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Abstract - Dr. Cai Wen defined in his 1983 paper:
- the distance formula between a point \( x_0 \) and a one-dimensional (1D) interval \([a, b]\);
- the dependence function which gives the degree of dependence of a point with respect to a pair of included 1D intervals.

This paper inspired us to generalize the Extension Set to two-dimensions, i.e. in plane of real numbers \( R^2 \) where one has a rectangle (instead of a segment of line), determined by two arbitrary points \( A(a_1, a_2) \) and \( B(b_1, b_2) \). And similarly in \( R^3 \), where one has a prism determined by two arbitrary points \( A(a_1, a_2, a_3) \) and \( B(b_1, b_2, b_3) \). We geometrically define the linear and non-linear distance between a point and the 2D- and 3D-extension set and the dependent function for a nest of two included 2D- and 3D-extension sets. Linearly and non-linearly attraction point principles towards the optimal point are presented as well.

The same procedure can be then used considering, instead of a rectangle, any bounded 2D-surface and similarly any bounded 3D-solid, and any bounded \( n-D \)-body in \( R^n \).

These generalizations are very important since the Extension Set is generalized from one-dimension to 2, 3 and even \( n \)-dimensions, therefore more classes of applications will result in consequence.

I. Introduction

Extension Theory (or Extencics) was developed by Professor Cai Wen in 1983 by publishing a paper called "Extension Set and Non-Compatible Problems". Its goal is to solve contradictory problems and also nonconventional, nontraditional ideas in many fields.

Extenics is at the confluence of three disciplines: philosophy, mathematics, and engineering.

A contradictory problem is converted by a transformation function into a non-contradictory one.

The functions of transformation are: extension, decomposition, combination, etc. Extenics has many practical applications in Management, Decision-Making, Strategic Planning, Methodology, Data Mining, Artificial Intelligence, Information Systems, Control Theory, etc.

Extenics is based on matter-element, affair-element, and relation-element.

II. Extension Distance in 1D-Space

Prof. Cai Wen has defined the extension distance between a point \( x_0 \) and a real interval \( X = [a, b] \) by

\[
\rho(x_0, X) = \left|x_0 - \frac{a + b}{2}\right| - \frac{b - a}{2}
\]
where in general $\rho : (\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^2) \to (-\infty, +\infty)$.

Algebraically studying this extension distance, we find that actually the range of it is:

$$\rho(x_0, X) \in \left[-\frac{b-a}{2}, +\infty\right)$$

or its minimum range value $-\frac{b-a}{2}$ depends on the interval $X$ extremities $a$ and $b$, and it occurs when the point $x_0$ coincides with the midpoint of the interval $X$, i.e. $x_0 = \frac{a+b}{2}$.

The closer is the interior point $x_0$ to the midpoint $\frac{a+b}{2}$ of the interval $[a, b]$, the negatively larger is $\rho(x_0, X)$.

In Fig. 1, for interior point $x_0$ between $a$ and $\frac{a+b}{2}$, the extension distance $\rho(x_0, X) = a - x_0$ the negative length of the brown line segment [left side]. Whereas for interior point $x_0$ between $\frac{a+b}{2}$ and $b$, the extension distance $\rho(x_0, X) = x_0 - b$ = the negative length of the blue line segment [right side].

Similarly, the further is exterior point $x_0$ with respect to the closest extremity of the interval $[a, b]$ to it (i.e. to either $a$ or $b$), the positively larger is $\rho(x_0, X)$.

In Fig. 2, for exterior point $x_0 < a$, the extension distance $\rho(x_0, X) = a - x_0 = \text{the positive length of the brown line segment}$ [left side]. Whereas for exterior point $x_0 > b$, the extension distance $\rho(x_0, X) = x_0 - b = \text{the positive length of the blue line segment}$ [right side].

III. PRINCIPLE OF THE EXTENSION 1D-DISTANCE

Geometrically studying this extension distance, we find the following principle that Prof. Cai has used in 1983 defining it:

$\rho(x_0, X) =$ the geometric distance between the point $x_0$ and the closest extremity point of the interval $[a, b]$ to it (going in the direction that connects $x_0$ with the optimal point), distance taken as negative if $x_0 \in [a, b]$, and as positive if $x_0 \subset [a, b]$.

This principle is very important in order to generalize the extension distance from 1D to 2D (two-dimensional real space), 3D (three-dimensional real space), and $n$-D (n-dimensional real space).

The extremity points of interval $[a, b]$ are the point $a$ and $b$, which are also the boundary (frontier) of the interval $[a, b]$.

IV. DEPENDENT FUNCTION IN 1D-SPACE

Prof. Cai Wen defined in 1983 in 1D the Dependent Function $K(y)$.

If one considers two intervals $X_0$ and $X$, that have no common end point, and $X_0 \subset X$, then:
\[ K(y) = \frac{\rho(y, X)}{\rho(y, X) - \rho(y, X^0)}. \]

Since \( K(y) \) was constructed in 1D in terms of the extension distance \((.,.)\), we simply generalize it to higher dimensions by replacing \((.,.)\) with the generalized \((.,.)\) in a higher dimension.

V. Extension Distance in 2D-Space

Instead of considering a segment of line \(AB\) representing the interval \([a, b]\) in \(1\mathbb{R}\), we consider a rectangle \(AMBN\) representing all points of its surface in \(2D\).

Let’s consider two arbitrary points \(A(a_1, a_2)\) and \(B(b_1, b_2)\). Through the points \(A\) and \(B\) one draws parallels to the axes of the Cartesian system \(XY\) and one thus one forms a rectangle \(AMBN\) whose one of the diagonals is just \(AB\).

\[ \text{Fig. 3} : \text{P is an interior point to the rectangle AMBN and the optimal point O is in the center of symmetry of the rectangle.} \]

Let’s note by \(O\) the midpoint of the diagonal \(AB\), but \(O\) is also the center of symmetry (intersection of the diagonals) of the rectangle \(AMBN\). Then one computes the distance between a point \(P(x, y)\) and the rectangle \(AMBN\).

One can do that following the same principle as Dr. Cai Wen did: - compute the distance in \(2D\) (two dimensions) between the point \(P\) and the center \(O\) of the rectangle (intersection of rectangle’s diagonals); - next compute the distance between the point \(P\) and the closest point (let’s note it by \(P’\)) to it on the frontier (the rectangle’s four edges) of the rectangle \(AMBN\); this step can be done in the following way:

considering \(P’\) as the intersection point between the line \(PO\) and the frontier of the rectangle, and taken among the intersection points that point \(P’\) which is the closest to \(P\); this case is entirely consistent with Dr. Cai’s approach in the sense that when reducing from \(2D\)-space to \(1D\)-space, i.e. the points \(A(a_1, a_2)\) and \(B(b_1, b_2)\) reduced to \(A(a)\) and respectively \(B(b)\), which is equivalent to the rectangle \(AMBN\) reduced to its diagonal \(AB\), one exactly gets his result.

The Extension 2D - Distance, for \(P \to O\), will be:
\[ \rho((x_0, y_0), AMBM) = d(\text{point } P, \text{ rectangle } AMBN) = |PO| - |P’O| = |PP| \]
i) which is equal to the negative length of the red segment $|PP'|$ in Fig. 3 when $P$ is interior to the rectangle $AMBN$;

ii) or equal to zero when $P$ lies on the frontier of the rectangle $AMBN$ (i.e. on edges $AM$, $MB$, $BN$, or $NA$) since $P$ coincides with $P'$;

iii) or equal to the positive length of the blue segment $|PP'|$ in Fig. 4 when $P$ is exterior to the rectangle $AMBN$.

where $|PO|$ means the classical 2D-distance between the point $P$ and $O$, and similarly for $|P'O|$ and $|PP'|$.

The Extension 2D-Distance, for the optimal point (i.e. $P=O$), will be

$$\rho(O, AMBM) = d(\text{point } O, \text{ rectangle } AMBN) = -\max d(\text{point } O, \text{ point } M \text{ on the frontier of } AMBN).$$

$Fig. 4$ : $P$ is an exterior point to the rectangle $AMBN$ and the optimal point $O$ is in the center of symmetry of the rectangle.

The last step is to devise the Dependent Function in 2D-space similarly as Dr. Cai's defined the dependent function in 1D.

The midpoint (or center of symmetry) $O$ has the coordinates $O(\frac{a_1+b_1}{2}, \frac{a_2+b_2}{2})$.

Let's compute the $|PO| - |P'O|$.

In this case, we extend the line $OP$ to intersect the frontier of the rectangle $AMBN$. $P'$ is closer to $P$ than $P''$, therefore we consider $P'$.

The equation of the line $PO$, that of course passes through the points $P(x_p, y_p)$ and $O(\frac{a_1+b_1}{2}, \frac{a_2+b_2}{2})$, is:

$$y - y_0 = \frac{a_2+b_2}{2a_1+b_1}(x - x_0)$$

Since the $x$-coordinate of point $P'$ is $a_1$ because $P'$ lies on the rectangle's edge $AM$, one gets the $y$-coordinate of point $P'$ by a simple substitution of $x_{P'} = a_1$ into the above equality:
Therefore $P'$ has the coordinates $P' (x_0 = a, \ y_0 = \frac{a_2 + b_2 - 2y_0}{a_1 + b_1 - 2x_0} (a_1 - x_0) )$.

The distance $d(P,O) = |PO| = \sqrt{(x_0 - \frac{a_1 + b_1}{2})^2 + (y_0 - \frac{a_2 + b_2}{2})^2}$

while the distance

$d(P',O) = |P'O| = \sqrt{(a_1 - \frac{a_1 + b_1}{2})^2 + (y_0 - \frac{a_2 + b_2}{2})^2}$

Also, the distance $d(P,P') = |PP'| = \sqrt{(a_1 - x_0)^2 + (y_0 - y_0)^2}$.

Whence the Extension 2D-Distance formula:

$$\rho((x_0, y_0), AMBM) = d(P(x_0, y_0), A(a_1, a_2)MB(b_1, b_2)N) = |PO| - |P'O|$$

$$= \sqrt{(x_0 - \frac{a_1 + b_1}{2})^2 + (y_0 - \frac{a_2 + b_2}{2})^2} - \sqrt{(a_1 - b_1)^2 + (y_0 - \frac{a_2 + b_2}{2})^2}$$

$$= \pm |PP'| = \pm \sqrt{(a_1 - x_0)^2 + (y_0 - y_0)^2}$$

where $y_0 = \frac{a_2 + b_2 - 2y_0}{a_1 + b_1 - 2x_0} (a_1 - x_0)$.

**Properties:**

As for 1D-distance, the following properties hold in 2D:

**Property 1.**

a) $(x,y) \in \text{Int}(AMBN)$ iff $\rho((x, y), AMBN) < 0$, where $\text{Int}(AMBN)$ means interior of $AMBN$;

b) $(x,y) \in \text{Fr}(AMBN)$ iff $\rho((x, y), AMBN) = 0$, where $\text{Fr}(AMBN)$ means frontier of $AMBN$;

c) $(x,y) \notin AMBN$ iff $\rho((x, y), AMBN) > 0$.

**Property 2.**

Let $A_0B_0C_0D_0$ and $AMBN$ be two rectangles whose sides are parallel to the axes of the Cartesian system of coordinates, such that they have no common end points, and $A_0B_0C_0D_0 \subset AMBN$.

We assume they have the same optimal points $O_1 \equiv O_2 \equiv O$ located in the center of symmetry of the two rectangles.

Then for any point $(x, y) \in R^2$ one has $\rho((x, y), A_0B_0C_0D_0) \geq \rho((x, y), AMBN)$.
VI. DEPENDENT 2D-FUNCTION

Let \( A_0M_0B_0N_0 \) and \( AMBN \) be two rectangles whose sides are parallel to the axes of the Cartesian system of coordinates, such that they have no common end points, and \( A_0M_0B_0N_0 \subset AMBN \).

The Dependent 2D-Function formula is:

\[
K_{2D}(x, y) = \frac{\rho((x, y), AMBN)}{\rho((x, y), AMBN) - \rho((x, y), A_0M_0B_0N_0)}
\]

Property 3.
Again, similarly to the Dependent Function in 1D-space, one has:

a) If \((x, y) \in \text{Int} (A_0M_0B_0N_0)\), then \(K_{2D}(x, y) > 1\);

b) If \((x, y) \in \text{Fr} (A_0M_0B_0N_0)\), then \(K_{2D}(x, y) = 1\);

c) If \((x, y) \in \text{Int} (AMBN - A_0M_0B_0N_0)\), then \(0 < K_{2D}(x, y) < 1\);

d) If \((x, y) \in \text{Fr} (AMBN)\), then \(K_{2D}(x, y) = 0\);

e) If \((x, y) \notin AMBN\), then \(K_{2D}(x, y) < 0\).

VII. GENERAL CASE IN 2D-SPACE

One can replace the rectangles by any finite surfaces, bounded by closed curves in 2D-space, and one can consider any optimal point \( O \) (not necessarily the symmetry center). Again, we assume the optimal points are the same for this nest of two surfaces.
VIII. Linear Attraction Point Principle

We introduce the Attraction Point Principle, which is the following:

Let $S$ be a given set in the universe of discourse $U$, and the optimal point $O \in S$. Then each point $P(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$ from the universe of discourse tends towards, or is attracted by, the optimal point $O$, because the optimal point $O$ is an ideal of each point.

That’s why one computes the extension $n$-D-distance between the point $P$ and the set $S$ as $\rho ((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S)$ on the direction determined by the point $P$ and the optimal point $O$, or on the line $PO$, i.e.:

- **a)** $\rho((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S) = \text{the negative distance between } P \text{ and the set frontier, if } P \text{ is inside the set } S$;
- **b)** $\rho ((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S) = 0$, if $P$ lies on the frontier of the set $S$;
- **c)** $\rho ((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S) = \text{the positive distance between } P \text{ and the set frontier, if } P \text{ is outside the set}$.

It is a king of convergence/attraction of each point towards the optimal point. There are classes of examples where such attraction point principle works.

If this principle is good in all cases, then there is no need to take into consideration the center of symmetry of the set $S$, since for example if we have a $2D$ piece which has heterogeneous material density, then its center of weight (barycenter) is different from the center of symmetry.

Let’s see below such example in the $2D$- space:
Fig. 7: The optimal point O as an attraction point for all other points P₁, P₂, ..., P₈ in the universe of discourse \( \mathbb{R}^2 \).

Remark 1.

Another possible way, for computing the distance between the point \( \mathcal{P} \) and the closest point \( \mathcal{P}' \) to it on the frontier (the rectangle’s four edges) of the rectangle \( \text{AMBN} \), would be by drawing a perpendicular from \( \mathcal{P} \) onto the closest rectangle’s edge, and denoting by \( \mathcal{P}' \) the intersection between the perpendicular and the rectangle’s edge.

And similarly if one has an arbitrary set \( \mathcal{S} \) in the 2D-space, bounded by a closed curve. One computes

\[
d(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}) = \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} |PQ|
\]

as in the classical mathematics.

IX. Extension Distance in 3D-Space

We further generalize to 3D-space the Extension Set and the Dependent Function. Assume we have two points \( A(a1, a2, a3) \) and \( B(b1, b2, b3) \) in 3D. Drawing through \( A \) and \( B \) parallel planes to the planes’ axes \( (XY, XZ, YZ) \) in the Cartesian system \( XYZ \) we get a prism \( AM₁M₂M₃BN₁N₂N₃ \) (with eight vertices) whose one of the transversal diagonals is just the line segment \( AB \). Let’s note by \( O \) the midpoint of the transverse diagonal \( AB \), but \( O \) is also the center of symmetry of the prism.

Therefore, from the line segment \( AB \) in 1D-space, to a rectangle \( AMBN \) in 2D-space, and now to a prism \( AM₁M₂M₃BN₁N₂N₃ \) in 3D-space.

Then one computes the distance between a point \( P(x_0, y_0, z_0) \) and the prism \( AM₁M₂M₃BN₁N₂N₃ \).

One can do that following the same principle as Dr. Cai’s:
- compute the distance in 3D (two dimensions) between the point \( \mathcal{P} \) and the center \( O \) of the prism (intersection of prism’s transverse diagonals);
- next compute the distance between the point \( \mathcal{P} \) and the closest point (let’s note it by \( \mathcal{P}' \)) to it on the frontier (the prism’s lateral surface) of the prism \( AM₁M₂M₃BN₁N₂N₃ \); considering \( \mathcal{P}' \) as the intersection point between the line \( OP \) and the frontier of the prism,
and taken among the intersection points that point $P'$ which is the closest to $P$; this case is entirely consistent with Dr. Cai’s approach in the sense that when reducing from 3D - space to 1D - space one gets exactly Dr. Cai’s result;
- the Extension 3D - Distance will be: $d(P, A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3) = |PO| - |PO| = \pm |PP'|$, where $|PO|$ means the classical distance in 3D - space between the point $P$ and $O$, and similarly for $|PO|$ and $|PP'|$.

**Fig. 8**: Extension 3D-Distance between a point and a prism, where O is the optimal point coinciding with the center of symmetry.

**Property 4.**

a) $(x, y, z) \in \text{Int}(A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3)$ iff $\rho((x, y, z), A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3) < 0$, where $\text{Int}(A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3)$ means interior of $A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3$;

b) $(x, y, z) \in \text{Fr}(A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3)$ iff $\rho((x, y, z), A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3) = 0$, where $\text{Fr}(A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3)$ means frontier of $A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3$;

c) $(x, y, z) \notin A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3$ iff $\rho((x, y, z), A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3) > 0$.

**Property 5.**

Let $A_0M_0M_3BN_0N_2N_3$ and $A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3$ be two prisms whose sides are parallel to the axes of the Cartesian system of coordinates, such that they have no common end points, and $A_0M_0M_3BN_0N_2N_3 \subseteq A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3$. We assume they have the same optimal points $O_1 \equiv O_2 \equiv O$ located in the center of symmetry of the two prisms.

Then for any point $(x, y, z) \in R^3$ one has

$$\rho((x, y, z), A_0M_0M_3BN_0N_2N_3) \geq \rho((x, y, z), A_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3).$$

**X. Dependent 2D-Function**

The last step is to devise the Dependent Function in 3D - space similarly to Dr. Cai’s definition of the dependent function in 1D - space.
Let $A_0M_0M_2BN_0N_2N_3$ and $AM_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3$ be two prisms whose faces are parallel to the axes of the Cartesian system of coordinates XYZ, such that they have no common end points, such that $A_0M_0M_2BN_0N_2N_3 \subset AM_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3$. We assume they have the same optimal points $O_1 \equiv O_2 \equiv O$ located in the center of symmetry of these two prisms.

The **Dependent 3D - Function** formula is:

$$K_{3D}(x, y, z) = \frac{\rho((x, y, z), AM_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3)}{\rho((x, y, z), AM_0M_2M_3BN_0N_2N_3) - \rho((x, y, z), A_0M_0M_2BN_0N_2N_3)}$$

**Property 6.**

Again, similarly to the Dependent Function in 1D- and 2D- spaces, one has:

a) If $(x, y, z) \in \text{Int} (A_0M_0M_2BN_0N_2N_3)$, then $K_{3D}(x, y, z) > 1$;
b) If $(x, y, z) \in \text{Fr} (A_0M_0M_2BN_0N_2N_3)$, then $K_{3D}(x, y, z) = 1$;
c) If $(x, y, z) \in \text{Int} (AM_1M_2BN_1N_2N_3 - A_0M_0M_2BN_0N_2N_3)$, then $0 < K_{3D}(x, y, z) < 1$;
d) If $(x, y, z) \in \text{Fr} (AM_1M_2BN_1N_2N_3)$, then $K_{3D}(x, y, z) = 0$;
e) If $(x, y, z) \notin AM_1M_2BN_1N_2N_3$, then $K_{3D}(x, y, z) < 0$.

**XI. General Case in 3D-Space**

One can replace the prisms by any finite 3D - bodies, bounded by closed surfaces, and one considers any optimal point $O$ (not necessarily the centers of surfaces’ symmetry). Again, we assume the optimal points are the same for this nest of two 3D - bodies.

**Remark 2.**

Another possible way, for computing the distance between the point $P$ and the closest point $P'$ to it on the frontier (lateral surface) of the prism $AM_1M_2M_3BN_1N_2N_3$ is by drawing a perpendicular from $P$ onto the closest prism’s face, and denoting by $P'$ the intersection between the perpendicular and the prism’s face.

And similarly if one has an arbitrary finite body $B$ in the 3D - space, bounded by surfaces. One computes as in classical mathematicians:

**Linear Attraction Point Principle in 3D-space.**

*Fig. 9 : Linear Attraction Point Principle for any bounded 3D-body.*
Non-Linear Attraction Point Principle in 3D - Space (and in n-D-Space).

There might be spaces where the attraction phenomena undergo not linearly by upon some specific non-linear curves. Let’s see below such example for points $P$, whose trajectories of attraction towards the optimal point follow some non-linear 3D-curves.

n-D-Space.

In general, in a universe of discourse $U$, let’s have an $n - D$ - set $S$ and a point $P$. Then the **Extension Linear n - D - Distance** between point $P$ and set $S$, is:

$$
\rho(P, S) = \begin{cases} 
-d(P, P'), & P \neq O, P \in \overline{OP'}; \\
d(P, P'), & P \neq O, P' \in \overline{OP}; \\
-\max d(P, M), & P = O.
\end{cases}
$$

where $O$ is the optimal point (or linearly attraction point);

$d(P, P')$ means the classical linearly $n - D$ - distance between two points $P$ and $P'$;

$Fr(S)$ means the frontier of set $S$;

and $\overline{OP}$ means the line segment between the points $O$ and $P'$ (the extremity points $O$ and $P'$ included), therefore $P \in \overline{OP}$ means that $P$ lies on the line $OP'$, in between the points $O$ and $P'$.

For $P$ coinciding with $O$, one defined the distance between the optimal point $O$ and the set $S$ as the negatively maximum distance (to be in concordance with the 1D-definition).

And the **Extension Non-Linear n-D-Distance** between point $P$ and set $S$, is:

$$
\rho_e(P, S) = \begin{cases} 
-d_e(P, P') & P \neq O, P \in c(OP'); \\
-d_e(P, P'), & P \neq O, P' \in c(OP'); \\
-\max d_e(P, M), & P = O.
\end{cases}
$$
where \( \rho_s(P, S) \) means the extension distance as measured along the curve \( c \); 
\( O \) is the optimal point (or non-linearly attraction point); 
the points are attracting by the optimal point on trajectories described by an injective curve \( c \); 
\( d_n(P, P') \) means the non-linearly \( n \)-\( D \)-distance between two points \( P \) and \( P' \), or the arclength of the curve \( c \) between the points \( P \) and \( P' \); 
\( Fr(S) \) means the frontier of set \( S \); 
and \( c(\text{OP}) \) means the curve segment between the points \( O \) and \( P' \) (the extremity points \( O \) and \( P' \) included), therefore \( P \in c(\text{OP})' \) means that \( P \) lies on the curve \( c \) in between the points \( O \) and \( P' \).

For \( P \) coinciding with \( O \), one defined the distance between the optimal point \( O \) and the set \( S \) as the negatively maximum curvilinear distance (to be in concordance with the 1D-definition).

In general, in a universe of discourse \( U \), let’s have a nest of two \( n \)-\( D \)-sets, \( S_1 \subset S_2 \), with no common end points, and a point \( P \).

Then the Extension Linear Dependent \( n \)-\( D \)-Function referring to the point \( P(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \) is:

\[
K_{nd}(P) = \frac{\rho(P, S_2)}{\rho(P, S_2) - \rho(P, S_1)}
\]

where \( \rho(P, S_2) \) is the previous extension linear \( n \)-\( D \)-distance between the point \( P \) and the \( n \)-\( D \)-set \( S_2 \).

And the Extension Non-Linear Dependent \( n \)-\( D \)-Function referring to point \( P(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \) along the curve \( c \) is:

\[
K_{nd}(P) = \frac{\rho_n(P, S_2)}{\rho_n(P, S_2) - \rho(P, S_1)}
\]

where \( \rho_n(P, S_2) \) is the previous extension non-linear \( n \)-\( D \)-distance between the point \( P \) and the \( n \)-\( D \)-set \( S_2 \) along the curve \( c \).

Remark 3.

Particular cases of curves \( c \) could be interesting to studying, for example if \( c \) are parabolas, or have elliptic forms, or arcs of circle, etc. Especially considering the geodesics would be for many practical applications.

Tremendous number of applications of Extenics could follow in all domains where attraction points would exist; these attraction points could be in physics (for example, the earth center is an attraction point), economics (attraction towards a specific product), sociology (for example attraction towards a specific life style), etc.

XII. Conclusion

In this paper we introduced the Linear and Non-Linear Attraction Point Principle, which is the following:

Let \( S \) be an arbitrary set in the universe of discourse \( U \) of any dimension, and the optimal point \( O \in S \).

Then each point \( P(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n), n \geq 1 \), from the universe of discourse (linearly or non-linearly) tends towards, or is attracted by, the optimal point \( O \), because the optimal point \( O \) is an ideal of each point.
It is a king of convergence/attraction of each point towards the optimal point. There are classes of examples and applications where such attraction point principle may apply.

If this principle is good in all cases, then there is no need to take into consideration the center of symmetry of the set \( S \), since for example if we have a 2D factory piece which has heterogeneous material density, then its center of weight (barycenter) is different from the center of symmetry.

Then we generalized in the track of Cai Wen’s idea the extension 1D - set to an extension \( n - D \) - set, and defined the Linear (or Non-Linear) Extension \( n - D \) - Distance between a point \( P(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \) and the \( n - D \) set \( S \) as \( p( (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S ) \) on the linear (or non-linear) direction determined by the point \( P \) and the optimal point \( O \) (the line \( PO \), or respectively the curvilinear \( PO \)) in the following way:

1. \( \rho((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S) = \) the negative distance between \( P \) and the set frontier, if \( P \) is outside the set \( S \);
2. \( \rho((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S) = 0 \), if \( P \) lies on the frontier of the set \( S \);
3. \( \rho((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S) = \) the positive distance between \( P \) and the set frontier, if \( P \) is inside the set \( S \);
4. \( \rho((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S) = \) the negative distance between \( P \) and the set frontier, if \( P \) is outside the set.

We got the following properties:

a) It is obvious from the above definition of the extension \( n - D \) - distance between a point \( P \) in the universe of discourse and the extension \( n - D \) - set \( S \) that:

i) Point \( P(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in \text{Int}(S) \) iff \( \rho((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S) < 0 \);

ii) Point \( P(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in \text{Fr}(S) \) iff \( \rho((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S) = 0 \);

iii) Point \( P(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \notin S \) iff \( \rho((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S) > 0 \).

b) Let \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \) be two extension sets, in the universe of discourse \( U \), such that they have no common end points, and \( S_1 \subset S_2 \). We assume they have the same optimal points \( O_1 \equiv O_2 \equiv O \) located in their center of symmetry. Then for any point \( P(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \) \( U \) one has:

\[
\rho((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S_1) \geq \rho((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S_2).
\]

Then we proceed to the generalization of the dependent function from 1D - space to Linear (or Non-Linear) \( n - D \) - space Dependent Function, using the previous notations.

The Linear (or Non-Linear) Dependent \( n - D \) - Function of point \( P(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \) along the curve \( c \), is:

\[
K_{nd}(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) = \frac{\rho_c((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S_2)}{\rho_c((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S_2) - \rho_c((x_1, x_2, ..., x_n), S_1)}
\]

(where \( c \) may be a curve or even a line)

which has the following property:

d) If point \( P(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in \text{Int}(S_1) \), then \( K_{nd}(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) > 1 \);

e) If point \( P(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \notin \text{Fr}(S_1) \), then \( K_{nd}(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) = 1 \);

f) If point \( P(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in \text{Int}(S_2 - S_1) \), then \( K_{nd}(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \) \( (0, 1) \);

g) If point \( P(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in \text{Int}(S_2) \), then \( K_{nd}(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) = 0 \);

h) If point \( P(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \notin \text{Int}(S_2) \), then \( K_{nd}(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) < 0 \).
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