rule 2 are used together, 143 of 169 data are correctly classified. The system performance is $84.615 \%$.
Rule 3: IF $x 5=4$ and $((x 1=x 2=x 3=1$ and $x 4 \neq 1)$ or ( $x 1=3$ and $x 2 \neq 1$ and $x 3 \neq 1$ and $x 4 \neq 1$ and $x 6 \neq 1$ ) or ( $x 1=2,3$ and $x 2=2,3$ and $\mathrm{x} 3=2,3$ and $\mathrm{x} 4=2,3$ and $\mathrm{x} 6=2$ )) THEN $\mathrm{b}=2$ use Eq. 2 ELSE $b=-2$ use Eq. 2
If Rule 1, Rule 2 and Rule 3 are used together, 149 of 169 data are correctly classified. The system performance is $88.166 \%$.
Rule 4: IF ( $\mathrm{x} 1=3$ or $\mathrm{x} 2=3$ or $\mathrm{x} 4=3$ or $\mathrm{x} 5=3$ ) and $((\mathrm{x} 1=\mathrm{x} 2=\mathrm{x} 3=$ $\mathrm{x} 6=1$ ) or $(\mathrm{x} 1=3$ and $\mathrm{x} 2=2,3$ and $\mathrm{x} 3=2,3$ and $\mathrm{x} 4=2,3$ and $\mathrm{x} 5=$ 2,3 and $\mathrm{x} 6=2$ ) or $(\mathrm{x} 1=2,3$ and $\mathrm{x} 2 \neq 2$ and $\mathrm{x} 3 \neq 2$ and $\mathrm{x} 4=\mathrm{x} 5=$ $x 6=1$ ) or ( $x 1=2$ and $x 2=3$ and $x 3=2$ and $x 4 \neq 1$ and $x 6 \neq 1$ ) or ( $\mathrm{x} 1 \neq 3$ and $\mathrm{x} 2 \neq 2$ and $\mathrm{x} 3=1$ and $\mathrm{x} 4=1$ and $\mathrm{x} 6 \neq 2$ ) or ( $\mathrm{x} 1=3$ and $\mathrm{x} 2=\mathrm{x} 5=\mathrm{x} 6=1$ )) THEN $\mathrm{b}=-2$ use Eq. 2 ELSE $\mathrm{b}=2$ use Eq. 2 If Rule 1, Rule 2, Rule 3 and Rule 4 are used together, 154 of 169 data are correctly classified. The system performance is $91.124 \%$.
Rule 5: IF ( $x 1 \neq 3$ or $x 2 \neq 3$ or $x 4 \neq 3$ or $x 5 \neq 3$ ) THEN $b=-2$ use Eq. 4
If Rule 1 , Rule 2 , Rule 3 , Rule 4 and Rule 5 are used together, 163 of 169 data are correctly classified. The system performance is $96.45 \%$. In the all rules, weights of the neuron models are chosen as 0.5 .
A study is carried out to examine the performance of $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ neuron model parameters $b$ and ti as shown in Table 4. To get the best performance, the parameters b and ti are to be chosen in $\mathrm{M}_{2}$ problem as follows:

Table 4. Performances due to different $b$ and ti values

| b | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | Perfor mance (\%) | b | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | Perfor mance (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\pm 1$ | $0.1$ | $94.675$ |  | $0.1$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.2$ | $94.083$ |  | $0.2$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.3$ | $96.450$ |  | $0.3$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.4$ | $93.491$ |  | $0.4$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.5$ | $89.941$ | $\pm 4$ | $0.5$ | 94.675 |
|  | $0.6$ | $89.941$ |  | $0.6$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.7$ | $89.941$ |  | $0.7$ | $94.083$ |
|  | $0.8$ | $89.941$ |  | $0.8$ | $94.083$ |
|  | $0.9$ | $89.941$ |  | $0.9$ | $93.491$ |
| $\pm 2$ | $0.1$ | $94.675$ |  | $0.1$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.2$ | $94.675$ |  | $0.2$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.3$ | $94.675$ |  | $0.3$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.4$ | $94.083$ |  | $0.4$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.5$ | $96.450$ | $\pm 5$ | $0.5$ | 94.675 |
|  | $0.6$ | $96.450$ |  | $0.6$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.7$ | $93.491$ |  | $0.7$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.8$ | $93.491$ |  | $0.8$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.9$ | $93.491$ |  | $0.9$ | $94.083$ |
| $\pm 3$ | $0.1$ | $94.675$ |  | $0.1$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.2$ | $94.675$ |  | $0.2$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.3$ | $94.675$ |  | $0.3$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.4$ | $94.675$ |  | $0.4$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.5$ | $94.083$ | $\pm 6$ | $0.5$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.6$ | $93.491$ |  | $0.6$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.7$ | $93.491$ |  | $0.7$ | $94.675$ |
|  | $0.8$ | $96.450$ |  | $0.8$ | $94.675$ |
|  | 0.9 | 96.450 |  | 0.9 | 94.675 |

- b: $\pm 1$ and ti: 0.3
- $\mathrm{b}: \pm 2$ and $\mathrm{ti}:[0.5-0.6]$
- $\mathrm{b}: \pm 3$ and ti: [0.8-0.9]

In addition to performance sequence of previous studies on Monk's problem, $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ and McCulloch-Pitts neuron models proposed in this study are given in Table 3. The results obtained in this paper have higher performance when compared to the some of the studies given in Table 3. Studies supplying $100 \%$ performance for $\mathrm{M}_{2}$ problem are already well known. This paper proposes a new approach which is called $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ neuron model. Moreover, 6 individual rules can be defined for the remaining 6 data, which are not correctly classified to make system performance $100 \%$.

## 5. Results of the Proposed Model for Balloon Problem

The application of either $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ or McCulloch-Pitts neuron model to Balloon problem and results are presented in this section. The data sets of Balloon problems are given in Table 5.

Table 5. The Data Sets of Balloon Problems

|  | DATA A | DATA B | DATA C | DATA D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & 1 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & 1 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ |
| 1 | $\begin{array}{llll}1 & 1 & 0 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}1 & 1 & 1 & 0\end{array}$ |
| 1 | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & 0 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ | 110 |
| 1 | 10000 | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{array}$ | $1 \begin{array}{llll}1 & 1 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ |
| 1 | 0 | 10 | $1 \begin{array}{lllll}1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0\end{array}$ | 10 |
| 1 | $0 \quad 10$ | $1 \begin{array}{lllll}1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $1 \begin{array}{lllll}1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $1 \begin{array}{lllll}1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 1\end{array}$ | $1 \begin{array}{lllll}1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\end{array}$ | $1 \begin{array}{lllll}1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\end{array}$ | $1 \begin{array}{lllll}1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\end{array}$ |
|  | $0 \begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $1 \begin{array}{lllll}1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $1 \begin{array}{lllll}1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $1 \begin{array}{lllll}1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ |
| 0 | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & 1 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0\end{array}$ | $0 \begin{array}{lll}0 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ |
| 0 | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & 1 & 0 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ |
| 0 | $\begin{array}{lllll}1 & 0 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0\end{array}$ |
| 0 | 10000 | $\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ |
| 0 | $\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 1 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0\end{array}$ | $0 \begin{array}{lll}0 & 0 & 1\end{array}$ |
| 0 | $\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 1 & 0 & 1\end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ |
| 0 | $\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 0 & 1 & 1\end{array}$ | 0 | 00000010 | $\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\end{array}$ |
| 0 | $\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | 01000000 | 0 |

When the following individual rules are defined for data sets of Balloon, the classification performance of the proposed model is $100 \%$ for each data set. As indicated in the following rules, there is no need to implement McCulloch-Pitts neuron model except for Data Set D.

Rule for Data Set A: IF $x 3=0$ or $x 4=0$ THEN $b=-2$ use Eq. 2 ELSE b=2 use Eq. 2
Rule for Data Set B: IF $x 3=0$ and $x 4=0$ THEN $b=-2$ use Eq. 2 ELSE b=2 use Eq.2.
Rule for Data Set C: IF $x 1=0$ and $x 2=0$ THEN $b=-2$ use Eq. 2 ELSE b=2 use Eq.2.
Rules for Data Set $D$ :
Rule 1: IF $((x 1=1$ and $x 2=1)$ or $(x 3=1$ and $x 4=1))$ and ( $(x 1=1$ and $x 2=0)$ or $(x 1=0$ and $x 2=1)$ or $(x 3=1$ and $x 4=0$ or $x 3=0$ and
$x 4=1)$ ) THEN use $b=-2$ Eq. 2 ELSE $b=2$ use Eq. 2
Rule 2: IF ( $x 1 \neq 1$ and $x 2 \neq 1$ ) or ( $x 3 \neq 1$ and $x 4 \neq 1$ ) THEN use $b=-2$ Eq.4.
A study, which is implemented for Data Set D, is carried out to examine the performance of $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ neuron model parameters b and $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}$. To get the $100 \%$ performance, the parameters $b$ and $t_{i}$ are to be chosen for Data Set D as follows:
$\mathrm{b}: \pm 1$ and ti: [0.3-0.4] or $\mathrm{b}: \pm 2$ and ti: [0.1-0.9]
When we compare the result which are performed for Balloon problems, of (Solorio et. al., 2002) introduce an algorithm called Ordered Classification (OC) with our proposed model, while OC has 0.27938 , ours has 0.0 classification error.

## 6. Application of $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ to Tic-Tac-Toe Problem

Tic-Tac-Toe is formed data which is taken from a game. The game, made from nine squares, is defined by (Pilgrim, 1995). Every one of these squares takes symbol of ' $x$ ', ' $o$ ', ' $b$ '. ' $x$ ' and ' $o$ ' show the first and second player, respectively. The symbol ' $b$ ' shows the space squares in the game.

| $x 1$ | $x 2$ | $x 3$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $x 4$ | $x 5$ | $x 6$ |
| $x 7$ | $x 8$ | $x 9$ |

Figure 2. Tic-Tac-Toe game
Each player individually marks their symbol in any square for writing respectively own letter in any square in Figure 2.
If any player signs with his/her letter with 3 successive places, the player wins. These successive places can be in column, row or diagonal. There are 958 data in this database [14, 15]. But the winner is determined according to first player in this data. Winner is described with positive, loser is described with negative. 626 of 958 databases are positive, it means that ' $x$ ' is won, 332 are negative and it means that ' $x$ ' is lost.
' $x$ ' value is selected 1 ; $o$ and $b$ are selected 0 so that this data translated to binary. In this way, it simulated to N-bit parity problem. If first player wins, result of related data groups is 1 , otherwise 0 : ( $\mathrm{x}_{10}$ : positive, negative $(1,0)$ ).
This data matrix of tic-tac-toe is applied to $\pi_{\mathrm{t}}$ neuron model. The 658 of 958 data is correct classified and the system performance is $63.466 \%\left(\mathrm{~b}<0, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}=0.5\right)$. Then, $\pi \mathrm{m}$ neuron model is used for this database and the above rule is written. The 942 of 958 data is correct classified, the system performance is $98.330 \%$.
Rule: If space number $=2$ or 3 Then $b<0$ use Eq. 2 Else b>0 use Eq. $2(\mathrm{~b}= \pm 2, \mathrm{t}=0.5$ ).
Performance's row of the other algorithm which solve this problem and algorithm used in this study is shown in Table 6.
The best algorithm is Newboole and second is IB3-CI (Instance Based 3-Constructive Induction). In 1991, Pierre Boneli and Alexander Parodi originated Stewart W. Wilson's Boole classification system and developed Newboole. This classification system is based on genetic and it uses supervised learning as learning algorithm [14, 15]. In 1991, Aha developed ib3-ci (1991) algorithm. It is another construction algorithm that generates Boolean features based on the conjunction operator. Tic-tac-toe is a simple game often used as a programming assignment for computer-science students or as an in-class example of how to develop software [17-20]. Every tic-tac-toe
program should include a way of representing the board and evaluating the board for a win. Often, this evaluation is done by checking all eight possibilities (on the traditional $3 \times 3$ tic-tac-toe board).

## 7. Conclusion

Modified translated multiplicative neuron which is inspired by the architecture of translated multiplicative neuron that is an effective ANN model in solving N -bit parity problem and McCulloch-Pitts neuron models are applied to Monk's $\mathrm{M}_{2}$ and Balloon problems. The $100 \%$ classification performances of studies given in Table 3 utilize hidden layer in ANN architecture such as the Backpropagation and Cascade Correlation models. The proposed model consists of only one neuron. While AQ17DCI algorithm uses 3 rules for obtaining $100 \%$ system performance, the proposed model uses 5 rules with $96.45 \%$ performance. Six additional rules can be individually defined for the remaining 6 data, which are not correctly classified for accomplishing $100 \%$ performance. Also the comparison with OC algorithm shows that the proposed neuron model $\pi_{\mathrm{m}}$ can be an alternative model. Once the weights and bias and also proper rule(s) are optimally selected, the proposed model can be classified any desired data without learning stage. The evaluations of $\pi \mathrm{m}$ model give satisfy result for the three machine learning datasets such as Monk's $\mathrm{M}_{2}$, Balloon and Tic-tac-toe.

Table 6. Order of performance of different algorithms for Tic-tactoe problem

| $\frac{\text { Order }}{1}$ | Algortihms | Performance(\%) |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NEWBOOLE | 100.00 |
| 2 | IB3-CI | 99.10 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\mathrm{m}}$ Model | $\mathbf{9 8 . 3 3}$ |
| 4 | IB1 | 98.10 |
| 5 | CN2 | 98.10 |
| 6 | IB3 | 82.00 |
| 7 | MBRtalk | 88.40 |
| 8 | NewID | 88.00 |
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