




**RS Global**  
Journals

**Scholarly Publisher**  
**RS Global Sp. z O.O.**  
ISNI: 0000 0004 8495 2390

Dolna 17, Warsaw, Poland 00-773  
Tel: +48 226 0 227 03  
Email: editorial\_office@rsglobal.pl

---

<b>JOURNAL</b>	World Science
<b>p-ISSN</b>	2413-1032
<b>e-ISSN</b>	2414-6404
<b>PUBLISHER</b>	RS Global Sp. z O.O., Poland
<b>ARTICLE TITLE</b>	SELECTION OF SOFTWARE ON BASE OF FUZZY TOPSIS METHOD
<b>AUTHOR(S)</b>	Salimov Vagif Hasan Oglu
<b>ARTICLE INFO</b>	Salimov Vagif Hasan Oglu. (2022) Selection of Software on Base of Fuzzy TOPSIS Method. World Science. 3(75). doi: 10.31435/rsglobal_ws/30042022/7799
<b>DOI</b>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ws/30042022/7799">https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ws/30042022/7799</a>
<b>RECEIVED</b>	02 February 2022
<b>ACCEPTED</b>	15 March 2022
<b>PUBLISHED</b>	19 March 2022
<b>LICENSE</b>	 This work is licensed under a <b>Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License</b> .

---

© The author(s) 2022. This publication is an open access article.

COMPUTER SCIENCE

SELECTION OF SOFTWARE ON BASE OF FUZZY TOPSIS METHOD

Ph.D., Salimov Vagif Hasan Oglu,

assoc. prof. of "Computer engineering" department, Azerbaijan state oil and industry university, Azerbaijan Republic, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0590-5437>

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal\\_ws/30042022/7799](https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ws/30042022/7799)

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 02 February 2022  
Accepted: 15 March 2022  
Published: 19 March 2022

KEYWORDS

multi-criteria decision making, alternative, criterion, fuzzy, TOPSIS method, ideal solution, distance to ideal solution, software.

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the problem of multi-criteria decision making. As application problem is used the software selection problem. The analysis of existing methods for solving this problem is given. As a method for solving this problem fuzzy TOPSIS (The Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution) is proposed. This method is based on ideal solution approach. The issues of practical implementation of this method are discussed in details. The results of the solution test problem at all stages are presented.

Citation: Salimov Vagif Hasan Oglu. (2022) Selection of Software on Base of Fuzzy TOPSIS Method. *World Science*. 3(75). doi: 10.31435/rsglobal\_ws/30042022/7799

Copyright: © 2022 Salimov Vagif Hasan Oglu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

**1. Introduction.** Multi Criteria Decision making (MCDM) is one of the actual problem in the theory of decision making [1-2]. From a mathematical point of view, it belongs to the class of vector optimization problems. The criteria can be divided into two groups: the criteria for which the maximum value is optimal and the criteria for which the minimum value is optimal. MCDM problems can be solved with an accuracy of many non-dominated alternatives or many trade-offs. Obtaining a single solution can only be implemented on the basis of some compromise scheme that reflects the preferences of the decision maker (DM). Methods for solving this problem can be divided into two large groups: methods using the aggregation of all alternatives according to all criteria and the solution of the resulting single-criterion problem, the second group is associated with the procedure of pairwise comparisons and stepwise aggregation. The first group includes methods: weighted average sum, weighted average product and their various modifications [3-4], the second group includes -Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP), Elimination and Choice Translating Reality (ELECTRE), The Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS), Preference Ranking Organization Method (PROMETHEE) [5-13]. The work [3] provides information on the popularity of various methods of multi-criteria decision-making. This paper discusses the TOPSIS method.

The TOPSIS method was developed by Hwang and Yoon in 1981. This method was very popular for solving multi-criteria problem under certain conditions. In general the TOPSIS method is based on the approach of ideal solution.

The fuzzy TOPSIS [4-13] method was developed by Chen in 2000 for problem with linguistic uncertainty.

**2. Description of the method.**

We consider the problem where DM makes decisions in linguistic form.

Consider all stages of fuzzy TOPSIS method:

1. First we define linguistic variables for criterion weight importance and the decisions with fuzzy trapezoidal numbers.

Table 1. Linguistic variables for the importance of criterion weights

Linguistic Variables	Trapezoidal Fuzzy Numbers
Very Low (VL)	(0,0.1,0.2,0.3)
Low (L)	(0.1,0.3,0.45,0.7)
Medium (ML)	(0.4,0.5,0.7,0.8)
High (H)	(0.5,0.6,0.75,0.85)
Very High (VH)	(0.6,0.7,0.8,0.9)

Table 2. Linguistic variables for the decision

Linguistic Variables	Trapezoidal Fuzzy Numbers
Very Poor (VP)	(0,1,2,3)
Poor (P)	(1,3,4,7)
Medium Poor (MP)	(4,5,7,8)
Good (G)	(7,8,9,9.25)
Very Good (VG)	(9, 9.25, 9.5,10)

2. Present the linguistic decisions as the matrix of outcomes (alternatives - criteria)  $n$  - number of criteria;  $m$  - number of alternatives

	C <sub>1</sub>	C <sub>2</sub>	C <sub>3</sub>		C <sub>n</sub>
A <sub>1</sub>	$\tilde{X}_{11}$	$\tilde{X}_{12}$	$\tilde{X}_{13}$		$\tilde{X}_{1n}$
A <sub>2</sub>	$\tilde{X}_{21}$	$\tilde{X}_{22}$	$\tilde{X}_{23}$		$\tilde{X}_{2n}$
A <sub>3</sub>	$\tilde{X}_{31}$	$\tilde{X}_{32}$	$\tilde{X}_{33}$		$\tilde{X}_{3n}$
A <sub>m</sub>	$\tilde{X}_{m1}$	$\tilde{X}_{m2}$	$\tilde{X}_{m3}$		$\tilde{X}_{mn}$

Fig. 1. MCDM problem representation

Where  $\tilde{X}_{ij} = (a_{ij}, b_{ij}, c_{ij}, d_{ij})$  is fuzzy trapezoidal representation of linguistic terms.

3. Calculate normalized matrix  $\tilde{R} = (r_{ij})$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m; j = 1, 2, \dots, n$

The normalized fuzzy decision matrix is calculated with the formulas given below, where  $J$  and  $J_1$  represent the maximization criteria set, and minimization criteria set respectively.

$$\tilde{r}_{ij} = \left( \frac{a_{ij}}{d_j^*}, \frac{b_{ij}}{d_j^*}, \frac{c_{ij}}{d_j^*}, \frac{d_{ij}}{d_j^*} \right), j \in J$$

$$\tilde{r}_{ij} = \left( \frac{a_j^*}{d_{ij}}, \frac{a_j^*}{c_{ij}}, \frac{a_j^*}{b_{ij}}, \frac{a_j^*}{a_{ij}} \right), j \in J_1$$

$$d_j^* = \max_i d_{ij}, j \in J$$

$$a_j^* = \min_i a_{ij}, j \in J_1$$

4. Calculate weighted decision matrix

$$\tilde{V} = (v_{ij}), i = 1, 2, \dots, m; j = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

Where

$$\tilde{v}_{ij} = \tilde{v}_{ij} \otimes \tilde{w}_j, i = 1, 2, \dots, m; j = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

5. Determine positive and negative ideal solutions

$$A^+ = (\tilde{v}_1^+, \tilde{v}_2^+, \tilde{v}_3^+, \dots, \tilde{v}_n^+)$$

$$A^- = (\tilde{v}_1^-, \tilde{v}_2^-, \tilde{v}_3^-, \dots, \tilde{v}_n^-)$$

Where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{v}_1^+ &= (1,1,1,1) \\ \tilde{v}_1^- &= (0,0,0,0) \end{aligned}$$

6. Calculate distances between actual decisions and positive and negative ideal solutions

$$\begin{aligned} d_i^+ &= \sum_{j=1}^n d(\tilde{v}_{ij}^+, \tilde{v}_j^+) \quad j=1,2,\dots,m \\ d_i^- &= \sum_{j=1}^n d(\tilde{v}_{ij}^-, \tilde{v}_j^-) \quad j=1,2,\dots,m \end{aligned}$$

Where distance is calculated by formula

$$D(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{4}[(a_1 - b_1)^2 + (a_2 - b_2)^2 + (a_3 - b_3)^2 + (a_4 - b_4)^2]}$$

7. Calculate closeness coefficient for all alternatives

$$CC_i = \frac{d_i^-}{d_i^- + d_i^+}, i = 1,2, \dots, m$$

8. Determine acceptance level of decisions

Table 3. Acceptance Criteria

Closeness Coefficient (CC <sub>i</sub> )	Evaluation
CC <sub>i</sub> ∈ [0,0.2)	Not recommended
CC <sub>i</sub> ∈ [0.2,0.4)	Recommended with high risk
CC <sub>i</sub> ∈ [0.4,0.6)	Recommended with low risk
CC <sub>i</sub> ∈ [0.6,0.8)	Acceptable
CC <sub>i</sub> ∈ [0.8,1.0)	Accepted and preferred

9. Select decision with maximum of closeness coefficient.

**3. Practical example.**

As practice problem we consider software selection problem [13-14]. With following 4 criteria and 3

C1- price,

C2 - functionality.

C3 – usability.

C4 – reliability

All calculation were implemented in Ms Excel. As seen for C1 optimal decision is minimum for other three criteria is maximum.

Consider application of fuzzy TOPSIS method for this problem. All computations were performed in Ms Excel.

1. Presentation of decisions in linguistic decision matrix

	C <sub>1</sub>	C <sub>2</sub>	C <sub>3</sub>	C <sub>4</sub>
A <sub>1</sub>	VG	G	VG	MP
A <sub>2</sub>	MP	G	G	VG
A <sub>3</sub>	G	VG	MP	G

The vector of criteria importance is presented as follows  $w = (ML, H, VH, H)$

2. Convert linguistic presentation in trapezoidal fuzzy numbers

	C <sub>1</sub>	C <sub>2</sub>	C <sub>3</sub>	C <sub>4</sub>
A <sub>1</sub>	(9, 9.25, 9.5,10)	(7,8,9,9.25)	(9, 9.25, 9.5,10)	(4,5,7,8)
A <sub>2</sub>	(0.4,0.5,0.7,0.8)	(7,8,9,9.25)	(4,5,7,8)	(9, 9.25, 9.5,10)
A <sub>3</sub>	(7,8,9,9.25)	(9, 9.25, 9.5,10)	(4,5,7,8)	(7,8,9,9.25)

$$w = \begin{matrix} (0.4,0.5,0.7,0.8) & (0.5,0.6,0.75,0.85) & (0.6,0.7,0.8,0.9) & (0.5,0.6,0.75,0.85) \end{matrix}$$

3. Calculate normalized fuzzy decision matrix by corresponding formulas

	$C_1$	$C_2$	$C_3$	$C_4$
$A_1$	(0.40,0.42,0.43,0.44)	(0.70, 0.80,0.90,0.93)	(0.9,0.93,0.95,1)	(0.4,0.5,0.7,0.8)
$A_2$	(0.5, 0.57, 0.8, 1)	(0.70,0.78,0.88, 1)	(0.7,0.8,0.9,0.93)	(0.9,0.925,0.95,1)
$A_3$	(0.43,0.44,0.5,0.57)	(0.90,0.74,0.76, 0.78)	(0.4,0.5,0.7,0.8)	(0.7,0.8,0.9,0.925)

4. Calculate weighted normalized fuzzy decision matrix

	$C_1$	$C_2$	$C_3$	$C_4$
$A_1$	(0.16,0.21,0.3, 0.36)	(0.35,0.48,0.68,0.79)	(0.54,0.65,0.76,0.9)	(0.20,0.30,0.53,0.68)
$A_2$	(0.2,0.29,0.56,0.8)	(0.35,0.48,0.68,0.79)	(0.42,0.56,0.72,0.83)	(0.45,0.56,0.71,0.85)
$A_3$	(0.17,0.22,0.35,0.46)	(0.45,0.56,0.71,0.85)	(0.24,0.35,0.56,0.72)	(0.35,0.48,0.68,0.79)

5. Calculate distance between decisions and positive and negative ideal solutions

	$C_1$	$C_2$	$C_3$	$C_4$
$d(A_1, A^+)$	0.75	0.73	0.49	0.99
$d(A_2, A^+)$	0.95	0.73	0.62	0.62
$d(A_3, A^+)$	1.22	0.62	0.92	0.73
$d(A_1, A^-)$	0.52	1.16	1.37	0.92
$d(A_2, A^-)$	1.02	1.16	1.25	1.26
$d(A_3, A^-)$	0.62	1.26	0.98	1.16

After calculating the distances between the alternatives and the fuzzy positive and fuzzy negative ideal solutions, we calculate the closeness coefficients for the all alternatives. The results is presented below

	$d_i^+$	$d_i^-$	$CC_i$	Ranking
$A_1$	2.96	3.96	0.57	2
$A_2$	2.91	4.69	0.62	1
$A_3$	3.48	4.02	0.54	3

According at the acceptance criteria of alternatives, all alternatives are determined as "Recommended with low risk". Since the closeness coefficients are ranked from the biggest to the smallest, as  $CC_2 > CC_1 > CC_3$ , so alternative  $A_2$  is optimal.

**Conclusions.** The article is devoted to the problem of multi-criteria decision making for software selection. The analysis of existing methods for solving this problem is given. The fuzzy TOPSIS is used as a method for solving this problem. The issues of practical implementation of this method are discussed in details.

As practical problem the software selection problem with 4 criteria and 3 alternatives is considered. The results of the solution at all stages are presented.

**REFERENCES**

1. Hwang, CL Yoon, K. Multiple Attribute Decision Making: Methods and Applications. New York: Springer- Verlag, 1981.
2. V. Belton and T. Stewart, Multiple criteria decision analysis: an integrated approach. Springer Science & Business Media, 2002.
3. A. Mardani, A. Jusoh, Khalil MD Nor, Z. Khalifah, N. Zakwan, A. Valipour Multiple criteria decision-making techniques and their applications - a review of the literature from 2000 to 2014, ISSN: 1331-677X (Print), 2015.
4. Chakraborty, S., & Zavadskas, EK Applications of WASPAS method in manufacturing decision making. Informatica, 25 (1), 1-20, 2014.
5. Boucher, TO, & MacStravic, E. L. Multi attribute evaluation within a present value framework and its relation to the analytic hierarchy process. The Engineering Economist, 37 (1), 1-32, 1991.

6. Taha, RA, & Daim, T. Multi-criteria applications in renewable energy analysis, a literature review. In *Research and Technology Management in the Electricity Industry* (pp. 17-30). Springer London, 2013.
7. Wu, HY, Chen, JK, Chen, IS, & Zhuo, HH Ranking universities based on performance evaluation by a hybrid MCDM model. *Measurement*, 45 (5), 856-880., 2012.
8. Beccali, M., Cellura, M., & Ardente, D. Decision making in energy planning: the ELECTRE multicriteria analysis approach compared to a fuzzy-sets methodology. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 39 (16-18), 1869-1881, 1998.
9. Rogers, M., & Bruen, M. Using ELECTRE III to choose route for Dublin port motorway. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 126 (4), 313-323, 2002.
10. Srdjevic, B., & Medeiros, YDP Fuzzy AHP assessment of water management plans. *Water Resources Management*, 22 (7), 877-894, 2008.
11. Meixner, O. Fuzzy AHP group decision analysis and its application for the evaluation of energy sources. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium on the Analytic Hierarchy / Network Process*, Pittsburgh, PA, USA (Vol. 29), 2009.
12. Srichet ta, P., Thurachon Applying fuzzy analytic hierarchy process to evaluate and select product of notebook computers. *International Journal of Modeling and Optimization*, 2 (2), 168, 2012.
13. Azadeh A. A robust decision-making methodology for evaluation and selection of simulation software package / A. Azadeh, SN Shirkouhi, K. Rezaie // *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*. - 2010. - Vol. 47. - P. 381–393.
14. Karaarslan N. An application for modular capability-based ERP software selection using AHP method / N. Karaarslan, E. Gundogar // *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*. – 2009. - Vol. 42. - P. 1025-1033.
15. Smirlis YG Data envelopment analysis models to support the selection of vehicle routing software for city logistics operations / YG Smirlis, V. Zeimpekis, G. Kaimakamis // *Operational Research*. 2012. –Vol. 12. - P. 399-420.