

# ProMCDA: A Python package for Probabilistic Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis

Flaminia Catalli<sup>1\*</sup> and Matteo Spada<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> wetransform GmbH, Germany <sup>2</sup> Zürich University of Applied Sciences, School of Engineering, INE Institute of Sustainable Development, Switzerland \* These authors contributed equally.

DOI: [10.xxxxxx/draft](https://doi.org/10.xxxxxx/draft)

## Software

- [Review](#)
- [Repository](#)
- [Archive](#)

Editor: [Open Journals](#)

## Reviewers:

- [@openjournals](#)

Submitted: 01 January 1970

Published: unpublished

## License

Authors of papers retain copyright and release the work under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License ([CC BY 4.0](#)).

## Summary

Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) is a formal process to assist decision makers (DMs) in structuring their decision problems and to provide them with tools and methods leading to recommendations on the decisions at stake (Roy (1996)). The recommendations are based on a comprehensive identification of the alternatives considered and the selection of criteria/subcriteria/etc. to evaluate them, which are aggregated taking into account the preferences of the DMs (Bouyssou et al. (2006)). In the literature, there is a wide range of MCDA methods used to integrate information and either classify alternatives into preference classes or rank them from best to worst (Cinelli et al. (2022)). In the context of ranking and benchmarking alternatives across complex concepts, composite indicators (CIs) are the most widely used synthetic measures (Greco et al. (2019)). Indeed, they have been applied, for example, in the context of environmental quality (Oțoiu & Grădinaru (2018)), resilience of energy supply (Gasser et al. (2020)), sustainability (Volkart et al. (2016)), global competitiveness (Klaus Schwab (2018)), etc. However, the uncertainty of the criteria, the effect of tuning the weights relative to them, and the choice of methods (normalization/aggregation) to construct CIs, have been shown to influence the final ranking of alternatives (e.g. Cinelli et al. (2020)).

The ProMCDA Python module proposed here allows a DM to explore the sensitivity and robustness of the CIs results in a user-friendly way. In other words, it allows the user to assess either the sensitivity related to the choice of normalization and/or aggregation method, but also to account for uncertainty in the criteria and weights.

## Statement of need

There are already dedicated tools for estimating CIs in the literature. In R, there is an existing package called COINr, which allows the user to develop CIs by including all common operations, from criteria selection, data treatment, normalization and aggregation, and sensitivity analysis (Becker et al. (2022)). There are also other packages in R, such as compind, that focus on weighting and aggregation (Fusco et al. (2018)). In MATLAB, there are some packages dedicated to specific parts of CI development, such as the CIA0 tool (Lindén et al. (2021)). The Python module Decisi-o-Rama (Chacon-Hurtado & Scholten (2021)) focuses on the implementation of the Multi-Attribute Utility Theory (MAUT) to normalize criteria, considering a hierarchical criteria structure and uncertain criteria, and to aggregate the results using different aggregation methods. Finally, the web tool called MCDA Index Tool allows sensitivity analysis based on different combinations of normalization functions and aggregation methods (MCDA Index Tool).

ProMCDA is a Python module for performing CIs MCDA considering a full probabilistic approach.

The tool provides sensitivity and robustness analysis of the ranking results. The sensitivity of the MCDA scores is caused by the different pairs of normalization/aggregation functions (Cinelli et al. (2020)) that can be used in the evaluation process. The uncertainty is instead caused by either the variability associated with the criteria values (Stewart & Durbach (2016)) or the randomness that may be associated with their weights (Lahdelma et al. (1998)). ProMCDA is unique in combining all these different sources of variability and providing a systematic analysis.

The tool is designed to be used by both researchers and practitioners in operations research. The approach has a wide range of potential applications, ranging from sustainability to healthcare and risk assessment, to name but a few. ProMCDA has been developed as a core methodology for the development of a decision support system for forest management (FutureForest). However, the tool is generic and can be used in any other domain involving multi-criteria decision-making.

## Overview

ProMCDA is a module consisting of a set of functions that allow CIs to be constructed considering the uncertainty associated with the criteria, the weights and the combination of normalization/aggregation methods. The evaluation process behind ProMCDA is based on two main steps of data manipulation:

- data normalisation, to work with data values on the same scale;
- data aggregation, to estimate a single composite indicator from all criteria.

ProMCDA receives all the necessary input information via a configuration file in JSON format (for more details see the README). The alternatives are represented in an input matrix (in CSV file format) as rows and described by the different values of the criteria in the columns. The sensitivity analysis is performed by comparing the different scores associated with the alternatives, which are obtained by using different combinations of normalization and aggregation functions. ProMCDA implements 4 different normalization and 4 different aggregation functions, as described in Table 1 and Table 2 respectively. However, the user can decide to run ProMCDA with a specific pair of normalization and aggregation functions, and thus switching off the sensitivity analysis.

Table 1: Normalization functions used in ProMCDA.

Normalization methods		Formula	Description	Comments
Linear scale	Min-max	$N_{ia} = \frac{x_{ia} - \min(x_i)}{\max(x_i) - \min(x_i)}$	It applies a linear transformation to rescale the data in a specified range (typically 0-1).	Most common normalization method used. The order and proximity of the data points are maintained. Outliers can have a significant impact on the transformation. Loss of information: it compresses the range of the original data.
	Standardization (z-score)	$N_{ia} = \frac{x_{ia} - x_{ia=\bar{a}}}{\sigma_{ia=\bar{a}}}$	It applies a linear transformation with mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1.	The order and proximity of the data points are maintained. The standardized data is not bounded. High values have a great impact on the result, which is desirable if the wish is to reward exceptional behaviour. It preserves the shape and distribution of the original data. Loss of information: none.
Ratio scale	Target	$N_{ia} = \frac{x_{ia}}{\max(x_i)}$	It normalizes the upper limit to 1.	The order and proximity of the data points are maintained. No fixed range. Sensitive to outliers. It can be useful when the maximum value is of particular interest or importance in the analysis. Loss of information: it can reduce the relative differences between values, potentially compressing the data.
Ordinal	Rank	$N_{ia} = \text{rank}(x_{ia})$	The data points are ranked based on their relative values.	The order and proximity of the data points are maintained. It does not impose a fixed range on the transformed data. It eliminates magnitude differences. It can be useful when the exact values are not important, but rather the relative positions or comparisons between values. Robust to outliers.
<b>Legend</b> $N_{ia}$ : the normalized value of indicator $i$ for alternative $a$ . $x_{ia}$ : the value of indicator $i$ for alternative $a$ . $x_{ia=\bar{a}}$ : the average value of indicator $i$ across all alternatives. $\sigma_{ia=\bar{a}}$ : the standard deviation of indicator $i$ across all alternatives. $\min(x_i)$ : the minimum value of indicator $i$ across all alternatives. $\max(x_i)$ : the maximum value of indicator $i$ across all alternatives.				

71 Table 2: Aggregation functions used in ProMCDA. The sum of the weights is normalized to 1 as  
72 in Langhans et al. (2014).

Aggregation methods	Formula	Level of compensation	Comments
<b>Additive</b> (weighted arithmetic mean)	$score_a = \sum_{i=1}^n N_{ia} w_i$	Full	Most common aggregation method used. It is a linear combination. It amplifies the effect of the higher values. Commonly used in situations where variables are considered equally important.
<b>Geometric</b> (weighted geometric mean)	$score_a = \prod_{i=1}^n N_{ia}^{w_i}$	Partial	The indicators values should be larger than 0. It is a non-linear combination. The impact of each variable's value is not proportional to its magnitude, and the relative contribution of each variable depends on the other variables involved. It amplifies the impact of variables with small values. The method is commonly used in situations where the interaction or joint effect of variables is of interest.
<b>Harmonic</b>	$score_a = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_i}{N_{ia}}}$	Partial (less than Geometric)	The indicators values should strictly be larger than 0. It is a non-linear combination. The impact of each value is not proportional to its magnitude, and the relative contribution of each variable depends on the other variables involved. Insensitivity to extreme values. It is primarily used in situations where smaller values are considered more important or when dealing with ratios or rates.
<b>Minimum</b>	$N_{ia} = \min(N_{1a}, N_{2a}, \dots, N_{na})$	None	The worst performing indicator equals the final score. Suitable if the DM is interested in an assessment driven by the worst performing indicator.
<b>Legend</b> $score_a$ : the composite score for alternative $a$ . $n$ : the number of indicators. $w_i$ : the weight of indicator $i$ . $N_{ia}$ : the normalized value of indicator $i$ for alternative $a$ .			

73

74 The user can also decide to run ProMCDA with or without a robustness analysis. The robustness  
75 analysis is triggered by adding randomness to either the weights or the criteria. This means  
76 that either the weights or the criteria values are randomly sampled using a Monte Carlo method.  
77 In ProMCDA randomness is not allowed for both weights and criteria in order to make the results  
78 as transparent as possible. In fact, mixing uncertainty from both weights and criteria would  
79 lead to a lack of distinction between the effect of one or the other. Randomness in the weights  
80 can be applied to one weight at a time or to all weights at the same time. In the first case, the  
81 aim is to be able to analyse the effect of each individual criteria on the scores; in the second  
82 case, it is to have an overview of the uncertainty associated with all the weights. In both cases,  
83 by default, the weights are sampled from a uniform distribution [0-1]. On the other hand, if  
84 the user decides to analyse the robustness of the criteria, he/she has to provide the parameters  
85 defining the marginal distribution (i.e. a probability density function, pdf) that best describes  
86 the criteria, rather than the criteria values. This means that if a criterion is characterized by a  
87 pdf described by 2 parameters, two columns should be allocated in the input CSV file for it. In  
88 ProMCDA 4 different pdfs describing the criteria uncertainty are considered:

- 89 ■ *uniform*, which is described by 2 parameters, i.e., minimum and maximum
- 90 ■ *normal*, which is described by 2 parameters, i.e., mean and standard deviation
- 91 ■ *lognormal*, which is described by 2 parameters, i.e., log(mean) and log(standard deviation)
- 92 ■ *Poisson*, which is described by 1 parameter, i.e., the rate.

93 Once the pdf for each criterion is selected and the input parameters are in place in the input  
94 CSV file, ProMCDA randomly samples n-values of each criterion per alternative from the given  
95 pdf and assesses the score and ranking of the alternatives, by considering robustness at the  
96 criteria level. The number of samples is given in the configuration file by the user.

97 Once the pdfs for each criterion are selected and the input parameters are in the input CSV  
98 file, ProMCDA randomly samples n-values of each criterion per alternative from the given pdf

99 to evaluate the score and ranking of the alternatives, taking into account robustness at the  
100 criteria level.

101 Finally, in all possible cases (i.e. a simple MCDA; MCDA with sensitivity analysis for the  
102 different normalization/aggregation functions used; MCDA with robustness investigation related  
103 either to randomness on the weights or on the indicators), ProMCDA will output a CSV file with  
104 the scores/average scores and their plots. For a quick overview of the functionality of ProMCDA,  
105 refer to [Table 3](#). For more details, refer to the [README](#).

106 *Table 3: Overview on the functionalities of ProMCDA.*

Possible usages of ProMCDA	Specifications	Notes
<b>Simple MCDA</b> No sensitivity nor robustness analysis is performed.	The specific pair normalization/aggregation to be used for the evaluation of the alternatives.	For a fully controlled MCDA.
<b>Sensitivity analysis</b> Focus is on the role of the normalization and aggregation functions.	All normalization and aggregation pairs are used for the evaluation of the alternatives.	Each pair normalization/aggregation will produce different scores for every alternative. <b>The sensitivity analysis can be associated with the robustness analysis due to the weights or the indicators.</b>
<b>Robustness analysis of one weight at time</b> Focus is on the role of one indicator and its relative weight at time.	One single weight at time is sampled from the uniform distribution [0,1].	This run can help investigate the importance of each indicator for the final scores. Average results are reported a number-of-indicator times. <b>This robustness analysis cannot be used together with the robustness analysis associated with the indicators.</b>
<b>Robustness analysis of all weights</b> Focus is on the role of the weights.	All weights are sampled from the uniform distribution [0,1].	This run can help understanding the overall impact of the uncertainty due to the weights. <b>This robustness analysis cannot be used together with the robustness analysis associated with the indicators.</b>
<b>Robustness analysis of the indicators</b> Focus is on the role of the uncertainty of the indicators.	All indicators, whose values are distributed as a non-exact pdf, are randomly sampled. ProMCDA needs N-values for each indicator per alternative to build N random input-matrices.	This run let the user analyse the impact of the uncertainty on the indicators for the final scores. <b>This robustness analysis cannot be used together with the robustness analysis associated to the weights.</b>

## 108 Acknowledgements

109 Flaminia Catalli was supported by the Future Forest II project funded by the Bundesministerium  
110 für Umwelt, Naturschutz, nukleare Sicherheit und Verbraucherschutz (Germany) grant Nr.  
111 67KI21002A. The authors would like to thank Kapil Agnihotri for thorough code revisions,  
112 Thorsten Reitz and the whole Future Forest II team for productive discussions on a problem  
113 for which we have found a robust and transparent solution over time.

## 114 References

- 115 Becker, W., Caperna, G., Sorbo, M. D., Norlén, H., Papadimitriou, E., & Saisana, M. (2022).  
116 COINr: An R package for developing composite indicators. *Journal of Open Source Software*,  
117 7(78), 4567. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.04567>
- 118 Bouyssou, D., Marchant, T., Pirlot, M., Tsoukiàs, A., & Vincke, P. (Eds.). (2006). Problem  
119 Formulation and Structuring: The Decision Aiding Process. In *Evaluation and Decision*  
120 *Models with Multiple Criteria: Stepping stones for the analyst* (pp. 19–65). Springer US.  
121 [https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-31099-1\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-31099-1_2)
- 122 Chacon-Hurtado, J. C., & Scholten, L. (2021). Decisi-o-rama: An open-source Python library  
123 for multi-attribute value/utility decision analysis. *Environmental Modelling & Software*,  
124 135, 104890. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2020.104890>
- 125 Cinelli, M., Burgherr, P., Kadziński, M., & Słowiński, R. (2022). Proper and improper uses  
126 of MCDA methods in energy systems analysis. *Decision Support Systems*, 163, 113848.  
127 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2022.113848>
- 128 Cinelli, M., Spada, M., Kim, W., Zhang, Y., & Burgherr, P. (2020). MCDA Index Tool: An  
129 interactive software to develop indices and rankings. *Environment Systems and Decisions*.  
130 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10669-020-09784-x>

- 131 Fusco, E., Vidoli, F., & Sahoo, B. K. (2018). Spatial heterogeneity in composite indicator: A  
132 methodological proposal. *Omega*, 77, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omega.2017.04.007>
- 133 Gasser, P., Suter, J., Cinelli, M., Spada, M., Burgherr, P., Hirschberg, S., Kadziński, M., &  
134 Stojadinovic, B. (2020). Comprehensive resilience assessment of electricity supply security  
135 for 140 countries. *Ecological Indicators*, 110. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.105731)  
136 [105731](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.105731)
- 137 Greco, S., Ishizaka, A., Tasiou, M., & Torrisi, G. (2019). On the Methodological Framework  
138 of Composite Indices: A Review of the Issues of Weighting, Aggregation, and Robustness.  
139 *Social Indicators Research*, 141(1), 61–94. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-017-1832-9>
- 140 Klaus Schwab. (2018). *The global competitiveness report 2018*. [https://apo.org.au/node/](https://apo.org.au/node/262576)  
141 [262576](https://apo.org.au/node/262576)
- 142 Lahdelma, R., Hokkanen, J., & Salminen, P. (1998). SMAA - Stochastic multiobjective  
143 acceptability analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 106(1), 137–143. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217\(97\)00163-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217(97)00163-X)  
144 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217\(97\)00163-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217(97)00163-X)
- 145 Langhans, S. D., Reichert, P., & Schuwirth, N. (2014). The method matters: A guide  
146 for indicator aggregation in ecological assessments. *Ecological Indicators*, 45, 494–507.  
147 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.05.014>
- 148 Lindén, D., Cinelli, M., Spada, M., Becker, W., Gasser, P., & Burgherr, P. (2021). A framework  
149 based on statistical analysis and stakeholders' preferences to inform weighting in composite  
150 indicators. *Environmental Modelling & Software*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2021.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2021.105208)  
151 [105208](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2021.105208)
- 152 Oțoiu, A., & Grădinaru, G. (2018). Proposing a composite environmental index to account for  
153 the actual state and changes in environmental dimensions, as a critique to EPI. *Ecological*  
154 *Indicators*, 93, 1209–1221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.06.009>
- 155 Roy, B. (1996). Decision Aiding: Major Actors and the Role of Models. In B. Roy (Ed.),  
156 *Multicriteria Methodology for Decision Aiding* (pp. 7–17). Springer US. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-2500-1_2)  
157 [10.1007/978-1-4757-2500-1\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-2500-1_2)
- 158 Stewart, T. J., & Durbach, I. (2016). Dealing with Uncertainties in MCDA. In S. Greco, M.  
159 Ehrgott, & J. R. Figueira (Eds.), *Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis: State of the Art Surveys*  
160 (pp. 467–496). Springer New York. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-3094-4\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-3094-4_12)
- 161 Volkart, K., Bauer, C., Burgherr, P., Hirschberg, S., Schenler, W., & Spada, M. (2016).  
162 Interdisciplinary assessment of renewable, nuclear and fossil power generation with and  
163 without carbon capture and storage in view of the new Swiss energy policy. *International*  
164 *Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 54, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2016.08.023>