How to Submit Proof Corrections Using Adobe Reader

Using Adobe Reader is the easiest way to submit your proposed amendments for your IGI Global proof. If you don't have Adobe Reader, you can download it for free at http://get.adobe.com/reader/. The comment functionality makes it simple for you, the contributor, to mark up the PDF. It also makes it simple for the IGI Global staff to understand exactly what you are requesting to ensure the most flawless end result possible.

Please note, however, that at this point in the process the only things you should be checking for are:

Spelling of Names and Affiliations, Accuracy of Chapter Titles and Subtitles, Figure/Table Accuracy, Minor Spelling Errors/Typos, Equation Display

As chapters should have been professionally copy edited and submitted in their final form, please remember that *no major changes to the text can be made at this stage*.

Here is a quick step-by-step guide on using the comment functionality in Adobe Reader to submit your changes.

 Select the **Comment** bar at the top of page to View or Add Comments. This will open the **Annotations** toolbar.



 To note text that needs to be altered, like a subtitle or your affiliation, you may use the Highlight Text tool. Once the text is highlighted, right-click on the highlighted text and add your comment. Please be specific, and include what the text currently says and what you would like it to be changed to.

법상교 ㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋㅋ 물건 종월 서		Tools Sign
		* * Annetatione
		0 III T 6
I would like to inform you that IGI Global is summath in the final stores of the production process f	or the	
ROOK TITLE adited by SDITOR(c) to which you are a contributing author. At this time I am yery o	ar une	+ Draming Markups
present you with the final version of your contribution to this publication for your review.	BISONE LIGHT AN	44, 1940
	OWAL	T Jorde *
As you are reviewing the proof of your chapter, I would like for you to take into consideration a few	Ta: The Title of the Book	A CONTRACTOR
As chapters should have been professionally copy edited (note: it is the responsibility of the chapter	Sector Sector Sector	-
have their work professionally copy edited) and submitted in their final form, no major changes to	the text can be	
made at this stage. Please do not be concerned with items that are part of IGI Global's House Styl	e and layout	
application. These items include: font type/size, title and subtitle styling, list formatting, and the ge	neral spacing	
and placement of figures and tables throughout the text.		
Please check only the following items:		1
 Spelling of Names and Affiliations 		
 Accuracy of Chapter Titles and Subtitles 		
Figure/Table Accuracy		
 Minor Spelling Errors/Typos 		
Equation Display		
We kindly request that you note your revisions directly in the PDF provided to you using the "cor	nment	
function" in Adobe Reader. You can find a quick tutorial on how to use this function attached to yo	ur PDF.	
Should you choose to submit your revisions in any other manner, IGI Global reserves the right to se	nd the book to	
print without your requested changes. Please note that this requested format for revisions allows I	GI Global's	

3. If you would like text inserted, like a missing coma or punctuation mark, please use the **Insert Text at Cursor** tool. Please make sure to include exactly what you want inserted in the comment box.



4. If you would like text removed, such as an erroneous duplicate word or punctuation mark, please use the **Add Note to Replace Text** tool and state specifically what you would like removed.

A CAMPACITY OF COMPANY AND A CAMPACITY OF		and the second
fen fjeder (øg		
값수법상도 ㅋㅋ되시 ㅋ★ MATE 법단 응유 //		Tools Sign Converse
Lwould like to inform you that IGI Global is currently in the final stages of the production process for BOOK TITLE, edited by EDITOR(6), to which you are a contributing author. At this time, I am very pl	or the leased to	 Avertalises Avertalises T de 42 & L & F I D D Dammy Markups Generate List (3)
present you with the final version of your contribution to this publication for your review.		1 Avela *
As you are reviewing the proof of your chapter, Lwould like for you to take into consideration a few	items)	Fage 1, 15 (2001) 11, 12, 344 Over 20 Point SCR, 17, 2 To The Title of The Bold
As chapters should have been professionally copy edited (note: it is the responsibility of the chapter have their work professionally copy edited) and submitted in their final form, no major chapters to	Registration And	Regard ADCORTON ACCURATE
mode at this stope. Please do not be concerned with items that are part of IGI Global's House Styli application. These items include: font type/site, title and subtite styling, list formatting, and the ge and placement of finures and tables throughout the text.	CAMES Form 1 would like for you to take into menderholders a first data. Ta: Heate consider the following	T _a , Jondan * Project 34:000000 tot 34:04 AM Associations Front Games and Afflicture To Particular Collabora
Please check only the following items:	8	
Spelling of Names and Affiliations		
Accuracy of Chapter Titles and Subtitles Figure/Table Accuracy		
Minor Spelling Errors/Typos		
Equation Display		
We kindly request that you note your revisions directly in the PDF provided to you using the "con	nment	
function" in Adobe Reader. You can find a quick tutorial on how to use this function attached to yo	our PDF.	
Should you choose to submit your revisions in any other manner, IGI Global reserves the right to se	nd the book to	
print without your requested changes. Please note that this requested format for revisions allows R	GI Global's	
book production staff to better address your revisions and also allows this book to be sent to print i	in a timely	

IJKSS Editorial Board			
Editor-in-Chief:	W.B. Lee, Knowledge Management Research Centre - The Hong Kong Polytechnic U. Hong Kong		
Associate Editors:	Leif Edvinsson, Lund U., Sweden Ton Jorg, U. of Utrecht, The Netherlands Jay Lee, U. of Cincinnati, USA Tieju Ma, Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Japan Rossi Setchi, Cardiff U., UK David Snowen, Cognitive Edge Pte Ltd., Singapore X. J. Tang, Chinese Academy of Science, China Jiangning Wu, Dalian U. of Technology, China Chengqi Zhang, U. of Technology, Sydney, Australia		

International Editorial Review Board:

C. M. Brugha, U. College Dublin, Ireland	Gerald Midgley, U. of Hull, UK
F. Burstein, Monash U., Australia	Alfonso Montuori, California Institute of Integral
J. Chen, Tsinghua U., China	Studies, USA
C. F. Cheung, The Hong Kong Polytechnic U., Hong Kong	Y. Nakamori, Japan Advanced Institute of Science and
Brian Davis, U. of British Columbia, Canada	Technology, Japan
R. Du, Xidian U., China	Kevin O'Sullivan, New York Institute of Technology, USA
David Griffiths, U. of Edinburg, UK	D. Pauline, U. of Queensland, Australia
J. F. Gu, Chinese Academy of Science, China	Rajesh K. Pillania, Management Development Institute,
P. Heisig, U. of Cambridge, UK	India
F. Heylighen, Vrije U. Brussel, Belgium	Mina Ryoke, Tsukuba U., Japan
T. B. Ho, Japan Advanced Institute of Science and	Y. Sawaragi, Kyoto U., Japan
Technology, Japan	Y. Shi, Chinese Academy of Science, China
L. Hordijk, Joint Research Centre, European Commission,	X. J. Tang, Chinese Academy of Science, China
Italy	T. Terano, U. of Tsukuba, Japan
V. N. Huynh, Japan Advanced Institute of Science and	Eric Tsui, The Hong Kong Polytechnic U., Hong Kong
Technology, Japan	S. Y. Wang, Chinese Academy of Science, China
M. Jackson, U. of Hull, UK	A. P. Wierzbicki, Academy of Science, Poland
Z. Jin, Chinese Academy of Science, China	J. Wu, Dalian U. of Technology, China
K. K. Kijima, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Japan	T. Yoshida, Japan Advanced Institute of Science and
K. K. Lai, City U. of Hong Kong, China	Technology, Japan
Ru Qian Lu, Chinese Academy of Science, China	W. Y. Yue, Konan U., Japan
Klaus Mainzer, Technical U. of Munich, Germany	M. J. Zhang, Wollongong U., Australia
Marek Makowski, International Institute for Applied	Z. C. Zhu, U. of Hull, UK
Systems Analysis, Austria	

IGI Editorial:

Lindsay Johnston, Managing Director Jennifer Yoder, Production Editor Adam Bond, Journal Development Editor I an Leister, Production Assistant

Jeff Snyder, Copy Editor Allyson Stengel, Asst. Journal Development Editor



International Journal of Knowledge and Systems Science

October-December 2013, Vol. 4, No. 4

Table of Contents

Special Issue on the $14^{\mbox{\tiny TH}}$ International Symposium on Knowledge and Systems Sciences and the $12^{\mbox{\tiny TH}}$ International Workshop on Meta-Synthesis and Complex Systems

GUEST EDITORIAL PREFACE

iv Shouyang Wang, CAS Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Beijing, China

Research Articles

- 1 Relationship Conflicts Modeling and Measuring Within Work Teams Jiangning Wu, Institute of Systems Engineering, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, China Fan Lei, Institute of Systems Engineering, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, China
- 16 Kansei Evaluation of Product Recommendation Based on a Partial Comparison Process Jing-Zhong Jin, School of Knowledge Science, Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Nomi City, Japan Yoshiteru Nakamori, School of Knowledge Science, Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Nomi City, Ishikawa, Japan
- 32 A New Back-Propagation Neural Network Algorithm for a Big Data Environment Based on Punishing Characterized Active Learning Strategy Qiuhong Zhao, School of Economics and Management, Beihang University, Beijing, China

Quinong Zhao, School of Economics and Management, Beihang University, Beijing, China Feng Ye, School of Economics and Management, Beihang University, Beijing, China Shouyang Wang, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

- 46 Linguistic Multi-Attribute Decision Making with a Prioritization Relationship Cuiping Wei, Yangzhou University, Yangzhou, China Xijin Tang, CAS Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Beijing, China Xiaojie Wang, Qufu Normal University, Rizhao, China
- 55 Collective Threshold Model Based on Utility and Psychological Theories Zhenpeng Li, Dali University, Dali, China Xijin Tang, CAS Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Beijing, China

Copyright

The International Journal of Knowledge and Systems Science (IJKSS) (ISSN 1947-8208; eISSN 1947-8216), Copyright © 2013 IGI Global. All rights, including translation into other languages reserved by the publisher. No part of this journal may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means without witten permission from the publisher, except for noncommercial, educational use including classroom teaching purposes. Product or company names used in this journal are flor identification purposes only. Inclusion of the names of the products or companies does not indicate a claim of ownership by IGI Global of the trademark or registered trademark. The views expressed in this journal are those of the authors but not neccessarily of IGI Global.

The International Journal of Knowledge and Systems Science is indexed or listed in the following: ACM Digital Library; Bacon's Media Directory; Cabell's Directories; DBLP; Google Scholar; INSPEC; JournalTOCs; Library & Information Science Abstracts (LISA); MediaFinder; The Standard Periodical Directory; Ulrich's Periodicals Directory

Linguistic Multi-Attribute Decision Making with a Prioritization Relationship

Cuiping Wei, Yangzhou University, Yangzhou, China

Xijin Tang, CAS Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Beijing, China

Xiaojie Wang, Qufu Normal University, Rizhao, China

ABSTRACT

In this paper we consider linguistic information aggregation problems where a prioritization relationship exists over attributes. The authors define a prioritized 2-tuple ordered weighted averaging (PTOWA) operator to aggregate satisfactions of alternatives under attributes with a linear prioritized ordering. The authors then use the PTOWA and a TOWA operator to aggregate linguistic information where attributes are partitioned into some categories of which prioritization between categories exists. Finally, two illustrative examples are employed to show the feasibility of the proposed method.

Keywords: 2-Tuple, Linguistic Information, Multi-Attribute Decision Making, Prioritized Two-Tuple Ordered Weighted Averaging (PTOWA) Operator, Two-Tuple Ordered Weighted Averaging (TOWA) Operator

1. INTRODUCTION

Due to the complexity and uncertainty of the objective world, as well as the fuzziness of the human mind, some attributes are more suitable to be evaluated in the form of language (Herrera & Verdegay, 1993; Herrera & Herrera-Viedma, 1997; Torra, 1997; Herrera & Martínez, 2000; Herrera & Martínez, 2001; Xu, 2007; Wei, Feng & Zhang, 2009). For example, when evaluating the comprehensive qualities of the students or the performance of cars, the decision makers prefer to use "excellent", "good" and "poor"

for judgment. For linguistic information aggregation, various linguistic aggregation operators have been proposed, including linguistic OWA operator (Herrera & Verdegay, 1993), induced-linguistic OWA operator (Herrera & Herrera-Viedma, 1997), linguistic WOWA operator (Torra, 1997), etc. In the aggregation process using these operators, the results do not exactly match any of the initial linguistic terms. Therefore, an approximation process is developed to express the results in the initial expression domain, but leads to the loss of information and lack of precision. Herrera and

DOI: 10.4018/ijkss.2013100104

Martínez (2000) presented an analytical method based upon 2-tuple for linguistic aggregation. They proposed both 2-tuple weighted average (TWA) operator and 2-tuple ordered weighted averaging (TOWA) operator (Herrera & Martínez, 2000), and then successfully applied the TOWA operator to multigranular hierarchical linguistic contexts in a multi-expert decision making problem (Herrera & Martínez, 2001). Many achievements have been taken in multiattribute decision making (MADM) with these linguistic aggregation operators.

It is important to see that the above linguistic aggregation operators have the ability to trade off between attributes. While in some situations where a prioritization relationship over the attributes exists, we do not expect this kind of compensation. Yager (2004) studied this kind of problem where decision information is described by real numbers. He pointed out that the importance weights of lower priority attributes were based on the satisfaction of alternative to the higher priority attributes. Based on this idea, Yager proposed the prioritized average (PA) operator (Yager, 2008) and the prioritized ordered weighted averaging (POWA) operator (Yager, 2009). Later Wei and Tang (2012) proposed two averaging operators, a generalized PA operator and a generalized POWA operator. In the case with one attribute in each priority category, both operators reduce to the PA operator and the POWA operator proposed by Yager.

Motivated by the above-mentioned studies, we consider linguistic aggregation problems where a prioritization relationship exists over the attributes. This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we make a brief review of 2-tuple and its related operators. In Section 3, we propose a prioritized 2-tuple ordered weighted averaging

Box 1.

(PTOWA) operator and discuss its properties. We then use this operator and a TOWA operator to aggregate satisfactions of attributes by alternatives. The paper is concluded in Section 4.

2. 2-TUPLE LINGUISTIC REPRESENTATION MODEL AND TOWA OPERATORS

For MADM problems with some qualitative attributes, we need to use a linguistic term set to describe the decision information. Herrera and Martínez (2000) introduced a finite and totally ordered discrete linguistic term set: $S = \{s_{\alpha} | \alpha = 0, 1, \dots, \tau\}$, whose cardinality value is odd. For example, a set of seven linguistic terms *s* could be the equation shown in Box 1.

Furthermore, Herrera defined 2-tuple to aggregate linguistic information:

Definition 1: (Herrera & Martínez, 2001) Let $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{\tau}\}$ be a linguistic term set, then the 2-tuple can be obtained by the translation function θ :

$$\begin{aligned} \theta : S &\to S \times \left[-0.5, 0.5 \right), \theta \left(s_i \right) \\ &= \left(s_i, 0 \right), \text{for any } s_i \in S \end{aligned}$$
 (1)

Definition 2: (Herrera & Martínez, 2001) Let $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{\tau}\}$ be a linguistic term set, $s_i = S$ and $\beta \in [0, \tau]$, a value representing the result of a symbolic aggregation operation, then the 2-tuple can be obtained with the following function:

 $S = \begin{cases} s_{_{0}} = \text{extremely poor, } s_{_{1}} = \text{very poor, } s_{_{2}} = \text{poor, } s_{_{3}} = \text{fair,} \\ s_{_{4}} = \text{good,} s_{_{5}} = \text{very good,} s_{_{6}} = \text{extremely good} \end{cases}$

$$\begin{split} \Delta &: \left[0, \tau \right] \to S \\ \times \left[-0.5, 0.5 \right), \Delta \left(\beta \right) &= \left(s_i, \alpha \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} s_i, i = round \left(\beta \right) \\ \alpha &= \beta - i, i \in \left[-0.5, 0.5 \right) \end{cases} \end{split}$$
(2)

where round (\bullet) is the usual round operation:

Definition 3: (Herrera & Martínez, 2001) Let $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{\tau}\}$ be a linguistic term set, $s_i \in S$ and (s_i, α) be a 2-tuple. There is always a Δ^{-1} function such that from a 2-tuple it returns its equivalent numerical value $\beta \in [0 \ \tau]$:

$$\Delta^{-1} : S \times [-0.5, 0.5]$$

$$\rightarrow [0, \tau], \Delta^{-1}(s_i, \alpha)$$

$$= i + \alpha = \beta$$
(3)

Let (s_i, α_1) and (s_j, α_2) be two 2-tuples, which have the properties as follows:

- There exists an order: if i > j then (s_i, α₁) is bigger than (s_i, α₂); if i = j then:
 - a. If $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, then (s_i, α_1) and (s_j, α_2) represent the same information;
 - b. If $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$, then (s_i, α_1) is bigger than (s_i, α_2) ;
 - c. If $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, then (s_i, α_1) is smaller than (s_i, α_2) ;
- 2. There exists a negative operator: $Neg(s_i, \alpha) = \Delta(\tau - (\Delta^{-1}(s_i, \alpha)))$, where (s_i, α) is an arbitrary 2-tuple, $\tau + 1$ is the cardinality of S, $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{\tau}\}$;
- 3. There exists a minimization and a maximization operator:

$$\begin{split} & \max\left\{\!\left(s_{i},\alpha_{1}\right)\!,\!\left(s_{j},\alpha_{2}\right)\!\right\} \\ &= \left(s_{i},\alpha_{1}\right)\!,\min\left\{\!\left(s_{i},\alpha_{1}\right)\!,\!\left(s_{j},\alpha_{2}\right)\!\right\} \\ &= \left(s_{j},\alpha_{2}\right)\!, \textit{if}\left(s_{i},\alpha_{1}\right) \geq \left(s_{j},\alpha_{2}\right) \end{split}$$

Definition 4: (Herrera & Martínez, 2001). Let $\{(b_1, \alpha_1), (b_1, \alpha_1), \dots, (b_n, \alpha_n)\}$ be a set of 2-tuples, the 2-tuple ordered weighted averaging (TOWA) operator is defined as:

$$TOWA\left\{ \left(b_{1}, \alpha_{1}\right), \left(b_{2}, \alpha_{2}\right), \cdots, \left(b_{n}, \alpha_{n}\right) \right\}$$
$$= \Delta \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{j} \beta_{j}^{*}\right)$$
(4)

where $w = \left\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\right\}^T$ is the related weighting vector of TOWA operator, such that $w_j \ge 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n w_j = 1$. β_j^* is the *jth* largest of the values β_i and $\beta_i = \Delta^{-1}(b_i, \alpha_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

3. PTOWA OPERATOR FOR LINGUISTIC AGGREGATION WITH ATTRIBUTES OF PRIORITIZATION RELATIONSHIP

In this section, we first define a prioritized 2-tuple ordered weighted averaging (PTOWA) operator to aggregate satisfactions of alternatives under attributes with a linear prioritized ordering. We then use the PTOWA and a TOWA operator to aggregate linguistic information where attributes can be partitioned into some categories of which prioritization between categories exists.

3.1. PTOWA Operator

For a linguistic MADM problem, assume that we have a collection of attributes

$$\begin{split} C &= \left\{C_1, C_2, \cdots, C_n\right\} \text{ and there is a prioritization between the attributes expressed by the linear ordering $C_1 > C_2 > \cdots > C_n$. For any alternative x and an attribute C_j, we assume that $C_j(x) \in S(x \in X)$ indicates the satisfaction of attribute C_j by alternative x, where $S = \left\{s_0, s_1, \cdots, s_\tau\right\}$ is a linguistic term set and τ is an even. For each attribute, we transform $C_j(x)$ into a 2-tuple, denoted by a_j. According to the prioritization relationship between attributes, we first obtain the importance weighting vector $u = (u_1, u_2, \cdots, u_n)^T$ of the attributes. For each attribute we assume T_j is its 2-tuple weight and define it with Equation 5:$$

Transform T_j into its equivalent value, we get the normalized importance weights:

$$u_{j} = \frac{\Delta^{-1}(T_{j})}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \Delta^{-1}(T_{j})}, \ j = 1, 2, \cdots, n$$
(6)

Now we obtain the importance weighting vector $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)^T$ of the attributes which reflects the prioritization relationship. For a given alternative x, when using TOWA operator to aggregation its satisfaction to each attribute, we have to consider the importance weight associated with each attribute. Both Yager (1997) and Torra (1997) suggested approaches to conducting the aggregation of this type by using OWA operator. Here we use their idea to apply the TOWA operator to the aggregation of linguistic terms with importance weights associated with each attribute.

Firstly we will derive a weighting vector $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)^T$ including the importance information of the prioritized attributes expressed by the weighting vector $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)^T$. We consider two cases to deriving the weighting vector $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)^T$.

Suppose that the weighting vector of TOWA operator is obtained by a BUM function f, a mapping $f:[0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$ satisfying f(0) = 0, f(1) = 1 and $f(x) \ge f(y)$ if x > y. We assume ind(j) is the index of the *jth* largest of a_j . Thus $a_{ind(j)}$ is the *jth* largest of a_j and $u_{ind(j)}$ is its associated importance weight. Next we get the weights v_j that will be used in the aggregation. Let $R_0 = 0$, $R_j = \sum_{k=1}^j u_{ind(k)}$, then the weights v_j used in the aggregation is acquired by Equation 7:

$$v_j = f\left(R_j\right) - f\left(R_{j-1}\right)$$
, for $j = 1$ to n (7)

In another case, suppose that we start with a weighting vector $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)^T$, such that $w_j \ge 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n w_j = 1$, corresponding to the TOWA operator. We modify these weights w_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, n$) to include the weighting vector $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)^T$ of the prioritized attributes. Both Yager (1997) and Torra (1997) suggested modeling a BUM function as a piecewise linear function. It is suggested that the function f interpolates the points $\left(\frac{i}{n}, \sum_{j \le i} w_j\right)$. With this, we acquire:

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} w_k + w_j \left(nx - (j-1) \right), \frac{j-1}{n} \le x \le \frac{j}{n}$$
 (8)

Using this function and Equation 7 we obtain the modified weights $v_i (j = 1, 2, \dots, n)$.

The modified weights $v_j (j = 1, 2, \dots, n)$ take into account both w_j and individual importance weights u_j of the attributes. Then we use the modified weights to aggregate the satisfactions of an alternative under attributes. We define a function as follows:

Definition 5: Let $a_j = (b_j, \alpha_j) \ (j = 1, 2, \dots, n)$

be the satisfactions of attributes C_{j} by an alternative, and there is a prioritization between the attributes expressed by the order $C_{1}>C_{2}>\cdots>C_{n}$. The prioritized 2-tuple ordered weighted averaging (PTOWA) operator is defined as:

$$PTOWA\left\{ \left(b_{1}, \alpha_{1}\right), \left(b_{2}, \alpha_{2}\right), \cdots, \left(b_{n}, \alpha_{n}\right) \right\}$$
$$= \Delta\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} v_{j} \Delta^{-1}\left(a_{ind(j)}\right)\right]$$
(9)

where $a_{ind(j)}$ represents the *jth* largest of a_j , $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)^T$ is the related weighting vector of PTOWA operator satisfying $v_j \ge 0 (j = 1, 2, \dots, n)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n v_j = 1$, and vcan be obtained by Equation 7.

Box 2.

For convenience of notation, we denote:

$$PTOWA\left\{\left(b_{1},\alpha_{1}\right),\left(b_{2},\alpha_{2}\right),\cdots,\left(b_{n},\alpha_{n}\right)\right\}=\left(\tilde{b},\tilde{a}\right)$$

We can easily prove that the PTOWA operator satisfies the following properties:

Proposition 1: (Boundedness) Let $\{(b_1, \alpha_1), (b_2, \alpha_2), \dots, (b_n, \alpha_n)\}$ be a set of 2-tuples, then we have:

$$\min_{j} \left\{ \left(b_{j}, \alpha_{j} \right) \right\} \leq \left(\tilde{b}, \tilde{\alpha} \right) \leq \max_{j} \left\{ \left(b_{j}, \alpha_{j} \right) \right\}$$

- **Proposition 2:** (Idempotency) Let $\{(b_1, \alpha_1), (b_2, \alpha_2), \dots, (b_n, \alpha_n)\}$ be a set of 2-tuples, if $(b_j, \alpha_j) = (b, \alpha), j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then we obtain $(\tilde{b}, \tilde{\alpha}) = (b, \alpha)$:
- **Example 1:** We assume there are three attributes C_1, C_2 and C_3 with the priority ordering: $C_1 > C_2 > C_3$ and the linguistic term set S is defined as shown in Box 2.

Assume for alternative x we have $C_1(x) = s_3, C_2(x) = s_5$ and $C_3(x) = s_2$.

First we conduct the PTOWA aggregation for the alternative x. We transform $C_j(x), j = 1,2,3$, into the form of 2-tuple denoted by $a_1 = (s_3,0), \quad a_2 = (s_5,0)$ and $a_3 = (s_2,0)$, respectively. Then we get $T_1 = (s_6,0), \quad T_2 = \min\left\{T_1, a_1\right\} = (s_3,0)$,

$$S = \begin{cases} s_0 = extremely \ poor, s_1 = very \ poor, s_2 = poor, s_3 = fair, \\ s_4 = good, s_5 = very \ good, s_6 = extremely \ good \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{split} T_3 &= \min\left\{T_2, a_2\right\} = \left(s_3, 0\right). \text{ By Equation 6,} \\ \text{we get } u_1 &= 0.5 \text{ , } u_2 = u_3 = 0.25 \text{ .} \end{split}$$

From the ordering of the satisfactions $a_1 > a_2 > a_3$, we have:

$$\begin{split} &ind\left(1\right)=2 \;,\; ind\left(2\right)=1 \;,\; ind\left(3\right)=3 \\ &a_{_{ind\left(1\right)}}=\left(s_{_{5}},0\right),\; a_{_{ind\left(2\right)}}=\left(s_{_{3}},0\right), \\ &a_{_{ind\left(3\right)}}=\left(s_{_{2}},0\right) \\ &u_{_{ind\left(1\right)}}=0.25 \;,\; u_{_{ind\left(2\right)}}=0.5 \;,\; u_{_{ind\left(3\right)}}=0.25 \end{split}$$

Thus:

$$R_{_0}=0\,,\;R_{_1}=0.25\,,\;R_{_2}=0.75\,,\;R_{_3}=1$$

Assume the aggregation is guided by the function $f(x) = x^2$. By Equation 7, we obtain the weights:

$$\begin{split} v_1 &= f(R_1) - f(R_0) = 0.0625 \\ v_2 &= f(R_2) - f(R_1) = 0.5 \end{split}$$

and:

$$v_3 = f(R_3) - f(R_2) = 0.4375$$

Then by Equation 9, we get the overall degree of satisfaction of alternative x:

$$\begin{split} & \left(\tilde{s}, \tilde{\alpha}\right) = \Delta \Biggl(\sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{j} \times \Delta^{-1} \left(a_{\operatorname{ind}(j)}\right) \Biggr) \\ & = \Delta \Bigl(2.6875 \Bigr) = \Bigl(s_{3}, -0.3125 \Bigr) \end{split}$$

Assume the scope of the aggregation is expressed by an importance weights vector w = (0.2, 0.3, 0.5) of TOWA, by Equation 8, we get the function f such that:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0.6x, & 0 \le x \le \frac{1}{3} \\ 0.2 + 0.3(3x - 1), & \frac{1}{3} < x \le \frac{2}{3} \\ 0.5 + 0.5(3x - 2), & \frac{2}{3} < x \le 1 \end{cases}$$

Using this we get $f(R_0) = 0$, $f(R_1) = 0.15$, $f(R_2) = 0.625$ and $f(R_3) = 1$. Then by Equation 7, we get our modified weights $v_1 = 0.15$, $v_2 = 0.475$ and $v_3 = 0.375$. From this we get he overall degree of satisfaction of alternative x:

$$\begin{split} & \left(\tilde{s}, \tilde{\alpha}\right) = \Delta \Biggl(\sum_{j=1}^{n} v_{j} \times \Delta^{-1} \left(a_{ind(j)}\right) \Biggr) \\ & = \Delta \Bigl(2.925 \Bigr) = \Bigl(s_{3}, -0.075 \Bigr) \end{split}$$

3.2. An Aggregation Algorithm Using PTOWA and TOWA Operators

Above we consider the situation that there is a prioritization between the attributes expressed by the linear ordering $C_1 > C_2 > \cdots > C_n$. Furthermore we assume that the collection $C = \{C_1, C_2, \cdots, C_n\}$ of attributes is partitioned into q distinct categories, H_1, H_2, \cdots, H_q such that $H_i = \{C_{i1}, C_{i2}, \cdots, C_{in_i}\}$. Here C_{ij} are the attributes in category H_i , $C = \bigcup_{i=1}^q H_i$ and $n = \sum_{i=1}^q n_i$. We assume a prioritization exists between these categories with $H_1 > H_2 > \cdots > H_n$. The attributes in the class H_i have a higher priority than those in H_k if i < k. Assume that for any alternative $x \in X$ and each attribute C_{ii} , we have one linguistic

term $C_{ij}(x) \in S$ indicating its satisfaction to attribute C_{ij} .

Next we present one algorithm to aggregate the satisfactions of attributes by alternative xbased on the PTOWA operator and the TOWA operator:

Step 1: Aggregate the satisfactions of each category H_i based on the TOWA operator. For each attribute, we transform $C_{ij}(x)$ into a 2-tuple, denoted by a_{ij} . We associate each priority class H_i with a TOWA weightingvector $W_i = \left(w_{i1}, w_{i2}, \dots, w_{in_i}\right)^T$, such that $w_{ij} \ge 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} = 1$. Using this we calculate the aggregation value a_i of each category H_i :

$$egin{aligned} &a_i = TOWA\Big(a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \cdots, a_{in_i}\Big) \ &= \Deltaiggl(\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij}eta_{ij}^*\Big) \end{aligned}$$

where β_{ij}^* is the *jth* largest of the values β_{ik} and $\beta_{ik} = \Delta^{-1}(a_{ik}), \ k = 1, 2, \cdots, n_i$:

- **Step 2:** Calculate the importance weight of each category H_i by Equation 5 and Equation 6;
- **Step 3:** Calculate the PTOWA aggregation value for alternative *x* :

Box 3.

$$\begin{split} PTOWA \Big(a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_q \Big) \\ = \Delta \Biggl(\sum_{j=1}^q v_j \Delta^{-1} \Big(a_{ind(j)} \Big) \Biggr) \end{split}$$

where $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)^T$ is the related weighting vector of PTOWA operator. Then we can use the PTOWA aggregation value to rank the alternatives:

Example 2: Consider the following prioritized collection of attributes: $H_1 = \{C_{11}, C_{12}\}$, $H_2 = \{C_{21}\}$ and $H_3 = \{C_{31}, C_{32}, C_{33}\}$. A prioritization ordering $H_1 > H_2 > H_3$ exists between these categories; the linguistic term set *S* is defined as shown in Box 3.

Assume for alternative x we have:

$$\begin{split} &C_{11}\left(x\right) = s_{3}, C_{12}\left(x\right) = s_{4}, \\ &C_{21}\left(x\right) = s_{6}, C_{31}\left(x\right) = s_{3}, \\ &C_{32}\left(x\right) = s_{4}, C_{33}\left(x\right) = s_{1} \end{split}$$

We now use the above algorithm to aggregate the satisfactions of attributes for alternative x. We associate each priority class H_i with an OWA weighting vector W_i as follows:

$$W_1 = (1), W_2 = (0.5, 0.5), W_3 = \left(\frac{1}{6}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{6}\right)$$

$$S = \begin{cases} s_0 = extremely \ poor, \ s_1 = very \ poor, \ s_2 = poor, \ s_3 = fair, \\ s_4 = good, \ s_5 = very \ good, \ s_6 = extremely \ good \end{cases}$$

For priority class H_i , by Step 1, we can get the TOWA aggregation values:

$$\begin{split} &a_1 = \left(s_3, 0\right) \\ &a_2 = TOWA\left\{\!\left(s_4, 0\right), \left(s_6, 0\right)\!\right\} = \left(s_5, 0\right) \end{split}$$

and:

$$a_{_{3}} = TOWA\left\{\!\left(s_{_{3}},0\right),\!\left(s_{_{4}},0\right),\!\left(s_{_{1}},0\right)\!\right\} = \left(s_{_{2}},0.83\right)$$

By Step 2, we get:

$$\begin{split} T_1 &= \left(s_6, 0\right), \\ T_2 &= \min\left\{T_1, a_1\right\} = \left(s_3, 0\right), \\ T_3 &= \min\left\{T_2, a_2\right\} = \left(s_3, 0\right) \end{split}$$

With this we have $u_1 = 0.5$, $u_2 = u_3 = 0.25$.

Assume the scope of the aggregation is expressed by a weighting vector $w = (0.2, 0.3, 0.5)^T$ of TOWA. By the process similar to Example 1, we get the modified weights $v_1 = 0.15$, $v_2 = 0.475$, $v_3 = 0.375$.

By Step 3, we get the overall satisfaction $(\tilde{b}, \tilde{\alpha})$ of alternative x:

$$\begin{split} & \left(\tilde{b}, \tilde{\alpha}\right) = PTOWA\left(a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}\right) \\ & = \Delta\left(\sum_{j=1}^{3} v_{j} \times \Delta^{-1}\left(a_{_{ind}(j)}\right)\right) \\ & = \Delta\left(3.236\right) = \left(s_{3}, 0.236\right) \end{split}$$

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

For linguistic aggregation problems where there exists a prioritization relationship between the attributes, we propose a prioritized 2-tuple ordered weighted averaging (PTOWA) operator. Based on the PTOWA operator and the TOWA operator, we give a method to aggregate the satisfactions of an alternative when attributes are partitioned into some categories and there exists a prioritization between categories.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank the anonymous referees for their valuable suggestions to revise the original paper. The main idea of this paper was originally presented at the 12th International Workshop on Meta-synthesis and Complex Systems (MCS2012) affiliated to the 2012 International Conference on Active Media Technologies held in Macao during December 4-7, 2012. The work was partly supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (71371107, 71171187), National Basic Research Program of China (2010CB731405) and Science Foundation of Shandong Province (ZR2013GM011).

REFERENCES

Herrera, F., & Herrera-Viedma, E. (1997). Aggregation operators for linguistic weighted information. *IEEE Transactions on Systems. Man and Cybernetics-Part A*, 27(5), 646–656. doi:10.1109/3468.618263

Herrera, F., & Martínez, L. (2000). A 2-tuple fuzzy linguistic representation model for computing with words. *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, *8*(6), 746–762. doi:10.1109/91.890332

Herrera, F., & Martínez, L. (2001). A model based on linguistic 2-tuples for dealing with multigranularity hierarchical linguistic contexts in multi-expert decision making. *IEEE Transactions on Systems*. *Man and Cybernetics-Part B*, *31*(2), 227–234. doi:10.1109/3477.915345

Herrera, F., & Verdegay, J. L. (1993). Linguistic assessments in group decision. In *Proceeding of the 1st European Congress on Fuzzy and Intelligent Technologies*, Aachen (pp. 941-948).

Torra, V. (1997). The weighted OWA operator. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, *12*(2), 153–166. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1098-111X(199702)12:2<153::AID-INT3>3.0.CO;2-P Wei, C.-P., Feng, X. Q., & Zhang, Y. Z. (2009). Method for measuring the satisfactory consistency of a linguistic judgment matrix. *Systems Engineering Theory and Practice*, 29(1), 104–110.

Wei, C.-P., & Tang, X. J. (2012). Generalized prioritized aggregation operators. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 27(6), 578–589. doi:10.1002/ int.21537

Xu, Z. S. (2007). Linguistic aggregation operators: an overview. In H. Bustince, F. Herrera, & J. Montero (Eds.), *Fuzzy Sets and their Extensions: Representation, aggregation and models* (pp. 163–181). Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag.

Yager, R. R. (1997). On the inclusion of importances in OWA aggregation. In R. R. Yager, & J. Kacprzyk (Eds.), *The ordered weighted averaging operators: Theory and applications* (pp. 41–59). Norwell, MA: Kluwer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4615-6123-1 5

Yager, R. R. (2004). Modeling prioritized multiattribute decision making. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics. Part B, Cybernetics, 34*, 2396–2404. doi:10.1109/TSMCB.2004.837348

Yager, R. R. (2008). Prioritized aggregation operators. International Journal of Approximate Reasoning, 48(1), 263–274. doi:10.1016/j.ijar.2007.08.009

Yager, R. R. (2009). Prioritized OWA aggregation. *Fuzzy Optimization and Decision Making*, 8(3), 245–262. doi:10.1007/s10700-009-9063-4