Implementation of an Online Software Tool for the Analytic Hierarchy Process

AHP-OS

Klaus D. Goepel

BPMSG – Business Performance Management Singapore – <u>https://bpmsg.com</u>

Objectives

- Develop a free AHP software tool
- for educational and research purposes
- Methods and algorithms well documented and validated
- Capable to analyze and study AHP projects under different parameters

- Web based tool
- Realized in php
- SQL database
- Classical AHP
- Users need to register (free)
- After 3 months Inactive users are removed (deleted)

BPMSG Home Latest News Java is enabled.

Welcome Klaus! Account (Logout)

AHP Online System - BPMSG

Multi-criteria Decision Making Using the Analytic Hierarchy Process

This free **web based AHP solution** is a supporting tool for decision making processes. The programs can be helpful in your daily work for simple decision problems and also support complex decision making problems. Participate in a group session and try a <u>practical example</u>. Download the <u>quick reference guide</u> or the <u>AHP-OS manual</u>. For full functionality you need to login. Please <u>register</u> as new user, if you don't have an account yet. It's all free!

- 1. My AHP Projects
- 2. AHP Priority Calculator
- 3. <u>AHP Hierarchies</u>
- 4. AHP Group Session

For programs 2 and 3 you can export the results as csv files (comma separated values) for further processing in excel. For terms of use please see our <u>user agreement and privacy policy</u>. If you like the program, please help and consider a <u>donation</u> to maintain the website.

AHP-OS author: Klaus D. Goepel, BPMSG, <u>contact</u>, last update: Sep 8, 2017 <u>AHP-OS admin</u>

Features (1)

- Flexible definition of decision hierarchies as text input, following a simple syntax with multi-language support using Unicode character coding
- Weight calculation (hierarchy mode) and alternative evaluation (alternative mode) using the AHP eigenvector method
- Pairwise comparison input, highlighting the top-3 most inconsistent judgments
- A posteriori application of different AHP judgment scales

Features (2)

- Group decision making using weighted geometric mean aggregation of individual judgments (WGM-AIJ).
- Group consensus calculation based on Shannon α and β -entropy.
- Weight uncertainty estimation using Monte Carlo simulation
- Sensitivity analysis
- Weighted sum model (WSM) and weighted product model (WPM) for the aggregation of alternatives
- Export of input and result data as comma separated value (CSV) files for further processing or presentation in a spreadsheet program

• Hierarchy definition Syntax

<hierarchy> → <branch>; [{<branch>;}]
<branch> → <node>: <leafs>, <leafs> [,<leafs>]
<leafs> → {<leaf> [= <weight>]}

• Example

AHP-project: Crit-1=0.3, Crit-2=0.7; Criterion-1: Sub-crit A, Sub-crit B; Criterion-2: Sub-crit C, Sub-crit D;

BPMSG – Business Performance Management Singapore – https://bpmsg.com

• Example Hierarchy



BPMSG – Business Performance Management Singapore – https://bpmsg.com

A posteriori application of different AHP Judgment Scales

- AHP fundamental Scale
- Logarithmic, Root Square, Inverse Linear Scale
- Balanced, Generalized Balanced, Adaptive Balanced Scale
- Adaptive, Power and Geometric Scale

Selected scale: 0 - Standard AHP linear scale

0 – Standard AHP linear scale 1 – Logarithmic scale 2 – Root square scale 3 – Inverse linear scale 4 – Balanced scale 5 – Balanced-n scale 6 – Adaptive bal scale 7 – Adaptive scale 8 – Power scale 9 – Geometric scale

Group decision making and Group Consensus

- Providing a web link to participants
- Aggregation of Individual Judgments
- Consensus using Shannon entropy and its partitioning in α and $\beta\text{-entropy}$
- Consensus indicator from 0% (no consensus) to 100% (full consensus)
- Consensus categorized in five categories
 - 1. very low,
 - 2. low,
 - 3. moderate,
 - 4. high and
 - 5. very high

AHP group consensus: 91.8% very high

Consolidated Decision Matrix

Aggregation of judgments for 2 Participant(s)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	1	1.00	1.00	0.58	1.00	0.58	1.00
2	1.00	1	1.00	1.00	2.00	0.58	1.41
3	1.00	1.00	1	0.41	1.73	0.50	1.00
4	1.73	1.00	2.45	1	3.46	1.00	3.00
5	1.00	0.50	0.58	0.29	1	0.33	1.00
6	1.73	1.73	2.00	1.00	3.00	1	2.45
7	1.00	0.71	1.00	0.33	1.00	0.41	1

Weight Uncertainties

- Randomized variations (± 0.5) of the original judgments
- Provides estimated weight uncertainties for all criteria or alternatives

		□min ■Result ■max
64%		
60%		
56%		
52%		
49%		
40%		
446		
40%		
36%		
32%		
28%		
24%		
20%		
16%		
12%		
8%		
4%		
0%		

Consolidated Priorities

Consistency Ratio CR: 1.4%

Category		Priority	Rank	(+)	(-)
1	Budget	11.4%	5	3.0%	2.2%
2	Sales Potential	14.4%	3	3.3%	3.1%
3	Market Trend	11.4%	4	2.2%	2.1%
4	Competitive Advantage	23.0%	1	3.2%	3.1%
5	Technical Success	8.0%	7	1.9%	1.3%
6	Commercial Success	22.5%	2	2.9%	3.0%
7	Risk	9.4%	6	2.2%	1.9%

Estimated weight uncertainties based on 1000 judgment variations.

Sensitivity Analysis (Triantaphyllou, 1997)

- Which is the most critical criterion, and
- Which is the most critical performance measure
- 1. Percent-top critical criterion
- 2. Percent-any critical criterion
- 3. Percent-any critical performance measure

Complete sensitivity tables will be exported

Sensitivity Analysis

Note: complete analysis via download.

Weight Uncertainties

No overlap of alternatives within uncertainties

Robustness

1. The *percent-top* critical criterion is Financing: a change from 33.3% by absolute 9.6% will change the ranking between alternatives House A and House B.

2. The *percent-any* critical criterion is the same as above.

3. The *percent-any* critical performance measure is for alternative House B under criterion Financing. A change from 64.9% by absolute -26.9% will change the ranking between House B and House C.

Data export

- Comma separated value file (csv)
- Can be opened with Excel
- Either "." or "," as decimal separator
- Group results
- Priorities by participants
- Decision matrices
- Sensitivity tables

Software Validation

- 10,000 lines source code
- Checklist for unit, integration & system testing
- Test cases for black box testing
- Comparing results with manually calculated results and results published in literature

ISAHP 2018

AHP Online Software AHP-OS

<u>Demo</u>

BPMSG – Business Performance Management Singapore – https://bpmsg.com

- Online Software Tool for the Analytical Hierarchy Process AHP-OS <u>https://bpmsg.com/academic/ahp.php</u>
- Full paper:

https://bpmsg.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/ahpsoftware.pdf

Goepel, K. D. (2017). Implementation of an Online Software Tool for the Analytic Hierarchy Process - Challenges and Practical Experiences. Working paper prepared for publication, Singapore July 2017

 7000 Users – 600 active – 9000 projects – up to 300 participants per project

BPMSG – Business Performance Management Singapore – <u>https://bpmsg.com</u>

ISAHP 2018

AHP Online Software AHP-OS

Thank You!

BPMSG – Business Performance Management Singapore – <u>https://bpmsg.com</u>