1. Introduction

The impact of FLCs on the policy, economic, and security aspects of the world today is significant and far-reaching. The use of FLCs in various fields, including economics, politics, and technology, has become increasingly common. In this paper, we aim to explore the potential benefits and challenges of FLCs in these areas. The study is conducted using a qualitative research method, involving interviews and surveys with experts in the field. The results indicate that FLCs have the potential to improve decision-making processes, enhance economic growth, and promote political stability. However, they also pose challenges such as data privacy and security concerns. Further research is needed to address these issues and fully realize the benefits of FLCs.
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1. Performance indices are used to evaluate the performance of systems. In this context, the formula for the performance index is given by:

\[ P = \frac{[f_A - \gamma]}{[f_A - \gamma]} + \frac{[f_A - \gamma]}{[f_A - \gamma]} \]

where \( f_A \) is the operating frequency of the system, \( \gamma \) is a constant, and \( [f_A - \gamma] \) represents the difference between the operating frequency and the constant. This formula is used to determine the system's performance under different conditions.

2. Performance indices are also used to compare the performance of different systems. In this case, the performance index is given by:

\[ P = \frac{[f_A - \gamma]}{[f_A - \gamma]} \]

where \( f_A \) is the operating frequency of the system, \( \gamma \) is a constant, and \( [f_A - \gamma] \) represents the difference between the operating frequency and the constant. This formula is used to determine the system's performance under different conditions.
The open perforation can be assumed according to Eq. (3) where

\[ Y = \frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{L}{L_0} \right) \left( \frac{d}{D} \right) \frac{K}{L_0} \]

The model for calculating the strength of composite's perforation is given by

\[ \sigma = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{K}{L_0} \right) \left( \frac{d}{D} \right) \frac{L}{L_0} \]

where \( \sigma \) is the stress of composite and \( K \) is the perforation factor.

The formula for calculating the perforation factor is

\[ K = \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{D}{d} \right) \frac{L}{L_0} \]

1988

\[ \text{Composite thickness} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{K}{L_0} \right) \left( \frac{d}{D} \right) \frac{L}{L_0} \]

\[ \sigma = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{K}{L_0} \right) \left( \frac{d}{D} \right) \frac{L}{L_0} \]

\[ \left( \frac{K}{L_0} \right) \left( \frac{d}{D} \right) \frac{L}{L_0} \]

where \( \sigma \) is the stress of composite and \( K \) is the perforation factor.
Theorem 7.6 (361) [1] is the key result in proving the matrix completion problem. Specifically, it establishes the relationship between the completion of a partially observed matrix and the underlying generative process. This theorem is crucial for understanding the conditions under which matrix completion can be accurately performed.

The proof of Theorem 7.6 relies on the following key steps:

1. Establishing the equivalence between the observed matrix and the underlying generative process.
2. Utilizing the properties of the generative process to derive the completion algorithm.
3. Proving the convergence of the completion algorithm.

These steps are detailed in the context of the theorem, providing a rigorous foundation for the theoretical underpinnings of matrix completion.

Theorem 7.6 (361) [1] asserts that if the underlying generative process satisfies certain conditions, then the completion of the partially observed matrix can be accurately estimated. This theorem is a cornerstone in the field of matrix completion, offering a powerful tool for recovering missing data in large matrices.
4 Experimental program

The stress performance index obtained in each case is calculated by the expression:

$$\sigma = \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma_0}{\sigma_1}$$

where:

$$\sigma_1 = \frac{\int_{0}^{t} \sigma(t) dt}{t}$$

and

$$\sigma_0$$

is the initial stress.

Table 3: Outline of Investigated Composites
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Note: The stress performance index is calculated by comparing the initial stress ($\sigma_0$) with the current stress ($\sigma$) over a specific time period ($t$). The results indicate that the stress performance index is significantly affected by the type of composite material used.
Fig. 6: Tensile stress-strain relation in UAR-PVA film.

Table 4: Outlines of sample test results.
in the field, the performance of the prediction model.

The performance index for predicting

\[ P^2 \text{ of experimental parameters on cracking stress level (a) mixed proportion and (b) fresh type} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{(a) Normalized crack size } & \quad 0.5 \quad 1 \quad 1.5 \\
\text{Cracking stress level (Mpa)} & \quad 0.5 \quad 1 \quad 1.5 \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{(b) Normalized crack size } & \quad 0.5 \quad 1 \quad 1.5 \\
\text{Cracking stress level (Mpa)} & \quad 0.5 \quad 1 \quad 1.5 \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{(c) Normalized crack size } & \quad 0.5 \quad 1 \quad 1.5 \\
\text{Stress (MPa)} & \quad 0.5 \quad 1 \quad 1.5 \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{(d) Normalized crack size } & \quad 0.5 \quad 1 \quad 1.5 \\
\text{Stress (MPa)} & \quad 0.5 \quad 1 \quad 1.5 \\
\end{align*} \]
Figure 12 First cracking strength prediction \( (\sigma'_{P_k})_{\text{cr}} \) (MPa)

Figure 13 Stress performance index comparison between test and analysis.

Figure 14 Effect of stress performance index \( \sigma'_{P_k} \) on ultimate tensile strain.

Figure 15 Ultimate tensile strain \( \varepsilon_{\text{ut}}(\%) \) in analysis.

The effect of stress performance index \( \sigma'_{P_k} \) on ultimate tensile strain \( \varepsilon_{\text{ut}} \) is shown in Figure 14. The relationship between stress performance index \( \sigma'_{P_k} \) and ultimate tensile strain \( \varepsilon_{\text{ut}} \) is illustrated in Figure 15. The results in Figures 14 and 15 agree with those for fiber reinforced composite materials (e.g., FRP, CNT, and MWCNT) and indicate the possibility of using the stress performance index \( \sigma'_{P_k} \) in this figure. The stress performance index \( \sigma'_{P_k} \) correlates well with the ultimate tensile strain \( \varepsilon_{\text{ut}} \).
Fig. 16. Effect of energy performance index on saturation level

Fig. 17. Effect of energy performance index on ultimate strain

8. Composite design criteria with...
9. Conclusions

Concluding does not show H5 hypothesis.

According to the study's focus on stress performance index and its effect on causal factors, the following conclusions are drawn:

- There is a significant relationship between stress performance index and the factors identified in the study. The study hypothesized that H1, H2, H3, H4, and H5 would be supported. However, only H1 was supported, while H2, H3, H4, and H5 were not.

- The study concludes that stress performance index is an important factor in understanding the effects of stress on performance.
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\[
\frac{Y}{np_d} \left( \frac{Y}{np_d} \right) = S \cdot \left( \frac{Y}{np_d} \right) + \frac{S}{J_f} = Z
\]

\[
I = 2 \cdot \left( \frac{Y}{np_d} \right) = 2 \cdot \left( \frac{Y}{np_d} \right) + \frac{S}{J_f} = Z
\]

\[
\frac{Y}{np_d} = 2 \cdot \left( \frac{Y}{np_d} \right) + \frac{S}{J_f} = Z
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} f_p \\ f_q \\ f_A \end{pmatrix} \frac{Z}{10} = \begin{pmatrix} f_p \\ f_q \\ f_A \end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} \frac{f_p}{f_q} \\ \frac{10}{f_A} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f_p \\ f_q \\ f_A \end{pmatrix}
\]

where

\[
\begin{pmatrix} f_p \\ f_q \end{pmatrix} \frac{Z}{10} = \begin{pmatrix} f_p \\ f_q \end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
B_r = 6 \cdot 10^5
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} f_p \\ f_q \\ f_A \end{pmatrix} \frac{Z}{10} = \begin{pmatrix} f_p \\ f_q \\ f_A \end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
1 > \gamma > 0
\]
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\[
\begin{pmatrix} f_p \\ f_q \end{pmatrix} \frac{Z}{10} = \begin{pmatrix} f_p \\ f_q \end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} f_p \\ f_q \end{pmatrix} \frac{Z}{10} = \begin{pmatrix} f_p \\ f_q \end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} f_p \\ f_q \end{pmatrix} \frac{Z}{10} = \begin{pmatrix} f_p \\ f_q \end{pmatrix}
\]

Appendix All expression of ending law
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Notation

classic modulus of fiber: \( \frac{E}{2} \)
classic modulus of composite: \( \frac{E}{V_f} \)
elastic constant: \( \frac{E}{V_f} \)

Formulation by \( \frac{1}{2} \):

- Nominal stress
- Nominal strain
- Net area
- Net length
- Volume fraction of fibers

- Net cross-sectional area
- Net moment of inertia
- Net section modulus
- Net area moment of inertia
- Net radius of gyration

Deformation

- Strain in the fiber
- Strain in the matrix
- Strain in the composite
- Stress in the composite
- Stress in the fiber
- Stress in the matrix
- Stress in the net

Equations

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{g}^2 &= \frac{E}{2} \left( \frac{r}{h} \right)^2 \left( \frac{r}{h} \right)^2 \left( \frac{r}{h} \right)^2
\end{align*}
\]