

LIST OF FIGURES

1	Introduction to Multi-Criteria Decision Making.....	1
<i>Figure 1-1:</i>	A Typical Decision Matrix	3
<i>Figure 1-2:</i>	A Taxonomy of MCDM methods (according to Chen and Hwang [1991]).....	4
2	Multi-Criteria Decision Making Methods	5
3	Quantification of Qualitative Data for MCDM Problems	23
<i>Figure 3-1:</i>	Actual Comparison Values.....	37
<i>Figure 3-2:</i>	Maximum, Average, and Minimum CI Values of Random CDP Matrices When the Original Saaty Scale is used.....	42
<i>Figure 3-3:</i>	Inversion Rates for Different Scales and Size of Set (Class 1 Scales)	46
<i>Figure 3-4:</i>	Indiscrimination Rates for Different Scales and Size of Set (Class 1 Scales)	47
<i>Figure 3-5:</i>	Inversion Rates for Different Scales and Size of Set (Class 2 Scales)	48
<i>Figure 3-6:</i>	Indiscrimination Rates for Different Scales and Size of Set (Class 2 Scales)	49
<i>Figure 3-7:</i>	The Best Scales	51
<i>Figure 3-8:</i>	The Worst Scales.....	52
4	Deriving Relative Weights from Ratio Comparisons ..	57
<i>Figure 4-1:</i>	Average Residual and CI versus Order of Set When the Human Rationality Assumption is Used (the Results Correspond to 100 Random Observations).....	70
<i>Figure 4-2:</i>	Average Residual and CI versus Order of Set When the Eigenvalue Method is Used (the Results Correspond to 100 Random Observations).....	71
5	Deriving Relative Weights from Difference Comparisons	73

6	A Decomposition Approach for Evaluating Relative Weights Derived from Comparisons	87
<i>Figure 6-1:</i>	Partitioning of the $n(n-1)/2$ Pairwise Comparisons	90
<i>Figure 6-2:</i>	Error Rates Under the LP Approach for Sets of Different Size as a Function of the Available Comparisons	106
<i>Figure 6-3:</i>	Error Rates Under the Non-LP Approach for Sets of Different Size as a Function of the Available Comparisons	107
<i>Figure 6-4:</i>	Error Rates Under the LP Approach for Sets of Different Size as a Function of the Common Comparisons	108
<i>Figure 6-5:</i>	Error Rates Under the Non-LP Approach for Sets of Different Size as a Function of the Common Comparisons	109
<i>Figure 6-6:</i>	Error Rates for the two Approaches as a Function of the Available Comparisons	110
<i>Figure 6-7:</i>	Error Rates for the two Approaches as a Function of the Common Comparisons	111
 7	 Reduction of Pairwise Comparisons Via a Duality Approach.....	 115
<i>Figure 7-1:</i>	Total Number of Comparisons and Reduction Achieved When the Dual Approach is Used. The Number of Criteria $n = 5$	125
<i>Figure 7-2:</i>	Total Number of Comparisons and Reduction Achieved When the Dual Approach is Used. The Number of Criteria $n = 10$	125
<i>Figure 7-3:</i>	Total Number of Comparisons and Reduction Achieved When the Dual Approach is Used. The Number of Criteria $n = 15$	126
<i>Figure 7-4:</i>	Total number of Comparisons and Reduction Achieved When the Dual Approach is Used. The Number of Criteria $n = 20$	126
<i>Figure 7-5:</i>	Net Reduction on the Number of Comparisons When the Dual Approach is used. Results for Problems of Various Sizes	127
<i>Figure 7-6:</i>	Percent (%) Reduction on the Number of Comparisons When the Dual Approach is used. Results for Problems of Various Sizes	127

8	A Sensitivity Analysis Approach for MCDM Methods	131
<i>Figure 8-1:</i>	Frequency of the time that the PT Critical Criterion is the Criterion with the Highest Weight	149
<i>Figure 8-2:</i>	Frequency of the time that the PT Critical Criterion is the Criterion with the Lowest Weight	149
<i>Figure 8-3:</i>	Frequency of the time that the PA Critical Criterion is the Criterion with the Highest Weight	150
<i>Figure 8-4:</i>	Frequency of the time that the PA Critical Criterion is the Criterion with the Lowest Weight	150
<i>Figure 8-5:</i>	Frequency of the time that the AT Critical Criterion is the Criterion with the Highest Weight	151
<i>Figure 8-6:</i>	Frequency of the time that the AT Critical Criterion is the Criterion with the Lowest Weight	151
<i>Figure 8-7:</i>	Frequency of the time that the AA Critical Criterion is the Criterion with the Highest Weight	152
<i>Figure 8-8:</i>	Frequency of the time that the AA Critical Criterion is the Criterion with the Lowest Weight	152
<i>Figure 8-9:</i>	Frequency of the time that the AT and PT Definitions point to the Same Criterion.....	153
<i>Figure 8-10:</i>	Frequency of the time that the AA and PA Definitions point to the Same Criterion.....	153
<i>Figure 8-11:</i>	Frequency of the time that the AT, PT, AA, and PA Definitions point to the Same Criterion Under the WSM Method	154
<i>Figure 8-12:</i>	Rate that the AT Criterion is the one with the Lowest Weight for Different Size Problems Under the WPM Method	154
9	Evaluation of Methods for Processing a Decision Matrix and Some Cases of Ranking Abnormalities	177
<i>Figure 9-1:</i>	Contradiction Rate (%) Between the	

	WSM and the AHP	184
<i>Figure 9-2:</i>	Contradiction Rate (%) Between the WSM and the Revised AHP	185
<i>Figure 9-3:</i>	Contradiction Rate (%) Between the WSM and the WPM.....	185
<i>Figure 9-4:</i>	Rate of Change (%) of the Indication of the Optimum Alternative When a Non-Optimum Alternative is Replaced by a Worse one. The AHP Case	191
<i>Figure 9-5:</i>	Rate of Change (%) of the indication of the Optimum Alternative When a Non-Optimum Alternative is Replaced by a Worse one. The Revised AHP Case	191
<i>Figure 9-6:</i>	Contradiction Rate (%) Between the WSM and TOPSIS Method.....	196
<i>Figure 9-7:</i>	Rate of Change (%) of the Indication of the Optimum Alternative When a Non-Optimum Alternative is Replaced by a Worse one. The TOPSIS Case	196
<i>Figure 9-8:</i>	Indication of the Best MCDM Method According to Different MCDM Methods	198
10	A Computational Evaluation of the Original and the Revised AHP.....	201
<i>Figure 10-1:</i>	The Failure Rates are Based on 1,000 Randomly Generated Problems. The AHP Case	210
<i>Figure 10-2:</i>	The Failure Rates are Based on 1,000 Randomly Generated Problems. The Revised AHP Case	211
11	More Cases of Ranking Abnormalities When Some MCDM Methods Are Used.....	213
<i>Figure 11-1:</i>	Contradiction Rates on the Indication of the Best Alternative When Alternatives are Considered Together and in Pairs. The Original AHP Case	225
<i>Figure 11-2:</i>	Contradiction Rates on the Indication of the Best Alternative When Alternatives are Considered Together and in Pairs. The Ideal Mode (Revised) AHP Case	225
<i>Figure 11-3:</i>	Contradiction Rates on the Indication of Any Alternative When Alternatives are	

	Considered Together and in Pairs.	
	The Original AHP Case.....	226
<i>Figure 11-4:</i>	Contradiction Rates on the Indication of Any Alternative When Alternatives are Considered Together and in Pairs.	
	The Ideal Mode (Revised) AHP Case	226
<i>Figure 11-5:</i>	Contradiction Rates on the indication of Any Alternative When Alternatives are Considered in Pairs.	
	The Original AHP Case.....	227
<i>Figure 11-6:</i>	Contradiction Rates on the indication of Any Alternative When Alternatives are Considered in Pairs.	
	The Ideal Mode AHP Case	227
12	Fuzzy Sets and Their Operations	235
<i>Figure 12-1:</i>	Membership Functions for the Two Fuzzy Alternatives $\hat{A}_1$ and $\hat{A}_2$	239
13	Fuzzy Multi-Criteria Decision Making	241
<i>Figure 13-1:</i>	Membership Functions of the Fuzzy Alternatives $\hat{A}_1$, $\hat{A}_2$, and $\hat{A}_3$ of Example 13-1 According to the Fuzzy WSM Method	243
<i>Figure 13-2:</i>	Membership Functions of the Fuzzy Alternatives $\hat{A}_1$, $\hat{A}_2$, and $\hat{A}_3$ of Example 13-2 According to the Fuzzy WPM Method	244
<i>Figure 13-3:</i>	Contradiction Rate R_{11} When the Number of Fuzzy Alternatives is Equal to 3.....	259
<i>Figure 13-4:</i>	Contradiction Rate R_{11} When the Number of Fuzzy Alternatives is Equal to 21	259
<i>Figure 13-5:</i>	Contradiction Rate R_{21} When the Number of Fuzzy Alternatives is Equal to 3.....	260
<i>Figure 13-6:</i>	Contradiction Rate R_{21} When the Number of Fuzzy Alternatives is Equal to 21	260
<i>Figure 13-7:</i>	Contradiction Rate R_{12} When the Number of Fuzzy Alternatives is Equal to 3.....	261
14	Conclusions and Discussion for Future Research.....	263

