Inverse Gram Matrix Methods for Prioritization in Analytic Hierarchy Process: Explainability of Weighted Least Squares Optimization Method

Kevin Kam Fung Yuen The Hong Kong Polytechnic University Hong Kong SAR, China <u>kevinkf.yuen@gmail.com, kevin.yuen@polyu.edu.hk</u> https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1497-2575

Abstract

This paper proposes Inverse Gram Matrix (IGM) methods to prioritize the Pairwise Reciprocal Matrix (PRM) in the Analytic Hierarchy Process. The IGM methods include Pseudo-IGM, Normalized-IGM, and Lagrange-IGM. Interestingly, the proposed IGM methods achieves the least error of Weighted Least Squares (WLS). Since clarity, explainability, usability and verification for the close-form solutions of WLS appears to be incomplete in the literature, the comprehensive mathematical proofs, detail computational demonstration, and intensive simulation verification to extend the prior studies are offered in this study. After a simulation of 1,000,000 random PRM instances is performed to verify equivalent results of several IGM methods, another simulation of 10,000 random PRM instances are performed to verify that a IGM method is the exact closed-form solution of WLS optimization method. The proposed IGM methods on top of the WLS method may be the promising alternatives of Saaty's Eigen system method to apply to the AHP.

Keywords: Pairwise Comparisons, Optimization, Linear Algebra, Decision Sciences

1. Introduction

The first use of the pairwise comparisons may be attributed to Ramon Llull in the 13th-century [1] [2]. "The Law of Comparative Judgments" was developed for the psychological research in [3]. [4] developed pairwise comparison based on paired ratio scale to establish Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) [5] and Analytic Network Process (ANP) [6]. [7, 8] proposed the Cognitive Network Process (CNP) based on Pairwise Opposite Matrix. The AHP should not be equated with pairwise comparisons [2], as several forms of PCs exist. While increasing uses of the AHP, the AHP is controversial, for examples, arbitrary hierarchic composition [9] [10] [11], conflict of expected utility theory [12, 13], defending eighteen critics of AHP [14], and rank reversals [15] [16] [17].

The prioritization method for AHP is one of unsettled controversial topics. The default and early prioritization method proposed by [4] in AHP was Eigenvector method and [5] introduced normalization methods including Normalization of the Row Sum, Normalization of Reciprocals of Column Sum, and Arithmetic Mean of Normalized Columns, which the methods were termed based on [18] as [5] did not provide the names for them. [19] proposed the Direct Least Squares (DLS) and Weighted Least Squares (WLS) methods. [20] proposed the Normalization of Geometric Means, a closed-form solution of the Logarithm Least Squares (LLS) and. [21] proposed the Enhanced Goal Programming. [22] proposed the Fuzzy Programming. [23] proposed the Singular Value Decomposition. [24] proposed the Maximization of Correlation Coefficient. [25] proposed the linear programming method. [26] proposed the Cosine Maximization Method. [27] proposed the Least Penalty Optimization Prioritization Operator. [28] proposed

the Relative Deviation Interconnection method. [29] proposed the Two-Stage Ranking method. There are many reviews and comparisons of prioritisation methods, e.g., [30], [31], [32], [18], [33], but none of them, including this study, are complete.

This study proposed IGM methods on top of WLS optimization model with explanations and clarity of the closed-form solution of WLS. The rest of this paper is summarized as follows. The related work with motivations for this study is presented in Section 2. The Pseudo-IGM, Normalized-IGM, and Langragian-IGM methods are developed in Section 3. Two numerical examples are demonstrated for the usability of IGMs in Section 4. In Section 5, two simulations have been conducted to verify the equivalent results of the proposed IGM methods, which produce the exact and only closed-form solution of WLS optimization method. The conclusion and future motivation are summarized in Section 6.

2. Related work and Motivations

The rating scores of pairwise comparison in AHP are encoded in a format of Pairwise Reciprocal Matrix (PRM),

$$A = \{a_{ij}: 0 < a_{ij} = a_{ji}^{-1}, \forall i, \forall j \in (1, ..., n)\}.$$
(1)

 a_{ij} is determined by a numeric point to estimate how much time is object *i* as much as important as object *j*. The rating score is usually selected from on a 9-point scale. The name of pairwise comparison matrix is due to the axiom of $0 < a_{ij} = a_{ji}^{-1}$.

To interpret the pairwise matrix, let a set of the ideal relative weights (or a priority vector) be $w = (w_1, ..., w_n)$ such that a weight sum equal to unity function is defined as below.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = 1.$$
 (2)

w can be determined by a subjective judgmental PRM denoted by $A = [a_{ij}]$, where a comparison score is

$$a_{ij} \cong \frac{w_i}{w_j}.$$
(3)

The ideal PRM $\tilde{A} = \begin{bmatrix} w_i \\ w_j \end{bmatrix}$ is generated by $A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{ij} \end{bmatrix}$ by the relationship below [18].

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{a}_{ij} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{w_1}{w_1} & \frac{w_1}{w_2} & \dots & \frac{w_1}{w_n} \\ \frac{w_2}{w_1} & \frac{w_2}{w_2} & \dots & \frac{w_2}{w_n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{w_n}{w_1} & \frac{w_n}{w_2} & \dots & \frac{w_n}{w_n} \end{bmatrix} \cong \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \dots & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{ij} \end{bmatrix} = A,$$
(4)

where $a_{ij} = a_{ji}^{-1}$, and $a_{ii} = 1, i, j = 1, ..., n$. *A* is the PRM from expert judgement. A prioritization method is to derive *w* from *A*. Examples of prioritization methods are illustrated in introduction section. This research focus on development of IGM methods highly related to the Weighted Least Squares (WLS) method. [19] proposed the Direct Least Squares (DLS) and WLS methods. The DLS method is to minimize the total variances between a_{ij} and \tilde{a}_{ij} .

$$Min \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(a_{ij} - \frac{w_i}{w_j} \right)^2$$
Subject to
$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = 1, \ w_i > 0, i = 1, 2, ..., n.$$
(5)

[19] indicated that the above non-linear optimisation problem has no special tractable form, may have multiple solutions, and is very difficult to solve numerically. [34] showed that the optimization problem can be reduced to solve a system of polynomial equations and concluded that the WLS solution is not unique in general, and the number of solutions of the LSM problem may be equal to or even twice as many as the dimension of the matrix. [35] indicated that it is seldom observed that such optimization problems may be multimodal and proposed an exact global optimization leading to globally optimal weights in reasonable time. [19] modified the objective function and proposed the Weighted Least Squares (WLS) in the form:

$$Min \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (w_i - a_{ij} w_j)^2 \tag{6}$$

Subject to
$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = 1, \ w_i > 0, i = 1, 2, ..., n$$
 (7)

Regarding the closed-form solution, [36] indicated that the minimand may be expressed as the quadratic form $v^T C^{-1} v$, where a square matrix *C* has the diagonal elements as below.

$$c_{ii} = (n-1) + \sum_{j,j \neq i} a_{ji}^2, \qquad i = 1, \cdots, n,$$
(8)

And the off-diagonal elements are of the form below.

$$c_{ij} = -a_{ij} - a_{ji}, \qquad i, j = 1, \cdots, n,$$
(9)

The unique solution of the closed form is expression as below.

$$v = \frac{C^{-1}e}{e^T C^{-1}e}$$
(10)

 $e = (1, \dots, 1)$ is a row vector of one's of the size subject to the associated calculation. Eqs.(8)-(9) were firstly mentioned in [19], which did not provide clear correct details how they came from. To bridge the research gap, Eqs.(8)-(9) are further explained and illustrated in Sections 3 and 4. Eq.(10) was proposed in [36]. [36] indicated the major problem that Eqs.(8)-(10) cannot solve a consistent PRM as *C* is not invertible due to the positive semidefinite. To bridge the research gap, The proposed Inverse Gram Matrix methods presented in the next section can fix this problem. In addition, [19] and [36] did not present the relevant proof of the closed-form solution, step-by-step calculation demonstration for the usage, and simulation for verification, which are further explored in this study. Possibly due to the reasons above, many studies in literature review, , e.g., [30, 31] [32] [18, 33], merely acknowledged the contribution from [19] and [36] but did not present closed-form solution form without the need of optimization solver. The objective of this study is to promote the proposed IGM methods associated with WLS.

3. Inverse Gram Matrix Methods

3.1. Pseudo Inverse Gram Matrix Method

A design matrix D is a coefficient matrix corresponding to w^T . D can be converted from A shown in Eq. (4) by

Algorithm **1**. To arrange the equality form $a_{ij} = \frac{w_i}{w_j}$, the weighted differential form is shown as below.

$$w_i - a_{ij}w_j = 0, i \neq j, \forall i, \forall j \in (1, \cdots, n).$$

$$(11)$$

Based on the element forms of Eqs. (2) and (11), the matrix expression is shown as below.

$$Dw^T = q^T, (12)$$

$$q^T = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}^T \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{13}$$

By Algorithm 1, A is converted to D below.

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{D} \\ e \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} d_{kj} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -a_{12} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ -a_{21} & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -a_{13} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ -a_{31} & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -a_{1n} \\ -a_{n1} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -a_{n-1,n} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & -a_{n,n-1} & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$
(14)

Algorithm 1 ($D = \Pi(A)$: Converting A into D).

Input: A Pairwise Reciprocal Matrix: A Step 1: Initialize the design matrix without weight sum unity function: $\overline{D} = [0]_{n(n-1),n}$ Step 2: initialize the first-row index for *D*: k = 1Step 3: Fill elements into \overline{D} For *i* from 1 to n - 1: For *j* from (i+1) to *n*: $\overline{D}_{k,i} = 1$ $\overline{D}_{k,j} = -a_{ij}$ k = k + 1 # move the index to the next row of \overline{D} $\overline{D}_{k,i} = -a_{ji}$ $D_{k,j} = 1$ k = k + 1 # move the index to the next row of \overline{D} Step 4: Insert *e*, a vector of 1, into the last row of *D*: $D = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{D} \\ e \end{bmatrix}$ Return: *D*. An example of D of size 4×4 is shown in Eq.(28). The design matrix D consists of two parts: \overline{D} and e. The design matrix for the objective function \overline{D} is the first n(n-1) rows of D and corresponds to the coefficients in Eq.(11). The unity vector for the weight sum unity function, e, is the row vector of ones at the last row of D and corresponds to the coefficients of the WLS constraints in Eq. (2).

 q^T is a column vector, a transposition of a row vector q, with the last element of 1 and the rest of 0, where $\mathbf{0}^T = (0, \dots, 0)^T$, with the length corresponding to the associated calculation. For Eq.(11), The row length of the output of Dw^T is n(n-1) + 1.

The sequence order of equations in D is not important as there are many forms of row-equivalent matrices, i.e., a new matrix swapping rows of a matrix is row equivalent to the original one.

Algorithm **1** provides one of examples to generalize the coefficient matrix, or design matrix of a system of linear equations.

The gram matrix G of the form below is the transpose of D (i.e., D^T) multiples D.

$$G = \left[g_{ij}\right] = D^T D. \tag{15}$$

G is a symmetric matrix. The Pseudo Inverse Gram Matrix (PIGM) method to derive the w is presented in Theorem 1.

Theorem 1 (Pseudo-IGM).

The matrix-form solution of Pseudo-IGM is of the form below.

$$w = \frac{eG^{-1}}{eG^{-1}e^{T}} = \frac{e(D^{T}D)^{-1}}{e(D^{T}D)^{-1}e^{T}}$$
(16)

As G and G^{-1} are symmetric, either column sum of Inverse Gram Matrix (eG^{-1}) or row sum of IGM $(e^{T}G^{-1})$ will produce the same values. $eG^{-1}e^{T}$ is the sum of the elements of the vector eG^{-1} . Therefore, summation of w leads to one, that is normalization.

Proof:

From Eq. (12), we have

$$Dw^T = q^T. (17)$$

 D^T is multiplied in both sides, and thus

$$D^T D w^T = D^T q^T. aga{18}$$

Since

$$D^T q^T = e^T, (19)$$

which is substitute to Eq. (18), equality of Eq. (2) may not be preserved. The new form is below.

$$D^T D v^T = e^T, (20)$$

where the normalized function is

$$w^T = \frac{v^T}{ev^T}.$$
(21)

Thus,

$$v^T = (D^T D)^{-1} e^T = G^{-1} e^T$$
, or (22)

$$v = e(D^T D)^{-1} = eG^{-1}, (23)$$

To normalize v, we have

$$w = \frac{v}{ve^{T}} = \frac{eG^{-1}}{eG^{-1}e^{T}} = \frac{e(D^{T}D)^{-1}}{e(D^{T}D)^{-1}e^{T}}.$$
(24)

Thus Eq. (16) is hold.

The unnormalized matrix-form solution of Pseudo-IGM is shown as below.

$$v^{T} = (D^{T}D)^{-1}D^{T}q^{T} = (D^{T}D)^{-1}e^{T} = G^{-1}D^{T}e^{T}$$
(25)

Whilst the form $G^{-1}D^T$ or $(D^TD)^{-1}D^T$ is called pseudo inverse of *D*, the form $G^{-1}D^Te^T$ is called pseudo inverse of *G* for this special case. As G^{-1} is also symmetric, the last column or row of $G^{-1}D^T$ is the solution of v^T due to multiplication of *q* in the last step. The calculation step of Pseudo-IGM is summarized as follows. Firstly, a design matrix *D* is converted from a PRM *A* by

Algorithm **1**. Secondly, a gram matrix is computed by Eq. (15). Thirdly, inverse gram matrix is computed by a general inverse method. Finally, w is computed by Eq. (16).

3.2. Normalized Inverse Gram Matrix Method

To avoid using design matrix with

Algorithm 1, another way is to directly convert a PRM to a Gram matrix with element form, which is presented in Theorem 2.

Theorem 2 (Element form of Gram matrix).

The elements of the Gram matrix, i.e., $g_{ij} \in G, \forall i, \forall j \in (1, \dots, n)$, derived from *A*, are of the form below.

$$g_{ij} = \begin{cases} (n-1) + \sum_{k} a_{kj}^{2} & i = j \\ 1 - a_{ij} - a_{ji} & i \neq j \end{cases}$$
(26)

Or

$$g_{ij} = \begin{cases} n + \sum_{k \neq j} a_{kj}^2 & i = j \\ 1 - a_{ij} - a_{ji} & i \neq j \end{cases}$$
(27)

Proof.

To simply the proof demonstration, take a 4×4 PRM below, instead of the $n \times n$ general form, as an initiative for better explanation.

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{ij} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & a_{12} & a_{13} & a_{14} \\ a_{21} & 1 & a_{23} & a_{24} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & 1 & a_{34} \\ a_{41} & a_{42} & a_{43} & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(28)

Based on

Algorithm 1, the design matrix is of the form below.

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -a_{12} & 0 & 0 \\ -a_{21} & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -a_{13} & 0 \\ -a_{31} & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -a_{14} \\ -a_{41} & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -a_{23} & 0 \\ 0 & -a_{32} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -a_{24} \\ 0 & -a_{42} & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -a_{34} \\ 0 & 0 & -a_{43} & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(29)

For $G = [g_{ij}] = D^T D$, a diagonal element, g_{ii} or g_{jj} , is sum of element-wise multiplication of the column *j* itself in *D*, or row *i* itself in D^T . When *j* is 1,

$$g_{11} = 3(1) + (1 + a_{21}^2 + a_{31}^2 + a_{41}^2) = (4 - 1) + \sum_{k=1}^{4} (-a_{k1})^2.$$
(30)

So $g_{22}, g_{33}, ..., g_{nn}$ do likewise. To extend, for *n* criteria, the general form of the *i*th diagonal element of *G* is

$$g_{ii} = g_{jj} = (n-1) + \sum_{k} a_{kj}^2 = n + \sum_{k \neq j} a_{kj}^2, j = 1, \cdots, n.$$
(31)

Similarly, the non-diagonal elements are the sum of element-wise multiplication of one column and another column in *D*. When i = 1 and j = 2,

$$g_{12} = (1)(-a_{12}) + (-a_{21})(1) + (1)(1) = 1 - a_{12} - a_{21}.$$
 (32)
Likewise, the general form of non-diagonal elements is

$$g_{ij} = 1 - a_{ij} - a_{ji}, j = 1, \cdots, n.$$
(33)

Therefore, Eqs.(26) and (27) hold.

The only difference between Eq.(27) and Eqs.(8)-(9) is "plus one", i.e.,

$$g_{ii} = c_{ii} + 1 \tag{34}$$

The reason is due to the equation summation equal to one is not added into D. Thus, D will be \overline{D} , and q will be θ . Finding a non-trivial unique solution $w \neq 0$ for the homogeneous system $\overline{D}w = 0$ may not be straightforward, as $\overline{D}^T \overline{D}w = \overline{D}^T 0$, $\overline{D}^T \overline{D}w = 0$, and $\overline{G}w = 0$, and the trivial solution, i.e., w = 0, is not valid. It looks it is not straightforward to find a non-trivial solution. To solve this problem, the Normalized-IGM in Theorem 3 is proposed.

Theorem 3 (NIGM).

$$w = \frac{e\tilde{v}}{e\tilde{v}e^{T}} = \frac{e\tilde{G}^{-1}}{e\tilde{G}^{-1}e^{T}} = \frac{e(\bar{G}+r)^{-1}}{e(\bar{G}+r)^{-1}e^{T}} , \tilde{g}_{ij} \in \tilde{G} ,$$
(35)

$$\tilde{g}_{ij} = r + \bar{g}_{ij} = \begin{cases} r + (n-1) + \sum_{k \neq i} a_{kj}^2 & i = j \\ r - a_{ij} - a_{ji} & i \neq j \end{cases}, r \in \mathbb{R}, r \neq 0, \forall i, \forall j.$$
(36)

t is a real number, except for 0. $\bar{g}_{ij} = \tilde{g}_{ij} - t$.

Proof.

From Theorem 1, Eq.(23) is arranged as below.

$$v = e(D^T D)^{-1} = e\left(\left[\frac{\overline{D}}{e}\right]^T \left[\frac{\overline{D}}{e}\right]\right)^{-1} = eG^{-1}$$
(37)

If r = 0, D is changed to \overline{D} . Thus,

$$\bar{\nu} = e(\bar{D}^T \bar{D})^{-1} = e\bar{G}^{-1}.$$
(38)

Similar to the proof steps in Theorem 2,

$$\bar{g}_{ij} = \begin{cases} (n-1) + \sum_{k \neq i} a_{kj}^2 & i = j \\ -a_{ij} - a_{ji} & i \neq j \end{cases}, \forall i, \forall j.$$
(39)

The Pseudo-inverse method of the form above is the alternative approach to obtain Eq. (10). when a PRM is perfectly consistent, \bar{G} or C is not invertible, and r = 0 is not recommended. To address this problem, two conditions are established as below.

For r > 0,

$$\tilde{v} = e \left(\tilde{D}^T \tilde{D} \right)^{-1} = e \left(\begin{bmatrix} \bar{D} \\ e \sqrt{r} \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \bar{D} \\ e \sqrt{r} \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} = e \tilde{G}^{-1}.$$
(40)

For r < 0,

$$\tilde{\nu} = e \left(\tilde{D}^T \tilde{D} \right)^{-1} = e \left(\begin{bmatrix} \bar{D} \\ e \sqrt{|r|} \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \bar{D} \\ -e \sqrt{|r|} \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} = e \left(\begin{bmatrix} \bar{D} \\ -e \sqrt{|r|} \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \bar{D} \\ e \sqrt{|r|} \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} = e \tilde{G}^{-1}.$$
(41)
o proof steps in Theorem 2, Eqs.(35) and (36) hold. #

Similar to proof steps in Theorem 2, Eqs.(35) and (36) hold.

Eqs. (37)-(38) and proof steps in Theorem 2 show how Eqs.(8)-(10) are derived, and not mentioned in [19] and [36]. If A is a perfectly consistent PRM, The remedy to non-invertible problem using Eqs.(8)-(10) in [36] is shown as below.

$$\tilde{G} = \bar{G} + r = C + r = \left[\bar{g}_{ij}\right] + r, r \neq 0$$

$$\tag{42}$$

To solve the non-invertible problem in Eqs.(8)-(10) raised by [36], simply a non-zero constant is added to \bar{G} or *C*. Is it possible to find a value for *r*, so that normalization of $e\bar{G}^{-1}$ is not needed? The next two subsections attempt to address this issue.

3.3. Lagrangian Inverse Gram Matrix Method

[19] presented Lagrange expression for Eq.(6) as below. (Note: The notations from (43) to (50) are quoted from [19] without modification with the purpose of comparisons with this study. They are treated as local variables for the function of [19].) The set of notations appears not to be mentioned and used in the literature, although some parts are correct and have merit for further investigation and use.

$$S' = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (w_i - a_{ij}w_j)^2 \right) + 2\lambda \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i$$
(43)

Differentiating Eq.(43) with respect to w_m yields the form below.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} (a_{im}w_m - w_i) a_{im} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} (a_{mj} - w_m) + \lambda = 0, \qquad m = 1, \dots, n.$$
(44)

Based on Eq.(44), [19] presented the matrix form below.

$$Bw = m, \tag{45}$$

where B is a $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ matrix with elements b_{ij} of the form below.

$$b_{ii} = \bar{g}_{ij} = c_{ii} = (n-1) + \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji}^2, \qquad i, j = 1, \cdots, n,$$
(46)

$$b_{ij} = \bar{g}_{ij} = c_{ij} = -a_{ij} - a_{ji}, \qquad i, j = 1, \cdots, n,$$
(47)

$$b_{k,n+1} = b_{n+1,k} = 1, \qquad k = 1, \cdots, n,$$
(48)

$$m = (0, \dots, 0, 1)^T,$$
 (49)

$$w = (w_1, \dots, w_n, \lambda)^T.$$
⁽⁵⁰⁾

[19] did not provide clear proof and demonstration to solve the linear system of Eq.(45). It is unclear how Eq. (43) is constructed and converted to Eq. (44), and how the equation form of Eq.(44) is related to the matrix form of Eq.(45). Although this study found that solving Eq.(45) yields the closed-form of WLS, [19] did not propose the way to solve. These are some mistakes for some illustrated steps. The constraint part of Eq.(43) appears not to match the definition of Lagrange theorem, which the corrected form is shown in Eq.(51) in this study. Although [19] did not show the partial differentiation for Eq.(43) with respect to λ , the result is not correct, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = 0$. Eq.(44) does not lead to Eq.(45); For example, a_{im}^2 still exist in off-diagonal elements whilst Eq. (47) does not have a_{im}^2 . To correct it, this study presents Eq.(52). To revise the Lagrange solution form leading to the least error of WLS, the Lagrange-IGM based on the notations and theorems derived from this study is presented in Theorem 4.

Theorem 4 (Lagrangian-IGM).

The Lagrange expression for the WLS is the form below.

$$y = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (w_i - a_{ij}w_j)^2 \right) + \lambda \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \right) - 1 \right).$$
(51)

The partial derivatives of y with respect to w_k and λ is as below.

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial w_k} = \left((n-1) + \sum_{i \neq k} a_{ik}^2 \right) w_k + \left(\sum_{i \neq k} (-a_{ik} - a_{ki}) w_i \right) + \lambda = 0, \qquad k = 1, \dots, n;$$
(52)

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial \lambda} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = 1.$$
(53)

 $\dot{\lambda} = 2\lambda$ is a Lagrange multiplier. The matrix expression of the system of linear equations above is

$$\ddot{G}\ddot{w}^T = \ddot{q}^T. \tag{54}$$

 $\ddot{q}^T = (\mathbf{0}, 1)^T$ where $\mathbf{0} = (0, ..., 0)$ of length n. $\ddot{w}^T = (w, \lambda)^T = (w_1, ..., w_n, \lambda)^T$ is a vector of solution weights and Lagrange multiplier. \ddot{G} is also the symmetric gram matrix. The 2x2 partition matrix \ddot{G} is mainly based on \bar{G} , i.e.,

$$\ddot{G} = \begin{vmatrix} \bar{G} & e^T \\ e & 0 \end{vmatrix}.$$
(55)

The solution of Lagrangian Inverse Gram Matrix is of the form below.

$$\ddot{w} = (w, \lambda) = \ddot{q}\ddot{G}^{-1}.$$
(56)

Proof.

Unlike the constraint function setting in Eq.(43) presented by [19], the Lagrange expression based on objective and constraint functions and in Eq. (6) is of the form shown in Eq.(51). $\dot{\lambda}$ is Lagrange multiplier for the constraint function, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i - 1 = 0$. To arrange the form in Eq.(51),

$$y = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(w_i^2 - 2a_{ij}w_jw_i + (a_{ij}w_j)^2\right)\right) - \dot{\lambda} + \dot{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i.$$
(57)

When i = j, $a_{ij} = 1$, and thus

$$w_i^2 - 2a_{ij}w_jw_i + (a_{ij}w_j)^2 = 0.$$
(58)

Eq. (57) will be

$$y = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \left(w_i^2 - 2a_{ij}w_jw_i + (a_{ij}w_j)^2\right)\right) - \dot{\lambda} + \dot{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i.$$
(59)

To take partial derivative of y with respect to w_k , k = 1, ..., n,

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial w_k} = 2 \sum_{j \neq k} w_k - 2 \sum_{j \neq k} a_{kj} w_j - 2 \sum_{i \neq k} a_{ik} w_i + 2 \sum_{i \neq k} (a_{ik}^2 w_k) + \dot{\lambda} = 0.$$
(60)

To remove the coefficient 2 in the form above, substitute

$$\lambda = \frac{\dot{\lambda}}{2} \tag{61}$$

to the form above and arrange it to have

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial w_k} = \left((n-1)w_k + w_k \sum_{i \neq k} a_{ik}^2 \right) + \left(-\sum_{i \neq k, i} a_{ik}w_i - \sum_{j \neq k, j} a_{kj}w_j \right) + \lambda = 0.$$
(62)

Finally, Eq. (52) holds. To take partial derivative of y with respect to λ , Eq. (53) holds. The Gram matrix \ddot{G} of the size $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$ with coefficient elements is shown as below.

$$\ddot{G} = \begin{bmatrix} \ddot{g}_{ij} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (n-1) + \sum_{i \neq 1} a_{i1}^2 & -a_{21} - a_{12} & \cdots & -a_{n1} - a_{1n} & 1 \\ -a_{21} - a_{12} & (n-1) + \sum_{i \neq 2} a_{i2}^2 & \cdots & -a_{2n} - a_{n2} & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ -a_{n1} - a_{1n} & -a_{2n} - a_{n2} & \cdots & (n-1) + \sum_{i \neq 3} a_{in}^2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(63)

 \overline{G} is proved in Theorem 3. \overline{G} is a block in \overline{G} . \overline{G} is non-singular and invertible. Thus, Eq. (55) holds. Eq.(54) holds and lead to the inverse solution shown in Eq.(56).

 \ddot{G} is invertible and satisfies the properties of Gram Matrix. The major difference between \ddot{G} and \bar{G} may be the Lagrange multiplier λ which makes the \ddot{G} become inhomogeneous when A is perfectly consistent. Although several ways such as Gaussian elimination can solve the linear system, for the focus of this study, inverse method is chosen as the solution shown in Eq.(56). \tilde{G} may be used instead of \bar{G} in \ddot{G} , i.e.,

$$\ddot{G} = \begin{vmatrix} \tilde{G} & \boldsymbol{e}^T \\ \boldsymbol{e} & 0 \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} \bar{G} + \tilde{r} & \boldsymbol{e}^T \\ \boldsymbol{e} & 0 \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} G - 1 + \tilde{r} & \boldsymbol{e}^T \\ \boldsymbol{e} & 0 \end{vmatrix}.$$
(64)

Although Lagrange multiplier element in the last row and the other elements of \ddot{G}^{-1} are changed, w located in the last row of \ddot{G}^{-1} , which we only feel interested, is the same, no matter what \tilde{r} of real value is used for \tilde{G} . To simply the calculation, $\tilde{r} = 0$ is used for Eq.(64), although it is nothing wrong to choose the other real value including one for r.

Nomo	Labal	Earma	Domontra
Name	Label	Form	Remarks
Pseudo-IGM	PIGM	eG^{-1} $e(D^TD)^{-1}$	Eqs. (16), (14) and (26) (or (27)).
		$W = \frac{1}{eG^{-1}e^T} = \frac{1}{e(D^T D)^{-1}e^T}$	
Normalized-IGM	NIGM	$e\tilde{G}^{-1}$ $e(\bar{G}+r)^{-1}$	Eqs. (35)-(36) or Eq. (42)
		$w = \frac{1}{e\tilde{G}^{-1}e^T} = \frac{1}{e(\bar{G}+r)^{-1}e^T}$	
Lagrangian -IGM	LIGM	$\ddot{w} = (w, \lambda) = \ddot{q}\ddot{G}^{-1}$	Eqs. (55) and (56)

Table 1. A family of three Inverse Gram Matrix Methods

4. Numerical Examples

One consistent and one inconsistent PRMs are used to demonstrate the calculation steps of three proposed Inverse Gram Matrix Methods summarized in Table 1 in Examples 1 and 2 respectively. For the baseline testing, when a PRM is consistent, *w* has only one solution, which must be produced by a valid prioritization method. To solve the optimization model in Eq.(6) and (7), the NLOPT_GN_ISRES solver algorithm of nloptr package [37] in R language is used, whilst the *solve()* function in R language is used to find the inverse of a matrix. For the following calculation, the display is round to three decimal places, but actual places are used as such as the R programme can handle. If the *w* values are round to three decimal places, the WLS optimization model of Eqs.(6) and (7) using optimization software produce the same results as IGM methods below.

4.1. Example 1

For the baseline of validity, a prioritization method must produce the only one prioritization solution of a perfectly consistent PRM. Given a perfectly consistent 4×4 PRM below,

	<u>1</u>	2	4	⁸ 1
	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	2	4
$A_1 =$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	2
	$\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1

by

Algorithm 1, a $(12 + 1) \times 4$ design matrix *D* is of the form below,

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{D} \\ e \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} & \overline{D} \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \overline{D} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -4 & 0 \\ -0.25 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -8 \\ -\frac{1}{8} & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -4 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{4} & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

The last row of *D* is *e* with respect to the coefficients of the weight sum equal to unity function and the rest rows of *D* is the 12×4 design matrix with respect to objective function, \overline{D} . The 4×4 gram matrix computed by matrix multiplication shown in Eq.(15) is of the form below.

$$G = D^{T}D = \begin{bmatrix} 4.328 & -1.5 & -3.25 & -7.125 \\ -1.5 & 8.312 & -1.5 & -3.250 \\ -3.25 & -1.5 & 24.25 & -1.5 \\ -7.125 & -3.25 & -1.5 & 88 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Alternatively, without constructing a D matrix, G can be computed by element form with Eq. (26). For example, two entries of G are computed as below.

$$g_{11} = (4-1) + \left(1 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{8}\right)^2\right) = 4.328;$$

$$g_{12} = 1 - 2 - \frac{1}{2} = -1.5.$$

The inverse gram matrix by *solve()* function in R is of the form below.

$$G^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.357 & 0.087 & 0.055 & 0.033 \\ 0.087 & 0.145 & 0.021 & 0.013 \\ 0.055 & 0.021 & 0.050 & 0.006 \\ 0.033 & 0.013 & 0.006 & 0.015 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Pseudo-IGM, sum each row or column of a symmetric G^{-1} to have

$$v = eG^{-1} = (0.533, 0.267, 0.133, 0.067);$$

$$eG^{-1}e^{T} = \sum v = 1;$$

$$w = \frac{eG^{-1}}{eG^{-1}e^{T}} = (0.533, 0.267, 0.133, 0.067).$$

For the method mentioned in [36], by Eq.(34),

$$\bar{G} = C = \bar{D}^T \bar{D} = G - 1 = \begin{bmatrix} 3.328 & -2.5 & -4.25 & -8.125 \\ -2.5 & 7.312 & -2.5 & -4.250 \\ -4.25 & -2.5 & 23.25 & -2.5 \\ -8.125 & -4.25 & -2.5 & 87 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For a perfectly consistent A, as \overline{G} is a singular matrix and not invertible, Eqs. (8)-(10) cannot produce the w solution. N-IGM proposed in **Theorem 3** is used to solve this problem.

$$w = \frac{e\tilde{G}^{-1}}{e\tilde{G}^{-1}e^{T}} = \frac{e(\bar{G}+r)^{-1}}{e(\bar{G}+r)^{-1}e^{T}}.$$

r is a real number, except for 0.

For r = 1, the result is the same as PIGM. For r = 5 as an illustration of NIGM, i.e.,

$$\tilde{G} = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{D} \\ e\sqrt{5} \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \overline{D} \\ e\sqrt{5} \end{bmatrix} = \bar{G} + 5 \, .$$

The inverse of \tilde{G} is

$$\tilde{G}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1300 & -0.0263 & 0.0015 & 0.0047 \\ -0.0263 & 0.0881 & 0.0070 & 0.0014 \\ 0.0015 & 0.0070 & 0.0361 & -0.0010 \\ 0.0047 & 0.0014 & -0.0010 & 0.0111 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Finally,

$$w = \frac{e\tilde{G}^{-1}}{e\tilde{G}^{-1}e^{T}} = \frac{(0.1067, 0.0533, 0.0267, 0.0133)}{0.2} = (0.533, 0.267, 0.133, 0.067).$$

Similarly, if we the other take non-zero value for r, w is the same as PIGM after the normalization procedure above.

By Lagrangian-IGM in Theorem 4, the Lagrange gram matrix is

$$\ddot{G} = \begin{vmatrix} \bar{G} & e^T \\ e & 0 \end{vmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 3.328 & -2.5 & -4.25 & -8.125 & 1 \\ -2.5 & 7.312 & -2.5 & -4.250 & 1 \\ -4.25 & -2.5 & 23.25 & -2.5 & 1 \\ -8.125 & -4.25 & -2.5 & 87 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Its inverse matrix is

$$\ddot{G}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0730 & -0.0547 & -0.0158 & -0.0024 & 0.5333 \\ -0.0548 & 0.0738 & -0.0141 & -0.0050 & 0.2667 \\ -0.0158 & -0.0141 & 0.0326 & -0.0028 & 0.1333 \\ -0.0024 & -0.0050 & -0.0028 & 0.0102 & 0.0666 \\ 0.5333 & 0.2667 & 0.1333 & 0.0666 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Finally, the last row or column of \ddot{G}^{-1} excluding the last element of Lagrange Multiplier is the solution of w, i.e.,

$$\ddot{w} = (w, \lambda) = \ddot{q}\ddot{G}^{-1} = (0.533, 0.267, 0.133, 0.067, 0).$$

4.2. Example 2

The inconsistent PRM below is to evaluate six criteria listed in sequence to select the high school: learning, friends, school life, vocational training, college preparation, music classes [5].

$$A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 4 \\ 1/4 & 1 & 7 & 3 & 1/5 & 1 \\ 1/3 & 1/7 & 1 & 1/5 & 1/5 & 1/6 \\ 1 & 1/3 & 5 & 1 & 1 & 1/3 \\ 1/3 & 5 & 5 & 1 & 1 & 3 \\ 1/4 & 1 & 6 & 3 & 1/3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Consistency index and ratio are 0.3 and 0.24 respectively. G can be computed by element form with Eq. (26) or

Algorithm 1 and Eq.(15).

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} 7.347 & -3.25 & -2.333 & -1 & -2.333 & -3.25 \\ -3.25 & 48.132 & -6.143 & -2.333 & -4.2 & -1 \\ -2.333 & -6.143 & 150 & -4.2 & -4.2 & -5.167 \\ -1 & -2.333 & -4.2 & 26.04 & -1 & -2.333 \\ -2.333 & -4.2 & -4.2 & -1 & 16.191 & -2.333 \\ -3.25 & -1 & -5.167 & -2.333 & -2.333 & 32.139 \end{bmatrix}$$

The inverse gram matrix is of the form below.

$$G^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.166 & 0.016 & 0.005 & 0.012 & 0.033 & 0.021 \\ 0.016 & 0.023 & 0.002 & 0.004 & 0.009 & 0.004 \\ 0.005 & 0.002 & 0.007 & 0.002 & 0.003 & 0.002 \\ 0.012 & 0.004 & 0.002 & 0.04 & 0.006 & 0.005 \\ 0.033 & 0.009 & 0.003 & 0.006 & 0.072 & 0.01 \\ 0.021 & 0.004 & 0.002 & 0.005 & 0.01 & 0.035 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By PIGM, the weights are

$$w = \frac{eG^{-1}}{eG^{-1}e^{T}} = \frac{(0.254, 0.057, 0.021, 0.069, 0.134, 0.077)}{(0.254 + 0.057 + 0.021 + 0.069 + 0.134 + 0.077)}$$

= (0.415, 0.094, 0.035, 0.112, 0.219, 0.125).

By NIGM the easiest way (but not the safety way as default) is to choose r=0 since A_2 is not perfectly consistent. As

$$\tilde{G} = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{D} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \overline{D} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \overline{G} = G - 1,$$

the inverse matrix is

$$\tilde{G}^{-1} = \bar{G}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.333 & 0.053 & 0.019 & 0.057 & 0.121 & 0.072 \\ 0.053 & 0.032 & 0.005 & 0.014 & 0.029 & 0.015 \\ 0.019 & 0.005 & 0.008 & 0.006 & 0.011 & 0.006 \\ 0.057 & 0.014 & 0.006 & 0.052 & 0.03 & 0.019 \\ 0.121 & 0.029 & 0.011 & 0.03 & 0.118 & 0.036 \\ 0.072 & 0.015 & 0.006 & 0.019 & 0.036 & 0.05 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Take the sum of rows or columns of the matrix above,

$$e\tilde{G}^{-1} = (0.655\ 0.148\ 0.055\ 0.177\ 0.346\ 0.198).$$

By Eq.(35), w is the same as PIGM. Please note that if PRM is perfectly consistent, r=0 leads to error due to non-invertible gram matrix. This is shown in the previous example. For the easiest and safe calculation, r=1 is recommended, and NIGM is PIGM.

By Lagrangian-IGM, the Lagrange gram matrix based on Eq. (64) where $\tilde{r} = 1$ and $G = \bar{G} + 1$ is shown as below.

$$\ddot{G} = \begin{vmatrix} G & e^T \\ e & 0 \end{vmatrix}.$$

The Lagrange inverse gram matrix is

	г 0.061	-0.008	-0.004	-0.017	-0.022	-0.01	ן 0.415
	-0.008	0.018	0	-0.003	-0.003	-0.004	0.094
	-0.004	0	0.006	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	0.035
$\ddot{G}^{-1} =$	-0.017	-0.003	-0.001	0.032	-0.009	-0.004	0.112
	-0.022	-0.003	-0.001	-0.009	0.042	-0.007	0.219
	-0.01	-0.004	-0.001	-0.004	-0.007	0.025	0.125
	L 0.415	0.094	0.035	0.112	0.219	0.125	-1.633

By Eq. (56), the solution for (w, λ) is the last row or column of \ddot{G}^{-1} . No matter what real value is chosen for \tilde{r} , w is the same as λ is changed accordingly. Small value like 1 or 0 is recommended to avoid unnecessary extra calculation.

5. Simulations and Verifications

As mentioned early, many comparisons and discussion for prioritizations including WLS exist in the literature, which is not the focus of this paper. The objective of this paper is to promote IGM methods, which are interestingly the closed-form solution of WLS. Therefore, IGM methods produce the least WLS error over all the other prioritization methods. This paper highlights computational efficiency and accuracy for the inverse matrix method for the exact values, instead of using optimization solver for WLS to find the approximate value. To further verify the validity of solutions from the proposed three IGM methods summarized in Table 1, especially to investigate if any missing or special cases are overlooked for the algorithm design and implementation, the pseudo code of the proposed verification algorithm is presented in Algorithm 2. The 9-point scale is used for τ . The maximum number of criteria, n^{max} , is set to 15. The hardware performed is OMEN by Laptop 16 with Intel i9-13900HX CPU and 32GB RAM. The single CPU core process is used for easier benchmarking.

Let w^{WLS} , w^{PIGM} , $w^{NIGM(r)}$, w^{LIGM} and $w^{LIGM(r)}$ be the prioritization weights by WLS of Eqs. (6) and (7), PIGM of Eq. (16), NIGM(r) of Eq. (35), LIGM of Eq.(56) and LIGM(r) of Eq.(64). Although r is a non-zero real number, it is set to between -1000 and 1000 for verification as a large value for r is not recommended due to computational workload. In principle, the following relationships are verified.

$$errorDectected = \begin{cases} False & w^{WLS} = w^{PIGM} = w^{NIGM(r)} = w^{LIGM} = w^{LIGM(r)} \\ True & Otherwise \end{cases}$$
(65)

In practise, the error detection is implemented as two parts due to different computational efficiency and floating-point comparisons. *testwlsOpt* in Algorithm 2 is used to set which part is tested.

Simulation 1 is to test the equality of $w^{PIGM} = w^{NIGM(r)} = w^{LIGM} = w^{LIGM(r)}$. The major step is shown in Step 2b of Algorithm 2. PIGM, LIGM and NIGM should produce the same results, which however are not always possible. Computing floating-point operations may induce rounded and truncated errors, a very small difference leads to false equality. Therefore, IGM equality verification in Eq.(65) are implemented by Eq. (66). The inverse matrix function is performed by *solve()* function in R programming language. The simulation of one million random PRMs calculated by four IGM methods took only 21.94 mins (1,316.48 seconds). The file of the simulation data is available in Supplementary 1. No error is found from the simulation results of the one million random instances. It is concluded four methods produce the same results. The significant decimal places, ε , is set to 8 for the round function.

Simulation 2 is to test the equality between WLS and one of IGM methods, e.g., *PIGM* in this case. The major step is shown in Step 2c of Algorithm 2. As the numerical solvers of diverse algorithms very likely achieve the good enough solution to approximate to the exact solution, a lower approximate error of w^{WLS} can usually be produced by setting higher searching cost. Therefore, WLS and IGM equality verification in Eq.(65) are implemented by Eq.(67) after Eq.(66) has been verified. The significant decimal places, ε , is set to 4 for the round function. The NLOPT_GN_ISRES solver algorithm of nloptr package [37] in R programming language is used to implement WLS of Eqs.(6) and (7). To obtain the better accuracy of the optimization solver, the maximum number of function evaluations is set for 500,000 for the fractional tolerance of 10^{-6} and the weights obtained by PIGM are used as the initial search values. If an error is detected, i.e., the weights varied slightly far from the exact value with higher WLS objective error, the computational cost should be increased, and the simulation should be re-run again.

For the simulation 2, 10,000 random PRMs have been performed by taking 156,882.8 seconds (43.58 hours). The file of the simulation data is available in Supplementary 2. No error or unexpected case is found from all generated random PRM instances. It can be concluded that IGM methods produce the exact closed-form solution for WLS of Eqs.(6) and (7), and the results can be used to verify the solutions of optimization solver. By comparing the computational time in simulations 1 and 2, the solver to obtain better precision from WLS is very computationally expensive. The IGM methods can be used to quickly determine the weights with less computational effort.

Algorithm 2: (*Verification*($N, n^{max}, \tau, testwlsOpt, \varepsilon$))

Input : <i>N</i> : Testing sample size; n^{max} : maximum number of criteria; τ : <i>z</i> -point scale for a_{ij} ;
testwlsOpt: False for Simulation 1; True to Simulation 2. ε : significant decimal places
Step 1: Initialize the values.
times = 1 $\#$ case number or counter
error = 0 # error checking
flag = TRUE # flag to continue or exist the while-loop.
Step 2: Perform comparisons for N samples.
While (flag):
Step 2a: Generate a random PRM.
Generate a random integer between 3 and n^{max} for <i>n</i> .
$n = random(3, n^{max})$
Generate a non-zero random number between -1000 and 1000.
$r = random(-1000, 1000, \neg 0)$
Generate a random $n \times n$ PRM based τ scale.
$A = generatePRM(n, \tau)$
Step 2b: Determine to perform Simulation 1
If $(testwlsopt = FALSE)$

Obtain *w* with four IGM methods.

 $w^{PIGM} = PIGM(A)$ $w^{NIGM(r)} = NIGM(A, r)$ $w^{LIGM} = LIGM(A)$ $w^{LIGM(r)} = LIGM(A, r)$ # Test if any error. $error = round\left(\sum_{k \in \left\{ \sum_{IIGM(r), \\ LIGM, LIGM(r) \right\}}} |round(w^{PIGM}, \varepsilon) - round(w^{k}, \varepsilon)|, (\varepsilon - 1) \right)$ (66)

Step 2c: Determine to perform Simulation 2 **If** (*testwlsopt* = *TRUE*) #Obtain *w* with difference methods. $w^{WLS} = wlsOpt(A)$ $w^{PIGM} = PIGM(A)$ # Test if any error.

$$error = round(|round(w^{WLS}, \varepsilon) - round(w^{PIGM}, \varepsilon)|, \varepsilon - 1)$$
(67)

Step 3c: determine the exit flag for the while-loop.

increment the counter by 1 times += 1# If N samples are performed or an error is found, exit the while-loop. Otherwise, continue. $flag = \begin{cases} FALSE, error \neq 0 \text{ or } times > N \\ TRUE, & otherwise \end{cases}$

End While

If an error is found, print the relevant information for further study.

Otherwise, no error is found, i.e., error = 0.

$$errorDectected = \begin{cases} True & error \neq 0\\ FALSE & error = 0 \end{cases}$$
(68)

Return: errorDectected

6. Conclusion

The initiative of this study is to propose independent Pseudo–Inverse Gram Matrix method to solve the pairwise reciprocal matrix in AHP. Interestingly, it is found that the PIGM method produces the exact solution for WLS without numerical solution with optimization solver. The the closed-form solution of WLS from the previous studies [19] and [36] were not completed, especially proofs, demonstration and verification are lacking. This study further proposed Normalized-IGM and Lagrangian-IGM to fill the gap. The solution of WLS can be clearly explained in different perspectives. Lagrangian-IGM needs to solve Lagrange multiplier without normalization, whilst Pseudo-IGM needs to take the normalization without solving Lagrange multiplier. Normalized-IGM is the general form to extend the properties based on Pseudo-

IGM, especially to explain the element formulations in the gram matrix. Two numerical examples demonstrate calculation differences and similarities among three IGM methods. The intensive simulations verify the equivalence of the three IGM methods which produce the exact solution of WLS. This paper provides the better simple alternative forms on top of the WLS to solve the prioritization problem in the AHP, i.e. using simple inverse method instead of intensive numerical solutions.

Acknowledgement

Sincere thanks are extended to the editors and anonymous referees for their time and effort to improve the work.

Funding

This research has not been funded by any company or organization.

Author Contribution

This research is solely conducted by K.K.F. Yuen.

Conflict of Interest

The author states that there is no conflict of interest.

Data

The data is available in the Supplements 1 and 2.

References

- 1. Faliszewski, P., E. Hemaspaandra, and L.A. Hemaspaandra, *Using complexity to protect elections*. Commun. ACM, 2010. **53**(11): p. 74–82.
- 2. Koczkodaj, W.W., et al., *Important Facts and Observations about Pairwise Comparisons*. Fundamenta Informaticae, 2016. **144**: p. 1-17.
- 3. Thurstone, L., *A law of comparative judgment*. Psychological Review, 1927. **34**(4): p. 273-286.
- 4. Saaty, T.L., *A scaling method for priorities in hierarchical structures*. Journal of Mathematical Psychology, 1977. **15**(3): p. 234-281.
- 5. Saaty, T.L., Analytic Hierarchy Process: Planning, Priority, Setting, Resource Allocation. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980.
- 6. Saaty, T.L., Theory and Applications of the Analytic Network Process: Decision Making with Benefits, Opportunities, Costs, and Risks. RWS Publications, 2005.
- 7. Yuen, K.K.F., *Cognitive network process with fuzzy soft computing technique for collective decision aiding.* The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, 2009. **Ph.D. thesis**.
- 8. Yuen, K.K.F., *Pairwise opposite matrix and its cognitive prioritization operators: Comparisons with pairwise reciprocal matrix and analytic prioritization operators.* Journal of the Operational Research Society, 2012. **63**(3): p. 322-338.
- 9. Dyer, J.S., *Remarks on the analytic hierarchy process*. Management Science 1990. **36** (3): p. 249-258.
- 10. Barzilai, J., On the decomposition of value functions11Research supported in part by NSERC. Operations Research Letters, 1998. **22**(4): p. 159-170.
- 11. Whitaker, R., *Criticisms of the Analytic Hierarchy Process: Why they often make no sense.* Mathematical and Computer Modelling, 2007. **46**(7-8): p. 948-961.
- 12. Gass, S.I., *Model world: The great debate MAUT versus AHP*. Interfaces, 2005. **35**(4): p. 308-312.

- 13. Smith, J.E. and D.v. Winterfeldt, *Anniversary Article: Decision Analysis in Management Science*. Management Science, 2004. **50**(5): p. 561-574.
- 14. Forman, E.H., *Facts and fictions about the analytic hierarchy process*. Mathematical and Computer Modelling, 1993. **17**(4–5): p. 19-26.
- 15. Belton, V. and T. Gear, *On a short-coming of Saaty's method of analytic hierarchies*. Omega, 1983. **11**(3): p. 228-230.
- 16. Harker, P.T. and L.G. Vargas, *The Theory of Ratio Scale Estimation: Saaty's Analytic Hierarchy Process.* Management Science, 1987. **33**(11): p. 1383-1403.
- 17. Tu, J. and Z. Wu, *Analytic hierarchy process rank reversals: causes and solutions*. Annals of Operations Research, 2023.
- 18. Yuen, K.K.F., Analytic hierarchy prioritization process in the AHP application development: A prioritization operator selection approach. Applied Soft Computing Journal, 2010. **10**(4): p. 975-989.
- Chu, A.T.W., R.E. Kalaba, and K. Spingarn, A comparison of two methods for determining the weights of belonging to fuzzy sets. Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 1979. 27(4): p. 531-538.
- 20. Crawford, G. and C. Williams, *A note on the analysis of subjective judgment matrices*. Journal of Mathematical Psychology, 1985. **29**(4): p. 387-405.
- 21. Lin, C.C., *An enhanced goal programming method for generating priority vectors*. Journal of the Operational Research Society, 2006. **57**(12): p. 1491-1496.
- 22. Mikhailov, L., *A fuzzy programming method for deriving priorities in the analytic hierarchy process.* Journal of the Operational Research Society, 2000. **51**(3): p. 341-349.
- 23. Gass, S.I. and T. Rapcsák, *Singular value decomposition in AHP*. European Journal of Operational Research, 2004. **154**(3): p. 573-584.
- 24. Wang, Y.-M., C. Parkan, and Y. Luo, *Priority estimation in the AHP through maximization of correlation coefficient*. Applied Mathematical Modelling, 2007. **31**(12): p. 2711-2718.
- Wang, Y.-M., C. Parkan, and Y. Luo, A linear programming method for generating the most favorable weights from a pairwise comparison matrix. Computers & Operations Research, 2008. 35(12): p. 3918-3930.
- 26. Kou, G. and C. Lin, *A cosine maximization method for the priority vector derivation in AHP.* European Journal of Operational Research, 2014. **235**(1): p. 225-232.
- 27. Yuen, K.K.F., *The Least Penalty Optimization Prioritization Operators for the Analytic Hierarchy Process: A Revised Case of Medical Decision Problem of Organ Transplantation.* Systems Engineering, 2014. **17**(4): p. 442-461.
- 28. Zhang, J., et al., *Estimating priorities from relative deviations in pairwise comparison matrices*. Information Sciences, 2021. **552**: p. 310-327.
- 29. Wang, H., Y. Peng, and G. Kou, *A two-stage ranking method to minimize ordinal violation for pairwise comparisons*. Applied Soft Computing, 2021. **106**: p. 107287.
- 30. Golany, B. and M. Kress, *A multicriteria evaluation of methods for obtaining weights from ratioscale matrices.* European Journal of Operational Research, 1993. **69**(2): p. 210-220.
- 31. Mikhailov, L. and M.G. Singh. Comparison analysis of methods for deriving priorities in the analytic hierarchy process. in IEEE SMC'99 Conference Proceedings. 1999 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (Cat. No.99CH37028). 1999.
- 32. Choo, E.U. and W.C. Wedley, *A common framework for deriving preference values from pairwise comparison matrices.* Computers & Operations Research, 2004. **31**(6): p. 893-908.
- 33. Gyani, J., A. Ahmed, and M.A. Haq, *MCDM and Various Prioritization Methods in AHP for CSS: A Comprehensive Review.* IEEE Access, 2022. **10**: p. 33492-33511.
- 34. Bozóki, S., *Solution of the least squares method problem of pairwise comparison matrices*. Central European Journal of Operations Research, 2008. **16**(4): p. 345-358.
- 35. Carrizosa, E. and F. Messine, *An exact global optimization method for deriving weights from pairwise comparison matrices.* Journal of Global Optimization, 2007. **38**(2): p. 237-247.

- 36.
- Blankmeyer, E., *Approaches to consistency adjustment*. Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 1987. **54**(3): p. 479-488. Johnson, S.G. *The NLopt nonlinear-optimization package*. Dec 2023; Available from: <u>https://nlopt.readthedocs.io/en/latest/</u>. 37.