

# Ensuring reliability of the weighting vector: Weak consistent pairwise comparison matrices

Bice Cavallo <sup>\*</sup>, Livia D'Apuzzo

*Department of Architecture, University of Naples "Federico II", Via Toledo 402, 80134 Naples, Italy*

Received 24 November 2014; received in revised form 27 May 2015; accepted 30 May 2015

Available online 3 June 2015

## Abstract

In the context of Pairwise Comparison Matrices (PCMs) defined over abelian linearly ordered group,  $\odot$ -consistency and  $\odot$ -transitivity represent a full coherence of the Decision Maker (DM) and the minimal logical requirement that DM's preferences should satisfy, respectively. Moreover, the  $\odot$ -mean vector  $w_{m_\odot}$  is proposed as weighting vector for the decision elements related to the PCM. In this paper, we investigate the effects of  $\odot$ -inconsistency of a  $\odot$ -transitive PCM on  $w_{m_\odot}$  and, in order to ensure its reliability as weighting vector, we provide the notion of weak  $\odot$ -consistency; it is weaker than  $\odot$ -consistency and stronger than  $\odot$ -transitivity, and ensures that vectors associated with a PCM, by means of a strictly increasing synthesis functional, are reliable for assigning a preference order on the set of related decision elements. The  $\odot$ -mean vector  $w_{m_\odot}$  is associated with a PCM by means of one of these functionals. Finally, we introduce an order relation on the rows of the PCM, that is a simple order if and only if the condition of weak  $\odot$ -consistency is satisfied; the simple order allows us to easily determine the actual ranking on the set of related decision elements.

© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** Multiple criteria evaluation; Abelian linearly ordered group; Pairwise comparison matrix; Weak  $\odot$ -consistency; Coherent priority vector

## 1. Introduction

The quantitative pairwise comparisons are a useful tool for estimating the relative weights on a set  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  of decision elements such as criteria or alternatives. Pairwise comparisons can be modeled by a quantitative preference relation on  $X$ :

$$\mathcal{A} : (x_i, x_j) \in X \times X \rightarrow a_{ij} = \mathcal{A}(x_i, x_j) \in \mathbb{R}$$

where  $a_{ij}$  quantifies the preference intensity of  $x_i$  over  $x_j$ . When the cardinality of  $X$  is small,  $\mathcal{A}$  can be represented by the *Pairwise Comparison Matrix (PCM)*

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author. Tel.: +39 081 2538913; fax: +39 081 2538909.

E-mail addresses: [bice.cavallo@unina.it](mailto:bice.cavallo@unina.it) (B. Cavallo), [liviadap@unina.it](mailto:liviadap@unina.it) (L. D'Apuzzo).

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2n} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \dots & a_{nn} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

In the literature, several kinds of PCMs are considered: if  $a_{ij} \in ]0, +\infty[$  represents a preference ratio, then  $\mathcal{A}$  is a *multiplicative* preference relation and  $A$  a *multiplicative* PCM; if  $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{R} = ]-\infty, +\infty[$  represents a preference difference, then  $\mathcal{A}$  is an *additive* preference relation and  $A$  an *additive* PCM; if  $a_{ij} \in [0, 1]$  reflects a preference degree, then  $\mathcal{A}$  is called fuzzy preference relation [14,19] and, as a consequence,  $A$  can be called fuzzy PCM.

If the DM is fully coherent when expresses his preferences, then the PCM satisfies the *consistency* condition; several kinds of consistency are proposed in literature: multiplicative consistency [23], additive consistency [1], fuzzy additive consistency (called additive transitivity in [25,15]), and fuzzy multiplicative consistency (called multiplicative transitivity in [15,24]).

Many authors have studied the problem of the inconsistency of a PCM, for instance: Saaty [22] proposes a consistency index defined in terms of the principal eigenvalue; Barzilai [1] proposes the relative error; Peláez and Lamata [20] propose a measure of consistency based on the determinant of the PCM; Bortot and Marques Pereira [5] propose a measure of dominance inconsistency in the framework of Choquet integration; Brunelli and Fedrizzi [6] present five axioms aimed at characterizing inconsistency indices.

In order to unify different approaches to PCMs and remove some drawbacks, in [8] the authors introduce PCMs defined over an abelian linearly ordered group (*alo-group*)  $\mathcal{G} = (G, \odot, \leq)$ , with identity element  $e$  (a comparison between an alo-group and a semiring, for dealing with PCMs, is performed in [7]).

In this general context, conditions of  $\odot$ -reciprocity and  $\odot$ -consistency are proposed. If  $\mathcal{G}$  is divisible, then, by means of a mean operator  $m_\odot$ ,  $\odot$ -consistency index  $I_{\mathcal{G}}$  (see [13] for its properties) and  $\odot$ -mean vector  $\mathbf{w}_{m_\odot}$  [10] are defined for measuring  $\odot$ -consistency and providing the weights for the alternatives/criteria, respectively. Under assumption of  $\odot$ -reciprocity, we set [11]:

$$x_i \succ x_j \Leftrightarrow a_{ij} > e, \quad x_i \sim x_j \Leftrightarrow a_{ij} = e, \quad (2)$$

where  $x_i \succ x_j$  and  $x_i \sim x_j$  stand for “ $x_i$  is strictly preferred to  $x_j$ ” and “ $x_i$  is indifferent to  $x_j$ ”, respectively, and

$$x_i \succsim x_j \Leftrightarrow (x_i \succ x_j \text{ or } x_i \sim x_j) \Leftrightarrow a_{ij} \geq e, \quad (3)$$

that stands for “ $x_i$  is weakly preferred to  $x_j$ ”.

Finally, in [11],  $\odot$ -transitivity, equivalent to transitivity of  $\succsim$ , ensures a rearrangement  $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)$  of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that:

$$x_{i_1} \succsim x_{i_2} \succsim \dots \succsim x_{i_n}; \quad (4)$$

equation (4) is called the *actual ranking* on  $X$ .

Under  $\odot$ -consistency condition, the weighting vector  $\mathbf{w}_{m_\odot}$  provides a preference order on  $X$  equal to the actual ranking. Unfortunately,  $\odot$ -consistency is hard to reach in real situations; thus, it may happen that the weighting vector  $\mathbf{w}_{m_\odot}$  provides a preference order on  $X$  different from the actual ranking.

This paper aims at dealing with the following research question:

**RQ.** Let  $A = (a_{ij})$  be a  $\odot$ -transitive PCM. Under which conditions weaker and easier to reach in real situations than  $\odot$ -consistency, does the weighting vector  $\mathbf{w}_{m_\odot}$  provide a preference order on  $X$  equal to the actual ranking?

We provide an answer to **RQ**, by introducing the *weak  $\odot$ -consistency* condition.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces preliminaries and notation useful in the sequel. Section 3 considers  $\odot$ -reciprocal PCMs, by focusing on  $\odot$ -transitive PCMs,  $\odot$ -consistent PCMs, and effects of  $\odot$ -inconsistency on the weighting vector  $\mathbf{w}_{m_\odot}$ . Section 4 introduces the weak  $\odot$ -consistency: Section 4.1 provides its characterizations; Section 4.2 shows that reaching and checking the weak  $\odot$ -consistency is easier than reaching and checking the  $\odot$ -consistency; Section 4.3 shows that the vectors associated with a weakly  $\odot$ -consistent PCM, by means of strictly increasing synthesis functionals, e.g.  $\mathbf{w}_{m_\odot}$ , provide a preference order on  $X$  equal to actual ranking. Section 5 provides concluding remarks and directions for future work.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/389141>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/389141>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)