12. Similarity Selection Anti Submarine Sensor of Helicopter Using ELECTRE III Method

By Okol Sri Suharyo

WORD COUNT 3935
TIME SUBMITTED 08-JUN-2021 06:20AM
PAPER ID 73139908

Selection anti submarine sensor of helicopter using ELECTRE III method

Article *in* International Journal of Applied Engineering Research · January 2017

CITATION
1

READS
255

4 authors, including:

O.s. Suharyo
Sekolah Tinggi Teknologi Angkatan Laut STTAL
14 PUBLICATIONS **16** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

April Kukuh Susilo
Sekolah Tinggi Teknologi Angkatan Laut Surabaya
8 PUBLICATIONS **6** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

International Journal of Applied Engineering Research ISSN 0973-4562 Volume 12, Number 9 (2017) pp. 1974-1981

Selection Anti Submarine Sensor of Helicopter Using ELECTRE III Method

Ahmadi[1], Siswo H. Sumarmi[2], Okol S. Suharyo[3] and A. Kukuh Susilo[4]

[1]*Indonesian Naval Technology College, STTAL. Bumimoro-Morokrembangan, Surabaya 60187, Indonesia.*

[1]*ORCID: 0000-0002-2859-3165,* [2]*ORCID:0000-0002-4456-5279,*
[3]*ORCID:0000-0003-4766-6662* [4]*ORCID:0000-0002-7012-7520*

Abstract
Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) is one of them component for Maritime Security and Defence in activities of warfare alert, basic training and operation at sea. It needs air power to support and covered sea power. Indonesian Naval Aviation as airpower will receive 11 helicopters to carry function about anti surface ship and submarine. The Helicopters needs sensor equipment to detect the submarine likes Magnetic Anomaly Detector (MAD), Sonobuoy, dan Dipping Sonar. The purpose this paper is giving alternatives for sensor equipments anti submarine in Helicopters at Indonesian Naval Aviation. For gives alternative sensor equipment, this paper used ELECTRE Methode in decision making. The result of choiced sensor equipment with type of dipping sonar, according the best rank is HELRAS DS 100, FLASH-S, AN/AQS-22 ALFS, VGS-3 dan AQS-18A. Alternative 1 dipping sonar sensor L3 Comm Helras DS 100 has 1 for value toward alternative 4, with 0,99 toward alternative A3, with 0,95 toward alternative A5 and 0,86 toward alternative A2. It result by compared with Concordance Global, alternative A1 has highest rank toward all alternatives. Alternative A3 (AN/AQS-22 ALFS) has 1 for Condordance Global value toward alternative A2 and A1, alternative A3 has 0,93 for Concordance Global value toward alternative A1, toward alternative A2 is 0,89 and alternative A5 is 0,94. So that, alternative A3 is second choiced.

Keyword: Anti Submarine, Helicopter, Dipping Sonar, ELECTRE Method.

INTRODUCTION

Today's, market for submarines over the coming decade is projected to exceed one hundred vessels of all types and more than half of these are destined for the Asia-Pacific region (1). Many countries develop their sea power with ability of submarine in the battle formation. To secure about battlespace from undersea threats by swiftly destroying enemy submarines, many countries needs Anti submarine operations (2).

Anti submarine warfare is handled by specialised ship equipped with low frequency long-range sonars and by helicopters with dipping sonar, the quality of performance depends largely on the efficiency and quality of sonar (3).

Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) is one of them component for Maritime Security and Defence in activities of warfare alert, basic training and operation at sea. For defence power, TNI AL needs air power to support and covered sea power. Because of these challenge in the Indonesia underwater region from border line, development of anti submarine warfare ability is response from TNI AL to counter and protect maritime area.

Indonesian Naval Aviation apart from Navy as airpower will receive 11 helicopters to carry function about anti surface ship and submarine. The Helicopters needs sensor equipment to detect the submarine likes *Magnetic Anomaly Detector (MAD), Sonobuoy, and Dipping Sonar*. Dipping sonar system have many criteria sensor equipment for helicopters. It needs decision making system to suitable choice for their option, one of ways is used Multi Criteria Decision Making (MCDM).

MCDM is the decision-making technique by considering some alternative option (4). MCDM approach handles both quantitative and qualitative choices and is able to combine the historical data and expert opinion by quantifying subjective judgement (9). There are two kinds of categories of MCDM, namely Multiple Objective Decision Making (MODM) and Multiple Attribute Decision Making (MADM) (4).

MADM can be defined as decision aids to help a decision maker identify the best alternatives that maximize his satisfaction with respect to more than one attribute (6). It can be solved by several method such as AHP, DEX, Macbeth, Pragma, SAW, Promethee, Topsis and ELECTRE (7).

This paper presents about alternatives for sensor of anti submarine in Helicopters at Indonesian Naval Aviation. To gives alternative sensor, this paper used ELECTRE Methode in decision making. The benefit is giving information and literature for Indonesian Naval Aviation in best decision making of anti submarine sensor procurement. Scope of paper is Dipping sonar for helicopter, decision making with ELECTRE III method.

This paper has many literature to support it, such as literatur about Anti submarine warfare, MCDM, MADM and ELECTRE Method. Literature of paper about Anti Submarine warfare likes Anti Submarine Warfare (ASW) Capability Transformation : Strategy of Response to Effect Based Warfare (2). Implementation of Contemporary technologies in The Modernisation of Naval Sonars (3). Under The Sea Air Gap : Australia's anti-submarine warfare challenge (1).

Other literature explained about MCDM and MADM likes ELECTRE Methods in Solving Group Decision Support System Bioinformatics on Gene Mutation Detection Simulation (4). Hearing thresholds of a harbor porpoise

(Phocoena phocoena) for helicopter apping sonar signals (1.43–1.33 kHz) (8). Applications of Multi-criteria Decision Making in Software Engineering (5). Selection of Cutting Tool Insert in Turning of EN 8 Steel using Multiple Attribute Decision (6). Reducing of Inconsistent Data Using Fuzzy Multi Attribute Decision Making for Accessing Data from Database (9). Land Suitability Analysis using Mu Attribute Decision Making Approach (10). Application of the Multi Criteri Decision Making Methods for Project Selection (11). Applications of M -criteria Decision Making in Software Engineering (5). A Qualitative Multi-Attribute Model for the Selection of the Private Hydropower Plant Investments in Turkey: By Foundation of the Search Results Clustering Engine, Hydropower Pl Clustering, DEXi and DEXiTree (7). Application of Multi-Attribute Decision Making Approa to Learning Management Systems Evaluation (12). A Multiple Attribute Decision Making Meth Based on Uncertain Linguistic Heronian Mean (13). Applications and Modelling Using Multi-Attribute Decision aking to Rank Terrorist Threats (14). Research on the Multi-attribute Decision Making Model Based the Possible Regret Degree of the Policy-maker (15). Multi Attribu Decision Making Techniques (16). Multi-attribute and Multi-criteria Decision Mak Model for technology selection using fuzzy logic (17). A Multiple Attribute Decision Making for In oving Information Security Control Assessment (18). Comparison of Multi Criteria Decision Making Methods From The Maintenance Alternative Selection Perspective (19).

Some paper literature about ELECTRE method likes Application of ELECTRE Method for Sub-Contractor Selecti using Interval-Valued Fuzzy Sets - Case Study (20). ELECTRE Methods in Solving Group Decision Support System nformatics on Gene Mutation Detection Simulation (4). A Comprehensive Solution to Automated Inspection De e Selection Problem Using ELECTRE Method (21). The development and application of multi-criteria decision-making tool with consideration of uncertainty: The selection of a management strategy for the degradable fraction in the municipal solid waste (22). Multiple Criteria Outranking A ithm: Implementation and Computational Tests (23). Development of a Fuzzy Multi-Criteria Decision Support System for Municipal Solid Waste Management (24). Logistic Center Location : ection using Multicriteria Decision Making (25). Hierarchical anking methods for multi-criteria decision aiding (26). ELECTRE III as a Support for Partcipatory Decision-Mak on the Localisation of Waste-treatment Plants (27). Selecting th Best Project Using the Fuzzy ELECTRE Method (28). A user-oriented implementation of the ELECTRE I method integrating preference elicitation support (29). ELECTRE I Decision Model of Reliability Desi Scheme for Computer NUmerical Control Machine (30). mproved ranking method for ELECTRE III (31)

This paper is organized as follows : section 2 describes ELECTRE III method, flowchart diagram and data collecting. Section 3 explaines the result and discussion of this paper. Section 4 present about conclusion this paper.

MATERIAL & METHODOLOGY

Flowchart Diagram:



Figure 1. flowchart Diagram

ELECTRE Method:

ELECTRE was envisage by Bernard Roy (1991) to overcome some deficiencies of popularly used MCDM tools to deal with ordinal attributes without the ed for transforming them into cardina values (21). ELECTRE (Elimination Et Choix Traduisant He realite) is based on the concept of ranking by paired comparison between alternatives on the appropriate criteria (4). An alternative is said to dominate th other alternatives if one or more criteria are met (compared with the criterion of other alternatives) and it is equal to the remaining criteria (4). A characteristic features of ELECTRE is the use of an outranking relation for the representation of decision maker's preferences (32). An advantage of using complementary ELECTRE is that the tradeof ong attributes is compensatory (24). The variants of the ELECTRE Method, namely ELECTRE II,IS,III,IV and TRI can be suitably applied in choosing the most efficien alternative that account for both the decision maker's intervention nd other technical elements (21). ELECTRE methods establish a realistic representation of four basic situations of preference : indifference, weak preference, strict preference and incomparability (26).

International Journal of Applied Engineering Research ISSN 0973-4562 Volume 12, Number 9 (2017) pp. 1974-1981

The strenghts of ELECTRE methods include the following (26) :

a. ELECTRE methods are able to take into account the qualitative nature of some criteria, allowing the DM to consider the original data directly, without the need to make transformations into arti_cial numerical scales.
b. ELECTRE methods can deal with heterogeneous criteria scales, preserving the original scores of the alternatives on each criterion co d in an ordinal scale or a \weak" interval scale, without the need for nornamlization techniques or the assessment of a value nction.
c. ELECTRE follows a the non-compensatory character in aggregation.
d. ELECTRE methods incorporate the notion of incomparability between a pair of alternatives, referring to the case where one option is better that the other in some criteria and simultaneously is worse in other criteria, making impossible the establishment of a preference relation between them.

The main weaknesses of ELECTRE methods are as follows (26) :

a. When the aim is to calculate an overall score for each alternative, ELECTRE methods are not suitable and er scoring methods should be applied.
b. When all the criteria are quantitative, it is better to apply another method, unless we are dealing with imperfect knowledge or a non-compensatory process should be taken into account.

ELECTRE III Method.

ELECTRE III method was chosen from the different ELECTRE family method mainly in relation to the imprecision and uncertainty of some available data, and was explained to the commission in its overa ogic (27). ELECTRE III method was chosen because it allows the use inaccurate, indefinite, imprecise and uncertain data (25). ELECTRE III method follows the two outranking steps: first, the construction of an outranking relation over all the possible pairs of alternative ; second, the exploitation of this outran g relation to solve the ranking decision problem (26). In order to construct a outranking relation in the ELECTR II method, three different threshold values, namely undifferentiated threshold (qj), strict superior threshold (pj) and rejection threshold (vj) are first introduced (21).

The evaluation procedures of the ELECTRE III method model encompass the establishment of a threshold function, disclosure of concordance and discordance indices, determination of credibility degree, and the ranking of the alternatives ( ).

If $g(a) \geq g(b)$, then

$$g(a) > g(b) + p(g(b)) \Leftrightarrow aPb \quad (1)$$

$$g(b) + q(g(b)) < g(a) < g(b) + p(g(b)) \Leftrightarrow aQb \quad (2)$$

$$g(b) < g(a) < g(b) + q(g(b)) \Leftrightarrow aIb \quad (3)$$

preference, I denotes indifference, and $g(a)$ is the criterion value of the alternative a (33).

The steps of ELECTRE III and calculations are presented below (33).

a. Step 1

The The concordance index c(*a, b*) is computed for each pair of alternatives :

$$c(a,b) = \frac{a}{w} \sum_{i=1}^{m} w_i\, c_i\,(a,b) \text{ and } W = \sum_{i=1}^{m} c_i \quad (4)$$

Where $c_i(a, b)$ is the outranking degree of the alternative a and the alternative b under the criterion i, and

$$c_i(a,b) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g_i(b) - g_i(a) > p_i(g_i(a)) \\ 1 & \text{if } g_i(b) - g_i(a) \leq q_i(g_i(a)) \\ \frac{p_i + g_i(a) - g_i(b)}{p_i - q_i} & otherwise \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Thus, $0 \leq C_i(a, b) \leq 1$,

The veto threshold $v_i(g_i(b))$ is defined for each criterion i as follows (33):

$$v_i(g_i(b)) = \alpha_v + \beta_v g_i(a) \quad (6)$$

The veto threshold, *vi*, allows for the possibility of aSb to be refused totally if, for any one criterion j. $g_i(b) > g_i(a) + v_i$.

b. Step 2.

The discordance index $d_i(a, b)$ for each criterion is then defined as follows (33):

$$c_i(a,b) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g_i(b) - g_i(a) \leq p_i(g_i(a)) \\ 1 & \text{if } g_i(b) - g_i(a) > v_i(g_i(a)) \\ \frac{g_i(b) - g_i(a) - p_i}{v_i - p_i} & otherwise \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Thus, $0 \leq d_i(a, b) \leq 1$.

International Journal of Applied Engineering Research ISSN 0973-4562 Volume 12, Number 9 (2017) pp. 1974-1981

Step 3.

Finally, the degree of outranking is defined by S(a,b) (33) :

$$S(a,b) = \begin{cases} c(a,b) \text{ if } d_i(a,b) \leq c(a,b)\ \forall j \in J \\ c(a,b) \times \prod_{j \in j(a,b)} \frac{1-d_i(a,b)}{1-c(a,b)} \quad otherwise \end{cases} \qquad (8)$$

Where $J(a, b)$ is the set of criteria for which $d_j(a, b) > c(a, b)$

d. Step 4.

To obtain the complete ranking of the alternatives, the normal ranking method of ELECTRE III uses a structured al-gorithm via two intermediate ranking procedures: one is descending, where the alternatives are classified from the best to the worst (descending distillation), while the other is based on the ascending order from the worst to the best alternative (ascending distillation) (33).

A new ranking method based on the introduction of three concepts, including the concordance credibility degree, the discordance credibility degree and the net credibility degree (31).

1) The concordance credibility degree is defined by

$$\varphi + (x_i) = \sum_{x_j \in X} S(x_i, x_j),\ \forall x_i \in X \qquad (9)$$

The concordance credibility degree is a measure of the outranking character of x_i (showing how x_i dominates all the other alternatives of X).

2) The discordance credibility degree is defined by

$$\varphi^- + (x_i) = \sum_{x_j \in X} S(x_i, x_j),\ \forall x_i \in X \qquad (10)$$

The discordance credibility degree describes the outranked x_j (showing how x_j is dominated by all the other alternatives of X).

3) The net credibility degree is defined by

$$\varphi(x_i) = \varphi^+(x_i) - \varphi^-(x_i),\ \forall x_i \in X \qquad (11)$$

The net credibility degree represents the value function, where a higher value reflects higher attractiveness of the alternative x_i. Then, all the alternatives can be completely ranked by the net credibility degree.

Data Collection:

a. Sonar with type Helicopter Long Range Active Sonar (HELRAS) DS-100 from L-3 Communication, United State.
b. Sonar with type FLASH-S from Thales Underwater System, French.
c. Sonar with type AN/AQS 22 ALFS from Raytheon Integrated Defence System, United State.
d. Sonar with type AN/AQS 18 from L-3 Communication, United State.
e. Sonar with type VGS-3 Foal Tail from Rosonboronexport, Russian.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result:

The result of choiced sensor equipment with type of dipping sonar, according the best rank is HELRAS DS 100, FLASH-S, AN/AQS-22 ALFS, VGS-3 dan AQS-18A. Alternative 1 dipping sonar sensor L3 Comm Helras DS 100 has 1 for value toward alternative 4, with 0,99 toward alternative A3, with 0,95 toward alternative A5 and 0,86 toward alternative A2. It result by compared with Concordance Global, alternative A1 has highest rank toward all alternatives. Alternative A3 (AN/AQS-22 ALFS) has 1 for Condordance Global value toward alternative A2 and A1, alternative A3 has 0,93 for Concordance Global value toward alternative A1, toward alternative A2 is 0,89 and alternative A5 is 0,94. So that alternative A3 is second choices.

International Journal of Applied Engineering Research ISSN 0973-4562 Volume 12, Number 9 (2017) pp. 1974-1981

Table 1. Result Of Sensor Selection

No	Sensor Name	Code	Ranking
1	*Helicopter Long Range Active Sonar (HELRAS)* DS-100	A 1	1
2	*Folding Light Acoustic System for Helicopters (*FLASH) *S*	A 2	2
3	ALFS *(Airborne Low Frequency Sonar)* AN/AQS 22	A3	3
4	VGS-3 *FoalTail*	A 5	4
5	AN/AQS 18	A 4	5



Figure 2. Result Of Sensor Selection

DISCUSSION

Assessment of each alternative in each criteria based from primer data (qualitative) in form of questionnaire to respondens from expert and quantitaive daat from references, technical specification of equipment from factory. Criteria Classification shows in table 2.

Table 2. Classification of Crtiteria

No	Criteria	Code	Data Clasification
1	Operational Depth	K1	Quantitative
2	Operational Mode	K2	Quantitative
3	Ability of Active Transmition	K3	Quantitative
4	Ability of Passive Receive	K4	Quantitative
5	Total of Target Tracked	K5	Quantitative
6	Overall Weight	K6	Quantitative
7	Readiness of Crew	K7	Qualitative
8	Readiness of Equipment	K8	Qualitative
9	Readiness of Support system	K9	Qualitative
10	Utilization of Local Component	K10	Qualitative
11	Prospect for Tansfer of Technology	K11	Qualitative
12	The First Purchase Costs	K12	Quantitative
13	Operational Costs	K13	Quantitative
14	Logistic Support	K14	Qualitative
15	Ease of Maintenance	K15	Qualitative
16	Reliability	K16	Qualitative

International Journal of Applied Engineering Research ISSN 0973-4562 Volume 12, Number 9 (2017) pp. 1974-1981

Table 3. Payoff Matrix

No	Criteria	Code	Alternative					
			A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	Units
1	Operational Depth	K1	500	750	777	290	500	Metre
2	Operational Mode	K2	3	3	5	3	3	Each
3	Ability of Active Transmition	K3	90	50	90	100	40	Nm
4	Ability of Passive Receive	K4	200	180	200	220	140	Nm
5	Total of Target Tracked	K5	10	10	8	6	8	Each
6	Overall Weight	K6	500	480	380	450	550	Kg
7	Readiness of Crew	K7	0,208633	0,194245	0,208633	0,208633	0,179856	-
8	Readiness of Equipment	K8	0,214815	0,192593	0,207407	0,207407	0,177778	-
9	Readiness of Support system	K9	0,210191	0,191083	0,210191	0,210191	0,178344	-
10	Utilization of Local Component	K10	0,222222	0,222222	0,177778	0,177778	0,2	-
11	Prospect for Tansfer of Technology	K11	0,188679	0,245283	0,188679	0,188679	0,188679	-
12	The First Purchase Costs	K12	4,2	4	4,1	4,5	3,9	$ (Million)
13	Operational Costs	K13	0,42	0,4	0,41	0,45	0,39	$ (Million)
14	Logistic Support	K14	0,209877	0,197531	0,209877	0,209877	0,17284	-
15	Ease of Maintenance	K15	0,246667	0,206667	0,24	0,2	0,106667	-
16	Reliability	K16	0,19883	0,204678	0,19883	0,19883	0,19883	-

In Rank of ELECTRE III method, to determine threshold value is based to compared in each criterion alternative. Threshold value have three part *indefference threshold* (q_j), *veto threshold* (v_j) dan *preference threshold* (p_j). Threshold value showed in table 4.

Table 4. Threshold Value of Each Criteria

No	Criteria	Code	q	p	v
1	Operational Depth	K1	162,333	324,667	487
2	Operational Mode	K2	0,66667	1,33333	2
3	Ability of Active Transmition	K3	20	40	60
4	Ability of Passive Receive	K4	2.666.667	5.333.333	80
5	Total of Target Tracked	K5	1.333.333	2.666.667	4
6	Overall Weight	K6	5.666.667	1.133.333	170
7	Readiness of Crew	K7	0,00959	0,01918	0,02878
8	Readiness of Equipment	K8	0,01235	0,02469	0,03704
9	Readiness of Support system	K9	0,01062	0,02123	0,03185
10	Utilization of Local Component	K10	0,01481	0,02963	0,04444
11	Prospect for Tansfer of Technology	K11	0,01887	0,03774	0,0566
12	The First Purchase Costs	K12	0,2	0,4	0,6
13	Operational Costs	K13	0,02	0,04	0,06
14	Logistic Support	K14	0,01235	0,02469	0,03704
15	Ease of Maintenance	K15	0,03111	0,06222	0,09333
16	Reliability	K16	0,00195	0,0039	0,00585

The table 5 showed that concordance value if global concordance index= 1, then alternative j absolute or more preferred than k in all criterion. If global concordance index site between 0 and 1, it has value almost 1 that is alternative j more preferred than k in all criterion and vice versa.

Table 6. Value Of Ranking Matrix



Table 5. Value of Concordance Global



Result from ranking matrix showed that I is alternative j and k indifference, that mean both of alternative must be choiced. P showed that alternative j more preferred than k, and alternative P- more preferred than j.

CONCLUSION

The result of choiced sensor equipment with type of dipping sonar, according the best rank is HELRAS DS 100, FLASH-S, AN/AQS-22 ALFS, VGS-3 dan AQS-18A. Alternative 1 dipping sonar sensor L3 Comm Helras DS 100 has 1 for value toward alternative 4, with 0,99 toward alternative A3, with 0,95 toward alternative A5 and 0,86 toward alternative A2. It result by compared with Concordance Global, alternative A1 has highest rank toward all alternatives. Alternative A3 (AN/AQS-22 ALFS) has 1 for Condordance Global value toward alternative A2 and A1, alternative A3 has 0,93 for Concordance Global value toward alternative A1, toward alternative A2 is 0,89 and alternative A5 is 0,94. So that alternative A3 is second choices.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research has been supported by Indonesia Naval Technology College (Sekolah Tinggi Teknologi Angkatan Laut/STTAL).

REFERENCES

[1] Pacey, Brice. Under The Sea Air Gap : Australia's anti-submarine warfare challenge. Canberra : Kokoda Foundation, 2011.

[2] Anti Submarine Warfare (ASW) Capability Transformation : Strategy of Response to Effect Based WArfare. Finch, David P. 2009, ICCRTS.

[3] Marszal, Jacek. Implementation of Contemporary technologies in The Modernisation of Naval Sonars. Poland : Gdansk University of Technology, 2014.

[4] Electre Methods in Solving Group Decision Support System Bioinformatics on Gene Mutation Detection Simulation. Ermatita, et al. 2011, International Journal of Computer Science & Information Technology (IJCSIT), hal. 40-52.

[5] Applications of Multi-criteria Decision Making in Software Engineering. Sehra, Sumeet, Brar, Yadwinder dan Kaur, Navdeep. s.l. : International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications, 2016.

[6] Selection of Cutting Tool Insert in Turning of EN 8 Steel using Multiple Attribute Decision. K.G.Nikam dan S.S.Kadam. 2014, International Journal of Engineering Sciences & Research Technology, hal. 109-115.

[7] A Qualitative Multi-Attribute Model for the Selection of the Private Hydropower Plant Investments in Turkey: By Foundation of the Search Results Clustering Engine (Carrot2), Hydropower Plant Clustering, DEXi and DEXiTree. Saracoglu, Burak O. 2016, Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management, hal. 152-178.

[8] Hearing thresholds of a harbor porpoise (Phocoena phocoena) for helicopter dipping sonar signals (1.43–1.33 kHz). Kasteleina, Ronald A. dan Hoek, Lean. 2011, The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, hal. 679-682.

[9] Reducing of Inconsistent Data Using Fuzzy Multi Attribute Decision Making for Accessing Data from Database. Yusof, Mohd Kamir, Rahman, M. Nordin M dan Azlan, Atiqah. 2013, International Journal of Database Theory and Application.

[10] Land Suitability Analysis using Multi Attribute Decision Making Approach. Sudabe Jafar, Narges Zaredar. 2010, International Journal of Environmental Science and Development.

[11] Application of the Multi Criteria Decision Making Methods for Project Selection. Pangsri, Prapawan. 2015, Universal Journal of Management, hal. 15-20.

[12] Application of Multi-Attribute Decision Making Approach to Learning Management Systems Evaluation. Tanja Arh, Borka Jerman Blažič. 2007, Journal of Computers .

[13] A Multiple Attribute Decision Making Method Based on Uncertain Linguistic Heronian Mean. Xiaodi Liu,

Jianjun Zhu, Guodong Liu,Jingjing Hao. 2013, Hindawi Publishing Corporation.

[14] Applications and Modelling Using Multi-Attribute Decision Making to Rank Terrorist Threats. Fox, William P. 2016, Journal of Socialomics.

[15] Research on the Multi-attribute Decision Making Model Based on the Possible Regret Degree of the Policy-maker. Weibing, Peng. 2012, Journal of Computers.

[16] Multi Attribute Decision Making Techniques. Sharma, Manoj. 2013, International Journal of Research in Management, Science & Technology.

[17] Multi-attribute and Multi-criteria Decision Making Model for technology selection using fuzzy logic. Kalbande, Dhananjay R. dan G.T.Thampi. 2009, International Journal of Computing Science and Communication Technologies.

[18] A Multiple Attribute Decision Making for Improving Information Security Control Assessment . Nadher Al-Safwani, Suhaidi Hassan, Norliza Katuk. 2014, International Journal of Computer Applications.

[19] Comparison of Multi Criteria Decision Making Methods From The Maintenance Alternative Selection Perspective. Thor, Jureen, Ding Lew-Hong dan Kamaruddin, Shahrul. 2013, The International Journal Of Engineering And Science, hal. 27-34.

[20] Application of Electre Method for Sub-Contractor Selection using Interval-Valued Fuzzy Sets - Case Study. Hassan Hadipour, Roozbeh Azizmohammadi, Abbas Mahmoudabadi, Mohammad Khoshnoud. Bali : s.n., 2014. International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management.

[21] A Comprehensive Solution to Automated Inspection Device Selection Problem Using Electre Method. Chatterjee, Prasenjit, Mondal, Suprakash dan Chakraborty, Shankar. 2014, International Journal of Technology, hal. 193-208.

[22] The development and application of multi-criteria decision-making tool with consideration of uncertainty: The selection of a management strategy for the bio-degradable fraction in the municipal solid waste. Ali El Hanandeh, Abbas El-Zein. 2009, Elsevier.

[23] Azziz, Mohamed Bou-Hamdan. Multiple Criteria Outranking Algorithm: Implementation and Computational Tests. Lisbon : s.n., 2015.

[24] Cheng, Steven KwokYam. Development of a Fuzzy Multi-Criteria Decision Support System for Municipal Solid Waste Management. Regina : University of Regina, 2000.

[25] Fagarasan, Maria dan Cristea, Ciprian. Logistic Center Location : Selection using Multicriteria Decision Making. s.l. : Annals of the Oradea university, 2015.

[26] Terrientes, Luis Miguel Del Vasto. Hierarchical outranking methods for multi-criteria decision aiding. Tarragona : Universitat Rovira Virgili, 2015.

[27] Electre III as a Support for Partcipatory Decision-Making on the Localisation of Waste-treatment Plants. Norese, Maria Franca. 2006, Elsevier, hal. 76-

[28] Selecting the Best Project Using the Fuzzy Electre Method. Babak Daneshvar Rouyendegh, Serpil Erol. 2012, Hindawi Publishing Corporation.

[29] A user-oriented implementation of the Electre III method integrating preference elicitation support. Mousseau, V., Slowinski, R. dan Zielniewicz, P. 2000, Elsevier, hal. 757-777.

[30] Electre I Decision Model of Reliability Design Scheme for Computer NUmerical Control Machine. Pang, Jihon, Zhang, Genbao dan Chen, Guohua. 2011, Journal of Software .

[31] An improved ranking method for ELECTRE III. Li, F. dan Wang, J.J. 2008. nternational Conferenceon Wireless Communications, Networking and Mobile Computing. hal. 766-776.

[32] Application of ELECTRE III and Shannon Entropy for Strategy Selection. Jafari, Hassan. 2013, International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies, hal. 189-194.

[33] Multicriteria Group Decision Making with ELECTRE III Method based on Interval-valued Intuitionostic Fuzzy Information. Hashemi, Shide S., et al. 2013, Elsevier, hal. 1554-1564.

[34] A Comprehensive Solution to Automated Inspection Device Selection Problem Using Electre Method. Prasenjit Chatterjee, Suprakash Mondal, Shankar Chakraborty. 2014, International Journal of Technology, hal. 193-208.

12. Similarity Selection Anti Submarine Sensor of Helicopter Using ELECTRE III Method

ORIGINALITY REPORT

42%
SIMILARITY INDEX

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Shide Sadat Hashemi, Seyed Hossein Razavi Hajiagha, Edmundas Kazimieras Zavadskas, Hannan Amoozad Mahdiraji. "Multicriteria group decision making with ELECTRE III method based on interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy information", Applied Mathematical Modelling, 2016 Crossref	337 words — 8%
2	K.B. Sarmila, S.V. Manisekaran. "A Study on Security Considerations in IoT Environment and Data Protection Methodologies for Communication in Cloud Computing", 2019 International Carnahan Conference on Security Technology (ICCST), 2019 Crossref	160 words — 4%
3	Luis Del Vasto-Terrientes, Aida Valls, Roman Slowinski, Piotr Zielniewicz. "ELECTRE-III-H: An outranking-based decision aiding method for hierarchically structured criteria", Expert Systems with Applications, 2015 Crossref	130 words — 3%
4	Made Sudarma, Anak Agung Kompiang Oka Sudana, Irwansyah Cahya. "Decision Support System for the Selection of Courses in the Higher Education using the Method of Elimination Et Choix Tranduit La Realite", International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering (IJECE), 2015 Crossref	91 words — 2%

5 Luis Del Vasto-Terrientes, Aida Valls, Piotr Zielniewicz, Joan Borràs. "A hierarchical multi-criteria sorting approach for recommender systems", Journal of Intelligent Information Systems, 2015 — 71 words — 2%
Crossref

6 Burak Omer Saracoglu. "Location selection factors of concentrated solar power plant investments", Sustainable Energy, Grids and Networks, 2020 — 62 words — 2%
Crossref

7 Huang, . "Appendix", Multiple Attribute Decision Making Methods and Applications, 2011. — 59 words — 1%
Crossref

8 Kaur, Sumeet, Yadwinder Singh, and Navdeep Kaur. "Applications of Multi-criteria Decision Making in Software Engineering", International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications, 2016. — 59 words — 1%
Crossref

9 Herva, Marta, and Enrique Roca. "Review of combined approaches and multi-criteria analysis for corporate environmental evaluation", Journal of Cleaner Production, 2013. — 57 words — 1%
Crossref

10 Rita Irviani, Siti Mukodimah, Muhammad Muslihudin, Trisnawati .. "Implementation of electre methods in determining for recipient candidate for pamsimas program in district pringsewu", International Journal of Engineering & Technology, 2018 — 47 words — 1%
Crossref

11 Atulkumar, Tailor Manthan. "Assessment of Nutrient Dynamics and Physico - Chemical Status of — 42 words — 1%

Freshwater Reservoirs of Vadodara District, Gujarat, India.", Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda (India), 2020
ProQuest

12 El Hanandeh, A.. "The development and application of multi-criteria decision-making tool with consideration of uncertainty: The selection of a management strategy for the bio-degradable fraction in the municipal solid waste", Bioresource Technology, 201001 — 33 words — 1%
Crossref

13 Syed Hammad Mian, Abdulrahman Al-Ahmari. "Comparative analysis of different digitization systems and selection of best alternative", Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing, 2017 — 32 words — 1%
Crossref

14 Xiaodi Liu, Jianjun Zhu, Guodong Liu, Jingjing Hao. "A Multiple Attribute Decision Making Method Based on Uncertain Linguistic Heronian Mean", Mathematical Problems in Engineering, 2013 — 32 words — 1%
Crossref

15 Jianbing Li, Lei Liu, Guohe Huang, Guangming Zeng. "A Fuzzy-Set Approach for Addressing Uncertainties in Risk Assessment of Hydrocarbon-Contaminated Site", Water, Air, & Soil Pollution, 2006 — 31 words — 1%
Crossref

16 Lineker M Goulart Coelho, Liséte C Lange, Hosmanny MG Coelho. "Multi-criteria decision making to support waste management: A critical review of current practices and methods", Waste Management & Research, 2016 — 30 words — 1%
Crossref

17 Ronald A. Kastelein, Nele Steen, Robin Gransier, Paul J. Wensveen, Christ A. F. de Jong. " Threshold received sound pressure levels of single 1–2 kHz and 6–7 kHz — 29 words — 1%

up-sweeps and down-sweeps causing startle responses in a harbor porpoise ( ) ", The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 2012
Crossref

18 Amit Kumar Mishra, Nisheeth Joshi, Iti Mathur. "A fuzzy based integrated model for identification of vital node in terrorist network using logarithmic concept", Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems, 2020 — 24 words — 1%
Crossref

19 Ali Al Mousa, Mohammad Al Qomri, Salman Al Hajri, Rachid Zagrouba, Sghaier Chaabani. "Environment Based IoT Security Risks and Vulnerabilities Management", 2020 International Conference on Computing and Information Technology (ICCIT-1441), 2020 — 22 words — 1%
Crossref

20 Nitesh Kumar, Tarun Soota, Neetesh Gupta, Sunil Kumar Rajput. "Multi attribute outranking approach for supplier selection", IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 2018 — 22 words — 1%
Crossref

21 Cavus, N.. "The evaluation of Learning Management Systems using an artificial intelligence fuzzy logic algorithm", Advances in Engineering Software, 201002 — 21 words — 1%
Crossref

22 Joonas Hokkanen, Pekka Salminen. "Choosing a solid waste management system using multicriteria decision analysis", European Journal of Operational Research, 1997 — 20 words — < 1%
Crossref

23 "Smart Intelligent Computing and Applications", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2020 — 19 words — < 1%
Crossref

24 Huang, . "ELECTRE Method", Multiple Attribute Decision Making Methods and Applications, 2011. — 19 words — < 1%
Crossref

25 Peide Liu, Xin Zhang. "Research on the supplier selection of a supply chain based on entropy weight and improved ELECTRE-III method", International Journal of Production Research, 2011 — 19 words — < 1%
Crossref

26 Ronald A. Kastelein, Lean Hoek, Robin Gransier, Christ A. F. de Jong, John M. Terhune, Nancy Jennings. "Hearing thresholds of a harbor porpoise (Phocoena phocoena) for playbacks of seal scarer signals, and effects of the signals on behavior", Hydrobiologia, 2014 — 19 words — < 1%
Crossref

27 Huifang Sun, Yaoguo Dang, Wenxin Mao. "A Decision-Making Method with Grey Multi-Source Heterogeneous Data and Its Application in Green Supplier Selection", International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2018 — 18 words — < 1%
Crossref

28 Abbas Bonyani, Moslem Alimohammadlou. "Identifying and prioritizing foreign companies interested in participating in post-sanctions Iranian energy sector", Energy Strategy Reviews, 2018 — 17 words — < 1%
Crossref

29 Banias, G.. "Assessing multiple criteria for the optimal location of a construction and demolition waste management facility", Building and Environment, 201010 — 17 words — < 1%
Crossref

30 Juan Carlos Leyva Lopez, Jesus Jaime Solano Noriega, Diego Alonso Gastelum Chavira. "A — 16 words — < 1%

Multi-Criteria Approach to Rank the Municipalities of the States of Mexico by its Marginalization Level: The Case of Jalisco", International Journal of Information Technology & Decision Making, 2017
Crossref

31 Khanam, Momtaj. "A Market Diffusion Potential (MDP) Assessment Model for Residential Energy Efficient (EE) Technologies in the U.S.", Portland State University, 2020 — 16 words — < 1%
ProQuest

32 Mousseau, V.. "A user-oriented implementation of the ELECTRE-TRI method integrating preference elicitation support", Computers and Operations Research, 200006 — 15 words — < 1%
Crossref

33 Babak Daneshvar Rouyendegh, Serpil Erol. "Selecting the Best Project Using the Fuzzy ELECTRE Method", Mathematical Problems in Engineering, 2012 — 14 words — < 1%
Crossref

34 Pang, Jihong, Genbao Zhang, and Guohua Chen. "ELECTRE I Decision Model of Reliability Design Scheme for Computer Numerical Control Machine", Journal of Software, 2011. — 14 words — < 1%
Crossref

35 Peng, Juan-juan, Jian-qiang Wang, Hong-yu Zhang, and Xiao-hong Chen. "An outranking approach for multi-criteria decision-making problems with simplified neutrosophic sets", Applied Soft Computing, 2014. — 14 words — < 1%
Crossref

36 Jelena Markovic Brankovic, Milica Markovic, Djordje Nikolic. "Comparative study of hydraulic structures alternatives using promethee II complete ranking — 13 words — < 1%

method", Water Resources Management, 2018
Crossref

37 José Ramón San Cristóbal Mateo. "Multi Criteria Analysis in the Renewable Energy Industry", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2012 — 13 words — < 1%
Crossref

38 Kannan Govindan, Martin Brandt Jepsen. "ELECTRE: A comprehensive literature review on methodologies and applications", European Journal of Operational Research, 2016 — 12 words — < 1%
Crossref

39 Babak Daneshvar Rouyendegh. "The Intuitionistic Fuzzy ELECTRE model", International Journal of Management Science and Engineering Management, 2017 — 9 words — < 1%
Crossref

40 Romie Oktovianus Bura, I Nengah Putra Apriyanto, Arica Dwi Susanto. "Analysis of installation of ducted propeller (kort nozzle) on cargo ship after maintenance", International Journal of Engineering & Technology, 2019 — 9 words — < 1%
Crossref

41 Figueira, José Rui, Salvatore Greco, Bernard Roy, and Roman Słowiński. "An Overview of ELECTRE Methods and their Recent Extensions : ELECTRE METHODS", Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis, 2013. — 8 words — < 1%
Crossref

42 Hui-Fen Li, Jian-Jun Wang. "An Improved Ranking Method for ELECTRE III", 2007 International Conference on Wireless Communications, Networking and Mobile Computing, 2007 — 8 words — < 1%
Crossref

43 Infante, Carlos Eduardo Durange de C., Fabricio Molica de Mendonça, Paula Michele Purcidonio, and Rogerio Valle. "Triple bottom line analysis of oil and gas industry with multicriteria decision making", Journal of Cleaner Production, 2013.
Crossref
8 words — < 1%

44 Malekmohammadi, B.. "Ranking solutions of multi-objective reservoir operation optimization models using multi-criteria decision analysis", Expert Systems With Applications, 201106
Crossref
8 words — < 1%

45 "Multicriteria Decision Making", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 1999
Crossref
6 words — < 1%

EXCLUDE QUOTES OFF
EXCLUDE MATCHES OFF
EXCLUDE BIBLIOGRAPHY OFF