



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

***FUZZY RULE-BASED APPROACH WITH Z-NUMBERS IN SOLVING
GROUP MULTI-ATTRIBUTE DECISION MAKING PROBLEMS***

SAEED BAHRAMI

FSKTM 2021 7



**FUZZY RULE-BASED APPROACH WITH Z-NUMBERS IN SOLVING
GROUP MULTI-ATTRIBUTE DECISION MAKING PROBLEMS**

By

SAEED BAHRAMI

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra
Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

May 2021

COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs, and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in
fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

FUZZY RULE-BASED APPROACH WITH Z-NUMBERS IN SOLVING GROUP MULTI-ATTRIBUTE DECISION MAKING PROBLEMS

By

SAEED BAHRAMI

May 2021

Chairman : Associate Professor Razali bin Yaakob, PhD
Faculty : Computer Science and Information Technology

Multi-Attribute Decision Making (MADM) process is the most well-known branch of decision making and it is one of the most important tasks that have received a lot of attentions in many areas. In solving MADM issues, the parameters of decision making are often faced problems, such as imprecise, vague, uncertainty or incomplete information which lead to inaccurate decision-making. To cope up with these problems, the researchers apply fuzzy set theory as the best-developed approach. Among different fuzzy methods, fuzzy rule-based system (FRBS) due to its flexibility, simplicity, and experts' knowledge modeling is an adequate technique to solving MADM problems. The main objective of this research is to apply experts' opinions by Z-numbers in MADM issues as improvement in ranking performance in decision making process.

Based on extensive literature review on MADM issues using FRBS and Z-numbers, two main problems are addressed in this work. The first problem is inaccurate ranking results drew from the process of aggregating experts' opinions before converting them into one opinion due to data losses, and the second problem is regarding inadequate information in the experts' opinion, which lead to some degree of decision uncertainties. Indeed, in FRBS research to ranking, the reliability level (Z-numbers) in experts' opinions within the decision-making process has not been taken into account. Whereas, the Z-numbers play a key role in decision-making process to reach more precise decisions affecting the final ranking results.

The methods which have been applied and proposed in this study were aimed to increase the accuracy of decision making in solving MADM problems with easing computational process. In the FRBS-TOPSIS method, the initial data

preparation is conducted and later FRBS are applied to rank the experts' opinions individually to obtain the final score of alternatives. Finally, aggregation of experts' opinions is performed by applying TOPSIS conventional technique. The proposed method was compared using the published data from another study by obtaining the final score of each alternative for all experts individually. In the Z-FRBS approach, by considering experts' opinion in form of Z-numbers to deal with inadequate information and modeling experts' knowledge through FRBS, the process of making decision is performed without using conventional techniques which resulted in a more accurate solving MADM problems. The effectiveness and validity of the main method is approved with an illustrative example, sensitivity analysis, and comparison with three others validated method.

In one of the comparisons, the findings showed among 25 alternatives, the Spearman Rho Coefficient (SRC) amount as decision making accuracy in the proposed method increased from 0.850 to 0.862. Indeed, based on the achieved results, with using the data from the other three methods, it is proven that the Z-FRBS method has made more efficient and accurate decisions than the compared methods in solving MADM problems. The advantages of the proposed methods are improvement in ranking performance by means of FRBS, easing computational process, and flexibility.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia
sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

PENDEKATAN BERDASARKAN PERATURAN FUZZY DENGAN NOMBOR Z DALAM MENYELESAIKAN KEPUTUSAN MULTI-ATTRIBUTE MEMBUAT MASALAH

Oleh

SAEED BAHRAMI

Mei 2021

Pengerusi : Profesor Madya Razali bin Yaakob, PhD
Fakulti : Sains Komputer dan Teknologi Maklumat

Proses Pembuatan Keputusan Multi-Atribute (MADM) adalah cabang membuat keputusan yang paling terkenal dan ianya adalah salah satu tugas yang paling penting yang telah menerima banyak perhatian dalam pelbagai bidang. Dalam menyelesaikan isu-isu MADM, parameter membuat keputusan sering menghadapi masalah seperti maklumat tidak tepat, kabur, tidak pasti atau tidak lengkap yang membawa kepada pembuatan keputusan yang tidak tepat. Untuk mengatasi masalah ini, penyelidik menggunakan teori set kabur sebagai pendekatan terbaik yang dibangunkan. Antara kaedah kabur yang berbeza, disebabkan oleh kebolehlenturan, kesederhanaan, dan pemodelan pengetahuan pakar, sistem berasaskan peraturan kabur (FRBS) adalah teknik yang memadai untuk menyelesaikan masalah MADM. Objektif utama penyelidikan ini adalah menerapkan pendapat pakar melalui nombor-Z dalam isu MADM seterusnya meningkatkan prestasi pemangkatan dalam proses membuat keputusan.

Berdasarkan tinjauan literatur yang luas mengenai isu-isu MADM menggunakan FRBS dan nombor-Z, dua masalah utama ditangani dalam kerja ini. Masalah pertama adalah keputusan pemangkatan yang tidak tepat kerana kehilangan data yang terhasil dari proses mengagregasikan pendapat pakar sebelum mengubahnya menjadi satu pendapat, menyebabkan kehilangan data, dan masalah kedua adalah mengenai maklumat yang tidak mencukupi di dalam pendapat pakar, yang membawa kepada beberapa peringkat ketidakpastian keputusan. Sesungguhnya, dalam penyelidikan FRBS bagi pemangkatan, tahap kebolehpercayaan (nombor-Z) dalam pendapat pakar di antara proses membuat keputusan yang telah tidak diambil kira. Sedangkan, nombor-Z memainkan peranan penting dalam proses membuat keputusan

untuk mencapai keputusan yang lebih tepat yang mempengaruhi keputusan kedudukan akhir.

Kaedah yang telah diguna pakai dan dicadangkan dalam kajian ini adalah bertujuan untuk meningkatkan ketepatan membuat keputusan dalam menyelesaikan masalah MADM dengan meringankan proses pengiraan. Dalam kaedah FRBS-TOPSIS, penyediaan data awal dijalankan dan kemudiannya FRBS digunakan untuk menarafkan pendapat pakar secara individu untuk mendapatkan skor akhir alternatif. Akhirnya, agregasi pendapat pakar dilakukan dengan menerapkan teknik konvensional TOPSIS. Kaedah yang dicadangkan telah dibandingkan dengan menggunakan data yang telah diterbitkan daripada kajian lain dengan mendapatkan skor terakhir setiap alternatif bagi semua pakar secara individu. Dalam pendekatan Z-FRBS, melalui pertimbangan pendapat pakar di dalam bentuk nombor-Z untuk menghadapi maklumat yang tidak lengkap dan memodelkan pengetahuan pakar melalui FRBS, proses pembuatan keputusan dilaksanakan tanpa menggunakan teknik konvensional di mana memberi keputusan lebih tepat menyelesaikan masalah MADM. Keberkesanan dan kesahan kaedah utama terbukti dengan contoh ilustrasi, analisis sensitif dan perbandingan dengan tiga kaedah yang telah disahkan.

Dalam salah satu perbandingan, penemuan telah menunjukkan di antara 25 alternatif, jumlah Spearman Rho Coefficient (SRC) sebagai ketepatan pembuatan keputusan di dalam kaedah yang dicadangkan telah meningkat dari 0.850 kepada 0.862. Sesungguhnya, berdasarkan keputusan yang dicapai, dengan menggunakan data daripada tiga kaedah yang lain, ianya telah terbukti bahawa kaedah Z-FRBS telah menghasilkan keputusan lebih berkesan berbanding dengan kaedah lain yang dibandingkan dalam menyelesaikan masalah MADM. Kelebihan kaedah yang dicadangkan adalah meningkatkan prestasi pemangkatan dengan FRBS, mengurangkan proses pengiraan, dan fleksibel.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank ALLAH Subhanahu Wataala, who has strengthened me through the best and toughest years of my life, and without his blessings, this achievement would not be possible. I am asking Him to accept this work.

I'm particularly grateful to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Razali Bin Yaakob for the supervising, encouraging and support given towards the execution this research, and to my supervisory committee Assoc. Prof. Dr. Azreen Bin Azman and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rodziah Binti Atan for their support.

Thank You All.

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of the Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Razali bin Yaakob, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Computer Science and Information Technology
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Azreen bin Azman, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Computer Science and Information Technology
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Rodziah binti Atan, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Computer Science and Information Technology
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

ZALILAH MOHD SHARIFF, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 12 August 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
APPROVAL	vi
DECLARATION	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
LIST OF APPENDICES	xvi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
 CHAPTER	
 1 INTRODUCTION	 1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background of the Research	1
1.3 Problem Statement	3
1.4 Objectives	5
1.5 Scope of the research	5
1.6 Contribution of the Research	6
1.7 Organization of the Thesis	6
 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	 8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Theoretical background on Related Subjects	8
2.2.1 Decision Making	8
2.2.2 Multi-Attribute Decision Making (MADM)	9
2.3 Related Works Techniques	12
2.3.1 TOPSIS Technique	12
2.3.2 Fuzzy Set Theory	14
2.3.2.1 Fuzzy Membership Function	15
2.3.2.2 Fuzzy Operators	19
2.3.2.3 Linguistic Variables	19
2.3.3 Fuzzy Rule Base Systems	20
2.3.3.1 Defuzzification Methods	22
2.3.3.2 Aggregation Operators	23
2.3.4 Z-numbers Concept	23
2.4 Related Works on FRBS and Z-numbers	25
2.4.1 Fuzzy Rule-Based Systems for MADM problems	27
2.4.2 Z-numbers for MADM problems	34
2.4.2.1 Z-number Theory Approach	34
2.4.2.2 Z-number Novell Approach	35
2.4.2.3 Z-number Developed Approach	39
2.4.2.4 Z-number Applied Approach	41

2.5	Critical Discussion and Research Directions	42
2.5.1	Critical Discussion on the FRBS and Combined papers	42
2.5.2	Critical Discussion on the Z-numbers papers	47
2.6	Summarized Research Directions	50
3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	52
3.1	Introduction	52
3.2	Methodology of the Research	52
3.2.1	Literature Review	53
3.2.2	Preparing Preliminary Data	55
3.2.2.1	Select all Criteria	55
3.2.2.2	Select all Alternatives	55
3.2.2.3	Make Decision Matrix	56
3.2.2.4	Experts Opinions	56
3.2.3	Design Propose Fuzzy System	56
3.2.3.1	Identifying Rules	56
3.2.3.2	Fuzzy System	57
3.2.4	Implementation of the Methods	57
3.2.4.1	The FRBS-TOPSIS proposed method	57
3.2.4.2	The Z-FRBS propose method	58
3.2.5	Validation of the proposed Methods	59
3.2.5.1	Numerical Example	59
3.2.5.2	Sensitive Analysis	61
3.2.5.3	Result Comparison	61
3.3	Summary	63
4	THE PROPOSED METHODS TO SOLVE GROUP MADM PROBLEMS	64
4.1	Introduction	64
4.2	The Review on the Previous Works	64
4.2.1	The Review on Mahmoudi's Method	64
4.2.2	The Review on Yaakob's Method	66
4.2.3	The Review on Dong's Method	68
4.3	Proposed Integrated FRBS-TOPSIS Method	70
4.4	Proposed Integrated Z-FRBS Method	75
4.5	Summary	81
5	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	82
5.1	Introduction	82
5.2	Validation of the FRBS-TOPSIS propose method	82
5.2.1	Utilizing an Illustrative Example	82
5.3	Validation of the Z-FRBS Method Validation	90
5.3.1	Illustrative Example	90
5.3.1.1	Rule Verification	100
5.3.2	Sensitive Analysis	105
5.4	Results of the Proposed Methods Comparison	108

5.4.1	Comparison Result of the FRBS-TOPSIS Method	108
5.4.2	Results Comparison of the Z-FRBS Method	110
5.4.2.1	Comparison with Mahmoudi's Method (2016)	110
5.4.2.2	Comparison with Yaakob's Method (2016)	113
5.4.2.3	Comparison with Dong's Method (2020)	121
5.5	Summary	123
6	CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS	124
6.1	Introduction	124
6.2	Summary of the Work	124
6.3	Conclusions	125
6.4	Future Works	127
	REFERENCES	128
	APPENDICES	138
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	158
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	159

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 The Decision matrix table	10
2.2 Advantages and Disadvantages of MADM methods	11
2.3 The information table of TOPSIS	12
2.4 Summary of Reviewed Papers about FRBS & Combined	43
2.5 Summary of Reviewed Papers about Z-numbers (2011-2020)	48
4.1 Outputs of fuzzy systems	80
5.1 The linguistic variables for the performance rating and their associated fuzzy numbers	83
5.2 The performance rating of the suppliers with DMs	84
5.3 Fuzzy decision matrix of expert1 (D_1)	85
5.4 Crisp decision matrix of expert1 (D_1)	86
5.5 Final score of suppliers based on Expert1 data (S_1)	87
5.6 Final score of suppliers for all Experts (S)	87
5.7 Best and Worst value of Experts	88
5.8 Euclidean distance from best values $(v_{ik} - v_k^+)^2$	89
5.9 Euclidean distance from worst values $(v_{ik} - v_k^-)^2$	89
5.10 Values of C_i^+ , C_i^- and C_i	89
5.11 Linguistic variables and their fuzzy numbers for Performance rating	93
5.12 Linguistic variables and their fuzzy numbers for Reliability	93
5.13 Linguistic variables and their fuzzy numbers for Importance of (sub-)criteria	93
5.14 Judgments of expert 1	94

5.15	Importance weight of criteria & sub-criteria	95
5.16	Weighted crisp value of Expert 1	95
5.17	DM's rules for computing performance scores	96
5.18	DM's rules for computing score of reliability	96
5.19	Score of performance and its reliability for each main criterion provided by Expert 1	98
5.20	Final score of performance and its reliability	99
5.21	Supplier's expected value and final ranking	99
5.22	Weight of experts in decision making process	100
5.23	Tests of input and output variables for "Product" criterion	102
5.24	Ranking orders of suppliers under different reliabilities	107
5.25	Values of $C_i +$, $C_i -$ and C_i	109
5.26	The proposed method ranking comparison with Mahmoudi's method	112
5.27	Crisp decision matrix of expert1 (D_1)	112
5.28	TOPSIS Ranking Performance based on (Yaakob & Gegov, 2015) method with its previous method which evaluated with Spearman Rho Correlation	114
5.29	Ranking Performance Based on the proposed method and evaluated with Spearman Rho Correlation	116
5.30	The General Comparison of the Yaakob's Method with the Proposed Method	118
5.31	Comparison of the Methods in terms of performance and properties	121
5.32	Alternative ratings using Z-numbers for the Dong et al. (2020) method	121
5.33	The final performance comparison for the Z-FRBS method with the Z-RIM method	122
5.34	Results of the comparison of the rankings between Dong et al.'s (2020) method and the proposed method	122

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 Hierarchical system for MADM	10
2.2 Triangular Fuzzy Number	17
2.3 Trapezoidal Membership Function	18
2.4 The Mamdani's fuzzy rule base system	21
2.5 A simple Z-number	24
2.6 Scope of this study	25
3.1 The methodological flow of the research	53
3.2 Structure of a decision making problem	60
4.1 General scheme of Mahmoudi's method	65
4.2 General scheme of the Yaakob's method	67
4.3 General scheme of Dong's method	69
4.4 Aggregation type in Mahmoudi's method	70
4.5 Aggregation type in the FRBS-TOPSIS proposed method	71
4.6 The scheme of the FRBS-TOPSIS Proposed Method	72
4.7 Scheme of separation rating and reliability in fuzzy system	77
4.8 The framework of the Z-FRBS method	78
5.1 Linguistic variables for the fuzzy rates of Alternatives	83
5.2 Hierarchical structure of supplier selection example	92
5.3 The rule viewer for one of the suppliers in the proposed system	97
5.4 The output surface for one of the suppliers in the proposed method	98
5.5 Relation between reliability and weight in decision-making process base on Z-numbers	100

5.6	Show test for Row 2	103
5.7	Interaction Graph for Criterion of Product	104
5.8	Main Effect Plots for Sub-criteria of Product Criterion	104
5.9	Interaction Plot between Main Criteria	105
5.10	Ranking order under different reliabilities	108
5.11	Comparison of SRC between Yaakob and Proposed Method	119



LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A Values used and produced based on the FRBS-TOPSIS proposed method	138
B Three Inputs Performance.fis and Reliability.fis	141
C The List of Rules and Sample Rule for the Z-FRBS	143
D Linguistic Variable for Importan Weight of Each Criterion in Yaakob Method (VL, L, ML, M, MH, H, VH)	150

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

MCDM	Multi-Criteria Decision Making
MCGDM	Multi-Criteria Group Decision Making
MADM	Multi-Attribute Decision Making
GDM	Group Decision Making
MODM	Multi-Objective Decision Making
FMCDM	Fuzzy Multi Criteria Decision Making
SSP	Supplier Selection Problem
MAGDM	Multi-Attribute Group Decision Making
FRBS	Fuzzy Rule Base System
AHP	Analytical Hierarchy Process
DEA	Data Environment Analysis
DMU	Decision-Making Unit
AHPFDEA	Analytic Hierarchy Process Z-number Data Environment Analysis
DS	Dempster-Shafer
HULZN	Hesitant Uncertain Linguistic Z-number
TOPSIS	Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution
VIKOR	VlseKriterijumska Optimizacija I Kompromisno Resenje
FTOPSIS	Fuzzy TOPSIS
ANP	Analytical Network Process
FANP	Fuzzy ANP
SCM	Supply Chain Management
ANN	Artificial Neural Network

SCCOL	Supply Chain Collaboration
PROMETHEE	Preference Ranking Organization METHod for Enrichment of Evaluations
ELECTRE	ELimination Et Choix Traduisant la REalité
COA	Center of Area
MISO	Multi Input Single Output
FIS	Fuzzy Information System
FRBS	Fuzzy Rule Base System
SCOR	Supply Chain Operations Reference
ZWAPA	Z-numbers Weight Arithmetic Power Average
ZWGPA	Z-numbers Weight Geometric Power Average

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the context on the issues that are pertinent to the topic of this research. Multi-Attribute Decision Making (MADM) is a branch of Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) that has been used for the selection of the best choice between many alternatives. MADM has many applications in many fields but one of the significant and main usages of it is in decision-making issues. One of the main objectives in MADM problems is to achieve the best decision among different choices. It is obvious that solving any problem by using the experts' opinions is to make the decision more confident.

In this chapter, a brief account of the background of the research is described firstly. And after that, the problem statement of the research is followed by the research objectives, scope and limitations, research contributions, and organization of the thesis.

1.2 Background of the Research

The decision making process is one of the most important tasks that has received a lot of attention in many domains such as computer science, engineering, management, mathematics, business, tourism, agriculture, and related problems in other fields (Salih, Zaidan, Zaidan, & Ahmed, 2019; Zavadskas, Govindan, Antucheviciene, & Turskis, 2016). Indeed, in this process, multiple criteria have been conflicted together and are famous for multiple criteria decision making (MCDM) issues. Also, this process is implied to identify alternative method which fits with defined objectives, goals, desires, and values (Harris, 1998). In general, there are two basic approaches for MCDM problems: the first one is Multiple Attribute Decision Making (MADM), and the second is Multiple Objective Decision Making (MODM). The MADM is the most well-known branch of decision making that deals with decision problems under the attendance of the number of decision criteria. The MADM approach requires the selection to be made among decision alternatives described by their attributes. It assumes that the problem is related to a predetermined number of decision alternatives (Malczewski, 1999).

In the MADM problems, the decision-maker (DM) attempts to choose the best alternatives which are characterized by a set of multiple attributes. In real-world MADM issues, it is hard to consider all aspects of decision problems for the individual DMs due to the limited practical experience and knowledge. Thus, to

ensure the accuracy and rationality of decisions, they use multiple experts' opinions about the specific field as DMs or group decision making (GDM) play a key role in this respect (Tavana & Hatami-Marbini, 2011). In GDM, for choosing the best alternative (or for ranking), the experts' opinions are under the process of aggregation. In this process, all experts' opinions are aggregated at first, and then in the next steps, it is faced solely with one opinion. Meanwhile, in the aggregation process, the type and the sequence of its effects are the final decision (Wan, Wang, & Dong, 2016). The study on how to develop multi-attribute group decision-making (MADM) issues is at the center of attention nowadays especially for practical applications (He, Wang, & Zhexue, 2016) (Salih et al., 2019).

Obtaining the experts' opinions can be established by numeric or linguistic (L A Zadeh, 1975). But in real-world situations, experts express their opinions about alternatives by using linguistic variables (Chen, 2000). Furthermore, it is preferable for a DM to employ linguistic variables instead of real numbers in the most complex and ill-defined decision-making environment (L A Zadeh, 1975), because the use of information by linguistics, reinforces the flexibility and reliability of classical decision models (Peng & Wang, 2017). Naturally, performed linguistic variables are considered imprecise, vague, uncertain, or incomplete data. Fuzzy set theory has been used for modeling decision-making processes (that is one of the most key challenges in decision making) based on imprecise and vague information such as the judgment of the decision-makers. Still, this theory has an advantage over the traditional set theory when measuring the ambiguity of concepts that are associated with human beings' subjective judgments (Salih et al., 2019).

Concerning the values associated with the parameters in the real world, MADM problems are often imprecise, vague, uncertain, or incomplete so hybridize fuzzy sets in MADM techniques are widely used by researchers for dealing with ambiguous data (Zavadskas et al., 2016). For this purpose, a wide range of studies has combined MADM techniques with a fuzzy set theory which is called fuzzy MADM (FMADM). Some of them are fuzzy TOPSIS (Chen, 2000), fuzzy AHP (Chen & Yang, 2011), fuzzy VIKOR (Shemshadi, Shirazi, Toreihi, & Tarokh, 2011), fuzzy ELECTREE (Sevcli, 2010), fuzzy ANP (Vinodh, Ramiya, & Gautham, 2011) and fuzzy PROMETHEE (Ying-hsiu Chen, Wang, & Wu, 2011).

It is logical and acceptable that reliable information will result in reliable and accurate decisions. Because of different knowledge, expertise, and experience, the reliability of experts' opinions and judgments has become an essential property of information. Therefore, in real problem situations, it is necessary to take the reliability of the information in the decision-making process to arrive at suitable decisions. Lotfi (Lotfi A. Zadeh, 2011) introduced the concept of Z-number as the most adequate concept for the description of real-world information. A Z-number is an ordered pair $Z = (A, B)$ of fuzzy

numbers used to describe a value of a variable X , where A is an imprecise constraint on values of X and B is an imprecise estimation of reliability of A and is considered as a value of probability (confidence, sureness, reliability) measure of A . Decisions making based on Z -information are more realistic and more adequate to real-life decision problems (Zeinalova, 2014). This concept is new and it is a vital issue which in recent years few researchers have been accepted (Jiang, Xie, Zhuang, Shou, & Tang, 2016).

In this study, at first, modifying the type of aggregation of experts' opinions through a fuzzy inference system and rank the alternatives by a conventional technique intend to solve MADM problems more efficiently. Moreover, the other goal is to develop a reliable fuzzy intelligence system for solving group MADM problems through Z -numbers to select the best alternatives based on priorities. To accomplish this main goal, it is needed to define an issue on supplier selection problem (SSP) as a MADM problem under group decision making. The robustness of the proposed method is demonstrated with sensitivity analysis. And also, it should be compared with three other compound conventional methods in order to have a strong validity. To evaluate another goal, it will be compared with the method which is used in its data.

1.3 Problem Statement

In the real world, there are many issues in the area of decision-making that solving with sophisticated mathematical calculations is highly difficult. In these situations, using experts' opinions and utilizing decision makers' knowledge as experience to solve them is inevitable. Besides, using experts' opinions to solve MADM issues, the parameters of decision-making are often faced problems, such as uncertainty, vagueness, incomplete information, and impreciseness which lead to inaccurate decision-making. To cope up with these problems, researchers apply the fuzzy set theory as the best-developed approach (Amindoust, Ahmed, Saghafinia, & Bahreininejad, 2012). Among different fuzzy methods, fuzzy rule-based system (FRBS) due to its flexibility, simplicity, and experts' knowledge modeling is a required technique in solving MADM problems (Osiro, Lima-Junior, & Carpinetti, 2014).

In reviewing the papers related to FRBS or a combination of it with conventional techniques, these key points were derived. Firstly, variables used in fuzzy numbers can be crisp (numerical) or linguistics but used terms by linguistics are easier, more tangible, and closer to the real world for experts that express their experience (Ghadimi, Dargi, & Heavey, 2017). Furthermore, using information by linguistics reinforces the flexibility and reliability in decision-making models (Peng & Wang, 2017). Secondly, using experts' knowledge can be performed individually or in groups, but utilizing them by group decision-making (GDM) to solve MADM problems is more rational, and more accurate (Salih et al., 2019).

Accordingly, the reviewed papers such as Mahmoudi, Sadi-nezhad, and Makui (2016) related to FRBS or combination of it with conventional techniques indicated that in GDM, all experts' opinions are aggregated together at first, and then researchers faced with only an opinion in the form of a decision matrix. The decision matrix plays a key role in solving MADM problems. As well, the type of aggregation of experts' opinions (that how, and in what way be done) affects the final ranking results (Wan et al., 2016). Besides, in carrying out the aggregation process, we are faced with the challenge of data losing (Salih et al., 2019) that leads to inaccurate results. Therefore, as regards this problem, the researcher intends to improve data loss and ranking performance by modifying the type of aggregation process by presenting a new approach. In order to overcome this problem, it is supposed to used FRBS for obtaining the final score of each expert individually, and TOPSIS conventional technique for aggregating all experts' opinions and ranking the alternatives by using it.

But concerning the second problem, as mentioned before, Lotfi and Zadeh (2011) introduced the concept of a Z-number as a more adequate concept for the description of real-world information. A Z-number is an ordered pair $Z = (A, B)$ of fuzzy numbers that are used to describe a value of a variable X , where A is an imprecise constraint on values of X and B is an imprecise estimation of reliability of A and it is considered as a value of probability measure of A . Often in the real world decision-making issues; because of different knowledge, expertise, and experience; the reliability of experts' opinions become as an essential property of information. So that reliable information gives more reliable results in decisions. Therefore, in real issue situations, it is necessary to take the reliability of the information in the decision-making process to arrive at suitable decisions.

Also, a key point that was derived by studying the papers related to Z-numbers shows that ranking of Z-numbers is very important and it is still a challenging issue in solving MADM problems (Salih et al., 2019). On the other hand, the study of papers related to FRBS shows that this technique has the necessary potential to rank Z-numbers. Besides, considering experts' opinions by Z-numbers as a critical property of information leads to an increase in the level of reliability in the decision-making process. It has also significant effect on final ranking results. But unfortunately, this issue in experts' opinions within the decision-making process by using FRBS has not been taken into account so far in solving MADM problems. Considering the experts' opinions in form of Z-numbers leads to dealing with inadequate information that can be handle the uncertainty issue better. So, in order to overcome this problem, the researcher intends to present a new approach based on Z-number to rely on FRBS. This approach which is proposed for the first time, will rank Z-numbers using only FRBS and without relying on conventional techniques. Although only Yaakob and Gegov (2015) were able to do this ranking, they were not able to perform ranking alternatives by relying on the maximum degree of influence on the expert's knowledge.

It is worth mentioning that in the Yaakob method, the FRBS technique has been used along with the TOPSIS technique in a way neither of them directly has used the FRBS for ranking. It means that the main body of their ranking has been performed by conventional techniques and not through FRBS. Also, the practice of ranking in their method was not systematic. On the other hand, in the Yaakob method, it can be seen that the Z-number has been converted to a type-1 fuzzy number that led to the loss of data, and then the TOPSIS technique to extract points has been used. And finally, according to what they proposed, an FRBS has been used for ranking is Z-TOPSIS, not Z-FRBS.

1.4 Objectives

The main objective of the study is to design a new method by using a fuzzy rule-based system under Z- number to solve multi-attribute group decision-making (MADM) problems. To have more reliable decision making, modeling experts' knowledge, and utility function, and improving accuracy in decision making are the basic issues and the main reason for the researcher who pursued this study. To do so, the following objectives are supported:

- To modify the aggregation process to improve data loss and ranking performance.
- To propose a new approach based on Z-number to complete information in modelling expert's knowledge through FRBS for more precise decision making in solving group MADM problems.

1.5 Scope of the research

Making a decision is an important issue that everyone deals with it in daily life. It is an interdisciplinary domain that is applied in many areas and has been paid attention to by many researchers. On related issues in this scope, every researcher deals with some criteria and alternatives that have a conflict with each other and their main purpose is choosing the best alternative by considering those criteria. These issues are known to multi-attribute decision-making (MADM) problems. In recent decades, many techniques have been developed to solve MADM problems by researchers whose main focus is on one matter and it's the precision of decision making. Indeed, in their opinion, a good technique is the one that makes the decision more accurate, certain and precise, and close to the human mind and real world. The first technique is attained by modifying the process of aggregation in solving MADM problems through combining FRBS and a conventional technique such as TOPSIS. This technique can increase decision-making accuracy. On the other hand, in recent years, with the advent of the Z-number concept (2011), the issue of ranking Z-numbers for more precise decision making, has been at the center of attention of researchers in this scope and it is still an open issue for researchers. Therefore, the main scope of this research has been concentrated on developing a new approach with modeling expert's knowledge

utilizing FRBS which derived from the first method but with considering Z-number in expert's opinions in ranking actions to complete information for more precise decision making in solving group MADM problems, independently. The proposed method is used to solve any MADM problems with some criteria and sub-criteria but, the method is open-ended. Furthermore, there is a limitation to this research. The expert's opinion in this method works only in the form of linguistics. The effectiveness and evaluation of the main method is approved with an illustrative example, sensitivity analysis, and comparison with three others validated method which has used a combination of FRBS technique or Z-number concept.

1.6 Contribution of the Research

The main contribution of this research is to develop a new method by the means of a fuzzy rule-based system to solve any group MADM problems under Z-number. This method, which is proposed for the first time, is used to rank the experts' opinions in terms of Z-number, including two components, score of performance and its reliability. The novel features of the proposed approaches are as follows:

- An improved aggregation process in order to reduction data loss in rank performance.
- A new approach based on Z-number to complete information in modelling expert's knowledge through FRBS for more precise decision making in solving group MADM problems.
- Determining experts' weight in decision-making based on the reliability of their opinions indicated that experts with high reliability have more weight in decisions making.
- Considering flexibility in the new approach in solving MADM problems.

1.7 Organization of the Thesis

Hereby, the organization of all chapters related to the thesis is introduced as follows.

As stated earlier, Chapter 1 figured out the research background, problem statement, objectives, scope of the research, and contribution of the research.

In Chapter 2, first, some subjects about theoretical background related to the research are expressed then it will be reviewed on reusable techniques, and after that literature on techniques based on fuzzy rule base systems and Z-numbers are reviewed. There will also be a critical discussion sub-section on

what has been studied and reviewed. Also, the summarized gaps in the previous works and the potential for future works will be discussed.

In Chapter 3, the methodologies that have been used to complete this research are described. Indeed, the readers can follow the process of establishing the whole research here.

In Chapter 4, at first, there will be a review of previous works. Then two proposed methods are presented. One technique based on FRBS and TOPSIS is proposed on the aggregation of experts' opinion process for more accurate make-decision. Thereafter, considering experts' opinions by the form of Z-numbers, the previous FRBS point of view in the first method is developed as a new approach for ranking independently.

In Chapter 5, with presenting a numerical example, each method separately will be validated and then will be demonstrated the proposed methods in Chapter 4 which are working properly. Thereafter, the proposed methods will be compared with other methods. The Z-FRBS method will be implemented for the first time to rank Z-numbers through the fuzzy rule base technique. Therefore, to demonstrate that the technique is a reliable one with a strong validity that is practical for ranking Z-numbers, it is required to be compared with three other methods.

In Chapter 6, the summary of the work and conclusions are brought and after that, the directions for the future works and researches are suggested. Publications from this research are the end of this study. Finally, references and appendices are presented.

REFERENCES

- Agakishiyev, E. (2016). Supplier Selection Problem under Z-information. *Procedia Computer Science*, 102(August), 418–425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2016.09.421>
- Al-Zahrani, F. A. (2020). Evaluating the Usable-Security of Healthcare Software through Unified Technique of Fuzzy Logic, ANP and TOPSIS. *IEEE Access*, 8, 109905–109916. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3001996>
- Aliev, R. A., Alizadeh, A. V., Huseynov, O. H., & Jabbarova, K. I. (2015). Z-Number-Based Linear Programming. *International Journal Of Intelligent Systems*, 00, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1002/int>
- Aliev, R. A., Huseynov, O. H., & Serdaroglu, R. (2016). Ranking of Z-Numbers and Its Application in Decision Making. *International Journal of Information Technology & Decision Making*, 15(06), 1503–1519. <https://doi.org/10.1142/s0219622016500310>
- Aliev, R. A., & Zeinalova, L. M. (2014). Decision Making Under Z-Information. *Human-Centric Decision-Making Models for Social Sciences*, 502, 233–252. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39307-5_10
- Aliev, R., & Memmedova, K. (2015). Application of Z -Number Based Modeling in Psychological Research. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2015, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/760403>
- Aliyev, R. R. (2016). Multi-attribute Decision Making Based on Z-valuation. *Procedia Computer Science*, 102(August), 218–222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2016.09.393>
- Alpay, S., & Iphar, M. (2018). Equipment selection based on two different fuzzy multi criteria decision making methods: Fuzzy TOPSIS and fuzzy VIKOR. *Open Geosciences*, 10(1), 661–677. <https://doi.org/10.1515/geo-2018-0053>
- Amindoust, A., Ahmed, S., Saghaforia, A., & Bahreininejad, A. (2012). Sustainable supplier selection: A ranking model based on fuzzy inference system. *Applied Soft Computing Journal*, 12(6), 1668–1677. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2012.01.023>
- Anisseh, M., Piri, F., Shahraki, M. R., & Agamohamadi, F. (2012). Fuzzy extension of TOPSIS model for group decision making under multiple criteria. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 38(4), 325–338. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-011-9258-2>
- Azadeh, A., & Kokabi, R. (2016). Z-number DEA: A new possibilistic DEA in the context of Z-numbers. *Advanced Engineering Informatics*, 30(3), 604–617. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aei.2016.07.005>

- Azadeh, A., Kokabi, R., Saberi, M., Hussain, F. K., & Hussain, O. K. (2014). Trust prediction using Z-numbers and Artificial Neural Networks. *2014 IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems*, (July), 522–528. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FUZZ-IEEE.2014.6891602>
- Azadeh, A., Saberi, M., Atashbar, N. Z., Chang, E., & Pazhoheshfar, P. (2013). Z-AHP: A Z-number extension of fuzzy analytical hierarchy process. *IEEE International Conference on Digital Ecosystems and Technologies*, 141–147. <https://doi.org/10.1109/DEST.2013.6611344>
- Behzadian, M., Kazemzadeh, R. B., Albadvi, A., & Aghdasi, M. (2010). PROMETHEE: A comprehensive literature review on methodologies and applications. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 200(1), 198–215. Retrieved from <https://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:eee:ejores:v:200:y:2010:i:1:p:198-215>
- Bellman, R. E., & Zadeh, L. A. (1970). Decision-Making in a Fuzzy Environment. *Management Science*, 17(4), B-141-B-273. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.17.4.B165>
- Carlsson, C., & Fullér, R. (2009). Possibilistic mean value and variance of fuzzy numbers: Some examples of application. *IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems*, 122, 587–592. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FUZZY.2009.5277230>
- Carrera, D. A., & Mayorga, R. V. (2008). Supply chain management: A modular Fuzzy Inference System approach in supplier selection for new product development. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing* 19, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10845-007-0041-9>
- Chen, C. (2000). Extensions of the TOPSIS for group decision-making under fuzzy environment. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 114, 1–9.
- Chen, C. T., Lin, C. T., & Huang, S. F. (2006). A fuzzy approach for supplier evaluation and selection in supply chain management. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 102(2), 289–301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2005.03.009>
- Chen, T. (2014). An ELECTRE-based outranking method for multiple criteria group decision making using interval type-2 fuzzy sets. *Information Sciences*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2013.12.012>
- Chen, Ying-hsiu, Wang, T., & Wu, C. (2011). Strategic decisions using the fuzzy PROMETHEE for IS outsourcing. *Expert Systems With Applications*, 38(10), 13216–13222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2011.04.137>
- Chen, Yuh-jen. (2011). Structured methodology for supplier selection and evaluation in a supply chain, 181, 2010–2012. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2010.07.026>

- Chen, Z., & Yang, W. (2011). An MAGDM based on constrained FAHP and FTOPSIS and its application. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 54(11–12), 2802–2815. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcm.2011.06.068>
- Cheng, Y., & Lin, Y. (2012). International Conference on Asia Pacific Business Innovation & Technology Management Performance Evaluation of Technological Innovation Capabilities In Uncertainty. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40, 287–314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.193>
- Devi, K., Yadav, S. P., & Kumar, S. (2009). Extension of Fuzzy TOPSIS Method Based on Vague Sets, 7(4), 58–62.
- Dong, P., Zhang, T., Ju, Y., & Wang, A. (2020). A novel multi-attribute decision-making framework based on Z-RIM: an illustrative example of cloud service selection. *Soft Computing*, 24, 18233–18247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-020-05087-0>
- Garg, H. (2017). Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence Novel intuitionistic fuzzy decision making method based on an improved operation laws and its application. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 60(July 2016), 164–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2017.02.008>
- Ghadimi, P., Dargi, A., & Heavey, C. (2017). Sustainable supplier performance scoring using audition check-list based fuzzy inference system: a case application in automotive spare part industry. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 105, 12–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2017.01.002>
- Güneri, A. F., Ertay, T., & Yücel, A. (2011). An approach based on ANFIS input selection and modeling for supplier selection problem. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(12), 14907–14917. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2011.05.056>
- Guo, S., & Zhao, H. (2017). Knowledge-Based Systems Fuzzy best-worst multi-criteria decision-making method and its applications. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 121, 23–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2017.01.010>
- Hao, Z., Xu, Z., Zhao, H., & Zhang, R. (2017). Novel intuitionistic fuzzy decision making models in the framework of decision field theory. *Information Fusion*, 33, 57–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2016.05.001>
- Harris, R. (1998). Introduction to Decision Making. Retrieved from <http://www.virtualsalt.com/crebook5.htm>
- He, Y., Wang, X., & Zhixue, J. (2016). Recent advances in multiple criteria decision making techniques. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13042-015-0490-y>

- Herrera, F., Alonso, S., Chiclana, F., & Herrera-Viedma, E. (2009). Computing with words in decision making: Foundations, trends and prospects. *Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making*, 8(4), 337–364. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10700-009-9065-2>
- Huseynov, O.H., Aliev, R.A., Aliyev, R.R., & Alizadeh, A. A. (2015). *The arithmetic of Z-numbers: theory and applications*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing.
- Hwang, C.L. and Yoon, K. (1981). Multiple Attribute Decision Making: Methods and Applications, A State-of-the-Art Survey. *Springer-Verlag, New York*. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-48318-9>
- Indahingwati, A., Barid, M., Wajdi, N., Susilo, D. E., Kurniasih, N., & Rahim, R. (2018). Comparison Analysis of TOPSIS and Fuzzy Logic Methods On Fertilizer Comparison Analysis of TOPSIS and Fuzzy Logic Methods On Fertilizer Selection. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 7(2.3), 109–114. <https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i2.3.12630>
- Information, B., Of, D., & Mcdm, S. (2000). Chapter 2 Multi-Criteria Decision Making Methods 2.1.
- Işık, A. H., İnce, M., & Yiğit, T. (2014). A Fuzzy AHP Approach to Select Learning Management System. *International Journal of Computer Theory and Engineering*, 7(6), 499–502. <https://doi.org/10.7763/ijcte.2015.v7.1009>
- Jang, J. S. R. (1993). ANFIS: Adaptive-Network-Based Fuzzy Inference System. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 23(3), 665–685. <https://doi.org/10.1109/21.256541>
- Jiang, W., Xie, C., Luo, Y., & Tang, Y. (2017). Ranking Z-numbers with an improved ranking method for generalized fuzzy numbers. *Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems*, 32(3), 1931–1943. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JIFS-16139>
- Jiang, W., Xie, C., Zhuang, M., Shou, Y., & Tang, Y. (2016). Sensor Data Fusion with Z-Numbers and Its Application in Fault Diagnosis. *Sensors*, 16(9), 1509. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s16091509>
- Jumarni, R. F., & Zamri, N. (2018). An integration of fuzzy TOPSIS and fuzzy logic for multi-criteria decision making problems. *International Journal of Engineering and Technology(UAE)*, 7(2), 102–106. <https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i2.15.11362>
- Junior, F. R. L., Osiro, L., & Carpinetti, L. C. R. (2013). A fuzzy inference and categorization approach for supplier selection using compensatory and non-compensatory decision rules. *Applied Soft Computing Journal*, 13(10), 4133–4147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2013.06.020>

- Kang, B., Deng, Y., & Sadiq, R. (2018). Total utility of Z-number. *Applied Intelligence*, 48(3), 703–729. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10489-017-1001-5>
- Kang, B., Hu, Y., Deng, Y., & Zhou, D. (2016). A New Methodology of Multicriteria Decision-Making in Supplier Selection Based on α -Numbers. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2016, 1–17. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2016/8475987>
- Kang, B., Wei, D., Li, Y., & Deng, Y. (2012). A method of converting Z-number to classical fuzzy number. *Article in Journal of Information and Computational Science* (Vol. 9). Retrieved from <http://www.joics.com>
- Karami, A. (2011). *Utilization and Comparison Of Multi Attribute Decision Making Techniques To Rank Bayesian Master Degree Project In Informatics*. University of Skövde.
- Kilic, M. (2015). Investment project evaluation by a decision making methodology based on type-2 fuzzy sets, 27, 399–410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2014.11.028>
- Kumar, D., Singh, J., Singh, O. P., & Seema. (2013). A fuzzy logic based decision support system for evaluation of suppliers in supply chain management practices. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 57(11–12), 2945–2960. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcm.2013.03.002>
- Lala M. Zeinalova. (2014). Choquet Aggregation Based Decision Making Under Z-Information. *ICTACT Journal on Soft Computing: Special Issue On Soft Computing In System Analysis, Decision And Control*, 04(04), 819–824. <https://doi.org/10.21917/ijsc.2014.0117>
- Lee, C. C. (1990). Fuzzy Logic in Control Systems: Fuzzy Logic Controller—Part I. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 20(2), 404–418. <https://doi.org/10.1109/21.52551>
- Liu, H. C., Liu, L., Liu, N., & Mao, L. X. (2012). Risk evaluation in failure mode and effects analysis with extended VIKOR method under fuzzy environment. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 39(17), 12926–12934. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2012.05.031>
- Liu, H., & Wang, G. (2007). Multi-criteria decision-making methods based on intuitionistic fuzzy sets, 179, 220–233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2006.04.009>
- Madi, E. N., Garibaldi, J. M., & Wagner, C. (2017). Exploring the use of type-2 fuzzy sets in multi-criteria decision making based on TOPSIS. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems (FUZZ-IEEE)* (pp. 1–6). Naples. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FUZZ-IEEE.2017.8015664>

- Mahmoudi, A., Sadi-nezhad, S., & Makui, A. (2016). A Hybrid Fuzzy-Intelligent System for Group Multi-Attribute Decision Making. *International Journal of Fuzzy Systems*, 18(6), 1117–1130. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40815-016-0173-1>
- Malczewski, J. (1999). GIS and Multicriteria Decision Analysis. *New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.* <https://doi.org/10.1039/c5gc01615k>
- Mamdani, E. H., & Assilian, S. (1975). An Experiment in Linguistic Synthesis with a Fuzzy Logic Controller. *International Journal of Man Machine Studies*, 7, 1–13.
- Mansouri, M., & Leghris, C. (2020). A Use of Fuzzy TOPSIS to Improve the Network Selection in Wireless Multiaccess Environments. *Hindavi Journal of Computer Networks and Communications*, 2020, 1–12. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/3408326>
- Mardani, A., Jusoh, A., & Kazimieras, E. (2015). Expert Systems with Applications Fuzzy multiple criteria decision-making techniques and applications – Two decades review from 1994 to 2014. *Expert System with Applications*, 42(8), 4126–4148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2015.01.003>
- Meng, F., & An, Q. (2017). Knowledge-Based Systems A new approach for group decision making method with hesitant. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 0, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2017.03.010>
- Montgomery, D. C. (2017). *Design and Analysis of Experiments*. John Wiley & sons.
- Nuriyev, M. (2020). Z-numbers based hybrid mcdm approach for energy resources ranking and selection. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 10(6), 22–30. <https://doi.org/10.32479/ijeep.9950>
- Nursikuwagus, A., & Melian, L. (2020). Extended Fuzzy TOPSIS to Improve Prediction Student on Selection Properly Majors at Vocational School. *Journal of Engineering Science and Technology*, 9–20.
- Osiro, L., Lima-Junior, F. R., & Carpinetti, L. C. R. (2014). A fuzzy logic approach to supplier evaluation for development. *International Journal of Production Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2014.02.009>
- Palczewski, K., & Sałabun, W. (2019). The fuzzy TOPSIS applications in the last decade. In *Procedia Computer Science* (Vol. 159, pp. 2294–2303). Elsevier B.V. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2019.09.404>
- Pannell, D. J. (1997). Sensitivity analysis of normative economic models: Theoretical framework and practical strategies. *Agricultural Economics*, 16(2), 139–152. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5150\(96\)01217-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5150(96)01217-0)

- Peng, H. gang, & Wang, J. qiang. (2017). Hesitant Uncertain Linguistic Z-Numbers and Their Application in Multi-criteria Group Decision-Making Problems. *International Journal of Fuzzy Systems*, 19(5), 1300–1316. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40815-016-0257-y>
- Personal, M., Archive, R., & Mukherjee, K. (2014). *M P RA Supplier selection criteria and methods: past, present and future Supplier selection criteria and methods: past, present and future*. *Int. J. Operations Research* (Vol. x, No. x). Retrieved from <http://mp.ra.uni-muenchen.de/60079/>
- Ploskas, N., & Papathanasiou, J. (2019). A decision support system for multiple criteria alternative ranking using TOPSIS and VIKOR in fuzzy and nonfuzzy environments. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 377, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2019.01.012>
- Pouresmaeil, H., Shivanian, E., Khorram, E., & Fathabadi, H. S. (2017). an Extended Method Using Topsis and Vikor for Multiple Attribute Decision Making With Multiple Decision Makers and Single Valued Neutrosophic Numbers. *Advances and Applications in Statistics*, 50(4), 261–292. <https://doi.org/10.17654/as050040261>
- Qiu, D., Xing, Y., & Dong, R. (2018). On Ranking of Continuous Z-Numbers with Generalized Centroids and Optimization Problems Based on Z-Numbers. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 33(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/int.21928>
- Rani, P., Mishra, A. R., Mardani, A., Cavallaro, F., Alrasheedi, M., & Alrashidi, A. (2020). A novel approach to extended fuzzy TOPSIS based on new divergence measures for renewable energy sources selection. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 257, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120352>
- Rezaei, J., & Ortt, R. (2013a). Industrial Marketing Management Supplier segmentation using fuzzy logic. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42(4), 507–517. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2013.03.003>
- Rezaei, J., & Ortt, R. (2013b). Supplier segmentation using fuzzy logic. *Industrial Marketing Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2013.03.003>
- Rosanisah, W., Mohd, W., & Abdullah, L. (2017). Aggregation Methods in Group Decision Making : A Decade Survey, 41, 71–86.
- Sadi-Nezhad, S., & Sotoudeh-Anvari, A. (2015). A new Data Envelopment Analysis under uncertain environment with respect to fuzziness and an estimation of reliability. *Opsearch*, 53(1), 103–115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12597-015-0217-6>

- Sadikoglu, F., Huseynov, O., & Memmedova, K. (2016). Z-Regression Analysis in Psychological and Educational Researches. *Procedia Computer Science*, 102(August), 385–389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2016.09.416>
- Sahin, B., Yip, T. L., Tseng, P. H., Kabak, M., & Soylu, A. (2020). An application of a fuzzy TOPSIS multi-criteria decision analysis algorithm for dry bulk carrier selection. *Information (Switzerland)*, 11(5). <https://doi.org/10.3390/INFO11050251>
- Sahrom, N.A., & Mohd Dom, R. (2015). a Z-Number Extension of the Hybrid Analytic Hierarchy Process – Fuzzy Data Envelopment Analysis for Risk Assessment. *International Conference on Research and Education in Mathematics (ICREM7)*, 19–24.
- Salari, M., Bagherpour, M., & Wang, J. (2014). A novel earned value management model using Z-number. *International Journal of Applied Decision Sciences*, 7(1), 97. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJADS.2014.058037>
- Salih, M. M., Zaidan, B. B., Zaidan, A. A., & Ahmed, M. A. (2019). Survey on fuzzy TOPSIS state-of-the-art between 2007 and 2017. *Computers and Operations Research*, 104, 207–227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2018.12.019>
- Sanayei, A., Mousavi, S. F., & Yazdankhah, A. (2010). Expert Systems with Applications Group decision making process for supplier selection with VIKOR under fuzzy environment. *Expert Systems With Applications*, 37(1), 24–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2009.04.063>
- Sari, K. (2017). Modeling of a Fuzzy Expert System for Choosing an Appropriate Supply Chain Collaboration Strategy. *Intelligent Automation and Soft Computing*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10798587.2017.1352258>
- Sen, D. K., Datta, S., Patel, S. K., & Mahapatra, S. S. (2015). Multi-criteria decision making towards selection of industrial robot Exploration of PROMETHEE II method. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 22(3), 465–487. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-01-2013-0002>
- Sevkli, M. (2010). An application of the fuzzy ELECTRE method for supplier selection. *International Journal of Production Research*, 48(12), 3393–3405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207540902814355>
- Shemshadi, A., Shirazi, H., Toreihi, M., & Tarokh, M. J. (2011). Expert Systems with Applications A fuzzy VIKOR method for supplier selection based on entropy measure for objective weighting. *Expert Systems With Applications*, 38(10), 12160–12167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2011.03.027>
- Simon, H. A. (1960). *The new science of management decision*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

- Soroudi, A., & Amraee, T. (2013). Decision making under uncertainty in energy systems: State of the art. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 28, 376–384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2013.08.039>
- Sotoudeh-Anvari, A., & Sadi-Nezhad, S. (2015). A new approach based on the level of reliability of information to determine the relative weights of criteria in fuzzy TOPSIS. *International Journal of Applied Decision Sciences*, 8(2), 164. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJADS.2015.069603>
- Takagi, T., & Sugeno, M. (1985). Fuzzy Identification of Systems and Its Applications to Modeling and Control, (1), 116–132.
- Tavana, M., & Hatami-Marbini, A. (2011). A group AHP-TOPSIS framework for human spaceflight mission planning at NASA. *Expert Systems with Applications*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2011.04.108>
- Triantaphyllou, E., & Rouge, B. (1997). A Sensitivity Analysis Approach for Some Deterministic Multi-Criteria Decision. *Decisions Science*, 28(1), 151–194.
- Tzeng, G.-H., & Huang, J.-J. (2011). *Multiple Attribute Decision Making: Methods and Applications*.
- Vahdani, B., Mousavi, S. M., Tavakkoli-moghaddam, R., & Hashemi, H. (2013). A new design of the elimination and choice translating reality method for multi-criteria group decision-making in an intuitionistic fuzzy environment. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 37(4), 1781–1799. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apm.2012.04.033>
- Vinodh, S., Ramiya, R. A., & Gautham, S. G. (2011). Application of fuzzy analytic network process for supplier selection in a manufacturing organisation. *Expert Systems With Applications*, 38(1), 272–280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2010.06.057>
- Wan, S. P., Wang, F., & Dong, J. Y. (2016). A novel group decision making method with intuitionistic fuzzy preference relations for RFID technology selection. *Applied Soft Computing Journal* (Vol. 38). Elsevier B.V. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2015.09.039>
- Wang, F., & Mao, J. (2019). Approach to Multicriteria Group Decision Making with Z-Numbers Based on TOPSIS and Power Aggregation Operators. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/3014387>
- Wang, Y. M., Yang, J. B., Xu, D. L., & Chin, K. S. (2006). On the centroids of fuzzy numbers. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 157(7), 919–926. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2005.11.006>
- Wu, J. W. J., Wang, J., & Chen, H. Z. X. (2016). Multi-criteria decision-making methods based on the Hausdorff distance of hesitant fuzzy linguistic numbers, 20(4), 1621–1633. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-015-1609-5>

- Yaakob, A. M., & Gegov, A. (2015). Fuzzy Rule Based Approach with Z-Numbers for Selection of Alternatives using TOPSIS Fuzzy Rule Based Approach with Z-Numbers for Selection of Alternatives using TOPSIS performance. In *IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems (FUZZ-IEEE)* (pp. 1–8). <https://doi.org/10.1109/FUZZ-IEEE.2015.7337862>
- Yaakob, A. M., Naim, K. M., Khalif, K., Gegov, A., Fatimah, S., & Rahman, A. (2015). Interval Type 2- Fuzzy Rule based System Approach for Selection of Alternatives using TOPSIS, 2(Ijcci), 112–120.
- Yager, R. R. (2012). On Z-Valuations Using Zadeh's Z-Numbers. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 27(2), 259–278. <https://doi.org/10.1002/int>
- Zadeh, L. A. (1965). Fuzzy Sets. *Information Control*.
- Zadeh, L. A. (1975). The Concept of a Linguistic Variable and its Application to Approximate Reasoning-I. *Information Sciences*, 8(3), 199–249.
- Zadeh, Lotfi A. (2011). A Note on Z-numbers. *Information Sciences*, 181(14), 2923–2932. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2011.02.022>
- Zanakis, S. H., Solomon, A., Wishart, N., & Dubish, S. (1998). *Multi-attribute decision making: A simulation comparison of select methods*. *European Journal of Operational Research* (Vol. 7).
- Zanon, L. G., Munhoz Arantes, R. F., Calache, L. D. D. R., & Carpinetti, L. C. R. (2019). A decision making model based on fuzzy inference to predict the impact of SCOR® indicators on customer perceived value. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2019.107520>
- Zavadskas, E. K., Govindan, K., Antucheviciene, J., & Turskis, Z. (2016). Hybrid multiple criteria decision-making methods: a review of applications for sustainability issues. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 29(1), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2016.1237302>
- Zeinalova, L. M. (2014). Expected Utility Based Decision Making Under Z-Information. *Intelligent Automation & Soft Computing*, 20(3), 419–431. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10798587.2014.901650>
- Zeinalova, L. M., & Mammadova, M. A. (2016). Decision making on oil extraction under z-information, 102(August), 168–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2016.09.385>
- Zhang, Z., & Zhang, S. (2012). A novel approach to multi attribute group decision making based on trapezoidal interval type-2 fuzzy soft sets. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 37(7), 4948–4971. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apm.2012.10.006>

BIODATA OF STUDENT



Saeed Bahrami was born in Qazvin, Iran, in 1971. He is married and has a son. He received his B.S. degree in Computer Software Engineering from the Qazvin Azad University in 1997. From 1999 to 2001, he had studied for an M.Sc of Computer Software Engineering at Najafabad Azad University. After gaining work experience in the fields of education and research, he began his doctoral studies at UPM University in the field of computer science, majoring in intelligent systems in the second semester of 2015-2016. Her field of work was solving decision problems by using fuzzy rule base system. The title of his thesis was "fuzzy rule-based approach with z-numbers in solving group multi-attribute decision making problems". He succeeded in defending her thesis in May 2021. He succeeded to extract three papers from his research, as well.

From 2000 up to now, he is a faculty member of Farhangian University in Iran. This University is special to teacher training for the ministry of education. He has experience in teaching at some other universities as Azad University and PNU University as he is interested in teaching. His area of research interests includes Mobile agents, E-learning, Decision-Making and Fuzzy Logic.

Moreover, he has conducted some research projects for universities and has published dozens of papers, as well as four books. He was honored as the best lecturer at Farhangian University in 2011. He is currently working as the director of the Center for Innovation and Entrepreneurship at Farhangian University in Qazvin.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Saeed Bahrami, Razali Yaakob, Azreen Azman, Rodziah Atan, (2018), A Review on Z-numbers, *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 7(4.31), 487-490.

Saeed Bahrami, Razali Yaakob, Azreen Azman, Rodziah Atan, (2020), An Integrated of Fuzzy Rule Base System and TOPSIS Technique for Multi-Attribute Decision Making Problems, *International Conference On Software Engineering AND Information Management (ICSIM2020)*, Sydney, Australia, January 12-15, 2020.





UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

STATUS CONFIRMATION FOR THESIS / PROJECT REPORT AND COPYRIGHT

ACADEMIC SESSION : _____

TITLE OF THESIS / PROJECT REPORT :

NAME OF STUDENT : _____

I acknowledge that the copyright and other intellectual property in the thesis/project report belonged to Universiti Putra Malaysia and I agree to allow this thesis/project report to be placed at the library under the following terms:

1. This thesis/project report is the property of Universiti Putra Malaysia.
2. The library of Universiti Putra Malaysia has the right to make copies for educational purposes only.
3. The library of Universiti Putra Malaysia is allowed to make copies of this thesis for academic exchange.

I declare that this thesis is classified as :

*Please tick (v)

☐

CONFIDENTIAL

(Contain confidential information under Official Secret Act 1972).

☐

RESTRICTED

(Contains restricted information as specified by the organization/institution where research was done).

☐

OPEN ACCESS

I agree that my thesis/project report to be published as hard copy or online open access.

This thesis is submitted for :

☐

PATENT

Embargo from _____ until _____
(date) (date)

Approved by:

(Signature of Student)
New IC No/ Passport No.:

Date :

(Signature of Chairman of Supervisory Committee)
Name:

Date :

[Note : If the thesis is CONFIDENTIAL or RESTRICTED, please attach with the letter from the organization/institution with period and reasons for confidentiality or restricted.]