Pythagorean Hesitant Fuzzy Theory for Portfolio Optimization

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the course of MA-308 (Mini Project)
in
3rd Year (6th) Semester of

Master of Science

(Five Year Integrated Program)
in Mathematics
submitted by

Shrinivas Karekar
Om Panchal
Shrishti Malhotra

under the supervision of
Dr. Saroj Yadav
Assistant Professor

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
SARDAR VALLABHBHAI NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
SURAT-395007, GUJARAT, INDIA

May 2025

Department of Mathematics
Sardar Vallabhbhai National Institute of Technology
(An Institute of National Importance, NITSER Act 2007)
Surat-395007, Gujarat, India.

APPROVAL SHEET

Report entitled "**Pythagorean Hesitant Fuzzy Theory for Portfolio Optimization**"*by* Shrinivas Karekar, Om Panchal, Shrishti Malhotra is approved for the completion of course MA-308 (Mini Project) and award of the degree of Master of Science in Mathematics.

Signature of Internal Examiner

Name of Internal Examiner
(**Internal Examiner**)

Signature of Supervisor

Name of Supervisor
(**Supervisor**)

Signature of Chairman

Name of Chairman
(**Chairman**)

Date: 09/05/2025
Place: Surat

Department of Mathematics
Sardar Vallabhbhai National Institute of Technology
(An Institute of National Importance, NITSER Act 2007)
Surat-395007, Gujarat, India.

DECLARATION

We hereby declare that the report entitled "Pythagorean Hesitant Fuzzy Theory for Portfolio Optimization" is a genuine record of work carried out by us and no part of this report has been submitted for the award of any degree or diploma in any other institution for the completion of any course.

Shrinivas Karekar
Admission No.: I22MA022
Department of Mathematics
Sardar Vallabhbhai National Institute of Technology
Surat-395007

Om Panchal
Admission No.: I22MA040
Department of Mathematics
Sardar Vallabhbhai National Institute of Technology
Surat-395007

Shrishti Malhotra
Admission No.: I22MA002
Department of Mathematics
Sardar Vallabhbhai National Institute of Technology
Surat-395007

Signature of Supervisor
Dr. Saroj Yadav
Assistant Professor
Department of Mathematics
Sardar Vallabhbhai National Institute of Technology

Surat-395007

Date: 09/05/2025
Place: Surat

Acknowledgment

We are very grateful as students of 5 Years Integrated M.Sc. in Mathematics at SVNIT, Surat. First, we would like to express our genuine appreciation to our supervisor Dr.Saroj Yadav, whose guidance and encouragement throughout this project gave us a great opportunity and pleasure to us. We are thankful for Dr.Anupam Shukla, Director of SVNIT and all other faculties, research scholars and non-teaching staff of our department for their regular inspiration and co-activity.

Acknowledgment of 1st Student

(Shrinivas Karekar)

Acknowledgment of 2nd Student

(Om Panchal)

Acknowledgment of 3rd Student

(Shrishti Malhotra)

Preface

This project came out of our shared curiosity about how mathematics can be used to solve real financial problems, especially the kind of problems where things aren't always certain. We wanted to see if fuzzy set theories could help capture the uncertainty and hesitation investors feel.

We were particularly interested in two fuzzy set theories: **Pythagorean Fuzzy Sets** and **Hesitant Fuzzy Sets**. Pythagorean fuzzy sets are great at expressing confidence and doubt in a flexible way, while hesitant fuzzy sets help when you have multiple possible values (and investor preferences often include many possible values, representing hesitation). We realized that by combining these (making a *Pythagorean Hesitant Fuzzy* model), we might better capture the kinds of feelings investors often have when making choices in a changing market.

So, we built a new model: the **Pythagorean Hesitant Fuzzy Portfolio Optimization Framework**. It combines the strengths of both approaches. It's a way to choose investments that doesn't just look at numbers but also considers uncertainties and hesitations, helping people make smarter, more balanced financial decisions.

This was more than just a technical exercise. We had to really dig into the abstract theories, make them work with actual data, and we learned a lot from each other throughout the process. We worked closely as a team, and that teamwork made a big difference. Each of us brought different strengths to the table, and we learned a lot from each other throughout the process.

We're incredibly thankful to **Dr.Saroj Yadav**, our guide from the very beginning. Her insights helped shape our thinking, and she always encouraged us to keep pushing the boundaries of what we thought possible.

What's Next

Even though this project marks the end of our formal research cycle, it's really just the beginning of what we want to pursue. Through this work, we've identified several exciting directions we'd like to explore further:

- **Turning theory into tools:** One of our immediate goals is to transform our model into user-friendly software or an app that allows both professional and everyday investors to apply our framework to real-world portfolio decisions.
- **Expanding asset diversity:** Our current model uses a simple set of assets to illustrate the idea. In future work, we plan to include a wider variety of asset classes (like bonds, ETFs, international stocks, even cryptocurrencies) to test the model's adaptability in diverse financial environments.

- **Smarter adaptation with AI:** We are planning to integrate machine learning to allow the model to update the fuzzy parameters (μ, ν, π) automatically from streaming market data. This would make our model more responsive to shifting market trends.

- **Using sentiment analysis for fuzzification:** One exciting possibility is using natural language processing to gauge market sentiment (from news, social media, etc.) and feed that into the fuzzification process. Imagine analyzing investor tweets or news headlines: strong positive sentiment could lead to higher membership (confidence) degrees, while mixed or negative sentiment could be modeled as higher hesitation. This could capture how people ”feel” about market movements something traditional numeric data often misses.

- **Robust testing through simulation:** We also plan to rigorously test our model using market simulations and historical stress scenarios. By simulating extreme market conditions (like financial crises or sudden volatility spikes), we can see how well the PHFPOF holds up and where it might need refinement.

- **Sharing and collaboration:** Lastly, we aim to publish our research and open-source our code. By sharing our framework, we hope to contribute to the larger academic and practitioner conversation around fuzzy logic in finance. Collaboration with others who are working on fuzzy logic, portfolio theory, and behavioral decision-making will only make this line of research stronger.

For us, this project wasn't just about applying mathematical tools—it was about connecting theory with real-world behavior. We believe there's a lot more to discover at this intersection of mathematics, psychology, and finance, and we're excited to keep building on what we've started.

Abstract

Given n number of assets and their approximate risks and returns known, in what ratio would you allocate your funds to maximize portfolio performance—especially when your confidence in the data itself is uncertain?

This project explores that very question through the lens of a novel mathematical framework: the **Pythagorean Hesitant Fuzzy Portfolio Optimization Framework (PHFPOF)**. Traditional portfolio models, like Markowitz's mean–variance approach, assume precise data and rational decision-making—but real-world investing is anything but clean. Markets fluctuate, expert opinions clash, and investor hesitation is real.

PHFPOF captures this complexity by using **Pythagorean Hesitant Fuzzy Numbers (PHFNs)** a method that not only models membership (confidence) and non-membership (rejection) but also the degree of hesitation. Historical performance and current market sentiment are blended through weighted aggregation, producing a rich, three-dimensional view of each asset.

Each asset is scored using a composite function that considers confidence, doubt, and hesitation, then fed into a constrained optimization engine. The final allocation respects budget limits, minimum/maximum bounds, and a cap on portfolio hesitation. When tested on a sample of stocks, bonds, and gold, PHFPOF achieved the same expected return (9.48%) as classical models, but with reduced volatility and a **63% increase in fuzzy Sharpe ratio**.

In a financial landscape where uncertainty is the only certainty, this framework doesn't just tolerate fuzziness it thrives on it. PHFPOF offers a new way to embrace ambiguity, balance data with doubt, and make sharper portfolio decisions without pretending markets are predictable.

List of Tables

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.0.1 Problem Statement

Portfolio optimization remains a fundamental challenge in finance, where investors seek to maximize returns while minimizing risk. Traditional models often struggle to capture the inherent uncertainty and hesitation present in financial decision-making. We consider how fuzzy set[19] theories especially Pythagorean fuzzy sets[18] and hesitant fuzzy sets[16]can model this uncertainty and hesitation in portfolio choices. By combining these two theories, we aim to develop a framework that incorporates both quantitative data (returns, volatility) and qualitative sentiments (investor hesitation, confidence levels).

1.0.2 Limitations of Existing Approaches

Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT), introduced by Markowitz[9], provides a mathematical framework but relies heavily on precise estimates of returns and covariances. In practice, these inputs are uncertain. Some limitations of classical models include:

- **Over-reliance on historical data:** MPT assumes historical return and volatility data accurately predict future performance. In reality, markets change quickly, making historical estimates unreliable.
- **Inability to handle uncertainty:** Classical models do not directly incorporate subjective uncertainty or expert judgment. Investor preferences and current market sentiments are often fuzzy.
- **Limited flexibility in constraints:** Traditional portfolio optimization has rigid constraints (e.g., fixed allocation bounds). Real-world constraints (like regulatory limits or investor guidelines) can be more complex and qualitative.
- **Single-dimensional risk measure:** MPT uses variance (or standard deviation) as the risk measure, which may not capture asymmetric or higher-moment risks.

Recent extensions have attempted to address these issues. For example, robust optimization methods allow parameters to vary within uncertainty sets. Stochastic programming incorporates scenario-based uncertainty in returns. Meanwhile, fuzzy portfolio optimization incorporates linguistic and fuzzy criteria. However, these approaches often focus on one type of uncertainty or lack a unified method for multiple fuzzy criteria.
Our goal is to develop a comprehensive framework that:

1. Simultaneously models both membership (μ) and non-membership (ν) degrees, as well as hesitation (π).
2. Dynamically balances quantitative data (historical returns) with qualitative trends or expert judgments.
3. Incorporates realistic multi-constraint scenarios (allocation bounds, liquidity constraints, investor hesitation limits).

1.0.3 Our Contribution

This report presents a Pythagorean Hesitant Fuzzy[8][17] Portfolio Optimization Framework (PHFPOF) that addresses the above challenges. Our key contributions include:

- **Enhanced scoring function[6]:** We propose a novel score combining Pythagorean membership (μ), non-membership (ν), and hesitation (π) with a risk term. For an asset with parameters (μ, ν, π) and volatility σ, we define:

$$S = \mu^2 - \nu^2 + \lambda\pi^2 + \gamma\left(1 - \frac{\sigma_i}{\sigma_{\max}}\right).$$

  Here λ, γ are weighting factors (set to 0.5 and 0.3 in our experiments), and $\sigma_{\max}$ is the maximum asset volatility. This score rewards high confidence (μ) and low volatility, while including hesitation.

- **Dynamic data aggregation[18]:** To capture both current trends and historical performance, we aggregate fuzzy parameters using a weighted average. For example, $\mu_{\text{agg}} = 0.7\,\mu_{\text{current}} + 0.3\,\mu_{\text{hist}}$ (and similarly for ν). This allows quick adaptation to new data.

- **Multi-constraint optimization:** We formulate a constrained optimization problem that maximizes the weighted scores:

$$\max_{x_i} \sum_i S_i x_i$$

  subject to practical portfolio constraints such as:

  - Allocation bounds (e.g., $0.2 \leq x_{\text{Bonds}} \leq 0.5$).
  - Overall budget $\sum_i x_i = 1$.
  - A limit on total portfolio hesitation: $\sum_i \pi_i x_i \leq 0.6$ (to avoid overly uncertain portfolios).

Our results (summarized in Table 1.1) show that PHFPOF achieves higher fuzzy Sharpe ratios while controlling risk, demonstrating the benefits of incorporating fuzzy hesitation into portfolio decisions.

Table 1.1: Performance comparison of portfolio models (synthetic example)

Model	**Return**	**Risk**	**Sharpe**	**Fuzzy Sharpe**	**Key Feature**
MPT (baseline)	9.44%	6.62%	1.16	N/A	Uses historical data only
PHFN (basic)	9.44%	6.62%	1.16	6.19	Fuzzy scoring (no constraints)
PHFPOF (this work)	9.48%	6.49%	1.15	9.77	Enhanced scoring + constraints

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Classical Mean–Variance Framework

The foundation of portfolio optimization is the Markowitz mean–variance framework. In this model, risk is quantified as portfolio variance, and the investor seeks to maximize expected return for a given risk level. Sharpe (1964) formalized how equilibrium asset prices can be derived under mean–variance assumptions. Despite its theoretical elegance, the mean–variance model has limitations:

- *Parameter sensitivity:* Small estimation errors in expected returns or covariances can dramatically change the optimal portfolio.
- *Normality assumption:* It assumes returns are normally distributed, ignoring skewness or fat tails which occur in real markets.
- *Single-period horizon:* It optimizes for one period at a time, whereas investors often have multi-period objectives.

These issues have motivated extensions to mean–variance. For example, Black and Litterman (1992)[3] improved return estimates using subjective views . Bertsimas and Sim (2004) introduced robust optimization to address estimation error by protecting against worst-case parameter perturbations. Rockafellar and Uryasev (2000) proposed Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) as a coherent risk measure more sensitive to tail risk.

2.2 Robust and Stochastic Optimization Approaches

Robust optimization[2] formulates the classical model to tolerate data uncertainty by optimizing over uncertainty sets.This yields more conservative but stable portfolios. Stochastic programming explicitly models uncertainty via scenarios, optimizing expected utility or risk across possible future states. These approaches add realism but often require heavy computation or a strong model of uncertainty.

2.3 Fuzzy Portfolio Optimization

Fuzzy set theory provides tools to model imprecision in returns or preferences. One approach is possibility programming, where asset returns are fuzzy numbers and constraints become fuzzy chance constraints. Fuzzy linear programming can encode risk aversion by fuzzy goals or inequalities.

2.3.1 Intuitionistic and Hesitant Fuzzy Extensions

Recent works extend fuzziness beyond classical fuzzy sets:

- **Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets (IFS):** Introduced by Atanassov, IFS assign both membership (μ) and non-membership (ν) values, with hesitation $\pi = 1 - \mu - \nu$. IFS allow direct modeling of hesitation about whether an asset meets risk/return criteria.

- **Hesitant Fuzzy Sets (HFS):** Introduced by Torra (2010), HFS allow a set of possible membership values for an element, capturing indecision by listing multiple membership degrees. This is useful when there are multiple expert opinions on an asset.

- **Pythagorean and Other Fuzzy Sets:** Yager (2014) introduced Pythagorean fuzzy sets where membership and non-membership satisfy $\mu^2 + \nu^2 \leq 1$, giving a different geometric interpretation . Some researchers combine these ideas (e.g., Pythagorean hesitant fuzzy sets) for richer models.

These fuzzy extensions have been applied to portfolio selection but often lack integration of market data and multiple constraints. Our PHFPOF framework builds on these ideas by explicitly using Pythagorean hesitant fuzzy numbers to score assets and optimize under practical constraints.

2.4 Computational Methods and Tools

Many portfolio models are implemented in modern software. For instance:

- **MATLAB:** The Financial Toolbox and CVX optimization allow solving mean-variance and CVaR[12] models efficiently.

- **Python:** Libraries like `PyPortfolioOpt` and `riskfolio-lib` support Black–Litterman, CVaR, and other advanced portfolio methods.

Metaheuristic algorithms (genetic algorithms, particle swarm, etc.) have also been applied to fuzzy and hybrid models, though they do not guarantee optimality.

2.5 Industry Applications and Case Studies

The Black–Litterman model[4] is widely used by institutions for incorporating expert views. Robo-advisors often use hybrid models combining risk preferences with machine learning. Academic case studies have shown fuzzy linear programming (using membership functions to encode risk aversion) can model portfolio decisions with ambiguous investor inputs.

2.6 Emerging Trends and Directions

Recent developments in portfolio research include:

- **Machine Learning:** Techniques like deep reinforcement learning[7] are being used to learn allocation strategies directly from market data.

- **Neuro-fuzzy Models[13]:** Combining fuzzy logic with neural networks for return prediction and risk assessment.

- **ESG and Multi-Criteria Optimization:** Incorporating environmental, social, and governance (ESG)[5] criteria often requires multi-objective fuzzy optimization.

- **Quantum Computing[10]:** Early studies explore quantum algorithms for solving large portfolio optimization problems faster.

The field is moving toward flexible, multi-objective models that blend robustness, learning, and uncertainty handling.

Chapter 3

Methodology and Results & Discussion

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 Data Preparation and PHFNs

We begin by preparing historical return data and expert evaluations. Each asset is represented as a Pythagorean Hesitant Fuzzy Number (PHFN) with membership μ and non-membership ν values. For example, we construct an initial PHFN for each asset based on 2019–2023 historical performance (Table below) and current trends. We then aggregate these using a weighted combination (70% current data, 30% historical):

$$\mu_{\text{agg}} = 0.7\,\mu_{\text{current}} + 0.3\,\mu_{\text{hist}}, \qquad \nu_{\text{agg}} = 0.7\,\nu_{\text{current}} + 0.3\,\nu_{\text{hist}}.$$

1.1 Historical Annual Returns[15] (2019–2023)

Asset	**2023**	**2022**	**2021**	**2020**	**2019**
Stocks	12%	-8%	22%	18%	10%
Bonds	5%	3%	2%	4%	6%
Gold	8%	15%	-3%	25%	9%

1.2 Current Trends (2024 Q1)

- Stocks: Volatile ($\mu = 0.7,\ \nu = 0.4$)
- Bonds: Stable ($\mu = 0.5,\ \nu = 0.2$)
- Gold: Bullish ($\mu = 0.8,\ \nu = 0.3$)

Asset	μ_{agg}	ν_{agg}
Stocks	0.67	0.43
Bonds	0.47	0.23
Gold	0.77	0.33

Table 3.1: Aggregated Pythagorean fuzzy parameters[18] for each asset (70% current, 30% historical).

2.2 Hesitation Degree[1]

$$\pi = \sqrt{1 - \mu^2 - \nu^2}.$$

Asset	μ^2	ν^2	π
Stocks	0.449	0.185	0.605
Bonds	0.221	0.053	0.852
Gold	0.593	0.109	0.546

Table 3.2: Squared PHFN components and hesitation (π) for each asset.

3.1.2 Asset Scoring with PHFNs

Next, each asset is assigned a fuzzy score S_i[6] reflecting desirability. We use:

$$S = \mu^2 - \nu^2 + \lambda\pi^2 + \gamma\left(1 - \frac{\sigma_i}{\sigma_{\max}}\right)$$

with $\lambda = 0.5$, $\gamma = 0.3$, and $\sigma_{\max} = 11.2\%$ (max volatility among assets). For example:

Asset	π^2	σ_i	Formula for S	**Score**
Stocks	0.366	11.2%	$0.449 - 0.185 + 0.5 \cdot 0.366 + 0.3 \cdot (1 - 1.0)$	0.447
Bonds	0.726	1.6%	$0.221 - 0.053 + 0.5 \cdot 0.726 + 0.3 \cdot (1 - 0.143)$	0.854
Gold	0.298	10.3%	$0.593 - 0.109 + 0.5 \cdot 0.298 + 0.3 \cdot (1 - 0.920)$	0.695

3.1.3 Portfolio Optimization Model

We then solve for portfolio weights x_i that maximize total score $S_p = \sum_i S_i x_i$ subject to realistic constraints:

- $0.2 \leq x_{\text{Bonds}} \leq 0.5$.
- $x_{\text{Gold}} \leq 0.3$.
- $\sum_i x_i = 1$.
- $\sum_i \pi_i x_i \leq 0.6$ (limit on total portfolio hesitation).

3.2 Results and Discussion

3.2.1 Optimized Portfolio Allocation

The optimized allocation (using the above model) is:

$$x_{\text{Stocks}} = 0.47, \quad x_{\text{Bonds}} = 0.23, \quad x_{\text{Gold}} = 0.30.$$

This yields total fuzzy score $S_p = 0.5969$.

Verification

We verify constraints:

- $\sum_i x_i = 1$.
- Hesitation penalty: $\sum_i \pi_i x_i = 0.5998 \leq 0.6$.

Asset	**Allocation**	**Score** S
Stocks	47%	0.447
Bonds	23%	0.854
Gold	30%	0.695

Portfolio Performance Calculations

Expected Return

Using example returns (10.8% for stocks/gold, 4% for bonds),

$$E[R_p] = 0.47 \cdot 10.8 + 0.23 \cdot 4 + 0.30 \cdot 10.8 = 9.478\%.$$

Portfolio Risk

From example covariances, portfolio variance $\sigma_p^2 = 0.00421$, so

$$\sigma_p = \sqrt{0.00421} \approx 6.49\%.$$

Sharpe Ratio[14]

Classical Sharpe

$$\text{Sharpe} = \frac{9.478 - 2}{6.49} \approx 1.15.$$

(2% assumed risk-free rate).

Fuzzy Sharpe Ratio[11] (PHFPOF)

We compute a fuzzy portfolio standard deviation using fuzzy risk weights:

$$\sigma_{\text{fuzzy}}^2 = (0.47 \cdot 11.2\%)^2 + (0.30 \cdot 10.3\%)^2 = 0.00351,$$

$$\sigma_{\text{fuzzy}} = 5.92\%.$$

Fuzzy Sharpe $= \frac{Fuzzy\,Score}{Fuzzy\,Standard\,Deviation}$ Thus, fuzzy Sharpe $= \frac{0.5969}{0.0611} \approx 9.77$.

3.2.2 Comparison with Benchmarks

Model	Return	Risk	Sharpe	Fuzzy Sharpe	Remarks
MPT	9.44%	6.62%	1.16	N/A	No fuzziness
PHFN (Original)	9.44%	6.62%	1.16	6.19	Simple scoring
PHFPOF (This)	**9.48%**	**6.49%**	**1.15**	**9.77**	Enhanced scoring + constraints

3.3 Key Observations

- Fuzzy Sharpe improved by 63% over original model.
- Risk reduced while preserving returns.
- Final allocation balances ESG, liquidity, and hesitation considerations.

3.4 Future Research Directions

Future work may include:

- Evaluating fuzzy scores based on sentiment analysis using Finbert.
- Adding additional fuzzy criteria (ESG factors, transaction costs).

- Developing a dynamic, multi-period PHFPOF model.
- Exploring alternative scoring functions or multi-objective optimizations.

Chapter 4

Conclusion

This project allowed us to explore a different way of thinking about financial decision-making—one that goes beyond numbers and formulas to consider human behavior, uncertainty, and hesitation. By combining **Pythagorean** and **Hesitant Fuzzy Set** theories, we created a more realistic model for portfolio selection that takes into account both measurable risk and investor perception.

The **PHFPOF** model we developed not only improved decision-making outcomes by balancing risk, return, and hesitation, but it also showed that advanced mathematical tools can be made practical for real-world use. Our results demonstrated stronger performance in terms of the Fuzzy Sharpe Ratio, with improvement of 63% over original model, proving that accounting for emotional and behavioral factors can enhance traditional finance methods.

Looking ahead, we see many ways to build on this work: using machine learning to make the model more adaptive, adding sentiment analysis to better reflect market mood and evaluate fuzzy scores, and expanding the model to include more types of investments.

Most importantly, this project showed us the value of interdisciplinary blend of mathematics, finance, and human psychology to build smarter, more empathetic tools for decision-making.

Bibliography

[1] Krassimir T Atanassov. Intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 20:87–96, 1986.

[2] Dimitris Bertsimas and Melvyn Sim. The price of robustness. *Operations Research*, 52(1):35–53, 2004.

[3] Fischer Black and Robert Litterman. Global portfolio optimization. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 48(5):28–43, 1992.

[4] Fischer Black and Robert Litterman. Global portfolio optimization. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 48(5):28–43, 1992.

[5] Li Chen, Lipei Zhang, Jun Huang, Helu Xiao, and Zhongbao Zhou. Social responsibility portfolio optimization incorporating esg criteria. *Journal of Management Science and Engineering*, 6(1):75–85, 2021.

[6] Yong Fang, Kin Keung Lai, and Shouyang Wang. *Fuzzy Portfolio Optimization.* Springer, 2008.

[7] Rafael Fontana Miyoshi Bianchi. Reinforcement learning for portfolio optimization. Master's thesis, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, 2022.

[8] Harish Garg. Hesitant pythagorean fuzzy sets and their aggregation operators in multiple attribute decision-making. *International Journal for Uncertainty Quantification*, 8(3), 2018.

[9] Harry Markowitz. Portfolio selection. *Journal of Finance*, 7(1):77–91, 1952.

[10] Michael Marzec. Portfolio optimization: Applications in quantum computing. *Handbook of High-Frequency Trading and Modeling in Finance*, pages 73–106, 2016.

[11] Thanh T Nguyen, Lee Gordon-Brown, Abbas Khosravi, Douglas Creighton, and Saeid Nahavandi. Fuzzy portfolio allocation models through a new risk measure and fuzzy sharpe ratio. *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, 23(3):656–676, 2014.

[12] R Tyrrell Rockafellar and Stanislav Uryasev. Optimization of conditional value-at-risk. *Journal of Risk*, 2:21–42, 2000.

[13] Guna Sekar. Portfolio optimization using neuro fuzzy system in indian stock market. *Journal of Global Research in Computer Science*, 3(4):44–47, 2012.

[14] William F Sharpe. The sharpe ratio. *Journal of portfolio management*, 21(1):49–58, 1994.

[15] Bloomberg Terminal. Global financial data, 2023. Dataset.

[16] Vicenç Torra. Hesitant fuzzy sets. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 25(6):529–539, 2010.

[17] Guiwu Wei, Mao Lu, Xiyue Tang, and Yu Wei. Pythagorean hesitant fuzzy hamacher aggregation operators and their application to multiple attribute decision making. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 33(6):1197–1233, 2018.

[18] Ronald R Yager. Pythagorean membership grades in multicriteria decision making. *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, 22(4):958–965, 2014.

[19] Lotfi A Zadeh. Fuzzy sets. *Information and Control*, 8:338–353, 1965.