Sensitivity Analysis in the QUALIFLEX and VIKOR Methods

Alireza Alinezhad[a,*], Nima Esfandiari[b]

[a] Assistant Professor, Department of industrial & Mechanical engineering, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin Branch, Qazvin, Iran.

[b]MSc, Department of industrial & Mechanical engineering, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin Branch, Qazvin, Iran.

Abstract

The sensitivity analysis for multi-attribute decision making (MADM) problems is important for two reasons: First, the decision matrix as the source of the results of a decision problem is inaccurate because it sorts the alternatives in each criterion inaccurately. Second, the decision maker may change his opinions in a time period because of changes in the importance of the criteria and in the policy of the organization over time. This in turn makes problem solving really time-consuming. Therefore, the best solution is to do sensitivity analysis. In this regard, this paper considers a sensitivity analysis in the QUALIFLEX method which is a compromise ranking method used for multi-criteria decision making (MCDM).

Keywords: Sensitivity Analysis; QUALIFLEX, VIKOR; Multi-criteria Decision Making; Multi-attribute Decision Making.

1. Introduction

Generally, as organizations have limited resources for fulfilling their goals, managers should always make important decisions regarding selecting the best option among different alternatives. Simple examples include deciding about what to buy, how to arrive to a place, where to go, and whom to employ. Decisions are made about various issues from logistics management, customer relationship management, marketing to production planning.

The process of decision making involves complications. Specifically, decision makers sometimes should deal with multi-attribute decision making (MADM) problems. MADM refers to making preference decision over the available alternatives that are characterized by multiple, usually conflicting, attributes. Inter and intra- attribute comparisons between alternatives enable decision makers to make the final decision (Lu, 2007).

Mathematically, a typical MADM method can be formulated as follows:

$$\begin{cases} Max(Min)A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m \\ S.t: \qquad C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n \end{cases} \qquad (1)$$

Where$A = (A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m)$ denotes m alternatives and C= $(C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n)$represents n attributes (often called criteria) for characterizing a decision situation. The *select* here is normally based on maximizing a multi-attribute value (or utility) function elicited from the stakeholders.

*Corresponding Author E-mail: alinezhad@qiau.ac.ir

The basic information involved in this model can be expressed by this matrix:

$$D = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} C_1 & C_2 & \ldots & C_n \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \\ \vdots \\ A_m \end{matrix} & \begin{bmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & \cdots & x_{1n} \\ x_{12} & x_{22} & \cdots & x_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{m1} & x_{m2} & \cdots & x_{mn} \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

$$W = [w_1 w_2 \ldots w_n]$$

where $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m$ are alternatives from which decision makers choose; $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n$ are attributes with which alternative performances are measured and x_{ij} i=1,…,m, j=1,…,n, is the rating of alternative A_i with respect to attribute C_j; and W_j is the weight of attribute C_j.

Alternatives, Criteria and weights are the three important factors in a MADM method. As weights of criteria are very important, any change in the weighting made by the Decision maker can change the ranking of alternatives. There are several methods for solving MADM problems. The difference between them lies in the approach to omitting alternatives.

The outline of the present paper is as follows: an introduction to the QUALIFLEX and VIKOR methods is presented in section 2, the sensitivity analysis of the QUALIFLEX and VIKOR methods are discussed in section3, numerical examples are provided in section4 and finally section 5 presents conclusions.

2. Introduction to the Methods

2.1. The QUALIFLEX Method

The starting point of QUALIFLEX (Paelinck, 1976), (Paelinck, 1997) was a generalization of Jacquet Lagrèze's permutation method (Guigouet, 1973). The QUALIFLEX method is based on the evaluation of all possible rankings (permutations) of alternatives under consideration. It is based on the comparisons among the comprehensive rankings of the alternatives and evaluations of alternatives according to each criterion from family F (Impact Matrix). For each couple of alternatives of permutations, a concordance and discordance index should be computed which reflects the concordance and discordance of their ranks and their evaluation preorder from the impact matrix.

This index is firstly computed at the level of single criterion, and then at a comprehensive level with respect to all possible rankings. We try to identify the permutation whose ranking best reflects (the most compromise between) the preorders according to each criterion from F and multi-criteria evaluation table.

Given the set of alternatives A, the concordance/discordance index for each couple of alternatives (a, b), $a, b \in A$, at the level of preorder according to the criterion $g_j \in F$ and the ranking corresponding to the Kth permutation is:

$$I_{jk}(a,b) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if there is concordance} \\ 0 & \text{if there is aequo} \\ -1 & \text{if there is discordance} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

There is concordance (discordance) if a and b are ranked (not ranked) in the same order within the two preorders, and *ex* aequo if they have the same rank. The concordance/discordance index between the pre-order according to the criterion and the ranking corresponding to the Kth permutation is:

$$I_{jk} = \sum_{a,b \in A} I_{jk}(a,b). \quad (3)$$

The comprehensive concordance/discordance index for the Kth permutation is:

$$I_k = \sum_j \pi_j I_{jk}(a,b). \quad (4)$$

Where π_j is the weight of criterion g_j, $j=1,2,...,n$. The number of permutations $k(per_k)$ is $m!$ Where $m = |A|$ The best compromise corresponds to the permutation that maximizes I_k. (Martel et al. 2005)

2.2. The VIKOR Method

The VIKOR method was developed for multi-criteria optimization of complex systems by Opricovic in 1998. It determines the compromise ranking-list, the compromise solution, and the weight stability intervals for the preference stability of the compromise solution obtained from the initial (given) weights. This method focuses on ranking and selecting from a set of alternatives in the presence of conflicting criteria. It introduces the multi-criteria ranking index based on the particular measure of ''closeness'' to the ''ideal'' solution (Opricovic et al., 2004).

The VIKOR method involves the following steps ((Martel et al. 2005), [16]):

Step1. Determine the normalized Decision Matrix

The normalized decision matrix can be expressed as follows:

$$F = [f_{ij}]_{m \times n} \quad (5)$$

Where $f_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{ij}^2}}$, $i=1,...,m$, $j=1,...,n$, and x_{ij} is the performance of alternative A_j with respect to the jth Criterion.

Step2. Determine the ideal and negative ideal solutions

The ideal solution A^* and negative ideal solution A^- are as follows:

$$A^* = \{(\max f_{ij} | j \in J) \text{ or } (\min f_{ij} | j \in J) | i = 1,2,...,m\} = \{f_1^*, f_2^*, ..., f_j^*, ..., f_n^*\} \quad (6)$$

$$A^- = \{(\min f_{ij} | j \in J) \text{ or } (\max f_{ij} | j \in J) | i = 1,2,...,m\} = \{f_1^-, f_2^-, ..., f_j^-, ..., f_n^-\} \quad (7)$$

Where
$$J = \{j = 1,2,...,n | f_{ij}, a \text{ larger respond is desired}\}$$
and
$$J' = \{j = 1,2,...,n | f_{ij}, a \text{ smaller respond is desired}\}.$$

Step3. Calculate the Utility and the Regret measure

The utility measure and the regret measure for each alternative are:

$$S_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_j \times (f_j^* - f_{ij})/(f_j^* - f_j^-) \quad (8)$$
$$R_i = \max_j [w_j \times (f_j^* - f_{ij})/(f_j^* - f_j^-)] \quad (9)$$

Where S_i represents the utility measure, R_i represents the regret measure, and w_j is the weight of the jth Criterion.

Step4. Calculate the VIKOR index.

The VIKOR index can be as follows:

$$Q_i = v \left[\frac{S_i - S^*}{S^- - S^*}\right] + (1-v) \left[\frac{R_i - R^*}{R^- - R^*}\right] \quad (10)$$

Where Qi represents the Ith alternative VIKOR value $I=1,...,m$; $S^* = \min_i S_i$, $S^- = \max_i S_i$, $R^* = \min_i R_i$, $R^- = \max_i R_i$

And v is the weight of the maximum group utility and usually set to 0.5 (Kacker, 1985 and Opricovic, 1994).

Step5. Rank the order of preference

The alternative with the smallest VIKOR value is the best solution.

3. Sensitivity Analysis

The literature on sensitivity analysis began with Evans (Evans. 1984). He focused on the sensitivity of an optimal decision to changes in the probabilities of the states of nature and the development of "confidence spheres" to bound arbitrary parametric changes in the probability vector. Then Schneller and Sphicas (1985)corrected the closed-form distance formulae and showed it was easily derived from Evans' data. Moreover, Isaacs (1963) explored the general question of sensitivity to subjective probability estimates and derived an analytical representation of sensitivity. In some other studies, problems of applying sensitivity analyses were explored and methods were also suggested for resolving conflict of choice under conditions of high sensitivity. Barron and Schmidt (1998) presented two simple computational procedures for sensitivity analysis of additive multi-attribute value models that yield variations in attribute weights (scaling constants). They developed the two methods of entropy-based and least squares procedure. Rios and French (1991) also introduced a framework for sensitivity analysis in multi-objective decision making within a Bayesian context. Rios and Salhi (2003) investigated an opportunistic approach aimed at reducing the number of optimization problems solved in the original framework and an alternative framework based on distance analysis. Triantaphyllou and Sanchez (1997) developed a methodology for performing sensitivity analysis on the weights of the decision criteria and the performance values of the alternatives expressed in terms of the decision criteria.

3.1. Sensitivity Analysis of the Present Study

In this paper, we use weight vector $W = [w_1 w_2 \dots w_n]$ and change weight of the kth criteria w'_k. Then we find the impact of this change on the other weights $W' = (w'_1, w'_2, \dots, w'_n)$ and the final score P' of the VIKOR alternatives.

We assume that the total weights are normalized and the total amount of the weights is equal to $1 (\sum_{j=1}^{n} w_j = 1)$.

Theorem1. In an MADM model if the weight of the kth criterion changes with the amount of Δ_k, the weight of other criteria will change with the amount of Δ_j as follows:

$$\Delta_j = \frac{\Delta_k w_j}{w_k - 1} \qquad j = 1,2,\dots,n, j \neq k \tag{11}$$

Proof. The new weights of the criterion k w'_k and the weights of other criteria w'_j are given as:

$$w'_k = w_k + \Delta_k \tag{12}$$

$$w'_j = w_j + \Delta_j \qquad j = 1,2,\dots,n, j \neq k \tag{13}$$

When $\sum_{j=1}^{n} w_j = 1$, we will have:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} w'_j = \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_j + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Delta_j \quad \Rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Delta_j = 0$$

Then:

$$\Delta_k = -\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^{n} \Delta_j$$

If we assume $\Delta_j = \frac{\Delta_k w_j}{w_k - 1}$, the following formulae is correct:

$$\Delta_k = -\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^{n} \Delta_j \Rightarrow -\Delta_k = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^{n} \Delta_j = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^{n} \frac{\Delta_k w_j}{w_k - 1}$$

$$= \frac{\Delta_k}{w_k - 1} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^{n} w_j = \frac{\Delta_k}{w_k - 1}(1 - w_k)$$

$$= -\Delta_k$$

Conclusion. If the weight of criterion k changes to w'_k, the weights of other criteria w'_j change as follows:

$$w'_j = w_j + \Delta_j = w_j + \frac{\Delta_k w_j}{w_k - 1} = \frac{w_j(w_k - 1) + \Delta_k w_j}{w_k - 1}$$

$$\Rightarrow w'_j = \frac{w_j(w_k-1)+\Delta_k w_j}{w_k-1} \tag{14}$$

Finally, the values of w'_j for two conditions of $j \neq k$ and $j = k$ will be as follows:

$$w'_j = \begin{cases} w_j + \Delta_k & if\ j = k \\ \frac{w_j(w_k-1)+\Delta_k w_j}{w_k-1} & if\ j \neq k \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

3.2. The Use of Sensitivity Analysis in the VIKOR Method

We introduce the VIKOR distance as follows:

$$d_{ij} = \frac{f_j^* - f_{ij}}{f_j^* - f_j^-}$$

We want to find the amount of changes in the final scores of the attributes as well as the final scores of the attributes after changing Δ_k of the weight of criteria k.

Theorem2. In a VIKOR multi-attribute decision making model, if the weight of the criteria k changes with the amount of Δ_k, the utility measure will be as follows:

$$S'_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} w'_j \times d_{ij} = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^{n} \frac{(1 - w_k - \Delta_k).w_j}{1 - w_k} \times d_{ij}$$

$$+ (w_k + \Delta_k) \times d_{ij}$$

$$= \left(\frac{(1 - w_k - \Delta_k).w_j}{1 - w_k} \right)$$

$$\times \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^{n} w_j \times d_{ij} + w_k \times d_{ij} + \Delta_k \times d_{ij}$$

$$= \left(\frac{(1 - w_k - \Delta_k).w_j}{1 - w_k} \right)$$

$$\times \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^{n} w_j \times d_{ij} + \frac{\Delta_k}{1 - w_k} \times d_{ij} + \Delta_k$$

$$\times d_{ij}$$

$$\Rightarrow S'_i = \left(1 - \frac{\Delta_k}{1-w_k}\right) \times S_i + \frac{\Delta_k}{1-w_k} \times d_{ij} \tag{16}$$

R_i will be exactly the same as S_i:

$$R'_i = \left(1 - \frac{\Delta_k}{1-w_k}\right) \times R_i + \frac{\Delta_k}{1-w_k} \times d_{ij} \tag{17}$$

Finally, the value of Q_i will change.

3.3. The Use of Sensitivity Analysis in the QUALIFLEX Method

In the QUALIFLEX method, we use the weight vector in the final step of problem solving so that just with using new weights, new permutations are provided and the result of the best alternative will change, too. The following numerical example shows the procedure.

4. Numerical Examples

4.1. The QUALIFLEX Numerical Example

A manager wants to decide between three alternatives for building a dam. Each alternative has designated a suitable site for building the dam. Yet there are differences between the attributes which can lead the manager to choose the best alternatives. The attributes are costs, capacity, and strength. The importance of these attributes (who is in charge of making decisions) is completely the same $(w_1 = w_2 = w_3 = 1/2)$for the manager. The evaluation of the alternatives is presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Decision Matrix

Criteria	Alternatives		
	A_1	A_2	A_3
f_1 Cost	1.2	2	2
f_2 Strength	Good	Excellent	moderate
f_3 Capacity	32000	24000	25000

Based on the above information, 3! Permutations are possible:

$$per_1 = A_1 > A_2 > A_3$$
$$per_2 = A_2 > A_1 > A_3$$
$$per_3 = A_2 > A_3 > A_1$$
$$per_4 = A_3 > A_2 > A_1$$
$$per_5 = A_3 > A_1 > A_2$$
$$per_6 = A_1 > A_3 > A_2$$

Thus, the rank evaluation of the alternatives is as follows in Table2.

Table2
Rank evaluation of alternatives

Criteria	Alternatives		
	A_1	A_2	A_3
f_1 Cost	1	2	2
f_2 Strength	2	1	3
f_3 Capacity	1	3	2

In this example, the concordance and discordance values for attributes $g_1$and Per_1 are calculated as follows:

$per_1 = A_1 > A_2 > A_3$ for g_1:
$A_2 < A_1 \rightarrow 1$
$A_2 = A_3 \rightarrow 0$
$A_3 < A_1 \rightarrow 1$
$per_1 = A_1 > A_2 > A_3$ for g_2:
$A_2 > A_1 \rightarrow 1$
$A_2 > A_3 \rightarrow 1$
$A_3 < A_1 \rightarrow 1$
$per_1 = A_1 > A_2 > A_3$ for g_3:
$A_2 < A_1 \rightarrow 1$
$A_2 < A_3 \rightarrow -1$
$A_3 < A_1 \rightarrow 1$

Here, the concordance and discordance indices for the permutations index are presented in Table 3.

Table3
The concordance/discordance indices

		Criteria		
		g_1	g_2	g_3
Permutation	per_1	2	1	1
	per_2	0	3	-1
	per_3	-2	1	-3
	per_4	-2	-1	-3
	per_5	0	-3	1
	per_6	2	-1	3

Now assuming that the weights of attributes are equally 1/3, the permutations are as follows:

$$per_1 = {}^4/_3$$
$$per_2 = {}^2/_3$$
$$per_3 = {}^{-4}/_3$$
$$per_4 = -2$$
$$per_5 = {}^{-2}/_3$$
$$per_6 = {}^4/_3$$

Finally, since permutations 1 and 6 are greater than others, alternative A_1 is the best alternative.

Sensitivity Analysis of the QUALIFLEX Numerical Example

Here, a sensitivity analysis is done for the above numerical example. Assuming that the weight of criterion 1 changes to $0.5(w_1' = 0.5)$, the other weights of the criteria are as follows:

$$w_2' = \frac{\frac{1}{3} \times \left(\frac{1}{3} - 1\right) + (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{3}) \times \frac{1}{3}}{\frac{1}{3} - 1} = \frac{-\frac{1}{6}}{-\frac{2}{3}} = \frac{1}{4} = 0.25$$

$$w_3' = \frac{\frac{1}{3} \times \left(\frac{1}{3} - 1\right) + (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{3}) \times \frac{1}{3}}{\frac{1}{3} - 1} = \frac{-\frac{1}{6}}{-\frac{2}{3}} = \frac{1}{4} = 0.25$$

Then the final permutations will be as follows:

$$per_1 = {}^3/_2$$

$per_2 = {}^1/_2$
$per_3 = {}^{-3}/_2$
$per_4 = -2$

$per_5 = {}^{-1}/_2$
$per_6 = {}^9/_4$

4.2. The VIKOR Numerical Example

A mountain climber (beginner) must choose an alternative from a set of three alternatives, i.e. destinations $\{A_1, A_2, A_3\}$. The evaluation of the alternatives is presented in Table 4. Let's suppose that both evaluation criteria—risk and altitude— are equally important, i.e. the weight of criteria are $w_i = {}^1/_2$ (Martel et al., 2005).

Table 4
Problem f

Criteria	Alternatives		
	A_1	A_2	A_3
f_1 Risk, subjective evaluation, scale: 1,2,3,4,5	1	2	5
f_2 Altitude, evaluated in meters above the sea	3000	3750	4500

$f_1^* = 1 , f_1^- = 5$
$f_2^* = 4500 , f_2^- = 3000$

After solving the problem, the values of S_i, R_i and Q_i will be as follows in Table5.

Table5
Values of S_i, R_i and Q_i

	Alternatives			Ranking
	A_1	A_2	A_3	
S	0.5	0.375	0.5	$A_2, A_1 \approx A_3$
R	0.5	0.25	0.5	$A_2, A_1 \approx A_3$
Q	1	0	1	$A_2, A_1 \approx A_3$

Sensitivity Analysis of the VIKOR Numerical Example

We assume that the weight of criterion 1 changes to 0.2 ($w_1' = 0.2$).

$$w_2' = \frac{0.5 \times (1 - 0.5 + 0.3)}{1 - 0.5} = 0.8$$

Then S_1', S_2' and S_3' will be as follows:
$$S_1' = 0.2 \times \frac{1-1}{5-1} + 0.8 \times \frac{3000-4500}{3000-4500} = 0.8$$

$$S_2' = 0.2 \times \frac{2-1}{5-1} + 0.8 \times \frac{3750-4500}{3000-4500} = 0.45$$

$$S_3' = 0.2 \times \frac{5-1}{5-1} + 0.8 \times \frac{4500-4500}{3000-4500} = 0.2$$

The regret measures of R_1', R_2' and R_3' are as follows:

$R_1' = \max\{0 , 0.8\} = 0.8$
$R_2' = \max\{0.05 , 0.4\} = 0.4$
$R_3' = \max\{0.2 , 0\} = 0.2$

Finally, the VIKOR indices will be as follows:
$$Q_1' = 0.5 \times \frac{0.8 - 0.8}{0.2 - 0.8} + 0.5 \times \frac{0.8 - 0.8}{0.2 - 0.8} = 0$$

$$Q_2' = 0.5 \times \frac{0.4 - 0.8}{0.2 - 0.8} + 0.5 \times \frac{0.45 - 0.8}{0.2 - 0.8} = 0.625$$

$$Q_3' = 0.5 \times \frac{0.2 - 0.8}{0.2 - 0.8} + 0.5 \times \frac{0.2 - 0.8}{0.2 - 0.8} = 0.5$$

$$Q_1' < Q_3' < Q_2' \ \Rightarrow A_1 > A_2 > A_3$$

5. Conclusions

Decision making can be categorized into two different categories: Multi-objective decision making problems and MADM problems. In multi-objective decision making problems, decision makers are looking for the solution which has the best results with different objectives, but in MADM problems decision makers choose the best alternative based on different attributes. All MADM problems have a decision matrix which shows alternatives and attributes. Sometimes the attributes are conflicting so that the maximization of one attribute will result in the minimization of other attributes.

In the classical techniques of MADM, it is often assumed that all used data (such as weights of attributes, efficiency of alternatives against attribute etc.) are deterministic, thus final scores or utility of alternatives are obtained by solving MADM. However, in reality data of decision making problems are changing. Therefore, after solving decision making problems, usually a sensitivity analysis must be done for them. In this paper, we developed sensitivity analysis for the QUALIFLEX and VOKOR methods and proposed a method based on changes in the weights.

6. References

[1] Barron ,H., Schmidt, C. P., (1988).Sensitivity Analysis of additive multi-attribute value models. Operations Research, 36(1), 122-127.
[2] Evans,J.R.,(1984). Sensitivity Analysis in Decision Theory, Decision Sciences. 15(2), 239-248.
[3] Guigou,J. L., (1973).Analyse des donneesetchoix a criteres Multiples, Dunod, Paris.
[4] Isaacs,H. H., (1963). Sensitivity of decision to probability estimation errors□. Operations Research, 11, 563-552.
[5] Kacker, R. N.,(1985). Off-line quality control, parameter design and the Taguchi method. Journal of Quality Technology, 17, 176–188.
[6] Lu,J. G., (2007). Zhang, Multi-objective Group Decision making. Imperial College Press. 3-35.

[7] Martel, J.M., Matarazzo, B., (2005).Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis: State of the Art Surveys☐. Other outranking approaches, Springer Science + Business Media, Inc., 199-201.

[8] Opricovic, S., (1994). Preference stability of compromise solution in multiple decision making. XIth International Conference on Multiple Criteria Decision Making, Coimbra, Portugal.

[9] Opricovic, S., (1998). Multi-criteria optimization of civil engineering systems. Faculty of Civil Engineering, Belgrade.

[10] Opricovic,S., Tzeng, G. H., (2004). Compromise solution by MCDM methods: A comparative analysis of VIKOR and TOPSIS, European Journal of Operational Research, 156, 445-455.

[11] Paelinck, J.H.P., (1976).Qualitative multiple criteria analysis, Environmental protection and multiregional development. Papers of the Regional Science Association, 36, 59–74.

[12] Paelinck, J.H.P.,(1997). Qualitative multiple criteria analysis: An airport location. Environment and Planning, 9:883–895.

[13] Rios, I. D., French, S., (1991). A framework for sensitivity analysis in discrete multi-objective decision making. European Journal of Operational Research, 54, 176-190.

[14] Rios,I. D.,Salhi, A., Proll, L.G.,(2003). Improving optimization based framework for sensitivity analysis in multi-criteria decision making, Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis, 10, 1-9.

[15] Schneller, G. O., Sphicas, G., (1985). On sensitivity Analysis in Decision Theory, Decision Sciences, 16(4), 399-410.

[16] Tong, L. I., Chen, C.C., Wang, C.H.,(2007).Optimization of multi-response processes using the VIKOR method, International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology, 31, 1049-1057.

[17] Triantaphyllou, E., Sanchez, A., (1997). A sensitivity analysis approach for same deterministic multi-criteria decision making methods, Decision Science, 28(1), 151-194.