

# A novel framework for MCDM based on Z numbers and soft likelihood function

Yuanpeng He

**Abstract**—The optimization on the structure of process of information management under uncertain environment has attracted lots of attention from researchers around the world. Nevertheless, how to obtain accurate and rational evaluation from assessments produced by experts is still an open problem. Specially, intuitionistic fuzzy set provides an effective solution in handling indeterminate information. And Yager proposes a novel method for fusion of probabilistic evidence to handle uncertain and conflicting information lately which is called soft likelihood function. This paper devises a novel framework of soft likelihood function based on information volume of fuzzy membership and credibility measure for extracting truly useful and valuable information from uncertainty. An application is provided to verify the validity and correctness of the proposed framework. Besides, the comparisons with other existing methods further demonstrate the superiority of the novel framework of soft likelihood function.

**Index Terms**—Intuitionistic fuzzy set, Soft likelihood function, Divergence measure, Information volume, Credibility

## I. INTRODUCTION

**D**UE to its effectiveness in handling uncertain information, multi-criterion applied in lots of relative fields, including but not limited to risk evaluation [27], [32], [39], supplier selection [1], [5], [38], fault diagnosis [43], [46]. However, how to obtain accurate decisions from uncertain environment and complex source is still an open issue [13], [19].

Traditionally, experts are supposed to provide accurate evaluation on actual situations based on random alternative [29]. But the process of producing judgments may be too arbitrary and subjective, which can lead to unexpected results. Therefore, a new concept of linguistic variable is designed to better conform to intuition of human instead of assigning specifically certain values to subjects. In other words, it is not reasonable to require experts to provide accurate judgments on different situations [16]. Besides, it can be concluded that the introduction of linguistic variable enables decision making to become more feasible [4], [25], [28]. Utilizing linguistic variables, some useful and meaningful techniques are developed such as intuitionistic fuzzy set (IFS) [2], [40], [48], [49], interval-valued IFS [6], [22], [50] and other categories of fuzzy technologies [3], [9], [15], [24].

In real life, in the process of generating estimations, experts may encounter different circumstances which shape varied judgments on actual conditions [18], [26], [44]. Degree of affirmation, negation and hesitancy from experts change with standard of knowledge or other potential influential factors in the process of recognition of situations. Compared with relative approaches in information modeling, IFS is more

flexible and possesses superiority in handling uncertainty and conflicts.

Furthermore, the Dempster-Shafer (D-S) evidence theory has been recognized as an efficient framework to handle uncertainty and incomplete information [14], [20]. It offers a robust mechanism for combining evidence from different sources to arrive at a degree of belief that considers all available information. D-S evidence theory extends the classical probability theory by allowing the representation of uncertainty and conflict explicitly, making it particularly effective in multi-criteria decision-making scenarios. The integration of D-S evidence theory into decision-making processes enhances the ability to deal with complex and uncertain environments, offering a complementary perspective to existing fuzzy technologies and improving overall robustness [12].

Moreover, in order to appropriately and effectively manage ambiguity, Yager propose a softer process in combining uncertain information [45] based on original likelihood function and OWA operators [23] to avoid generating too absolute and counter-intuitive results, which is named as soft likelihood function (SLF). And some interesting researches are developed on the base of SLF [30], [34], [37] which provide some efficient solutions to extract instructive information from uncertainty. Because of the feasibility and excellent performance of soft likelihood function [17], it is introduced into the process of MCDM under intuitionistic environment in order to obtain correct and reasonable proofs for decision and strategy designing in this paper. And the contributions of the proposed framework for MCDM are listed as follows:

- Information volume of fuzzy membership and credibility measure of judgments of experts are properly combined to serve as a new dimension of estimation of each judgment among the ones belongs to groups.
- A novel method of producing fuzzy preference relation is devised for detecting degrees of importance of every node contained in information, which further improves sensitivity of the whole framework in erasing dirty data.
- A process of generating varied attitude characters (ACs) is designed. The superiority of this operation is that the phenomenon of setting AC for information manually and subjectively is avoided, which reduces the possibility in producing counter-intuitive results on account of unexpected fictitious factors.
- The proposed framework for SLF is able to obtain sufficiently accurate and rational results for decision and strategy making.

The remaining part of the paper is organized as follows.

The section of preliminaries generally introduces relevant information of useful concepts of techniques. And in the next section, some necessary discussions about the proposed framework are provided. Besides, detailed process of method proposed is well illustrated in the forth section. Moreover, an application and corresponding analysis are given to verify the correctness and validity of the proposed framework. In the last, conclusions are made to summarize the value of the work presented in this paper.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

Some related concepts are briefly introduced in this part. Some interesting work are completed based on them, such as decision making under intuitionistic environment [10], [33], network model [21], expert decision using Z-number [36] and information management based on soft likelihood function [8].

### A. Intuitionistic fuzzy set [2]

Let  $R$  be a finite universe of discourse. Then, an IFS  $T$  can be defined as:

$$T = \{\langle r, \varrho_T(r), \varphi_T(r) \rangle \mid r \in R\} \quad (1)$$

where

$$\varrho_T(r) : R \rightarrow [0, 1], \varphi_T(r) : R \rightarrow [0, 1] \quad (2)$$

and the property satisfied by the IFS can be defined as:

$$0 \leq \varrho_T(r) + \varphi_T(r) \leq 1, \forall r \in R \quad (3)$$

in which  $\varrho_T(r)$  indicates the degree of membership and  $\varphi_T(r)$  indicates the degree of non-membership with respect to  $r \in R$ .

Besides, the degree of hesitance can be defined as:

$$\xi_T(r) = 1 - \varrho_T(r) - \varphi_T(r) \quad (4)$$

Moreover, in a more simple expression, the tuple  $t = (\varrho_T(r), \varphi_T(r), \xi_T(r))$  is utilized to represent an intuitionistic fuzzy number (IFN), which can be regarded as one element of set  $T$ .

### B. First-order information volume of fuzzy membership function [7]

Assume there exist one IFN  $t = (\varrho_T(r), \varphi_T(r), \xi_T(r))$ , then the information volume of it can be defined as:

$$EIFN(t) = -(\varrho_T(r) \log_2 \varrho_T(r) + \varphi_T(r) \log_2 \varphi_T(r) + \xi_T(r) \log_2 \frac{\xi_T(r)}{C}) \quad (5)$$

in which the parameter  $C$  indicates the cardinal number of fuzzy sets which can be defined as:

$$C = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{(traditional fuzzy sets)} \\ 3 & \text{(intuitionistic fuzzy set)} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

After evaluation, the value of entropy reaches its zenith when  $\varrho_T(r) = \varphi_T(r) = \frac{1}{5}$ ,  $\xi_T(r) = \frac{3}{5}$ .

### C. Score function for IFS

Assume there exist one IFN  $t = (\varrho_T(r), \varphi_T(r), \xi_T(r))$ , then the score function can be defined as:

$$SF(t) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \xi_T)(1 - \varrho_T) \quad (7)$$

It can be concluded that when the value of  $SF(t)$  becomes smaller,  $T(r)$  is regarded less reliable.

### D. A Jensen–Shannon divergence-based distance measure for IFS [42]

Assume there exist two IFSs  $G = \{\langle r, \varrho_G(r), \varphi_G(r) \rangle \mid r \in R\}$  and  $V = \{\langle r, \varrho_V(r), \varphi_V(r) \rangle \mid r \in R\}$  under the finite universe of discourse  $R$ . And the degree of hesitancy can be obtained by  $\xi_G(r) = 1 - \varrho_G(r) - \varphi_G(r)$  and  $\xi_V(r) = 1 - \varrho_V(r) - \varphi_V(r)$ . Then, the distance measure of IFS can be defined as:

$$D(Z, V) = \left[ \frac{1}{2}(\varrho_G(r) \log_2 \frac{2 * \varrho_G(r)}{\varrho_G(r) + \varrho_V(r)} + \varrho_V(r) \log_2 \frac{2 * \varrho_V(r)}{\varrho_G(r) + \varrho_V(r)} + \varphi_G(r) \log_2 \frac{2 * \varphi_G(r)}{\varphi_G(r) + \varphi_V(r)} + \varphi_V(r) \log_2 \frac{2 * \varphi_V(r)}{\varphi_G(r) + \varphi_V(r)} + \xi_G(r) \log_2 \frac{2 * \xi_G(r)}{\xi_G(r) + \xi_V(r)} + \xi_V(r) \log_2 \frac{2 * \xi_V(r)}{\xi_G(r) + \xi_V(r)}) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (8)$$

### E. Closeness centrality [41]

The closeness centrality represents the level of difficulty of the process that one point reaches other points which can be defined as:

$$CC_f = \frac{|F| - 1}{\sum_{f \neq j} D_{fj}} \quad (9)$$

in which  $|F|$  indicates the total number of points and  $D_{fj}$  represents the distance between  $f$  and  $j$ .

### F. Z-number [47]

Z-number is proposed by Zadeh to better handle uncertain information which can be defined as:

$$ZN = \{\Upsilon, U\} = ZN^+(\Upsilon, \tau_\Upsilon \cdot p_{H_\Upsilon} \text{ is } U) \quad (10)$$

$\Upsilon$  is a fuzzy constraint with respect to certain problem  $H_\Upsilon$  and  $U$  is an estimation of reliability of  $\Upsilon$ . Besides, the variable  $H_\Upsilon$  is stochastic for  $\Upsilon$  and the membership of  $\Upsilon$  and  $U$  are represented by  $\varrho_\Upsilon(r)$  and  $\varrho_U(r)$ . Additionally,  $\Upsilon$  and  $U$  are not independent with each other which are connected by the hidden probability  $p_{H_\Upsilon}$ .

### G. Fuzzy preference relation [31]

Assume there exist a set  $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k\}$ , a fuzzy preference relation  $F$  can be expressed by a complementary matrix  $FPRM = (f_{we})_{k \times k}$  which can be defined as:

$$f_{we} > 0, f_{we} + f_{ew} = 1, f_{ww} = 1, w, e = 1, 2, \dots, k \quad (11)$$

where the  $f_{we}$  represents the extent that  $t_w$  is preferred to  $t_e$ . And the details of parameter  $f_{we}$  can be defined as:

$$f_{we} = \begin{cases} 1 & t_w \text{ is strongly preferred to } t_e \\ \vartheta \in (0.5, 1) & t_w \text{ is slightly preferred to } t_e \\ 0.5 & \text{no difference between } t_w \text{ and } t_e \\ \omega \in (0, 0.5) & t_e \text{ is slightly preferred to } t_w \\ 0 & t_e \text{ is strongly preferred to } t_w \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

in which the bigger the value of  $\vartheta$  the more degree of preference whit respect to  $t_w$  to  $t_e$ . On the contrary, the value of  $\omega$  becomes less, more preference is given to  $t_e$ .

#### H. Original likelihood function

Assume there exist a series of distributions of probability,  $dp_j$ , in regard to incident  $I_x$  and the according likelihood function which can be defined as:

$$LF_{I_x} = \prod_{j=1}^k dp_j \quad (13)$$

#### I. Ordered weighted aggregation operator [23]

The ordered weighted aggregation operator is composed of  $k$  dimensions and is a mapping of  $W^k \rightarrow W$  which can be defined as:

$$\psi = \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ \dots \\ w_k \end{bmatrix} \quad (14)$$

and the property of the operator can be defined as:

$$\sum_{j=1}^k w_j = 1, 0 \leq w_j \leq 1 \quad (15)$$

When  $\psi = \psi^* = [1, 0, \dots, 0]^T$ , it can be regarded as a optimized strategy; when  $\psi = \psi^* = [0, 0, \dots, 1]^T$ , it can be regarded as a pessimistic strategy. Besides, if  $\psi = \psi_K = [\frac{1}{k}, \frac{1}{k}, \dots, \frac{1}{k}]^T$ . Based on the regulations, an attitude character  $\Delta$  is devised and then one method to produce weights for OWA operator can be defined as:

$$w_j = \left(\frac{s}{k}\right)^{\frac{1-\Delta}{\Delta}} - \left(\frac{s-1}{k}\right)^{\frac{1-\Delta}{\Delta}} \quad (16)$$

#### J. Soft likelihood function [45]

Yager thinks the expression of likelihood function is too absolute, so a softer process of creating likelihood function is designed based on the definition of OWA operators which can be defined as:

$$\Upsilon S_l(a) = \subseteq_{h=1}^a dp_l v_l(h) \quad (17)$$

Utilizing OWA operators, the formula for soft likelihood function  $E_l$  in regard to one element  $c_l$  can be defined as:

$$E_{l,\psi} = \sum_{a=1}^k w_a \Upsilon S_l(a) \quad (18)$$

### III. SOME DISCUSSIONS ON THE DESIGN AND PERFORMANCE OF THE PRESENTED METHOD

The method proposed in this paper first takes the relationship of individual IFSs which are within one group of judgments made by one expert to further indicate the role of each part of a group of IFS. Then, by considering the situation of the judgments in all estimation produce by expert, the total degree of reliability of judgments can be obtained. Besides, another dimension of assessing the conditions of judgments in the form of IFS individually is designed by introducing the information volume of fuzzy membership function to ensure the judgments are assigned a comprehensive estimation. Through combining the weights generated by reliability measure and information volume, a new framework based on dynamic attitude characters of soft likelihood function can be obtained. Compared with the traditional formula of soft likelihood function [45], the difference is that the attitude characters in the traditional one are set subjectively without taking internal and external factors of these judgments into consideration, which is not a intuitive operation because the attitude character can not be exactly the same for different judgments. However, in some related works, the attitude character dose not vary with the changes of source of information and conditions of information itself. In order to overcome this drawback, the method of generating attitude character is designed and the corresponding formula of varied expression of improved soft likelihood function is also produced. After necessary checking and comparisons with other effective method, the improved version of soft likelihood function performs very well in decision making and strategy designing.

Besides, the expectation of the performance of the presented method can be concluded into two points. The first one is that the proposed method highlights the most credible judgments produced by experts and exaggerates the values of indicators with respect to estimations on actual situations. Therefore, the differences of values of indicator can be obvious enough and even very divergent with each other, which is determined by the feature of the method of generation of attitude character and original soft likelihood function. The second is an extension of the first one. The crucial point needing to be emphasized is that what is expected to be concerned is the final results of the judgments on certain subjects instead of focusing on the difference of values of incompletely processed data. For decision makers, the thing to determine the priority of different decisions and strategy is the most important. Therefore, the values of judgments produced by algorithms are expected to be straightforward and clear for decision and strategy making, then the performance and the credibility of them can be believable and efficient

### IV. NOVEL FRAMEWORK OF SOFT LIKELIHOOD FUNCTION IN EXPERT DECISION SYSTEMS

In this section, a new framework of soft likelihood function is proposed to handle multiple criteria decision making problems. The presented method takes attributes of information provided into consideration fully so as to generate enough

accurate estimations to actual situations. And the detailed process of the presented method is given as below:

**Step 1:** Obtain corresponding information for linguistic variables in decision making. Then, transfer them into the form of IFS. Linguistic variables are widely utilized to manage uncertain information for decision makers. One thing which is supposed to be pointed out is that if experts are familiar with the concept of IFS, they can make judgments directly based on IFS.

**Step 2:** Utilize the concept of traditional score function, a formula is devised to calculate measurement of reliability of each individual IFS. For example, assume there exist one IFS  $I = (\varrho_T(r), \varphi_T(r))$ , the degree of reliability of it can be defined as:

$$SF(t)^I = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \varrho_T)(1 - \varphi_T) \quad (19)$$

Because the degree of membership is a crucial factor which indicates the general situation of judgments given by experts, then the formula focuses on the influence brought by the membership and the part which dose not opposes certain subjects evaluated.

**Step 3:** Then, the fuzzy numbers can be transferred into the form which can be defined as:

$$I_Z = ((\varrho_T(r), \varphi_T(r)), SF(t)^I) \quad (20)$$

**Step 4:** Combine the transformed fuzzy numbers by getting products of degree of reliability and membership and non-membership. The detailed process can be defined as:

$$I = (\varrho_T(r) \times SF(t)^I, \varphi_T(r) \times SF(t)^I) \quad (21)$$

**Step 5:** Calculate distances of IFSs within groups,  $D(Z, V)$ , by utilizing Jensen–Shannon divergence-based distance measure which can be defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} D(Z, V) = & \left[ \frac{1}{2}(\varrho_Z(r) \log_2 \frac{2 * \varrho_Z(r)}{\varrho_Z(r) + \varrho_V(r)} + \varrho_V(r) \log_2 \frac{2 * \varrho_V(r)}{\varrho_Z(r) + \varrho_V(r)} \right. \\ & + \varphi_Z(r) \log_2 \frac{2 * \varphi_Z(r)}{\varphi_Z(r) + \varphi_V(r)} + \varphi_V(r) \log_2 \frac{2 * \varphi_V(r)}{\varphi_Z(r) + \varphi_V(r)} \\ & \left. + \xi_Z(r) \log_2 \frac{2 * \xi_Z(r)}{\xi_Z(r) + \xi_V(r)} + \xi_V(r) \log_2 \frac{2 * \xi_V(r)}{\xi_Z(r) + \xi_V(r)} \right]^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

**Step 6:** Produce similarity measure for IFSs. Assume there exist one IFS  $Z_i$  and other IFSs which are contained in one group with  $Z_i$  are denoted by  $Z_k$  and the total number of IFSs in one group is  $M$ . Then, the similarity for IFS  $Z_i$  can be produced by the formula which can be defined as:

$$SM_{Z_i} = \frac{M - 1}{\sum_{k \neq i} D(Z_i, Z_k)} \quad (23)$$

**Step 7:** Generate fuzzy preference relation in groups of IFSs. Assume there exist two similarity of IFSs which can be given as  $SM_{Z_i}$  and  $SM_{Z_j}$ . Then, normalize the two similarities using the formula which can be defined as:

$$\vartheta = \frac{SM_{Z_i}}{SM_{Z_i} + SM_{Z_j}}, \varphi = \frac{SM_{Z_j}}{SM_{Z_i} + SM_{Z_j}} \quad (24)$$

then, compare the two parameter  $\vartheta$  and  $\omega$ , if  $\vartheta$  is bigger than  $\omega$ , then it can be regarded that  $Z_j$  prefers  $Z_i$  to be considered as the reference in the decision making; on the contrary, if  $\omega$  is bigger than  $\vartheta$ , then it can be regarded that  $Z_i$  prefers  $Z_j$  to be considered as the reference in the decision making. Besides, when  $\vartheta$  and  $\omega$  are identically equal, there exist no winner in comparison. The preferred ones are allocated an indicator of 1 and the other ones are distributed 0, then one fuzzy preference relation matrix can be constructed which can be defined as:

$$FPRM = \begin{bmatrix} pr_{11} & pr_{12} & \cdots & pr_{1k} \\ pr_{21} & pr_{22} & \cdots & pr_{2k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ pr_{k1} & pr_{k2} & \cdots & pr_{kk} \end{bmatrix}, pr_{ij} = 0, 1 \quad (25)$$

The final results of FPRM with respect to one IFS are summed to indicate the importance of it in decision making. For one IFS  $Z_i$ , its corresponding point can be defined as:

$$PO_{Z_i} = \sum_{j \neq i} pr_{ij} \quad (26)$$

**Step 8:** Obtain the final judgments of IFSs withing groups using the results of points obtained based on the fuzzy preference relation. Assume there exist one groups of judgments in the form of IFS and the according values of points can be given as  $A_{Z_i} = \{PO_{Z_1}, PO_{Z_2}, \dots, PO_{Z_k}\}$ . Then, the weights indicating the role of calculating divergences among groups of IFSs for any one of IFSs can be defined as:

$$B_{Z_i} = \frac{PO_{Z_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^k PO_{Z_j}} \quad (27)$$

**Step 9:** Calculate total distances of groups of IFSs using judgments. Assume there exist the first group of IFSs which is denoted by  $Z_i^1$  and other groups which are represented by  $\{V_i^2, \dots, V_i^N\}$ . Then, the total distance between groups of  $Z_i^1$  and  $V_i^2$  can be calculated as:

$$D(Z_i^1, V_i^2)^{total} = \sum_{i=1}^k B_{Z_i} \times D(Z_i^1, V_i^2) \quad (28)$$

**Step 10:** Compute the credibility measurement of groups of IFSs. Taking the complete environment of groups of IFSs within judgments produced by one expert into consideration, the degree of credibility of one group  $Z_i^1$  can be defined as:

$$CR_{Z_i^1} = D(Z_i^1, V_i^2)^{total} - D(Z_i^1, V_i^2)^{total} \quad (29)$$

**Step 11:** Normalize the degree of credibility. And the process of the normalization with respect to  $Z_i^1$  can be defined as:

$$CR_{Z_i^1}^{Nor} = \frac{CR_{Z_i^1}}{CR_{Z_i^1} + \sum_{j=2}^N CR_{V_i^j}} \quad (30)$$

**Step 12:** Obtain the total information volume of each groups of original IFSs. Utilizing the first-order information volume

of fuzzy membership function, the corresponding information volume with respect to  $Z_i^1$  can be calculated as:

$$IVF_{Z_i^1} = \sum_{i=1}^k -(\varrho_T(r)^{Z_i^1} \log_2 \varrho_T(r)^{Z_i^1} + \varphi_T(r)^{Z_i^1} \log_2 \varphi_T(r)^{Z_i^1} + \xi_T(r)^{Z_i^1} \log_2 \frac{\xi_T(r)^{Z_i^1}}{C}) \quad (31)$$

**Step 13:** Generate the modified values of information volume to avoid producing a weights which is exactly equal to 0. And the process of it in regard to  $Z_i^1$  can be defined as:

$$IVF_{Z_i^1}^M = e^{IVF_{Z_i^1}} \quad (32)$$

**Step 14:** Normalize the modified values of information volume to adapt to process of generating attitude character, the process with respect to  $Z_i^1$  can be defined as:

$$IVF_{Z_i^1}^{MN} = \frac{IVF_{Z_i^1}^M}{IVF_{Z_i^1}^M + \sum_{j=2}^N IVF_{V_j^1}^M} \quad (33)$$

**Step 15:** Generate attitude character utilizing degree of credibility and modified information volume. The process about  $Z_i^1$  can be defined as:

$$\alpha_{Z_i^1} = IVF_{Z_i^1}^{MN} \times CR_{Z_i^1}^{Nor} \quad (34)$$

**Step 16:** Normalize the attitude character to be adaptive to construction of soft likelihood function. Besides, the corresponding formula can be defined as:

$$\alpha_{Z_i^1}^{Nor} = \frac{\alpha_{Z_i^1}}{\alpha_{Z_i^1} + \sum_{j=2}^N \alpha_{V_j^1}} \quad (35)$$

**Step 17:** According to the attitude characters obtained, the corresponding formula of soft likelihood function about  $Z_i^1$  can be designed which can be defined as:

$$P = \frac{1 - \alpha_{Z_i^1}^{Nor}}{\alpha_{Z_i^1}^{Nor}} \quad (36)$$

$$DSL F_{Z_i^1} = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k \left( \binom{j}{k}^P - \binom{j-1}{k}^P \right) \prod_{h=1}^k w_h \Upsilon S_l(h) \right\} \quad (37)$$

What is expected to be pointed out is that  $w_h$  and  $\Upsilon S_l(h)$  are calculated under the situation of  $Z_i^1$ .

**Step 18:** Input the attitude characters obtained into the formula of soft likelihood function to generate corresponding judgments with respect to each group of IFSs.

**Step 19:** For every IFS in the estimation made by experts, all of them is distributed to a sequence to adapt to demand of soft likelihood function. For example, the IFSs in the column of x1 are allocated a sequence of 1 and the other ones in the column x2 are distributed a order of 2. With respect to other ones, the method of assigning sequences are in the same manner.

**Step 20:** Assume the IFSs in one group can be denoted by  $A^{Modified} = (\varrho_T(r)^i, \varphi_T(r)^i)$ . Then, for the process of iteration of construction of basic likelihood function, the element dpi can be replaced by  $\varrho_T(r)^i - \varphi_T(r)^i$  which can be defined as:

$$dp_i = \varrho_T(r)^i - \varphi_T(r)^i \quad (38)$$

Besides, the values in each group is supposed to be sorted.

**Step 21:** Suppose the judgments of experts can be divided into three groups of IFSs which can be denoted by  $\{Z_i^1, V_i^2, V_i^3\}$ . Then, the gross estimation of the suggestions made by the expert can be defined as:

$$GE_{Expert} = \frac{DSL F_{Z_i^1} + DSL F_{V_i^2} + DSL F_{V_i^3}}{0.03} \quad (39)$$

The value of the final judgments are amplified 100 times to ensure the process of comparison of these values becomes more convenient.

**Step 22:** Rank the values of gross estimation,  $GE_{Expert}$ , with respect to different subjects.

**Step 23:** Obtain the processed information and description of actual conditions.

**Note:** In **Step 6-21**, the corresponding values of  $\{V_i^2, \dots, V_i^N\}$  can be calculated in the same manner as  $Z_i^1$ . Moreover, the detailed process of the presented method is given in Figure ??.

## V. APPLICATION

In this section, an application is provided to illustrate the efficiency of the presented method.

Nowadays, in general, manufactures may establish relationships with material suppliers to make sure the sources of materials of production of products are abundant and healthy. However, it is necessary to make estimation about the quality of materials from suppliers from time to time, because the environment of supply and relation in collaboration may vary, which indicates that it is a metabolic problem. Moreover, due to the complexity of the problem, how to fully utilize uncertain information offered is one of the most important concern in fuzzy decision making under this kind of case. Therefore, the proposed algorithm in handling uncertain information possesses superiority in this filed, because it is exactly designed to sufficiently extract all useful part of information to serve as a proof in decision and strategy making.

Assume there exist one review meeting and three experts participate it to make assessment on five suppliers. More specifically, in order to make the process of estimation on the suppliers more accurate under the condition that  $Supplier_3$  quits the process of estimation, each expert appends one more vote in the second round. Besides, in the round three, a new  $Supplier_6$  joins in the review meeting. And the detailed information about the judgments in provided in Table 1.

Based on the description of the problem, the process of proposed method is divided into three parts, namely round 1, 2 and 3. The calculation of the method presented in this paper is provided as in Table 2.

### A. Round 1

In the first round, detailed process of generating final judgments on situation of suppliers is provided.

**Step 1:** Obtain information in the form of IFS.

**Step 2:** For example, in regard to  $B = (Expert_1, x1)$ , the corresponding value of score function can be obtained by  $SF(B) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + 0.6)(1 - 0.2) = 0.64$ . Then, the values of IFSs are provided in Table5.

Round	Alternative		x1	x2	x3	x4	x5	x6
r=1	Supplier <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.6,0.2)	(0.3,0.5)	(0.7,0.1)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.5,0.3)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.3,0.4)	(0.4,0.4)	(0.5,0.2)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.5,0.3)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.5,0.4)	(0.4,0.3)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.3,0.4)	-
	Supplier <sub>2</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.8,0.0)	(0.3,0.6)	(0.5,0.4)	(0.3,0.5)	(0.6,0.2)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.7,0.3)	(0.4,0.5)	(0.4,0.3)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.5,0.2)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.8,0.1)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.4,0.5)	(0.4,0.4)	(0.6,0.1)	-
	Supplier <sub>3</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.3,0.6)	(0.7,0.0)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.6,0.2)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.5,0.2)	(0.6,0.3)	(0.5,0.1)	(0.4,0.4)	(0.8,0.2)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.7,0.2)	(0.5,0.2)	(0.6,0.3)	(0.9,0.1)	(0.7,0.1)	-
	Supplier <sub>4</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.6,0.3)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.7,0.1)	(0.7,0.1)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.7,0.1)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.5,0.2)	(0.7,0.1)	(0.7,0.1)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.7,0.1)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.8,0.1)	(0.7,0.1)	(0.7,0.2)	-
	Supplier <sub>5</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.4,0.5)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.3,0.5)	(0.3,0.5)	(0.4,0.3)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.4,0.4)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.2,0.3)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.6,0.2)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.6,0.2)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.5,0.3)	-
r=2	Supplier <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.7,0.1)	(0.4,0.4)	(0.5,0.1)	(0.5,0.1)	(0.4,0.4)	(0.6,0.3)
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.8,0.1)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.5,0.4)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.5,0.4)
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.3,0.4)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.2,0.4)	(0.6,0.2)
	Supplier <sub>2</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.8,0.1)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.5,0.4)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.5,0.2)
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.6,0.2)	(0.5,0.4)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.6,0.1)
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.5,0.2)	(0.4,0.2)	(0.5,0.4)	(0.5,0.4)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.7,0.1)
	Supplier <sub>4</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.7,0.3)	(0.6,0.3)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.7,0.1)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.7,0.1)
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.7,0.1)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.5,0.2)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.8,0.1)	(0.6,0.2)
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.8,0.1)	(0.6,0.3)	(0.5,0.1)	(0.8,0.1)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.7,0.2)
	Supplier <sub>5</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.5,0.3)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.5,0.1)	(0.4,0.4)	(0.3,0.3)	(0.7,0.2)
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.5,0.3)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.4,0.3)	(0.5,0.2)	(0.5,0.2)	(0.7,0.2)
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.6,0.1)	(0.4,0.4)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.5,0.2)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.6,0.2)
	Supplier <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.6,0.2)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.5,0.1)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.5,0.2)	(0.5,0.2)	(0.6,0.3)	(0.4,0.2)	(0.5,0.3)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.5,0.4)	(0.4,0.3)	(0.5,0.1)	(0.6,0.3)	(0.4,0.4)	-
Supplier <sub>2</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.7,0.2)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.5,0.1)	(0.5,0.4)	(0.5,0.2)	-	
	Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.6,0.1)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.5,0.1)	(0.6,0.2)	-	
	Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.6,0.2)	(0.5,0.2)	(0.5,0.3)	(0.5,0.4)	(0.6,0.2)	-	
Supplier <sub>3</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.7,0.1)	(0.6,0.3)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.7,0.1)	(0.6,0.1)	-	
	Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.6,0.2)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.8,0.1)	-	
	Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.7,0.1)	(0.7,0.1)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.7,0.1)	(0.5,0.2)	-	
Supplier <sub>4</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.8,0.1)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.7,0.1)	-	
	Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.8,0.1)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.6,0.2)	-	
	Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.7,0.1)	(0.8,0.1)	(0.7,0.1)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.6,0.3)	-	
Supplier <sub>5</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.6,0.3)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.8,0.1)	(0.6,0.2)	-	
	Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.7,0.2)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.8,0.1)	(0.5,0.1)	(0.6,0.3)	-	
	Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.6,0.3)	(0.5,0.4)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.7,0.1)	(0.8,0.1)	-	
Supplier <sub>6</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.7,0.2)	(0.8,0.1)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.8,0.1)	(0.7,0.2)	-	
	Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.7,0.2)	(0.6,0.1)	(0.8,0.1)	(0.6,0.3)	(0.7,0.1)	-	
	Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.8,0.1)	(0.7,0.2)	(0.6,0.2)	(0.6,0.3)	(0.8,0.1)	-	

TABLE 1: Detailed information about the judgments from experts

	AQM[38]	Static ranking[39]	Dynamic ranking[39]	Presented method
Round <sub>1</sub>	$S_3 > S_4 > S_2 > S_1 > S_5$	$S_4 > S_3 > S_2 > S_1 > S_5$	$S_4 > S_3 > S_2 > S_1 > S_5$	$S_4 > S_3 > S_2 > S_1 > S_5$
Round <sub>2</sub>	$S_4 > S_2 > S_5 > S_1$	$S_4 > S_2 > S_5 > S_1$	$S_4 > S_2 > S_5 > S_1$	$S_4 > S_2 > S_5 > S_1$
Round <sub>3</sub>	$S_6 > S_4 > S_3 > S_5 > S_2 > S_1$	$S_6 > S_4 > S_5 > S_3 > S_2 > S_1$	$S_6 > S_4 > S_3 > S_5 > S_2 > S_1$	$S_6 > S_4 > S_3 > S_5 > S_2 > S_1$

TABLE 2: Results obtained by four methods (Note: Supplier is denoted by S)

The motivation to produce reliability of each IFS is for reduce the influence brought by unreliable ones, which is devised to avoid producing biased results.

**Step 3:** Using the values obtained in the last step, Z numbers can be constructed. The results are given in Table 3.

**Step 4:** Combine the transformed numbers. And the results are provided in Table 4.

**Step 5:** Calculate distances of IFSs within groups. Besides, the results are given in Table 6.

This operation is carried out to alleviate the negative effects led by the isolated individuals of IFS which do not conform to the trend exerted by the main body of information.

TABLE 6: Distances of IFSs within groups (Round1)

Round	Alternative		x1	x2	x3	x4	x5	x6
r=1	Supplier <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	((0.6,0.2),0.6400)	((0.3,0.5),0.3250)	((0.7,0.1),0.7650)	((0.6,0.1),0.7200)	((0.5,0.3),0.5250)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	((0.3,0.4),0.3900)	((0.4,0.4),0.4200)	((0.5,0.2),0.6000)	((0.7,0.2),0.6800)	((0.5,0.3),0.5250)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	((0.5,0.4),0.4500)	((0.4,0.3),0.4900)	((0.6,0.1),0.7200)	((0.5,0.3),0.5250)	((0.3,0.4),0.3900)	-
	Supplier <sub>2</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	((0.8,0.0),0.9000)	((0.3,0.6),0.2600)	((0.5,0.4),0.4500)	((0.3,0.5),0.3250)	((0.6,0.2),0.6400)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	((0.7,0.3),0.5950)	((0.4,0.5),0.3500)	((0.4,0.3),0.4900)	((0.6,0.1),0.7200)	((0.5,0.2),0.6000)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	((0.8,0.1),0.8100)	((0.6,0.2),0.6400)	((0.4,0.5),0.3500)	((0.4,0.4),0.4200)	((0.6,0.1),0.7200)	-
	Supplier <sub>3</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	((0.3,0.6),0.2600)	((0.7,0.0),0.8500)	((0.6,0.2),0.6400)	((0.5,0.3),0.5250)	((0.6,0.2),0.6400)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	((0.5,0.2),0.6000)	((0.6,0.3),0.5600)	((0.5,0.1),0.6750)	((0.4,0.4),0.4200)	((0.8,0.2),0.7200)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	((0.7,0.2),0.6800)	((0.5,0.2),0.6000)	((0.6,0.3),0.5600)	((0.9,0.1),0.8550)	((0.7,0.1),0.7650)	-
	Supplier <sub>4</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	((0.3,0.6),0.2600)	((0.7,0.2),0.6800)	((0.6,0.2),0.6400)	((0.7,0.1),0.7650)	((0.7,0.1),0.7650)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	((0.7,0.1),0.7650)	((0.7,0.2),0.6800)	((0.5,0.2),0.6000)	((0.7,0.1),0.7650)	((0.7,0.1),0.7650)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	((0.7,0.1),0.7650)	((0.7,0.2),0.6800)	((0.8,0.1),0.8100)	((0.7,0.1),0.7650)	((0.7,0.2),0.6800)	-
	Supplier <sub>5</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	((0.4,0.5),0.3500)	((0.6,0.2),0.6400)	((0.3,0.5),0.3250)	((0.3,0.5),0.3250)	((0.4,0.3),0.4900)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	((0.4,0.4),0.4200)	((0.5,0.3),0.5250)	((0.2,0.3),0.4200)	((0.5,0.3),0.5250)	((0.6,0.2),0.6400)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	((0.6,0.2),0.6400)	((0.5,0.3),0.5250)	((0.6,0.2),0.6400)	((0.6,0.2),0.6400)	((0.5,0.3),0.5250)	-

TABLE 3: Transformed information about the judgments from experts in the first round

Round	Alternative		x1	x2	x3	x4	x5	x6
r=1	Supplier <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.3840,0.1280)	(0.0975,0.1625)	(0.5355,0.0765)	(0.4320,0.0720)	(0.2625,0.1575)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.1170,0.1560)	(0.1680,0.1680)	(0.3000,0.1200)	(0.4760,0.1360)	(0.2625,0.1575)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.2250,0.1800)	(0.1960,0.1470)	(0.4320,0.0720)	(0.2625,0.1575)	(0.1170,0.1560)	-
	Supplier <sub>2</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.7200,0.0000)	(0.0780,0.1560)	(0.2250,0.1800)	(0.0975,0.1625)	(0.3840,0.1280)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.4165,0.1785)	(0.1400,0.1750)	(0.1960,0.1470)	(0.4320,0.0720)	(0.3000,0.1200)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.6480,0.0810)	(0.3840,0.1280)	(0.1400,0.1750)	(0.1680,0.1680)	(0.4320,0.0720)	-
	Supplier <sub>3</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.0780,0.1560)	(0.5950,0.0000)	(0.3840,0.1280)	(0.2625,0.1575)	(0.3840,0.1280)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.3000,0.1200)	(0.3360,0.1680)	(0.3375,0.0675)	(0.1680,0.1680)	(0.5760,0.1440)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.5355,0.0765)	(0.4760,0.1360)	(0.3000,0.1200)	(0.5355,0.0765)	(0.5355,0.0765)	-
	Supplier <sub>4</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.3360,0.1680)	(0.4760,0.1360)	(0.3840,0.1280)	(0.5355,0.0765)	(0.5355,0.0765)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.5355,0.0765)	(0.4760,0.1360)	(0.3000,0.1200)	(0.5355,0.0765)	(0.5355,0.0765)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.5355,0.0765)	(0.4760,0.1360)	(0.6480,0.0810)	(0.5355,0.0765)	(0.5355,0.0765)	-
	Supplier <sub>5</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	(0.1400,0.1750)	(0.3840,0.1280)	(0.0975,0.1625)	(0.0975,0.1625)	(0.1960,0.1470)	-
		Expert <sub>2</sub>	(0.1680,0.1680)	(0.2625,0.1575)	(0.0840,0.1260)	(0.2625,0.1575)	(0.3840,0.1280)	-
		Expert <sub>3</sub>	(0.3840,0.1280)	(0.2625,0.1575)	(0.3840,0.1280)	(0.3840,0.1280)	(0.2625,0.1575)	-

TABLE 4: Transformed information about the judgments from experts in the first round

Alternative		x1	x2	x3	x4	x5
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	0.64	0.325	0.765	0.72	0.525
	Expert <sub>2</sub>	0.39	0.42	0.6	0.68	0.525
	Expert <sub>3</sub>	0.45	0.49	0.72	0.525	0.39
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	0.9	0.26	0.45	0.325	0.64
	Expert <sub>2</sub>	0.595	0.35	0.49	0.72	0.6
	Expert <sub>3</sub>	0.81	0.64	0.35	0.42	0.72
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	0.26	0.85	0.64	0.525	0.64
	Expert <sub>2</sub>	0.6	0.56	0.675	0.42	0.72
	Expert <sub>3</sub>	0.68	0.6	0.56	0.855	0.765
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	0.56	0.68	0.64	0.765	0.765
	Expert <sub>2</sub>	0.765	0.68	0.6	0.765	0.765
	Expert <sub>3</sub>	0.765	0.68	0.81	0.765	0.68
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>1</sub>	0.35	0.64	0.325	0.325	0.49
	Expert <sub>2</sub>	0.42	0.525	0.42	0.525	0.64
	Expert <sub>3</sub>	0.64	0.525	0.64	0.64	0.525

Alternative		x1	x2	x3	x4	x5
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	x1	0	0.2442	0.1114	0.0685	0.0921
	x2	0.2442	0	0.3453	0.2795	0.1566
	x3	0.1114	0.3453	0.2795	0.1566	
	x4	0.0685	0.2795	0.0782	0	0.1423
	x5	0.0921	0.1566	0.2014	0.1423	0
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	x1	0	0.0558	0.1615	0.2912	0.1358
	x2	0.0558	0	0.1134	0.2399	0.0821
	x3	0.1615	0.1134	0	0.1411	0.1601
	x4	0.0338	0.0609	0.1423	0	0.1358
	x5	0.1114	0.0774	0.2588	0.1358	0
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	x1	0	0.0458	0.1755	0.0338	0.1114
	x2	0.0458	0	0.1869	0.0609	0.0774
	x3	0.1755	0.1869	0	0.1423	0.2588
	x4	0.494	0.0262	0.1308	0	0.2442
	x5	0.2909	0.2673	0.1239	0.2442	0
Supplier <sub>2</sub>	x1	0	0.5115	0.3994	0.494	0.2909

TABLE 5: Values of score function of IFSs

Supplier<sub>2</sub>

	x2	0.2326	0	0.0557	0.2403	0.1402
	x3	0.1901	0.0557	0	0.2403	0.0859
	x4	0.1186	0.2403	0.1869	0	0.1032
	x5	0.1243	0.1402	0.0859	0.1032	0
<i>Supplier<sub>2</sub></i>	x1	0	0.2326	0.1901	0.1186	0.1243
	x2	0.2326	0	0.0557	0.2403	0.1402
	x3	0.1901	0.0557	0	0.1869	0.0859
	x4	0.1186	0.2403	0.1869	0	0.1032
	x5	0.1243	0.1402	0.0859	0.1032	0
<i>Supplier<sub>2</sub></i>	x1	0	0.1883	0.3794	0.3546	0.1666
	x2	0.1883	0	0.1992	0.1727	0.0685
	x3	0.3794	0.1992	0	0.0275	0.2403
	x4	0.3546	0.1727	0.0275	0	0.2146
	x5	0.1666	0.0685	0.2403	0.2146	0
<i>Supplier<sub>3</sub></i>	x1	0	0.4415	0.2673	0.1812	0.2673
	x2	0.4415	0	0.2403	0.309	0.2403
	x3	0.2673	0.2403	0	0.0921	0
	x4	0.1812	0.309	0.0921	0	0.0921
	x5	0.2673	0.2403	0	0.0921	0
<i>Supplier<sub>3</sub></i>	x1	0	0.0645	0.0658	0.1134	0.2222
	x2	0.0645	0	0.1154	0.1427	0.178
	x3	0.0658	0.1154	0	0.1628	0.2276
	x4	0.1134	0.1427	0.1628	0	0.3159
	x5	0.2222	0.178	0.2276	0.3159	0
<i>Supplier<sub>3</sub></i>	x1	0	0.1411	0.1011	0.2216	0.0714
	x2	0.1411	0	0.0645	0.3531	0.1698
	x3	0.1011	0.0645	0	0.3183	0.1536
	x4	0.2216	0.3531	0.3183	0	0.1985
	x5	0.0714	0.1698	0.1536	0.1985	0
<i>Supplier<sub>4</sub></i>	x1	0	0.1011	0.0466	0.1536	0.1536
	x2	0.1011	0	0.0734	0.0714	0.0714
	x3	0.0466	0.0734	0	0.1114	0.1114
	x4	0.1536	0.0714	0.1114	0	0
	x5	0.1536	0.0714	0.1114	0	0
<i>Supplier<sub>4</sub></i>	x1	0	0.0714	0.1698	0	0
	x2	0.0714	0	0.1411	0.0714	0.0714
	x3	0.1698	0.1411	0	0.1698	0.1698
	x4	0	0.0714	0.1698	0	0
	x5	0	0.0714	0.1698	0	0
<i>Supplier<sub>4</sub></i>	x1	0	0.0714	0.0891	0	0.0714
	x2	0.0714	0	0.1239	0.0714	0
	x3	0.0891	0.1239	0	0.0891	0.1239
	x4	0	0.0714	0.0891	0	0.0714
	x5	0.0714	0	0.1239	0.0714	0
<i>Supplier<sub>5</sub></i>	x1	0	0.1992	0.0506	0.0506	0.0557
	x2	0.1992	0	0.2442	0.2442	0.1487
	x3	0.0506	0.2442	0	0	0.0993
	x4	0.0506	0.2442	0	0	0.0993
	x5	0.0557	0.1487	0.0993	0.0993	0
<i>Supplier<sub>5</sub></i>	x1	0	0.0821	0.1066	0.0821	0.1727
	x2	0.0821	0	0.1819	0	0.0921
	x3	0.1066	0.1819	0	0.1819	0.2647
	x4	0.0821	0	0.1819	0	0.0921

	x5	0.1727	0.0921	0.2647	0.0921	0
<i>Supplier<sub>5</sub></i>	x1	0	0.0921	0	0	0.0921
	x2	0.0921	0	0.0921	0.0921	0
	x3	0	0.0921	0	0.0921	0
	x4	0	0.0921	0	0	0.0921
	x5	0.0921	0	0.0921	0.0921	0

**Step 6:** Utilize the closeness centrality to obtain similarity measure of IFSS within groups. And the results are offered in Table 7.

The introduction of closeness centrality indirectly to construct a series of simple network for groups of IFSSs, which provide a convenient method in measuring degree of importance of nodes which is consisted of membership and non-membership of IFSSs.

Alternative	x1	x2	x3	x4	x5
<i>Supplier<sub>1</sub></i>	7.7485	3.9002	5.4325	7.0353	6.7521
	6.2072	8.1436	8.7036	4.8064	9.4891
	10.9134	10.7812	5.2398	10.7274	6.8566
<i>Supplier<sub>2</sub></i>	2.3588	4.1611	4.9355	4.4679	4.3184
	6.0091	5.9812	7.7137	6.1635	8.8186
	3.6734	6.3625	4.7261	5.1998	5.7973
<i>Supplier<sub>3</sub></i>	8.7929	12.6087	11.6697	11.8908	11.8908
	16.584	11.2598	6.1493	16.584	16.584
	7.4749	5.4913	6.275	3.6648	6.7414
<i>Supplier<sub>4</sub></i>	8.7929	12.6087	11.6697	11.8908	11.8908
	16.584	11.2598	6.1493	16.584	16.584
	17.2536	14.9994	9.392	17.2536	14.9994
<i>Supplier<sub>5</sub></i>	11.2355	4.7835	10.1516	10.1516	9.9286
	9.0211	11.2331	5.4408	11.2331	6.4342
	21.7061	14.4708	21.7061	21.7061	14.4708

TABLE 7: Degree of similarity measure of IFSSs within groups  
**Step 7:** Then, generate the fuzzy relationship based on the similarity measure. The corresponding fuzzy relationship matrices can be given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_1^{E_1} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & a_1^{E_2} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & a_1^{E_3} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
 a_2^{E_1} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & a_2^{E_2} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & a_2^{E_3} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
 a_3^{E_1} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & a_3^{E_2} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & a_3^{E_3} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
 a_4^{F_1} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & a_4^{E_2} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & a_4^{E_3} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
 a_5^{E_1} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} & a_5^{E_2} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & a_5^{E_3} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
 \end{aligned}$$



And the points obtained by each IFS is given in Table 8.

The 0-1 relationship is introduced based on divergence of individual IFSs within one group to serve as a selective tool in distinguishing important information and erasing useless part.

**Step 8:** Compute the weights which is based on the points obtained in **Step 7**. The results of the weights are given in Table 9.

**Step 9:** Calculate the distances between groups of IFSs. The corresponding values of distances are given in Table 10.

**Step 10 and 11:** Compute the degree of credibility and normalize them. And the values of degree of credibility is provided in Table 21.

After evaluating difference of individuals and groups, the final degree of credibility can be obtained.

Alternative	x1	x2	x3	x4	x5
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>1</sub>	4	0	1	3	2
	1	2	3	0	4
	4	3	0	2	1
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>2</sub>	0	1	4	3	2
	1	0	3	2	4
	0	4	1	2	3
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>3</sub>	1	0	3	2	3
	4	3	2	1	0
	4	1	2	0	3
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>4</sub>	0	4	1	2	2
	2	1	0	2	2
	3	1	0	3	1
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>5</sub>	4	0	2	2	1
	2	3	0	3	1
	2	0	2	2	0

TABLE 8: Points obtained by each IFS

Alternative	x1	x2	x3	x4	x5
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>1</sub>	0.4000	0.0000	0.1000	0.3000	0.2000
	0.1000	0.2000	0.3000	0.0000	0.4000
	0.4000	0.3000	0.0000	0.2000	0.1000
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>2</sub>	0.0000	0.1000	0.4000	0.3000	0.2000
	0.1000	0.0000	0.3000	0.2000	0.4000
	0.0000	0.4000	0.1000	0.2000	0.3000
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>3</sub>	0.1111	0.0000	0.3333	0.2222	0.3333
	0.4000	0.3000	0.2000	0.1000	0.0000
	0.4000	0.1000	0.2000	0.0000	0.3000
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>4</sub>	0.0000	0.4444	0.1111	0.2222	0.2222
	0.2857	0.1429	0.0000	0.2857	0.2857
	0.3750	0.1250	0.0000	0.3750	0.1250
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>5</sub>	0.4444	0.0000	0.2222	0.2222	0.1111
	0.2222	0.3333	0.0000	0.3333	0.1111
	0.3333	0.0000	0.3333	0.3333	0.0000

**Step 12:** Calculate the information volume of each group of IFSs and the values of information volumes are offered in Table 12.

**Step 13 and 14:** Modify and normalize the information volume. The results are provided in Table 13.

Alternative	Distances	x1	x2	x3	x4	x5
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>1</sub>	$D_{E_{1-2}}$	0.4000	0.0000	0.1000	0.3000	0.2000
	$D_{E_{1-3}}$	0.0496	0.0000	0.0078	0.0427	0.0272
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>1</sub>	$D_{E_{2-1}}$	0.0224	0.0152	0.0509	0.0000	0.0000
	$D_{E_{2-3}}$	0.0111	0.0060	0.0310	0.0000	0.0543
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>1</sub>	$D_{E_{3-1}}$	0.0496	0.0298	0.0000	0.0285	0.0136
	$D_{E_{3-2}}$	0.0445	0.0090	0.0000	0.0320	0.0136
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>2</sub>	$D_{E_{1-2}}$	0.0000	0.0267	0.0325	0.0228	0.0137
	$D_{E_{1-3}}$	0.0000	0.0267	0.0325	0.0228	0.0137
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>2</sub>	$D_{E_{2-1}}$	0.0297	0.0000	0.0138	0.0429	0.0413
	$D_{E_{2-3}}$	0.0170	0.0000	0.0167	0.0429	0.0413
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>2</sub>	$D_{E_{3-1}}$	0.0000	0.1069	0.0081	0.0152	0.0206
	$D_{E_{3-2}}$	0.0000	0.0797	0.0056	0.0429	0.0310
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>3</sub>	$D_{E_{1-2}}$	0.0229	0.0000	0.0301	0.0128	0.0518
	$D_{E_{1-3}}$	0.0371	0.0000	0.0301	0.0182	0.0518
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>3</sub>	$D_{E_{2-1}}$	0.0824	0.0842	0.0181	0.0082	0.0000
	$D_{E_{2-3}}$	0.0564	0.0193	0.0231	0.0449	0.0000
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>3</sub>	$D_{E_{3-1}}$	0.1334	0.0272	0.0093	0.0000	0.0334
	$D_{E_{3-2}}$	0.0564	0.0064	0.0231	0.0000	0.0300
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>4</sub>	$D_{E_{1-2}}$	0.0000	0.0000	0.0076	0.0000	0.0000
	$D_{E_{1-3}}$	0.0000	0.0000	0.0209	0.0000	0.0000
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>4</sub>	$D_{E_{2-1}}$	0.0439	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	$D_{E_{2-3}}$	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0204
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>4</sub>	$D_{E_{3-1}}$	0.0576	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0089
	$D_{E_{3-2}}$	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0089
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>5</sub>	$D_{E_{1-2}}$	0.0122	0.0000	0.0095	0.0348	0.0165
	$D_{E_{1-3}}$	0.0885	0.0000	0.0543	0.0543	0.0068
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>5</sub>	$D_{E_{2-1}}$	0.0061	0.0307	0.0000	0.0522	0.0165
	$D_{E_{2-3}}$	0.0384	0.0000	0.0000	0.0307	0.0102
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>5</sub>	$D_{E_{3-1}}$	0.0664	0.0000	0.0814	0.0814	0.0000
	$D_{E_{3-2}}$	0.0575	0.0000	0.0882	0.0307	0.0000

TABLE 10: Weight obtained by points

Alternative	<i>Expert</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>3</sub>
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>1</sub>	0.3221	0.3434	0.3345
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>2</sub>	0.3453	0.3375	0.3172
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>3</sub>	0.3403	0.3270	0.3327
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>4</sub>	0.3378	0.3326	0.3296
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>5</sub>	0.3373	0.3666	0.2962

TABLE 11: Degree of credibility of groups of IFSs

Information volume is an index of the degree of uncertainty of IFS. This step utilize the concept of the entropy method to further optimize the effect of strategy designing.

**Step 15 and 16:** Generate the attitude character and normalize them.

The modified attitude characters are provided in Table 14.

**Step 17:** According to the attitude characters obtained, the

Alternative	<i>Expert</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>3</sub>
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>1</sub>	8.5376	8.9641	9.1858
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>2</sub>	7.5027	8.1791	7.8977
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>3</sub>	7.9891	7.9707	6.6730
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>4</sub>	7.4047	7.6976	6.6585
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>5</sub>	8.8588	9.4098	8.6688

TABLE 12: Information volume of each group of IFSs

Alternative	<i>Expert</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>3</sub>
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>1</sub>	0.2250	0.3447	0.4303
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>2</sub>	0.2247	0.4419	0.3335
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>3</sub>	0.4445	0.4364	0.1192
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>4</sub>	0.3553	0.4762	0.1685
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>5</sub>	0.2807	0.4871	0.2322

TABLE 13: Processed information volume of each group of IFSs

Alternative	<i>Expert</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>3</sub>
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>1</sub>	0.2165	0.3536	0.4299
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>2</sub>	0.2333	0.4485	0.3181
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>3</sub>	0.4534	0.4277	0.1189
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>4</sub>	0.3594	0.4743	0.1663
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>5</sub>	0.2768	0.5221	0.2011

TABLE 14: Attitude characters of each group of IFSs

dynamic formula for determining the expression of OWA operator utilizing varied parameters can be constructed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Supplier}_1 &: \left(\frac{s}{k}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha_1^{Nor}}{\alpha_1^{Nor}}} - \left(\frac{s-1}{k}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha_1^{Nor}}{\alpha_1^{Nor}}} \\
 \text{Supplier}_2 &: \left(\frac{s}{k}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha_2^{Nor}}{\alpha_2^{Nor}}} - \left(\frac{s-1}{k}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha_2^{Nor}}{\alpha_2^{Nor}}} \\
 \text{Supplier}_3 &: \left(\frac{s}{k}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha_3^{Nor}}{\alpha_3^{Nor}}} - \left(\frac{s-1}{k}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha_3^{Nor}}{\alpha_3^{Nor}}} \\
 \text{Supplier}_4 &: \left(\frac{s}{k}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha_4^{Nor}}{\alpha_4^{Nor}}} - \left(\frac{s-1}{k}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha_4^{Nor}}{\alpha_4^{Nor}}} \\
 \text{Supplier}_5 &: \left(\frac{s}{k}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha_5^{Nor}}{\alpha_5^{Nor}}} - \left(\frac{s-1}{k}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha_5^{Nor}}{\alpha_5^{Nor}}}
 \end{aligned}$$

**Step 18:** Calculate the corresponding weights using improved method of generating OWA operators which are provided in Table 15.

Alternative	<i>Expert</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>3</sub>
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>1</sub>	3.618937644341801	1.8280542986425337	1.3261223540358225
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>2</sub>	3.2863266180882977	1.229654403567447	2.1436655139893115
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>3</sub>	1.2055580061755622	1.3380874444704232	7.410428931875526
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>4</sub>	1.7824151363383418	1.1083702298123552	5.013229104028864
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>5</sub>	2.6127167630057806	0.9153418885271021	3.9726504226752857

TABLE 15: Corresponding weights of groups of IFSs

**Step 19:** Allocate a mark number to each of IFS based on its sequence which is within groups of judgments from experts.

**Step 20, 21, 22, 23:** Based on the expressions of soft likelihood function, the weights for each IFS within groups can be obtained. And then, divide the degree of hesitancy into membership and non-membership and input them into the improved soft likelihood function to generate the final judgments for gross estimations from experts. The gross estimation with respect to suppliers are given in Table 16 and Figure 4.

In the round one, it can be concluded that the sequence of desired suppliers is *Supplier*<sub>3</sub> > *Supplier*<sub>4</sub> > *Supplier*<sub>2</sub> > *Supplier*<sub>1</sub> > *Supplier*<sub>5</sub>, which is generally consistent with intuitive judgments. For example, by analyzing the information about *Supplier*<sub>3</sub>, the modified affirmative part is bigger than

Alternative	Degree of preference
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>1</sub>	5.659509966930474
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>2</sub>	8.792310830908539
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>3</sub>	11.779741914481567
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>4</sub>	16.267048625369885
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>5</sub>	4.6228307296199755

*Supplier*<sub>4</sub> > *Supplier*<sub>3</sub> > *Supplier*<sub>2</sub> > *Supplier*<sub>1</sub> > *Supplier*<sub>5</sub>

TABLE 16: Gross estimation with respect to suppliers




Fig. 1: Detailed process of novel framework of soft likelihood function

other ones owned by information belongs to other suppliers, [45] which can be verified by checking the values obtained by improved soft likelihood function. Due to the effectiveness of soft likelihood function in information fusion, it is reasonable to regard the generated results are intuitive and rational.

**B. Round 2**

In the second round, some necessary and crucial processed information is provided. The normalized degree of credibility, modified values of information value, attitude characters and the final judgments on suppliers are given in Table 19,18,19,20 and Figure 4, 5 respectively.

Alternative	<i>Expert</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>3</sub>
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>1</sub>	0.2430	0.2819	0.4751
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>2</sub>	0.1859	0.2734	0.5407
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>4</sub>	0.2430	0.6099	0.1472
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>5</sub>	0.3423	0.3466	0.3111

TABLE 17: Degree of credibility of groups of IFSs

Alternative	<i>Expert</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>Expert</i> <sub>3</sub>
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>1</sub>	0.3382	0.3287	0.3331
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>2</sub>	0.3440	0.3272	0.3288
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>4</sub>	0.3286	0.3400	0.3314
<i>Supplier</i> <sub>5</sub>	0.3253	0.3356	0.3391

TABLE 18: Degree of credibility of groups of IFSs

In the second round, the level of priority of suppliers is *Supplier*<sub>4</sub> > *Supplier*<sub>2</sub> > *Supplier*<sub>5</sub> > *Supplier*<sub>1</sub>.

Alternative	Expert <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>2</sub>	Expert <sub>3</sub>
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	0.2467	0.2782	0.4751
Supplier <sub>2</sub>	0.1931	0.2701	0.5368
Supplier <sub>4</sub>	0.2376	0.6172	0.1452
Supplier <sub>5</sub>	0.3342	0.3469	0.3166

TABLE 19: Attitude characters with respect to suppliers

Alternative	Degree of preference
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	4.770726973598357
Supplier <sub>2</sub>	6.605666698011237
Supplier <sub>4</sub>	14.521609619624286
Supplier <sub>5</sub>	4.8011760761178754
<i>Supplier<sub>4</sub> &gt; Supplier<sub>2</sub> &gt; Supplier<sub>5</sub> &gt; Supplier<sub>1</sub></i>	

TABLE 20: Gross estimation with respect to suppliers

C. Round 3

In the third round, some necessary and crucial processed information is provided. The normalized degree of credibility, modified values of information value and the final judgments on suppliers are given in Table 21, 22, 23, 24 and Figure 5,4 respectively.

In the second round, the level of priority of suppliers is  $Supplier_6 > Supplier_4 > Supplier_3 > Supplier_5 > Supplier_2 > Supplier_1$ .

Alternative	Expert <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>2</sub>	Expert <sub>3</sub>
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	0.3252	0.3464	0.3284
Supplier <sub>2</sub>	0.3379	0.3401	0.3220
Supplier <sub>3</sub>	0.3345	0.3238	0.3417
Supplier <sub>4</sub>	0.3260	0.3430	0.3310
Supplier <sub>5</sub>	0.3348	0.3184	0.3468
Supplier <sub>6</sub>	0.3458	0.3459	0.3083

TABLE 21: Degree of credibility of groups of IFSs




Fig. 2: Detailed process of novel framework of soft likelihood function




Fig. 3: Detailed process of novel framework of soft likelihood function

Alternative	Expert <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>2</sub>	Expert <sub>3</sub>
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	0.2949	0.4356	0.2694
Supplier <sub>2</sub>	0.3067	0.3261	0.3672
Supplier <sub>3</sub>	0.3307	0.2615	0.4079
Supplier <sub>4</sub>	0.3234	0.4006	0.2760
Supplier <sub>5</sub>	0.3058	0.4156	0.2786
Supplier <sub>6</sub>	0.1868	0.5016	0.3115

TABLE 22: Processed information volume of each group of IFSs

Alternative	Expert <sub>1</sub>	Expert <sub>2</sub>	Expert <sub>3</sub>
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	0.2860	0.4501	0.2639
Supplier <sub>2</sub>	0.3114	0.3333	0.3553
Supplier <sub>3</sub>	0.3305	0.2530	0.4165
Supplier <sub>4</sub>	0.3155	0.4112	0.2734
Supplier <sub>5</sub>	0.3090	0.3994	0.2916
Supplier <sub>6</sub>	0.1933	0.5193	0.2874

TABLE 23: Processed information volume of each group of IFSs

Alternative	Degree of preference
Supplier <sub>1</sub>	4.424209272010652
Supplier <sub>2</sub>	7.010993730725694
Supplier <sub>3</sub>	14.140671975325015
Supplier <sub>4</sub>	16.388871792488427
Supplier <sub>5</sub>	13.152765205135305
Supplier <sub>6</sub>	18.489995324457407
<i>Supplier<sub>6</sub> &gt; Supplier<sub>4</sub> &gt; Supplier<sub>3</sub> &gt; Supplier<sub>5</sub> &gt; Supplier<sub>2</sub> &gt; Supplier<sub>1</sub></i>	

TABLE 24: Gross estimation with respect to suppliers




Fig. 4: Detailed process of novel framework of soft likelihood function




Fig. 5: Detailed process of novel framework of soft likelihood function

## VI. COMPARISON AND DISCUSSIONS ON THE RESULTS PRODUCED BY PROPOSED METHOD

In this part, some comparisons are provided to verify the effectiveness of the proposed method and the results are provided in Table 2.

### A. Round 1

In the first round, the results obtained by *StaticMCDM*, *DynamicMCDM* and the proposed method are exactly the same. However, in regard to AQM [11], the estimation about *Supplier3* and *Supplier4* are opposite compared with results of other three methods. The reasons for preferring *Supplier4* instead of *Supplier3* are well illustrated in [35] from its own dimension of viewpoints. And the detailed causes are further explained on the base of data generated in the course of completing the process of the novel framework of soft likelihood function.

The first reason for this phenomenon is that the values of reliability measurement of *Supplier4* are generally bigger than

that of *Supplier3*, which illustrates that *Supplier4* possesses more affirmative part of information according to the definition of reliability function. It indicates that experts mainly prefer *Supplier4* to *Supplier3* well.

The second reason is that the degree of credibility of *Supplier4* is closer to each other than *Supplier3*, which demonstrates that the judgments from experts are consistent with each other and can be fully trusted. On the contrary, the information of *Supplier4* has more conflicting parts than *Supplier3*, which can be obtained from the divergence of the value of degree of credibility. Therefore, when information conflicts, it is not convincing to distribute a comparatively high level of belief to it, which is fully embodied by the process of soft likelihood function [45].

The third reason is an extension of the second one. The information volume of *Supplier3* diverges much more than *Supplier4*, which is also an indicator that judgments given by experts are very different from each other. Therefore, the information about *Supplier3* transfers more negative signals in the role of decision and strategy making.

In one word, the relation  $S_4 > S_3$  is correct and valid.

### B. Round 2

All of the methods reach an agreement in the judgments with respect to all of the Supplier discussed. Therefore, there is no need to have further discussions about the final results of judgments.

### C. Round 3

In the third round, it can be summarized that *AQM*, *Dynamic MCDM* and the proposed method reach an agreement on the estimation of actual situations. Moreover, some detailed causes are clearly given in [35] based on its own techniques. And some other standpoints are provided utilizing data obtained by proposed method.

First, the degree of credibility of *Supplier5* are much more divergent than *Supplier3*, which indicates that there exist conflicting information in the judgments about *Supplier5*. Besides, it is also an evidence that the situation of information with respect to *Supplier5* are in chaos and the confidence level of it is lowered which embodies in the priority ranking of *Supplier5*.

Second, the value of information volume is also a proof of the conclusion of the first part of reason. The information volume of *Supplier3* is much more consistent than the one of *Supplier5*, which proves that the information provided by experts may be extremely varied when compared with each other.

Third, when checking the degree of reliability generated for *Supplier3* and *Supplier5* which is not provided, the mean value of the reliability of *Supplier3* is much higher than the one of *Supplier5*, which well illustrates that there exist a relatively bigger part of positive information about *Supplier3* according to the definition of reliability function.

All in all, the relation  $S_3 > S_5$  is reasonable and rational.

## VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, a novel framework of soft likelihood function is proposed to serve for expert decision systems based on credibility measure, information volume and certain transformations. The proposed method fully takes all factors which may have potential effects on the process of decision making, which ensures that correct judgments are accurately detected and extracted. The final modified results well illustrates that the proposed method possesses very excellent performance in managing multi-source uncertain information and is able to handle productions of precise decisions under complex environments. All in all, the proposed method can be regarded as a good solution in solving problems occurred in expert decision systems.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Maryam Almasi, Sahar Khoshfetrat, and Masoud Rahiminezhad Galankashi. Sustainable supplier selection and order allocation under risk and inflation condition. *IEEE Trans. Engineering Management*, 68(3):823–837, 2021.
- [2] Krassimir T. Atanassov. *Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets - Theory and Applications*, volume 35 of *Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing*. Physica-Verlag, 1999.
- [3] Gozde Bakioglu and Ali Osman Atahan. AHP integrated TOPSIS and VIKOR methods with pythagorean fuzzy sets to prioritize risks in self-driving vehicles. *Appl. Soft Comput.*, 99:106948, 2021.
- [4] Itzcóatl Bueno, Ramón Alberto Carrasco, Carlos Porcel, Gang Kou, and Enrique Herrera-Viedma. A linguistic multi-criteria decision making methodology for the evaluation of tourist services considering customer opinion value. *Appl. Soft Comput.*, 101:107045, 2021.
- [5] Z. H. Che, Tzu-An Chiang, and Tzu-Ting Lin. A multi-objective genetic algorithm for assembly planning and supplier selection with capacity constraints. *Appl. Soft Comput.*, 101:107030, 2021.
- [6] Shyi-Ming Chen and Yun-Chen Chu. Multiattribute decision making based on u-quadratic distribution of intervals and the transformed matrix in interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy environments. *Information Sciences*, 537:30–45, 2020.
- [7] Jixiang Deng and Yong Deng. Information volume of fuzzy membership function. *International Journal of Computers Communications & Control*, 16(1), 2021.
- [8] Liguó Fei, Yuqiang Feng, and Luning Liu. On pythagorean fuzzy decision making using soft likelihood functions. *Int. J. Intell. Syst.*, 34(12):3317–3335, 2019.
- [9] Fatemeh Firouzi and Omid Jadidi. Multi-objective model for supplier selection and order allocation problem with fuzzy parameters. *Expert Syst. Appl.*, 180:115129, 2021.
- [10] Harish Garg and Dimple Rani. Novel aggregation operators and ranking method for complex intuitionistic fuzzy sets and their applications to decision-making process. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 53:3595–3620, 2020.
- [11] Xunjie Gou, Zeshui Xu, and Huchang Liao. Alternative queuing method for multiple criteria decision making with hybrid fuzzy and ranking information. *Inf. Sci.*, 357:144–160, 2016.
- [12] Y He and Y Deng. Ordinal fuzzy entropy. *Iranian Journal of Fuzzy Systems*, 19(3):171–186, 2022.
- [13] Yuanpeng He and Yong Deng. Mmget: a markov model for generalized evidence theory. *Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 41:1–41, 2022.
- [14] Yuanpeng He and Yong Deng. Ordinal belief entropy. *Soft Computing*, 27(11):6973–6981, 2023.
- [15] Yuanpeng He and Yong Deng. Tdqm: Two-dimensional quantum mass function. *Information Sciences*, 621:749–765, 2023.
- [16] Yuanpeng He, Lijian Li, and Tianxiang Zhan. A matrix-based distance of pythagorean fuzzy set and its application in medical diagnosis, 2024.
- [17] Yuanpeng He, Lijian Li, Tianxiang Zhan, Wenpin Jiao, and Chi-Man Pun. Generalized uncertainty-based evidential fusion with hybrid multi-head attention for weak-supervised temporal action localization. In *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 3855–3859. IEEE, 2024.
- [18] Yuanpeng He, Wenjie Song, Lijian Li, Tianxiang Zhan, and Wenpin Jiao. Residual feature-reutilization inception network. *Pattern Recognition*, page 110439, 2024.
- [19] Yuanpeng He and Fuyuan Xiao. Conflicting management of evidence combination from the point of improvement of basic probability assignment. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 36(5):1914–1942, 2021.
- [20] Yuanpeng He and Fuyuan Xiao. A new base function in basic probability assignment for conflict management. *Applied Intelligence*, 52(4):4473–4487, 2022.
- [21] Wen Jiang, Ying Cao, and Xinyang Deng. A novel z-network model based on bayesian network and z-number. *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, 28(8):1585–1599, 2020.
- [22] Liting Jing, Jian Yao, Fei Gao, Jiquan Li, Xiang Peng, and Shaofei Jiang. A rough set-based interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy conceptual design decision approach with considering diverse customer preference distribution. *Adv. Eng. Informatics*, 48:101284, 2021.
- [23] Janusz Kacprzyk and Ronald R Yager. *The ordered weighted averaging operators: theory and applications*. Springer, 1997.
- [24] Ankit Kumar, Vijay K. Yadav, Subir Das, and Rajeev. Global exponential stability of takagi-sugeno fuzzy cohen-grossberg neural network with time-varying delays. *IEEE Control. Syst. Lett.*, 6:325–330, 2022.
- [25] Han Lai and Huchang Liao. A multi-criteria decision making method based on DNMA and CRITIC with linguistic D numbers for blockchain platform evaluation. *Eng. Appl. Artif. Intell.*, 101:104200, 2021.
- [26] Lijian Li, Yuanpeng He, and Li Li. Nndf: A new neural detection network for aspect-category sentiment analysis. In *International Conference on Knowledge Science, Engineering and Management*, pages 339–355. Springer, 2022.
- [27] Baoyu Liu and Yong Deng. Risk evaluation in failure mode and effects analysis based on D numbers theory. *Int. J. Comput. Commun. Control*, 14(5):672–691, 2019.
- [28] Peide Liu and Xiaohong Zhang. A new hesitant fuzzy linguistic approach for multiple attribute decision making based on dempster-shafer evidence theory. *Appl. Soft Comput.*, 86, 2020.
- [29] Abbas Mardani, Ahmad Jusoh, and Edmundas Kazimieras Zavadskas. Fuzzy multiple criteria decision-making techniques and applications - two decades review from 1994 to 2014. *Expert Syst. Appl.*, 42(8):4126–4148, 2015.
- [30] Xiangjun Mi, Ye Tian, and Bingyi Kang. A modified soft-likelihood function based on POWA operator. *Int. J. Intell. Syst.*, 35(5):869–890, 2020.
- [31] SA484282 Orlovsky. Decision-making with a fuzzy preference relation. In *Readings in fuzzy sets for intelligent systems*, pages 717–723. Elsevier, 1993.
- [32] Yue Pan, Limao Zhang, Xianguo Wu, and Miroslaw J. Skibniewski. Multi-classifier information fusion in risk analysis. *Inf. Fusion*, 60:121–136, 2020.
- [33] Yafei Song, Qiang Fu, Yi-Fei Wang, and Xiaodan Wang. Divergence-based cross entropy and uncertainty measures of atanassov’s intuitionistic fuzzy sets with their application in decision making. *Appl. Soft Comput.*, 84, 2019.
- [34] Yutong Song and Yong Deng. A new soft likelihood function based on power ordered weighted average operator. *Int. J. Intell. Syst.*, 34(11):2988–2999, 2019.
- [35] Ran Tao, Zeyi Liu, Rui Cai, and Kang Hao Cheong. A dynamic group MCDM model with intuitionistic fuzzy set: Perspective of alternative queuing method. *Inf. Sci.*, 555:85–103, 2021.
- [36] Ye Tian, Lili Liu, Xiangjun Mi, and Bingyi Kang. ZSLF: A new soft likelihood function based on z-numbers and its application in expert decision system. *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, 29(8):2283–2295, 2021.
- [37] Ye Tian, Xiangjun Mi, Lili Liu, and Bingyi Kang. A new soft likelihood function based on D numbers in handling uncertain information. *Int. J. Fuzzy Syst.*, 22(7):2333–2349, 2020.
- [38] Chin-Hsin Wang, Mohd Helmi Ali, Kuen-Suan Chen, Yeneneh Tamirat Negash, Ming-Lang Tseng, and Raymond R. Tan. Data driven supplier selection as a circular economy enabler: A taguchi capability index for manufactured products with asymmetric tolerances. *Adv. Eng. Informatics*, 47:101249, 2021.
- [39] Hongping Wang, Yi-Ping Fang, and Enrico Zio. Risk assessment of an electrical power system considering the influence of traffic congestion on a hypothetical scenario of electrified transportation system in new york state. *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, 22(1):142–155, 2021.
- [40] Zhou-Jing Wang. A representable uninorm-based intuitionistic fuzzy analytic hierarchy process. *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, 28(10):2555–2569, 2020.

- [41] Stefan Wuchty and Peter F Stadler. Centers of complex networks. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 223(1):45–53, 2003.
- [42] Fuyuan Xiao. A distance measure for intuitionistic fuzzy sets and its application to pattern classification problems. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. Syst.*, 51(6):3980–3992, 2021.
- [43] Fuyuan Xiao, Zehong Cao, and Alireza Jolfaei. A novel conflict measurement in decision-making and its application in fault diagnosis. *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, 29(1):186–197, 2021.
- [44] Tianchi Xu, Kai Yan, Yuanpeng He, Si Gao, Kai Yang, Jingrui Wang, Jinxu Liu, and Zhao Liu. Spatio-temporal variability analysis of vegetation dynamics in china from 2000 to 2022 based on leaf area index: A multi-temporal image classification perspective. *Remote Sensing*, 15(12):2975, 2023.
- [45] Ronald R. Yager, Paul Elmore, and Frederick E. Petry. Soft likelihood functions in combining evidence. *Inf. Fusion*, 36:185–190, 2017.
- [46] Songlin Yang, Feng Xu, Xueqian Wang, and Bin Liang. A novel online active fault diagnosis method based on invariant sets. *IEEE Control. Syst. Lett.*, 5(2):457–462, 2021.
- [47] Lotfi A Zadeh. A note on z-numbers. *Information sciences*, 181(14):2923–2932, 2011.
- [48] Qinghua Zhang, Chenchen Yang, and Guoyin Wang. A sequential three-way decision model with intuitionistic fuzzy numbers. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. Syst.*, 51(5):2640–2652, 2021.
- [49] Wei-Bo Zhang and Guang-Yu Zhu. A multiobjective optimization of PCB prototyping assembly with OFA based on the similarity of intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, 29(7):2054–2061, 2021.
- [50] Zhiming Zhang, Chong Wu, and Witold Pedrycz. A novel group decision-making method for interval-valued intuitionistic multiplicative preference relations. *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, 28(8):1799–1814, 2020.