Applied Soft Computing xxx (2014) xxx-xxx



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Applied Soft Computing



41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/asoc

Site selection in waste management by the VIKOR method using linguistic assessment

3 Q1 Hu-Chen Liu^{a,b}, Jian-Xin You^{a,b}, Xiao-Jun Fan^a, Yi-Zeng Chen^{a, a}

^a School of Management, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, PR China

^b School of Economics and Management, Tongji University, Shanghai 200092, PR China 5

ARTICLE INFO 70

Article history:

Received 12 January 2013 10

Received in revised form 20 March 2014 11

Accepted 3 April 2014 12

13 Available online xxx

14 Keywords: 15

VIKOR method 16

17 Multi-criteria decision making

18 Municipal solid waste management

Interval 2-tuple 19

ABSTRACT

Site selection is an important issue in municipal solid waste (MSW) management. Selection of the appropriate solid waste site is an extensive evaluation process that requires consideration of multiple alternative solutions and evaluation criteria. In reality, it is easier for decision makers to express their judgments on the alternatives by using linguistic terms, and there usually exists uncertain and incomplete assessment information. Moreover, decision makers may have different risk attitudes in the siting process because of their different backgrounds and personalities. Therefore, an attitudinal-based interval 2-tuple linguistic VIKOR (ITL-VIKOR) method is proposed in this paper to select the best disposal site for MSW. The feasibility and practicability of the proposed method are further demonstrated through an example of refuse-derived fuel (RDF) combustion plant location. Results show that the new approach is more suitable and effective to handle the MSW site selection problems by considering the decision maker's attitudinal character and incorporating the uncertain and incomplete assessment information. © 2014 Published by Elsevier B.V.

1. Introduction 21

Municipal solid waste (MSW) is the stream of solid waste gen-22 erated by households, commercial establishments, industries and 23 institutions, which consists of everyday items such as product 24 packaging, grass clippings, furniture, clothing, bottles, food scraps, 25 26 newspapers, appliances, paint and batteries [1]. The management of MSW is increasingly becoming a challenging task for the munic-27 ipal authorities due to increasing waste quantities, changing waste 28 composition, decreasing land availability for waste disposal sites 29 and increasing awareness about the environmental risk associated 30 with the waste management facilities [2]. The MSW management 31 system can be thought to be a cycle with many closely related 32 stages, which begins with the production of goods and continues 33 with generation, storage, sweeping, collection and final disposal of 34 waste [3]. Poor waste management systems coupled with hot cli-35 matic conditions result in increasing environmental problems with 36 significant local as well as global dimensions [4]. Therefore, effec-37 tive MSW management methods are desired to be developed, by 38

* Corresponding author at: School of Management, Shanghai University, 99 Shangda Road, Shanghai 200444, PR China. Tel.: +86 021 6613 7931; fax: +86 021 6613 4284.

E-mail addresses: huchenliu@foxmail.com (H.-C. Liu), mfcyz@shu.edu.cn (Y.-Z. Chen).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/i.asoc.2014.04.004 1568-4946/© 2014 Published by Elsevier B.V. which decision makers and waste management planners can deal with the increase in complexity, uncertainty, multi-objectivity, and subjectivity associated with the MSW management problem. In this paper, we focus on the final stage of the life cycle of MSW, i.e., the waste disposal.

MSW disposal sites have been the focus of special attention because they are a significant source of soil, water and air contamination. Selection of the appropriate solid waste facilities constitutes one of the primary issues of municipal solid waste disposal. Optimized siting decisions have gained considerable importance in order to ensure minimum damage to the various environmental sub-components as well as reduce the stigma associated with the residents living in its vicinity, thereby enhancing the overall sustainability associated with the MSW life cycle [4]. In the past decades, a number of mathematical analysis methods were proposed for supporting solid waste site selection problems. For example, Sener et al. [5] combined analytical hierarchy process (AHP) and geographic information system (GIS) to determine the landfill site for the Lake Beyşehir catchment area (Konya, Turkey). Sumathi et al. [4] used multi-criteria decision analysis and GIS for optimized siting of municipal solid waste landfill. Wang et al. [6] proposed the use of GIS based on AHP to select sites suitable for disposal of solid wastes. Other methods of integrating GIS with multi-criteria decision making (MCDM) for waste disposal site selection include [7–13]. In [14], the analytic network process (ANP) was applied to select the best location for the construction

Please cite this article in press as: H.-C. Liu, et al., Site selection in waste management by the VIKOR method using linguistic assessment, Appl. Soft Comput. J. (2014), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2014.04.004

2

84

85

of a MSW plant in the metropolitan area of Valencia (Spain). On the other hand, some fuzzy methods have been developed to deal 66 with the vagueness and ambiguity in the site selection process. For 67 instance, Ekmekçioğlu et al. [15] presented an approach based on 68 the use of fuzzy AHP-based fuzzy technique for order preference by 60 similarity to an ideal solution (TOPSIS) methodology for the selec-70 tion of appropriate disposal method and site for municipal solid 71 waste. Önüt and Soner [16] proposed a combined AHP and fuzzy 72 TOPSIS methodology for locating and selecting candidate areas in 73 the transshipment site selection process of the solid wastes. Chang 74 et al. [17] suggested an integrated approach of GIS and fuzzy AHP 75 to construct a spatial decision support system (SDSS) for the selec-76 tion of landfill sites. Akbari et al. [18] also integrated GIS and fuzzy 77 AHP to solve the landfill site selection problem and to develop a 78 ranking of the potential landfill areas based on a variety of crite-79 ria. In Ref. [19], a fuzzy MCDM approach was applied to solve the 80 landfill selection problem in Regina of Saskatchewan Canada. The 81 techniques that were used for the analysis of solid waste manage-82 ment systems include simple weighted addition (SWA) method, 83 weighted product (WP) method, TOPSIS, cooperative game theory, and ELECTRE.

86 The above literature review demonstrates that the majority of researchers concentrated on site selection methods applying lin-87 guistic value by using fuzzy logic to handle the uncertainty in real 88 situations. They usually deal with linguistic terms by using the 89 extension principle [20] and the symbolic method [21]. As a result, 90 an approximation process must be developed to express the results 91 in the initial expression domain, since the computation results usu-92 ally do not exactly match any of the initial linguistic terms. This 97 produces a loss of information and hence a lack of precision in the 94 final results [22-24]. In addition, decision makers are often unsure 95 of their preferences during the site selection process because of 96 time pressure, lack of experience and data. It is easier for a decision 97 maker to describe a value for an alternative by using linguistic terms 98 [16]. They often demonstrate different evaluations or opinions and 99 produce different types of assessment information for a certain 100 alternative concerning a given criterion, some of which may be pre-101 cise or imprecise, certain or uncertain, and complete or incomplete. 102 These different types of information are very hard to incorporate 103 into the site selection by using the traditional models and fuzzy 104 logic based methods. Whereas, the interval 2-tuple linguistic rep-105 resentation model [25-27] overcomes the above limitations. The 106 advantages of this approach are that decision makers can express 107 their preferences by the use of linguistic term sets with different 108 109 granularity of uncertainty and their judgments can be expressed with an interval 2-tuple from the predefined linguistic term set. 110 Therefore, the approach based on the interval 2-tuple linguistic 111 variables is more flexible and precise to deal with linguistic terms 112 in solving site selection problems in MSW management. 113

In other way, the evaluation of a new waste disposal site is a 114 difficult and complicated process and it requires taking into consid-115 eration many parameters (or criteria) such as distance to residential 116 area, distance from the main roads, investment costs, climate, avail-117 ability of solid waste, land slope, and so on [16]. In order to select the 118 best disposal location of the solid wastes to be collected it is neces-119 sary to make balance among these tangible and intangible factors 120 some of which may conflict and compete. Moreover, there may be 121 several decision makers take part in the evaluation of alternatives 122 together during the selection and the placement of waste disposal 123 facilities. For these reasons, waste facility selection can be viewed 124 as a group MCDM (GMCDM) problem and GMCDM methods have 125 been found to be a useful approach to solve this kind of problem. The 126 VIKOR (VIsekriterijumska optimizacija i KOmpromisno Resenje) 127 method, a very useful technique for GMCDM, was first developed 128 129 by Opricovic [28] to solve a discrete decision problem with non-130 commensurable and conflicting criteria. This method focuses on ranking and selecting from a set of alternatives, and determines compromise solutions for a problem with conflicting criteria, which can help the decision makers to reach a final decision [29,30]. The compromise solution is a feasible solution, which is the closest to the ideal, and a compromise means an agreement established by mutual concessions. The main advantages of the VIKOR method are that it introduces the multi-criteria ranking index based on the particular measure of "closeness" to the ideal solution [31], and the obtained compromise solution provides a maximum group utility for the "majority" and a minimum individual regret for the "opponent" [29]. Due to its characteristics and capabilities, the VIKOR method has been widely studied and applied in group decision making problems in recent years [32-40].

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

The background introduced above shows that it may be inappropriate to use fuzzy methods for evaluation and selection of waste disposal sites because of the loss of information in the linguistic information processing. Moreover, decision makers tend to use different linguistic term sets to express their judgments on the subjective criteria, and there usually exist uncertain and incomplete assessments. Therefore, the aim of this study is to present a new GMCDM method with interval 2-tuple linguistic information to solve the site selection problem under uncertain and incomplete information environment. The method is an extended VIKOR for group decision making with interval 2-tuple linguistic variables. It can overcome both the drawbacks of the crisp and fuzzy site section methods. Additionally, the risk attitudes of decision makers are taken into account in the assessments of alternatives to reflect different levels of optimism. In order to do so, the rest of the paper is set out as follows. In Section 2, some basic concepts of 2-tuple and interval 2-tuple linguistic variables are briefly reviewed. In Section 3, an extended VIKOR for group decision making is developed to solve the group multi-criteria site selection problem with interval 2-tuple linguistic information. A numerical example is provided in Section 4 to illustrate the developed methodology and the conclusions are drawn in Section 5.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. 2-Tuple linguistic variables

The 2-tuple linguistic representation model was firstly presented in [22] based on the concept of symbolic translation. It is used to represent the linguistic information by means of a linguistic 2-tuple, (s, α) , where s is a linguistic term from the predefined linguistic term set *S* and α is a numerical value representing the symbolic translation. In other words, a 2-tuple linguistic variable can be denoted as (s_i, α_i) , $s_i \in S$, where s_i represents the central value of the *i*th linguistic term and α_i indicates the distance to the central value of the *i*th linguistic term.

In the 2-tuple linguistic approach proposed by Herrera and Martínez [22], the range of β is between 0 and g, which is relevant to the granularity of the linguistic term sets. Here, β is the result of an aggregation of the indices of a set of labels assessed in a linguistic term set S. For overcoming the restriction, Chen and Tai [41] proposed a generalized 2-tuple linguistic model and translation functions.

Definition 1. Let $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_g\}$ be a linguistic term set and $\beta \in [0, 1]$ a value representing the result of a symbolic aggregation operation. Then the generalized translation function Δ used to obtain the 2-tuple linguistic variable equivalent to β can be defined as follows [41,42]:

$$\Delta: [0,1] \to S \times \left[-\frac{1}{2g}, \frac{1}{2g} \right) \tag{1}$$

Please cite this article in press as: H.-C. Liu, et al., Site selection in waste management by the VIKOR method using linguistic assessment, Appl. Soft Comput. J. (2014), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2014.04.004

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/495475

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/495475

Daneshyari.com