Solving robot selection problem by a new interval-valued hesitant fuzzy multi-attributes group decision method

S. M. Mousavi *, B. Vahdani ††, H. Gitinavard ‡, H. Hashemi ¶

Received Date: 2014-12-11 Revised Date: 2015-12-30 Accepted Date: 2016-01-01

Abstract

Selecting the most suitable robot among their wide range of specifications and capabilities is an important issue to perform the hazardous and repetitive jobs. Companies should take into consideration powerful group decision-making (GDM) methods to evaluate the candidates or potential robots versus the selected attributes (criteria). In this study, a new GDM method is proposed by utilizing the complex proportional assessment method under interval-valued hesitant fuzzy (IVHF)-environment. In the proposed method, a group of experts is established to evaluate the candidates or alternatives among the conflicted attributes. In addition, experts assign their preferences and judgments about the rating of alternatives and the relative importance of each attribute by linguistic terms which are converted to interval-valued hesitant fuzzy elements (IVHFEs). Also, the attributes weights and experts weights are applied in procedure of the proposed interval-valued hesitant fuzzy group decision-making (IVHF-GDM) method. Hence, the experts opinions about the relative importance of each attribute are considered in determination of attributes weights. Thus, we propose a hybrid maximizing deviation method under uncertainty. Finally, an illustrative example is presented to show the feasibility of the proposed IVHF-GDM method and also the obtained ranking results are compared with a recent method from the literature.
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1 Introduction

In a competitive marketing environment, selecting the most suitable robot is an important role to achieve the best quality product for some companies. In this respect, companies should be taken into account the best robot among some candidate robots versus their characteristics. Therefore, decision-making approaches are powerful tools to deal with this condition. Hence, some researchers are solved their robot selection problems based on the precise information [2, 21, 22].

In this regard, some decision methods and studies have been presented to solve the robot selection problems. Thus, Bhangale et al. [1] proposed a methodology based on the TOPSIS and graphical methods, and then compared the ranking results of two methods. Karsak and Ahiska [13] implemented an applicable common...
weight multi-attribute decision-making (MADM) methodology with an enhanced distinguishing power. Bhattacharya et al. [2] incorporated the quality function deployment and AHP methods to solve robot selection problem based on four candidates or alternatives and seven selected attributes (criteria). Chatterjee et al. [4] implemented two types of MADM methods, i.e. ELECTRE II and VIKOR methods. Also, Singh and Rao [25] extended a hybrid decision-making method based on incorporating the matrix approach and graph theory along with AHP method.

In real-life complex decision-making problems, the preferences and judgments of experts are difficult to be expressed precisely. In this case, the experts should define their opinions under fuzzy environments. Fuzzy sets theory has been first defined by Zadeh [33]; this theory and its extension have been widely utilized in imprecise conditions to solve the decision-making problems [9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 26, 28, 29]. The fields can consist of management [3, 15], pattern recognition [6, 20], artificial intelligence [30] and robot selection problems [12, 14].

In this respect, to solve the industrial robot selection problem based on decision-making analysis under the fuzzy environment, Devi [7] developed VIKOR method under an intuitionistic fuzzy environment, in which the evaluating the candidate robots and the attributes weights are defined by triangular intuitionistic fuzzy sets. Samantra et al. [24] presented an interval-valued trapezoidal fuzzy VIKOR method to deal with uncertainty in solving the decision-making problems. Vahdani et al. [27] developed a complex proportional assessment method based on the interval-valued fuzzy sets regarding to the objective information and subjective judgments. Rashid et al. [23] proposed a generalized interval-valued trapezoidal fuzzy TOPSIS method according to the subjective judgment and objective information. In their method, the experts opinions are aggregated on different attributes.

The investigation of the literature shows that applying the extensions of fuzzy sets theories are the powerful tools to solve the industrial robot selection problems under uncertainty. In this respect, one of the most appropriate tools is the interval-valued hesitant fuzzy sets (IVHFSs) that first introduced by Chen et al. [5], which help experts to define their opinions by some interval-values for a candidate robot in terms of the conflicted attributes under a set to margin of errors.

In this paper, a new group decision-making (GDM) method is developed under an interval-valued hesitant fuzzy (IVHF)-environment by utilizing the complex proportional assessment method. The weight of each attribute is computed based on the hybridization of the extended maximizing deviation method and the experts judgments about the significance of each attribute (criterion). However, the main purposes of this study are outlined: (1) we propose a GDM method in an interval-valued hesitant fuzzy setting by regarding the complex proportional assessment method, (2) we consider a group of experts to rating the candidates or alternatives among the conflicted attributes based on linguistic variables, (3) we propose a hybrid maximizing deviation method to determine the weight of each attribute, and (4) we consider the attributes and experts weights in procedure of the proposed IVHF-GDM method.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: some basic operations and concepts of IVHFSs are defined in Section 2. The procedure of the proposed IVHF-GDM method is defined in Section 3. Hence, an illustrative example about the robot selection problem, and a comparative analysis are presented in Section 4. Finally, some concluding remarks are provided in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, some operators in an interval-valued hesitant fuzzy setting are expressed which are applied in the proposed IVHF-GDM method.

Definition 2.1 Consider $X$ is a universe set, and then the IVHFS on this set is represented as follows:

$$\tilde{E} = \left\{ \langle x_i, \tilde{h}_{E}(x_i) \rangle \mid x_i \in X, i = 1, 2, ..., n \right\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

where $\tilde{h}_{E}(x_i)$ is defined as an interval membership degree for an object $x_i \in X$ under set $E$.

Definition 2.2 [5], Consider three interval-valued hesitant fuzzy elements (IVHFE) as $\tilde{h}, \tilde{h}_1$ and $\tilde{h}_2$, then some basic relations are represented
as follows:

\[
\tilde{h}^c = \left\{ \left[ 1 - \tilde{\gamma}_1^L, 1 - \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \right] \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h} \right\}; \quad (2.2)
\]

\[
\tilde{h}^\lambda = \left\{ \left[ (\tilde{\gamma}_1^L)^\lambda, (\tilde{\gamma}_1^U)^\lambda \right] \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h} \right\}; \quad (2.3)
\]

\[
\lambda \tilde{h} = \left\{ \left[ 1 - (1 - \tilde{\gamma}_1^L)^\lambda, 1 - (1 - \tilde{\gamma}_1^U)^\lambda \right] \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h} \right\}, \quad \lambda > 0; \quad (2.4)
\]

\[
\tilde{h}_1 \oplus \tilde{h}_2 = \left\{ \left[ \tilde{\gamma}_1^L + \tilde{\gamma}_2^L - \tilde{\gamma}_1^L \tilde{\gamma}_2^L, \tilde{\gamma}_1^U + \tilde{\gamma}_2^U - \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \tilde{\gamma}_2^U \right], \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in \tilde{h}_2 \right\}; \quad (2.5)
\]

\[
\tilde{h}_1 \otimes \tilde{h}_2 = \left\{ \left[ \tilde{\gamma}_1^L \tilde{\gamma}_2^L, \tilde{\gamma}_1^U \tilde{\gamma}_2^U \right], \mid \tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \tilde{h}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \in \tilde{h}_2 \right\}; \quad (2.6)
\]

**Definition 2.3** [5], The hesitant interval-valued fuzzy geometric (HIVFG) aggregation operator is demonstrated as follows:

\[
HIVFG(\tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2, \ldots, \tilde{h}_n) = \left( \bigoplus_{j=1}^{n} (\tilde{h}_j)^{w_j} \right)_{\tilde{w}_j} = \bigcup_{\gamma_1 \in \tilde{h}_1, \gamma_2 \in \tilde{h}_2, \ldots, \gamma_n \in \tilde{h}_n} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{n} (\gamma_j^{L_j})^{w_j} \right\} \quad (2.7)
\]

**Definition 2.4** [31], The hesitant interval-valued fuzzy weighted geometric (HIVFWG) aggregation operator is represented as follows:

\[
HIVFWG(\tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2, \ldots, \tilde{h}_n) = \left( \bigoplus_{j=1}^{n} (\tilde{h}_j)^{w_j} \right)_{\tilde{w}_j} = \bigcup_{\gamma_1 \in \tilde{h}_1, \gamma_2 \in \tilde{h}_2, \ldots, \gamma_n \in \tilde{h}_n} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{n} (\gamma_j^{L_j})^{w_j} \right\} \quad (2.8)
\]

where the weight vector of \( \tilde{h}_j (j = 1, \ldots, n) \) is indicated by \( w = (w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n)^T \) and \( w_j > 0 \), \( \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_j = 1 \).

**Definition 2.5** [8], Two types of ordering in an interval-valued hesitant fuzzy setting are defined. The hesitant interval-valued hesitant fuzzy decision matrix can be obtained by applying the following relation:

\[
b_{ij} = \bigcup_{t_{ij} \in b_{ij}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \gamma_{ij}^L \\ \gamma_{ij}^U \end{array} \right) \quad \text{for positive criteria}
\]

\[
b_{ij} = \bigcup_{t_{ij} \in b_{ij}} \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 - \gamma_{ij}^U \\ 1 - \gamma_{ij}^L \end{array} \right) \quad \text{for negative criteria}
\]

\[
M \leq \bar{N} \quad \text{if} \quad \text{Score}(M) \leq \text{Score}(\bar{N})
\]

**Definition 2.6** [34], The normalized interval-valued hesitant fuzzy decision matrix can be obtained by applying the following relation:

\[
b_{ij} = \bigcup_{t_{ij} \in b_{ij}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \mu_{ij}^L \\ \mu_{ij}^U \end{array} \right)
\]

\[
M = \left\{ \left[ \begin{array}{c} \mu_{11}^L, \mu_{11}^U \\ \mu_{21}^L, \mu_{21}^U \end{array} \right], \ldots, \left[ \begin{array}{c} \mu_{m1}^L, \mu_{m1}^U \\ \mu_{m2}^L, \mu_{m2}^U \end{array} \right] \right\}
\]

3 Proposed IVHF-GDM method

**Step 1.** Specify significant attributes (criteria) which satisfy the potential candidate or alternatives.

**Step 2.** Establish the interval-valued hesitant fuzzy decision matrix by utilizing a group of experts.
... ... \left[ \mu_{11}^L, \mu_{11}^U \right] 
... ... \left[ \mu_{m1}^L, \mu_{m1}^U \right] 
\left\{ \left[ \mu_{1n}^L, \mu_{1n}^U \right], \left[ \mu_{2n}^L, \mu_{2n}^U \right], \ldots, \left[ \mu_{mn}^L, \mu_{mn}^U \right] \right\}
(3.12)

**Step 3.** Compute the experts’ weights by considering the following relations:

\[
\lambda_k^L = \frac{\sum_i^{n} \sum_j^{m} \mu_{ij}^{kL}}{\sum_k^{K} \sum_i^{m} \sum_j^{n} \mu_{ij}^{kL}}
(3.13)
\]

\[
\lambda_k^U = \frac{\sum_i^{n} \sum_j^{m} \mu_{ij}^{kU}}{\sum_k^{K} \sum_i^{m} \sum_j^{n} \mu_{ij}^{kU}}
(3.14)
\]

**Step 4.** Calculate the attributes weights based on a hybrid maximizing deviation method.

**Step 4.1.** Aggregate the relative significance of attributes weights which specified by linguistic variables regarding to the experts judgments.

\[
\tilde{v}_j = HJIVFG(\tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_2, \ldots, \tilde{h}_n)
= \left( \oplus_{k=1}^{K} \left( \frac{\lambda_k^L \tilde{h}_k}{\lambda_k^U \tilde{h}_k} \right) \right)
= \cup_{\gamma_1 \in \mathbb{h}_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{h}_2, \ldots, \gamma_k \in \mathbb{h}_k}
\left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{K} \frac{1}{\lambda_k^L \gamma_k} + \prod_{j=1}^{K} \frac{1}{\lambda_k^U \gamma_k} \right\}^{-1}
(3.15)
\]

where \( \lambda_k = [\lambda_k^L, \lambda_k^U] \) is defined the weight of each expert.

**Step 4.2.** The maximizing deviation method for determining the attributes weights is defined by Xu and Zhang [32]. We specify the final weight of each attribute based on the extended maximizing deviation method and regarding to the experts opinions about the attributes weights.

\[
\omega_j = \left[ \tilde{v}_j, \sum_i^{m} \sum_k^{n} \left( \frac{1}{2f} \sum_{\lambda=1}^{l} \left( |h_j^{\sigma(\lambda)^L} - h_k^{\sigma(\lambda)^L}| + |h_j^{\sigma(\lambda)^U} - h_k^{\sigma(\lambda)^U}| \right) \right) \right]
\left( \sum_j^{n} \sum_i^{m} \sum_k^{n} \left( \frac{1}{2f} \sum_{\lambda=1}^{l} \left( |h_j^{\sigma(\lambda)^L} - h_k^{\sigma(\lambda)^L}| + |h_j^{\sigma(\lambda)^U} - h_k^{\sigma(\lambda)^U}| \right) \right)^2 \right) \frac{1}{2}
(3.16)
\]

where the normalized optimal weight vector is computed as follows:

\[
\omega^*_j = \frac{\omega_j}{\sum_j^{n} \omega_j}, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, n.
(3.17)
\]

**Step 5.** Establish the weighted normalized interval-valued decision matrix regarding to the attributes weights.

**Step 6.** Specify sums of positive attribute values \((R_i^P)\) and sums of negative attribute values \((R_i^N)\) by using the following relations, respectively:

\[
R_i^P = (1 - X_j) \left[ \Pi_{k=1}^{K} \left( 1 - \Pi_{j=1}^{l} \left( 1 - \mu_{ij}^u \right) \right) \right] \frac{1}{k},
\]

\[
\Pi_{k=1}^{K} \left( 1 - \Pi_{j=1}^{l} \left( 1 - \mu_{ij}^u \right) \right) \frac{1}{k} \forall i,
\]

\[
R_i^N = X_j \left[ \Pi_{k=1}^{K} \left( 1 - \Pi_{j=1}^{l} \left( 1 - \mu_{ij}^u \right) \right) \right] \frac{1}{k},
\]

\[
\Pi_{k=1}^{K} \left( 1 - \Pi_{j=1}^{l} \left( 1 - \mu_{ij}^u \right) \right) \frac{1}{k} \forall i,
(3.18)
\]

\[
\frac{R_i^P}{R_i^N} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} R_i^P & \forall X_j = 0 \text{ for positive attribute}(j) \\ R_i^N & \forall X_j = 0 \text{ for negative attribute}(j) \end{array} \right\}
(3.19)
\]

**Step 7.** Compute the minimum value of sums for negative attribute value as follows:

\[
R_{\min}^N = \left[ \min_{i} (R_i^N), \min_{i} (R_i^N) \right] \forall k
(3.20)
\]
Step 8. Determine the relative significance of each candidate potential alternative as follows:

\[
Q_i = \left[ R_{i1}^{lp} + (1 - R_{i1}^{lp}) \right] \\
\times \left[ 1 - \left( \Pi_i^m (1 - R_{i1}^{ln}) \right) R_{iN}^{\min} \left( R_{iN}^{ln} \right) \right] \\
\times \left[ 1 - \left( \Pi_i^m (1 - R_{i1}^{ln}) \right) R_{iN}^{\min} \left( R_{iN}^{ln} \right) \right] \forall i \) (3.21)
\]

Step 10. The utility degree for each potential alternative is computed as below:

\[
N_i = \left[ \frac{Q_i^l}{\max(Q_i^l)} \right] \times \left[ \frac{Q_i^u}{\max(Q_i^u)} \right] \times 100\% \) (3.22)
\]

Step 11. Select the best candidate alternative which has maximum value of utility degree regarding to ordering relation.

4 Illustrative example

In this section, an illustrative example which is adopted from Vahdani et al. [27] is presented to indicate the procedure of the proposed IVHF-multi-criteria group decision method. In addition, the proposed method is compared with Vahdani et al. [27] method to show the feasibility of the proposed method. In an illustrative example, there is a manufacturing company which requires a robot to perform the material handling. In this case, three robots (\( R_i, i = 1, 2, 3 \)) are considered as alternatives and also sixth attributes are selected. In addition, the candidate robots versus the conflicted attributes are evaluated based on the fourth experts judgments. The selected attributes are expressed as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Man-machine interface (\( C1 \));
  \item Programming flexibility (\( C2 \));
  \item Vendors service contract (\( C3 \));
  \item Load capacity (\( C4 \));
  \item Positioning accuracy (\( C5 \)); and
  \item Purchase cost (\( C6 \)).
\end{itemize}

The group of experts defines their preferences and judgments about the attributes significance and the rating of candidate robots among the selected attribute by linguistic variables and then, the linguistic variables are converted to the IVH-FEs. The linguistic terms and their hesitant fuzzy values about the attribute importance and evaluating the candidate robots are listed in Table 1 and 2, respectively. In addition, the opinions of each expert about the assessment of robots versus the attributes and the weight of each attribute are demonstrated by linguistic variables in Tables 3 and 4.

The weight of each expert is computed by using Eqs. (3.13) and (3.14). In addition, the relative importance of each attribute based on the experts opinions is determined by utilizing the Eq. (3.15). Then, the optimal attributes weight is obtained based on Eqs. (3.16) and (3.17). The computational results of determining the experts weights and attributes weights are demonstrated in Table 5. Hence, the normalized interval-valued hesitant fuzzy decision matrix is obtained based on definition 2.6. Then, the weighted normalized interval-valued hesitant fuzzy decision matrix is established.

Sums of positive/negative attributes values are assessed by using Eqs. (3.18) and (3.19), respectively. Thus, the smallest value of sums for negative attribute value is specified based on Eq. (3.20). The results are reported in Table 6. Finally, the relative importance and the utility degree of each candidate potential alternatives are computed by Eqs. (3.21) and (3.22), respectively. The potential alternatives are ranked based on the total ordering. The mentioned results are represented in Table 7. In this case, the worst and the best candidate robots are obtained (i.e., the first and the third robots). The ranking results of proposed method is compared with Vahdani et al. [27] method which have the same results. Consequently, the proposed IVHF-GDM method is feasible and powerful regarding to their considerable characteristics under uncertainty.

5 Conclusions

The robot selection problem is a complex issue for some companies that reduce the production cost and increase the product quality. This paper proposed a group decision-making (GDM) method in an interval-valued hesitant fuzzy (IVHF)-setting by the complex proportional assessment to se-
lect the best candidate robot. In the proposed method, the preferences and judgments of decision makers were defined by linguistic terms which were transformed to interval-valued hesitant fuzzy elements (IVHFEs). In addition, a hybrid maximizing deviation method was presented by incorporating the extended maximizing deviation method and the opinions of each decision maker about the relative significance of each attribute. In this respect, the optimal at-

Table 1: Linguistic variables for rating the importance of attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic variables</th>
<th>Hesitant interval-valued fuzzy elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high (VH)</td>
<td>[0.90, 0.90]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (H)</td>
<td>[0.75, 0.80]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (M)</td>
<td>[0.50, 0.55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (L)</td>
<td>[0.35, 0.40]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low (VL)</td>
<td>[0.10, 0.10]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Linguistic variables for rating the potential alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic variables</th>
<th>Hesitant interval-valued fuzzy elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely good (EG)</td>
<td>[1.00, 1.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very very good (VVG)</td>
<td>[0.90, 0.90]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good (VG)</td>
<td>[0.80, 0.90]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good (G)</td>
<td>[0.70, 0.80]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately good (MG)</td>
<td>[0.60, 0.70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair (F)</td>
<td>[0.50, 0.60]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately poor (MP)</td>
<td>[0.40, 0.50]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (P)</td>
<td>[0.25, 0.40]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor (VP)</td>
<td>[0.10, 0.25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very very poor (VVP)</td>
<td>[0.10, 0.10]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Performance ratings of the alternatives in linguistic variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
<th>Decision makers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>$R_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_1$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_2$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>$G$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_3$</td>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>$G$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_2$</td>
<td>$VG$</td>
<td>$G$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_3$</td>
<td>$G$ $F$</td>
<td>$VG$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3$</td>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_2$</td>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_3$</td>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>$G$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_4$</td>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>$G$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_2$</td>
<td>$MG$</td>
<td>$G$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_3$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_5$</td>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_2$</td>
<td>$MG$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_3$</td>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>$G$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_6$</td>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>$G$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_2$</td>
<td>$MG$</td>
<td>$MG$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_3$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Decision makers judgments about attributes weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Decision makers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$DM_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>VH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>VH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>VH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Experts weights and the attributes weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\lambda_i^f$</th>
<th>$\bar{v}_i$</th>
<th>$\omega_i^j$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.225080</td>
<td>[0.259560, 0.257426]</td>
<td>$\omega_1^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.191442</td>
<td>[0.229432, 0.233663]</td>
<td>$\omega_2^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.067535</td>
<td>[0.260718, 0.259406]</td>
<td>$\omega_3^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.237524</td>
<td>[0.250900, 0.249505]</td>
<td>$\omega_4^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.204737</td>
<td>[0.214696, 0.218288]</td>
<td>$\omega_5^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.073680</td>
<td>[0.214696, 0.218288]</td>
<td>$\omega_6^6$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Positive/negative attributes values and the minimum negative attributes value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robots</th>
<th>$R_i^P$</th>
<th>$R_i^N$</th>
<th>$R_{\min}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>[0.394022, 0.455495]</td>
<td>[0.024919, 0.036293]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_2$</td>
<td>[0.439182, 0.493126]</td>
<td>[0.039000, 0.050348]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_3$</td>
<td>[0.464669, 0.516752]</td>
<td>[0.052696, 0.065202]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Final $Q_i$ values regarding to each DM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robots</th>
<th>$Q_i$</th>
<th>$N_i$</th>
<th>Total ordering</th>
<th>Ranked by the proposed IVHF-GDM method</th>
<th>Ranked by Valhdani et al. [27] method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>[0.395818, 0.458570]</td>
<td>[84.8929, 88.2695]</td>
<td>86.5812%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_2$</td>
<td>[0.440844, 0.495989]</td>
<td>[94.5498, 95.4722]</td>
<td>95.011%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_3$</td>
<td>[0.466256, 0.519511]</td>
<td>[100,100]</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

attributes weight and the importance of each decision maker were applied in the proposed IVHF-GDM method. Finally, the proposed approach was implemented in an illustrative example. The results showed that the third robot was selected as the best robot and the worst robot was the first robot. Also, the comparative analysis which indicated the same ranking results was presented the feasibility and applicability of the proposed IVHF-GDM method. For future direction, the proposed method can be enhanced by proposing a method to determine the experts weights precisely. Also, the preferences and judgments of experts should be aggregated in last steps to pre-
vent the loss of data.
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 حل مسئله انتخاب ربات بوسیله یک روش جدید تصمیم گیری گروهی چند معیاره فازی ترددی پازه ای

چکیده:

انتخاب مناسبترین ربات از میان محدوده و سیگنال از قابلیت ها و ویژگی های پاکشان، یک مسئله مهم برای اجرای فعالیت های خطرناک و تکراری است. شرکت ها بهره است که روش های تصمیم‌گیری گروهی توأم‌مند را به منظور ارزیابی ربات‌های کاندید تحت مبناهای مختلف قرار دهند. در این مطالعه، یک روش جدید تصمیم‌گیری گروهی با در نظر گرفتن روش ارزیابی نسبی پیچیده تحت میدان ثابتی پازه ای ارائه می‌شود. در روش پیشنهادی، گروهی از خبرنگان به منظور ارزیابی کاندیداها یا گزینه‌ها تحت معیارهای مناسب، تکمیل می‌شود. بعلاوه، خبرنگان نظارت خود را در مورد ارزیابی گزینه‌ها و اهمیت نسبی هر معیار بوسیله ی متفاوت‌های فیزیکی ارائه می‌آورند که سیستم آنها به عنصر فازی ترددی پازه ای تبدیل می‌شود. همچنین، وزن معیارها و خبرنگان در فرآیند روش پیشنهادی فازی تصمیم‌گیری گروهی گروهی ترددی پازه ای عامل می‌گردد. از این روش، نظارت خبرنگان در مورد اهمیت نسبی هر معیار نیز در تعیین وزن معیارها در نظر گرفته می‌شود. بنابراین، می‌توان روش پیشنهادی انحراف ترکیبی تحت عدم قطعیت ارائه‌های نیز در پایان، یک مثال تشکیل‌دهنده به منظور نشان دادن شدیدی بودن روش پیشنهادی تصمیم‌گیری گروهی چند معیاره ترددی پازه ای ارائه شده است و همچنین نتایج رتبه‌بندی بسته آمده نیز با یک روش موجود در ادبیات اخیر مورد مقایسه قرار گرفته است.