

Fighter Aircraft Selection Using Neutrosophic Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis

C. Ardil

Abstract—Fuzzy set and intuitionistic fuzzy set are dealing with the imprecision and uncertainty inherent in a complex decision problem. However, sometimes these theories are not sufficient to model indeterminate and inconsistent information encountered in real-life problems. To overcome this insufficiency, the neutrosophic set, which is useful in practical applications, is proposed, triangular neutrosophic numbers and trapezoidal neutrosophic numbers are examined, their definitions and applications are discussed. In this study, a decision making algorithm is developed using neutrosophic set processes and an application is given in fighter aircraft selection as an example of a decision making problem. The estimation of the fighter aircraft selection with the neutrosophic multiple criteria decision analysis method is examined.

Keywords—Neutrosophic set, multiple criteria decision making analysis, fighter aircraft selection, MCDMA, neutrosophic numbers.

I. INTRODUCTION

A fuzzy set is a class of objects with a continuum of grades of membership. Such a set is characterized by a membership function that assigns to each object a grade of membership ranging between zero and one. The notions of inclusion, union, intersection, complement, relation, convexity, etc., are extended to such sets, and various properties of these notions in the context of fuzzy sets are established [1]. Decision-making in a fuzzy environment was introduced to address the uncertainty in decision making analysis [1, 2]. A neutrosophic set [3, 4] is a generalization of the concepts of classical set and fuzzy set [1], intuitionistic fuzzy set [5], and interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy set [6]. Unlike interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy sets, uncertainty characterized in a neutrosophic set. A neutrosophic set has three principal components, truth membership T , indeterminacy membership I , and falsity membership F , which are defined independently of each other. In practice, a neutrosophic set is an instance of the single-valued neutrosophic set (SVNS) and interval neutrosophic set (INS) concepts are proposed and set-theoretical operators and various properties of SVNSs and INSs are provided [7-17]. Neutrosophic set provides uncertainty, inconsistent and incomplete information, and it is more appropriate to deal with indeterminate and inconsistent information.

Due to the inherent uncertainty and complexity of the problems, decision-making methods are often needed. With multiple criteria decision making analysis (MCDMA) methods, the best alternative can be determined among multiple alternatives according to some decision criteria. Recently, many quantitative MCDMA techniques have been developed for the selection problem in decision making

research. Some of these techniques are additive weighted model (AWM)[18-22], multiplicative weighted model (MWM)[23], analytical hierarchy process (AHP)[24-26], composite programming [27-28], compromise programming [29-31], entropic programming [32], preference analysis for reference ideal solution (PARIS) [33-38], elimination et choix traduisant la réalité (ELECTRE) [39-40], preference ranking organization method for enrichment of evaluations (PROMETHEE) [41-45], the technique for order preference by similarity to ideal solution (TOPSIS)[46-51], vlskriterijumska optimizacija i kompromisno resenje (VIKOR) [51-54].

However, most of these methods were developed based on crisp data and therefore lack a few influence factors such as uncertainty preferences, additional qualitative criteria, and incomplete information. Therefore, fuzzy set, intuitionistic fuzzy set, and neutrosophic set theory are more suitable for tackling problems in the decision making process.

Single-valued neutrosophic information is a generalization of intuitionistic fuzzy information, while intuitionistic fuzzy information generalizes fuzzy information. A single-valued neutrosophic set is an instance of a neutrosophic set, which gives an additional possibility to represent uncertain, imprecise, incomplete, and inconsistent information. It can identify and process indeterminate information and inconsistent information.

However, there has not been much work on the single-valued neutrosophic sets integrated with the multiple criteria decision making methods that take into account the criteria values of the alternatives.

An extended single-valued neutrosophic AHP and MULTIMOORA method to evaluate the optimal training aircraft for flight training organizations was proposed to deal with inconsistent environments [55]. In addition, the study has extended a single-valued neutrosophic analytic hierarchy process (AHP) based on multi-objective optimization based on ratio analysis plus a full multiplicative form (MULTIMOORA) to rank the training aircraft as the alternatives.

A sensitivity analysis was performed to demonstrate the stability of the developed single-valued neutrosophic AHP and MULTIMOORA method. Also, a comparison between the results of the developed approach and existing approaches to validate the model was discussed.

Fuzzy triangular and trapezoidal numbers were applied to aircraft selection problems [56-57]. A stealth fighter aircraft selection model was proposed for the aircraft evaluation problem by the neutrosophic multiple criteria decision analysis method [58]. The study deals with the problem of

selecting a stealth fighter aircraft using the single-valued neutrosophic set.

These studies reveal that the fighter aircraft selection problem can be modeled with a single-valued neutrosophic set approach. The main objectives of this study are (1) to define a formulation to calculate the performance importance weights of decision makers expressed with single-valued neutrosophic numbers, (2) to create a multiple criteria decision-making analysis method for the fighter aircraft selection problem under single-valued neutrosophic numbers, and (3) to illustrate the application and effectiveness of the proposed method with a decision making case.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 neutrosophic sets are briefly summarized. The steps of neutrosophic MCDMA are briefly summarized. In Section 3, a fighter aircraft selection application is carried out and, the results are analyzed. In Section 4, the paper concludes with a recommendation for further work.

II. METHODOLOGY

This section presents some basic definitions of neutrosophic sets, single-valued neutrosophic numbers, and theoretical concepts of multiple criteria decision analysis.

Definition 1. [1] Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ be a fixed set. A fuzzy set J in X is an object having the form

$$J = \{x, \mu_J(x) \mid x \in X\}$$

that is characterized by a function: membership function $\mu_X : X \rightarrow [0,1]$ with the condition for all $x \in X$.

Definition 2. [5] Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ be a fixed set. An intuitionistic fuzzy set K in X is an object having the form

$$K = \{x, \mu_K(x), \gamma_K(x) \mid x \in X\}$$

that is characterized by two functions: membership function $\mu_K : X \rightarrow [0,1]$ and non-membership function $\gamma_K : X \rightarrow [0,1]$ with the condition $0 \leq \mu_K(x) + \gamma_K(x) \leq 1$, for all $x \in X$.

Definition 3. [12] Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ be a fixed set. A single-valued neutrosophic set (SVN set) L in X is an object having the form

$$L = \{x, T_L(x), I_L(x), F_L(x) \mid x \in X\}$$

that is characterized by three functions: truth-membership function $T_L : X \rightarrow [0,1]$, indeterminacy-membership function $I_L : X \rightarrow [0,1]$, and falsity-membership function $F_L : X \rightarrow [0,1]$ with the condition $0 \leq T_L(x) + I_L(x) + F_L(x) \leq 3$, for all $x \in X$.

The operations of SVN-sets [59, 60] are given as: Assume that A and B are two SVN-sets. Then

$$A \oplus B = \left\{ \left\langle x, T_A(x) + T_B(x) - T_A(x)T_B(x), \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. I_A(x)I_B(x), F_A(x)F_B(x) \right\rangle \mid x \in X \right\}$$

$$A \otimes B = \left\{ \left\langle x, T_A(x)T_B(x), I_A(x) + I_B(x) - \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. I_A(x)I_B(x), F_A(x) + F_B(x) - F_A(x)F_B(x) \right\rangle \mid x \in X \right\}$$

$$\xi A = \left\{ \left\langle x, (1 - (1 - T_A(x))^\xi), I_A(x)^\xi, F_A(x)^\xi \mid x \in X \right\rangle \right\}$$

$$A^\xi = \left\{ \left\langle x, T_A(x)^\xi, 1 - (1 - I_A(x)^\xi), 1 - (1 - F_A(x)^\xi) \mid x \in X \right\rangle \right\}$$

where $\xi \in R$. For convenience, the notation $\langle T, I, F \rangle$ is adopted, instead of $\langle x, (T_A(x), I_A(x), F_A(x)) \rangle$ for a single-valued neutrosophic element.

Definition 4. [59] Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$ be a set of alternatives, $G = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n\}$ be the set of attributes. The ratings of alternatives $x_i \in X (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ on attributes $g_j \in G$ are expressed with SVN-number $A_{ij} = \langle T_{ij}, I_{ij}, F_{ij} \rangle$. Then,

$$[A_{ij}]_{m \times n} = \begin{matrix} g_1 & \begin{matrix} x_1 & x_2 & \dots & x_n \\ \langle T_{11}, I_{11}, F_{11} \rangle & \langle T_{12}, I_{12}, F_{12} \rangle & \dots & \langle T_{1n}, I_{1n}, F_{1n} \rangle \end{matrix} \\ g_2 & \begin{matrix} \langle T_{21}, I_{21}, F_{21} \rangle & \langle T_{22}, I_{22}, F_{22} \rangle & \dots & \langle T_{2n}, I_{2n}, F_{2n} \rangle \end{matrix} \\ \vdots & \begin{matrix} \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \end{matrix} \\ g_n & \begin{matrix} \langle T_{n1}, I_{n1}, F_{n1} \rangle & \langle T_{n2}, I_{n2}, F_{n2} \rangle & \dots & \langle T_{nn}, I_{nn}, F_{nn} \rangle \end{matrix} \end{matrix}$$

$[A_{ij}]_{m \times n}$ is called a multiple criteria decision making matrix.

The importance weight vector of attribute set G is given as

$$\omega_j = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_n) = (\langle \alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1 \rangle, \langle \alpha_2, \beta_2, \gamma_2 \rangle, \dots, \langle \alpha_n, \beta_n, \gamma_n \rangle)$$

Then, the weighted multiple criteria decision making matrix $[\bar{A}_{ij}]_{m \times n} = \omega[A_{ij}]_{m \times n}$ is presented as

$$[\bar{A}_{ij}]_{m \times n} = \begin{matrix} g_1 & \begin{matrix} x_1 & x_2 & \dots & x_n \\ \langle \bar{T}_{11}, \bar{I}_{11}, \bar{F}_{11} \rangle & \langle \bar{T}_{12}, \bar{I}_{12}, \bar{F}_{12} \rangle & \dots & \langle \bar{T}_{1n}, \bar{I}_{1n}, \bar{F}_{1n} \rangle \end{matrix} \\ g_2 & \begin{matrix} \langle \bar{T}_{21}, \bar{I}_{21}, \bar{F}_{21} \rangle & \langle \bar{T}_{22}, \bar{I}_{22}, \bar{F}_{22} \rangle & \dots & \langle \bar{T}_{2n}, \bar{I}_{2n}, \bar{F}_{2n} \rangle \end{matrix} \\ \vdots & \begin{matrix} \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \end{matrix} \\ g_n & \begin{matrix} \langle \bar{T}_{n1}, \bar{I}_{n1}, \bar{F}_{n1} \rangle & \langle \bar{T}_{n2}, \bar{I}_{n2}, \bar{F}_{n2} \rangle & \dots & \langle \bar{T}_{nn}, \bar{I}_{nn}, \bar{F}_{nn} \rangle \end{matrix} \end{matrix}$$

where

$$\langle \bar{T}_{ij}, \bar{I}_{ij}, \bar{F}_{ij} \rangle = \omega_j A_{ij} = \langle \alpha_j, \beta_j, \gamma_j \rangle \langle T_{ij}, I_{ij}, F_{ij} \rangle \\ = \langle \alpha_j T_{ij}, \beta_j + I_{ij} - \beta_j I_{ij}, \gamma_j + F_{ij} - \gamma_j F_{ij} \rangle$$

Using arithmetic average operator [60], comprehensive evaluation of each alternative $x_i \in X (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$, V_i , is given by

$$V_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \overline{T_{ij}}, \overline{I_{ij}}, \overline{F_{ij}} \rangle = \langle T_i, I_i, F_i \rangle$$

The score, accuracy and certainty function [61,62] to compare two alternatives are defined as

Score function of $V_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$, denoted as $s(V_i)$, defined as

$$s(V_i) = \frac{2 + T_i - F_i - I_i}{3}$$

Accuracy function of $V_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$, denoted as $a(V_i)$, defined as

$$a(V_i) = T_i - F_i$$

and then for $s, t \in \{i = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$,

(a) If $s(V_s) < s(V_t)$, then V_s is smaller than V_t , denoted by $V_s < V_t$,

(b) If $s(V_s) = s(V_t)$;

(i) If $a(V_s) < a(V_t)$, then V_t is smaller than V_s , denoted by $V_t < V_s$

(ii) If $a(V_s) < a(V_t)$, then V_t and V_s are the same, denoted by $V_t = V_s$

Certainty function of $V_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$, denoted as $c(V_i)$, defined as

$$c(V_i) = T_i$$

III. APPLICATION

In this section, the fighter aircraft selection problem was presented as an illustrative example to show its applicability and effectiveness in decision making problems.

Assume that $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ be a set of fighter aircraft alternatives and $G = \{g_1, g_2, g_3\}$ be a set of attributes (g_1 : survivability, g_2 : maneuverability, g_3 : reliability). The evaluation attributes of fighter aircraft alternatives are briefly defined as follows:

Aircraft combat survivability is defined as the capability of an aircraft to avoid or withstand a man-made hostile environment. Aircraft combat maneuverability is defined as the ability to change the aircraft flight path by application of

forces from the rotors or other control devices. Also, agility is defined as how quickly the aircraft flight path can be changed. The purpose of an aircraft reliability program is to ensure that the aircraft maintenance program tasks are effective, and their intervals are acceptable.

In this decision making problem, a decision maker wants to select the best alternative fighter aircraft considering the three evaluation attributes. All evaluation attributes (g_j) are considered as benefit criteria for the direction of optimization. Using information of criteria weights, such as the vector of the importance weights of the attributes, allows the decision maker to set priorities in the decision problem. Therefore, the algorithmic decision making process is given as

Step 1. Decision making matrix $[A_{ij}]_{m \times n}$ is established as

$$[A_{ij}]_{3 \times 3} = \begin{pmatrix} \langle 0.7, 0.2, 0.7 \rangle & \langle 0.7, 0.6, 0.9 \rangle & \langle 0.1, 0.5, 0.7 \rangle \\ \langle 0.8, 0.3, 0.8 \rangle & \langle 0.3, 0.1, 0.4 \rangle & \langle 0.3, 0.1, 0.9 \rangle \\ \langle 0.9, 0.1, 0.7 \rangle & \langle 0.8, 0.6, 0.3 \rangle & \langle 0.7, 0.3, 0.8 \rangle \end{pmatrix}$$

Step 2. The importance weight vector of attributes is determined as

$$\omega = (\langle 0.6, 0.9, 0.7 \rangle, \langle 0.9, 0.5, 0.9 \rangle, \langle 0.8, 0.6, 0.4 \rangle)$$

Step 3. The weighted decision making matrix $[\overline{A}_{ij}]_{m \times n}$ is found as

$$[\overline{A}_{ij}]_{3 \times 3} = \begin{pmatrix} \langle 0.42, 0.92, 0.91 \rangle & \langle 0.63, 0.8, 0.99 \rangle & \langle 0.08, 0.8, 0.82 \rangle \\ \langle 0.48, 0.93, 0.94 \rangle & \langle 0.27, 0.55, 0.94 \rangle & \langle 0.24, 0.64, 0.94 \rangle \\ \langle 0.54, 0.91, 0.91 \rangle & \langle 0.72, 0.8, 0.93 \rangle & \langle 0.56, 0.72, 0.88 \rangle \end{pmatrix}$$

Step 4. The score function (V_i) of the alternatives $x_i \in X (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ is calculated as

$$V_1 = \langle 1 - (1 - 0.42)(1 - 0.48)(1 - 0.54), 0.92 \times 0.93 \times 0.91, 0.91 \times 0.94 \times 0.91 \rangle \\ V_1 = 0.861264, 0.778596, 0.778414$$

$$V_2 = \langle 1 - (1 - 0.63)(1 - 0.27)(1 - 0.72), 0.8 \times 0.55 \times 0.8, 0.99 \times 0.94 \times 0.93 \rangle \\ V_2 = 0.924372, 0.352, 0.865458$$

$$V_3 = \langle 1 - (1 - 0.08)(1 - 0.24)(1 - 0.56), 0.8 \times 0.64 \times 0.72, 0.82 \times 0.94 \times 0.88 \rangle \\ V_3 = 0.692352, 0.36864, 0.678304$$

respectively.

Step 5. The scores of $V_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ are calculated as

$$s(V_1) = 0.434751 \\ s(V_2) = 0.568971 \\ s(V_3) = 0.548469$$

respectively. Then, the ranking of alternatives is found as

$$x_2 \succ x_3 \succ x_1$$

According to the decision making analysis results, the alternative (x_2) is found to be the best fighter aircraft in the decision making problem.

Step 6. The accuracies of $V_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ are calculated as

$$a(V_1) = 0,082850$$

$$a(V_2) = 0,058914$$

$$a(V_3) = 0,014048$$

respectively.

Step 7. Certainties of $V_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ are found as

$$c(V_1) = 0,861264$$

$$c(V_2) = 0,924372$$

$$c(V_3) = 0,692352$$

respectively.

Neutrosophic sets (NSs) have widely been recognized as successful mathematical tools for solving ambiguous and imprecise problems. In this study, a single-valued neutrosophic set approach was used to determine the final ranking scores of alternatives. Using the proposed approach to address initial neutrosophic information, a fighter aircraft selection problem with three criteria and three candidate alternatives was applied to demonstrate its applicability and effectiveness.

Consequently, neutrosophic decision analysis procedure successfully ranked fighter aircraft candidates using the importance weight vector and the three evaluation attributes of the alternatives.

IV. CONCLUSION

Recently, multiple criteria decision making analysis problems have gained extensive awareness in single-valued neutrosophic sets. A multiple criteria decision making analysis problem with a single valued neutrosophic sets (SVN-sets) was explored with both criteria weights and attribute ratings expressed by single-valued neutrosophic information. Firstly, some basic concepts concerning SVN-sets were reviewed for the subsequent decision making analysis.

Secondly, a multiple criteria decision making method of SVN-sets was developed to describe the ranking order of the alternatives. Finally, fighter aircraft selection problem was presented as an illustrative example to show its applicability and effectiveness in decision making problems. The proposed neutrosophic MCDMA approach can be applied to various fields of study in solving real-life problems.

REFERENCES

- [1] Zadeh L.A., (1965). Fuzzy Sets. *Information and Control*, 8, 338-353.
- [2] Bellman, R.E., Zadeh, L.A. (1970). Decision-making in a fuzzy environment. *Management Science*, 17(4), 141-164.
- [3] Smarandache, F. (1999). *A Unifying Field in Logics, Neutrosophic Logic, Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Set and Neutrosophic Probability*. 4th (eds) American Research Press, Rehoboth, DE, USA.
- [4] Smarandache, F. (2019). Neutrosophic Set is a Generalization of Intuitionistic Fuzzy Set, Inconsistent Intuitionistic Fuzzy Set (Picture Fuzzy Set, Ternary Fuzzy Set), Pythagorean Fuzzy Set, Spherical Fuzzy Set, and q-Rung Orthopair Fuzzy Set, while Neutrosophication is a Generalization of Regret Theory, Grey System Theory, and Three-Ways Decision (revisited) . *Journal of New Theory*, (29), 1-31.
- [5] Atanasov, K.T. (1986). Intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *Fuzzy sets and systems*, 20, 87-96.
- [6] Atanassov, K., Gargov, G. (1989). Interval valued intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 31(3), 343-349.
- [7] Ye, J. (2014). Similarity measures between interval neutrosophic sets and their applications in multicriteria decision-making. *J. Intell. Fuzzy Syst.* 26, 165-172.
- [8] Broumi, S., Smarandache, F., Talea, M., Bakali, A. (2016). An introduction to bipolar single valued neutrosophic graph theory. *Appl. Mech. Mater.*, 841, 184-191.
- [9] Ye, J. (2013). Multicriteria decision-making method using the correlation coefficient under single-valued neutrosophic environment. *Int. J. Gen. Syst.* 42, 386-394.
- [10] Chakraborty, A., Mondal, S.P., Ahmadian, A., Senu, N., Alam, S., Salahshour, S. (2018). Different Forms of Triangular Neutrosophic Numbers, De-Neutrosophication Techniques, and their Applications. *Symmetry* 10, 327.
- [11] Garg, H. (2018). New Logarithmic operational laws and their applications to multiattribute decision making for single-valued neutrosophic numbers. *Cogn. Syst. Res.* 52, 931-946.
- [12] Wang, H., Smarandache, F., Zhang, Y., Sunderraman, R. (2010). Single valued neutrosophic sets. *Multispace and Multistructure*, 4, 410-413.
- [13] Garg, H., Nancy (2020). Linguistic single-valued neutrosophic power aggregation operators and their applications to group decision-making problems. *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, 7, 546-558.
- [14] Garg, H. (2019). Algorithms for possibility linguistic single-valued neutrosophic decision-making based on COPRAS and aggregation operators with new information measures. *Measurement* 138, 278-290.
- [15] Kumar, R., Edalatpanah, S.A., Jha, S., Broumi, S., Dey, A. (2018). Neutrosophic shortest path problem. *Neutrosophic Sets Syst.* 23, 5-15.
- [16] Edalatpanah, S.A. (2019). Nonlinear approach for neutrosophic linear programming. *J. Appl. Res. Ind. Eng.* 6, 367-373.
- [17] Smarandache, F. (2020). The Score, Accuracy, and Certainty Functions determine a Total Order on the Set of Neutrosophic Triplets (T, I, F). *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems* 38 (1), 1-14.
- [18] Ardil, C., Bilgen, S. (2017). Online Performance Tracking. *SocioEconomic Challenges*, 1(3), 58-72. ISSN (print) – 2520-6621.
- [19] Ardil, C. (2018) Multidimensional Performance Tracking. *International Journal of Computer and Systems Engineering*, Vol:12, No:5,320-349
- [20] Ardil, C. (2021). Architectural Acoustic Modeling for Predicting Reverberation Time in Room Acoustic Design Using Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis. *International Journal of Architectural and Environmental Engineering*, 15(9), 418 - 423.
- [21] Ardil, C. (2019). Aircraft Selection Using Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis Method with Different Data Normalization Techniques. *International Journal of Industrial and Systems Engineering*, 13(12), 744 - 756.
- [22] Ardil, C. , Pashaev, A. , Sadiqov, R. , Abdullayev, P. (2019). Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis for Selecting and Evaluating Fighter Aircraft. *International Journal of Transport and Vehicle Engineering*, 13(11), 683 - 694.
- [23] Ardil, C. (2019). Military Fighter Aircraft Selection Using Multiplicative Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis Method. *International Journal of Mathematical and Computational Sciences*, 13(9), 184 - 193.
- [24] Saaty, T. L. (1990). How to make a decision: The Analytic Hierarchy Process. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 48(1), 9-26. doi: 10.1016/0377-2217(90)90057-I

- [25] Saaty, T. L. (2008). Decision making with the analytic hierarchy process. *International Journal of Services Sciences*, 1(1), 83-98. doi: 10.1504/IJSSCI.2008.017590
- [26] Saaty, T.L. (1980). *Analytic Hierarchy Process: Planning, Priority Setting, Resource Allocation*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- [27] Ardil, C. (2021). Advanced Jet Trainer and Light Attack Aircraft Selection Using Composite Programming in Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis Method. *International Journal of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering*, 15(12), 486 - 491.
- [28] Ardil, C. (2021). Comparison of Composite Programming and Compromise Programming for Aircraft Selection Problem Using Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis Method. *International Journal of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering*, 15(11), 479 - 485.
- [29] Ardil, C. (2018) Multidimensional Compromise Optimization for Development Ranking of the Gulf Cooperation Council Countries and Turkey. *International Journal of Mathematical and Computational Sciences* Vol:12, No:6, 131-138.
- [30] Ardil, C. (2018) Multidimensional Compromise Programming Evaluation of Digital Commerce Websites. *International Journal of Computer and Information Engineering* Vol:12, No:7, 556-563.
- [31] Ardil, C. (2018) Multicriteria Decision Analysis for Development Ranking of Balkan Countries. *International Journal of Computer and Information Engineering* Vol:12, No:12, 1118-1125.
- [32] Ardil, C. (2021). Freighter Aircraft Selection Using Entropic Programming for Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis. *International Journal of Mathematical and Computational Sciences*, 15(12), 125 - 132.
- [33] Ardil, C. (2020). A Comparative Analysis of Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis Methods for Strategic, Tactical, and Operational Decisions in Military Fighter Aircraft Selection. *International Journal of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering*, 14(7), 275 - 288.
- [34] Ardil, C. (2020). Aircraft Selection Process Using Preference Analysis for Reference Ideal Solution (PARIS). *International Journal of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering*, 14(3), 80 - 93.
- [35] Ardil, C. (2020). Regional Aircraft Selection Using Preference Analysis for Reference Ideal Solution (PARIS). *International Journal of Transport and Vehicle Engineering*, 14(9), 378 - 388.
- [36] Ardil, C. (2020). Trainer Aircraft Selection Using Preference Analysis for Reference Ideal Solution (PARIS). *International Journal of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering*, 14(5), 195 - 209.
- [37] Ardil, C. (2020). Software Product Quality Evaluation Model with Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis. *International Journal of Computer and Information Engineering*, 14(12), 486 - 502.
- [38] Ardil, C. (2021). Airline Quality Rating Using PARIS and TOPSIS in Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis. *International Journal of Industrial and Systems Engineering*, 15(12), 516 - 523.
- [39] Roy, B. (1991). The outranking approach and the foundation of ELECTRE methods. *Theory and Decision*, 31(1), 49-73.
- [40] Fei, L., Xia, J., Feng, Y., Liu, L. (2019) An ELECTRE-Based Multiple Criteria Decision Making Method for Supplier Selection Using Dempster-Shafer Theory. *IEEE Access*, 7, 84701-84716.
- [41] Brans JP., Mareschal B. (2005). Promethee Methods. In: *Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis: State of the Art Surveys*. International Series in Operations Research & Management Science, vol 78, pp 163-186. Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-23081-5_5.
- [42] Brans, J., Ph. Vincke. (1985). A Preference Ranking Organisation Method: (The PROMETHEE Method for Multiple Criteria Decision-Making). *Management Science*, 31(6), 647-656.
- [43] Brans, J.P., Macharis, C., Kunsch, P.L., Chevalier, A., Schwaninger, M., (1998). Combining multicriteria decision aid and system dynamics for the control of socio-economic processes. An iterative real-time procedure. *European Journal of Operational Research* 109, 428-441.
- [44] Brans, J.P., Vincke, Ph., Mareschal, B., (1986). How to select and how to rank projects: the PROMETHEE method. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 24, 228-238.
- [45] Ardil, C. (2020) Facility Location Selection using Preference Programming. *International Journal of Industrial and Systems Engineering*, 14(1), 1 - 12.
- [46] Hwang, C.L.; Yoon, K. (1981). *Multiple Attribute Decision Making: Methods and Applications*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- [47] Chu, T.C. (2002). Facility location selection using fuzzy TOPSIS under group decisions", *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, Vol. 10 No. 6, pp. 687-701.
- [48] Choudhary, D. and Shankar, R. (2012). A STEEP-fuzzy AHP-TOPSIS framework for evaluation and selection of thermal power plant location: a case study from India", *Energy*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 510-521.
- [49] Zavadskas, E.K., Mardani, A., Turskis, Z., Jusoh, A., Nor, K.M. (2016) Development of TOPSIS method to solve complicated decision-making problems: An overview on developments from 2000 to 2015. *International Journal of Information Technology & Decision Making*, 15, 645-682.
- [50] Ardil, C. (2019) Scholar Index for Research Performance Evaluation Using Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis. *International Journal of Educational and Pedagogical Sciences*, Vol:13, No:2, 93-105.
- [51] Ardil, C. (2019). Fighter Aircraft Selection Using Technique for Order Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution with Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis. *International Journal of Transport and Vehicle Engineering*, 13(10), 649 - 657.
- [52] Opricovic, S. (1998). *Multicriteria Optimization of Civil Engineering Systems*. PhD Thesis, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Belgrade (in Serbian).
- [53] Opricovic, S. (2007). A fuzzy compromise solution for multicriteria problems. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, 15(3), 363-380.
- [54] Opricovic, S., Tzeng, G.-H. (2004). Compromise solution by MCDM methods: A comparative analysis of VIKOR and TOPSIS. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 156(2), 445-455.
- [55] Karamaşa, Ç., Karabasevic, D., Stanujkic, D., Kookhdan, A. R., Arunodaya Raj, M., Ertürk, M., (2021). An extended single-valued neutrosophic AHP and MULTIMOORA method to evaluate the optimal training aircraft for flight training organizations. *Facta Universitatis Series Mechanical Engineering*, 19(3), 555 - 578.
- [56] Ardil, C. (2021). Fighter Aircraft Evaluation and Selection Process Based on Triangular Fuzzy Numbers in Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis Using the Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS). *International Journal of Computer and Systems Engineering*, 15(12), 402 - 408.
- [57] Ardil, C. (2021). Military Combat Aircraft Selection Using Trapezoidal Fuzzy Numbers with the Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS). *International Journal of Computer and Information Engineering*, 15(12), 630 - 635.
- [58] Ardil, C. (2021). Neutrosophic Multiple Criteria Decision Making Analysis Method for Selecting Stealth Fighter Aircraft. *International Journal of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering*, 15(10), 459 - 463.
- [59] Peng J.J., Wang J.Q., Zhang H.Y., Chen X.H., (2014). An outranking approach for multi-criteria decision-making problems with simplified neutrosophic sets, *Applied Soft Computing*, 25, 336-346.
- [60] Ye J., (2014). A multicriteria decision-making method using aggregation operators for simplified neutrosophic sets, *Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems*, 26, 2459-2466.
- [61] Smarandache, F. (2020). The Score, Accuracy, and Certainty Functions determine a Total Order on the Set of Neutrosophic Triplets (T, I, F). *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems* 38(1), 1-14.
- [62] Liu P., Chu Y., Li Y., Chen Y., (2014). Some generalized neutrosophic number Hamacher aggregation operators and their application to group decision making, *International Journal of Fuzzy Systems*, 16(2) 242-255.