

JMcDM: A Julia package for multiple-criteria decision-making tools

Mehmet Hakan Satman¹, Bahadır Fatih Yıldırım², and Ersagun Kuruca³

¹ Department of Econometrics, Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey ² Department of Transportation and Logistics, Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey ³ Independent researcher

DOI: [10.21105/joss.03430](https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.03430)

Software

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

Editor: [Vincent Knight](#)

Reviewers:

- [@brunaw](#)
- [@sylvaticus](#)

Submitted: 08 May 2021

Published: 17 July 2021

License

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

Summary

JMcDM is a Julia package that implements some leading multiple-criteria decision-making tools for both researchers and developers. By having a REPL tool, Julia is well suited for researchers to perform their analysis using different methods and comparing their results. JMcDM also provides the necessary infrastructure, utility functions, and a standardized API for implementing recently published methods. The proposed package has brought MCDM (Multiple-Criteria Decision-Making) tools to a relatively new language such as Julia with its significant performance promises. Besides Julia being a new language, the methods developed in the package are designed to be familiar to users who previously used R and Python languages. The paper presents the basics of the design, example usage, and code snippets.

Introduction

The one-dimensional array a is in ascending order if and only if $a_i \leq a_{i+1}$ where $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, and n is the length of array. In other terms, the process of ordering numbers requires the logical \leq operator to be perfectly defined. Since the operator \leq is not defined for any set of points in higher dimensions, \mathbb{R}^p for $p \geq 2$, there is not a unique ordering of points.

In multi-dimensional case, the binary domination operator \succ applied on points a and b , $a \succ b$, is true iif each item in a is not worse than the corresponding item in b and at least one item is better than the corresponding item in b ([Deb et al., 2002](#)). On the other hand, the more relaxed operator \succeq returns true if each item in a is as good as the corresponding item in b ([Greco et al., 2016](#)). Several outranking methods in MCDM (Multiple-Criteria Decision Making) define a unique ranking mechanism to select the best alternative among others.

Suppose a decision process has n alternatives and m criteria which are either to be maximized or minimized. Each single criterion has a weight $0 \leq w_i \leq 1$ where $\sum_i^m w_i = 1$. f_i is either maximum or minimum. $g_j(\cdot)$ is evolution function and it is taken as $g_j(x) = x$ in many methods. A multiple criteria decision problem can be represented using the decision table

Criteria	C_1	C_2	\dots	C_m
Weights	w_1	w_2	\dots	w_m
Functions	f_1	f_2	\dots	f_m
A_1	$g_1(A_1)$	$g_2(A_1)$	\dots	$g_m(A_1)$
A_2	$g_1(A_2)$	$g_2(A_2)$	\dots	$g_m(A_2)$
			\ddots	
A_n	$g_1(A_n)$	$g_2(A_n)$	\dots	$g_m(A_n)$

without loss of generality. When A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n are alternatives and C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m are different situations of a single criterion then the decision problem is said to be single criterion decision problem. If A_i and C_j are strategies of two game players then $g_j(A_i)$ is the gain of the row player when she selects the strategy i and the column player selects the strategy C_j .

State of the field

Multiple-criteria decision-making (MCDM) tools provide several algorithms for ordering or selecting alternatives and/or determining the weights when there is uncertainty. Although some algorithms are suitable for hand calculations, a computer software is often required. While some previous applications only focused on a single method, some applications appear to include multiple methods. PyTOPS is a Python tool for TOPSIS (Yadav et al., 2019). Super Decisions is a software package which is mainly focused on AHP (Analytic Hierarchy Process) and ANP (Analytic Network Process) (Adams & Saaty, 2003). Visual Promethee implements Promethee method on Windows platforms (Mareschal & Smet, 2009). M-BACBETH is an other commercial software product that implements MACBETH with an easy to use GUI (Bana e Costa et al., 2011). Sanna is a standard MS Excel add-in application that supports several basic methods for multi-criteria evaluation of alternatives (WSA, TOPSIS, ELECTRE I and III, PROMETHEE I and II, MAPPAC and ORESTE) (Jablonsky, 2014). DEA Frontier software requires an Excel add-in that can solve up to 50 DMUs with unlimited number of inputs and outputs (subject to the capacity of the standard MS Excel Solver) (Zhu, 2014).

Statement of need

While the applications mentioned above are lacking in at least one of the features such as the number of methods included, being programmable, being free, and the results being comparable by the researcher; JMCDM clearly differs as it solves these problems. JMCDM is designed to provide a developer-friendly library for solving multiple-criteria decision problems in Julia (Bezanson et al., 2017). Since Julia is a dynamic language, it is also useful for researchers that familiar with REPL (Read-Eval-Print-Loop) environments. The package includes multi-criteria decision methods as well as a game solver for zero-sum games, and methods for single criterion methods.

The package implements methods for AHP (Saaty, 1977), ARAS (Edmundas Kazimieras Zavadskas & Turskis, 2010), COCOSO (Yazdani et al., 2019), CODAS (Keshavarz Ghorabae et al., 2016), COPRAS (Edmundas Kazimieras Zavadskas et al., 1994), CRITIC (Diakoulaki et al., 1995), DEMATEL (Gabus & Fontela, 1972), EDAS (Ghorabae et al., 2015), ELECTRE (Roy, 1968), Entropy (Shannon, 1948), GRA (Ju-Long, 1982), MABAC (Pamučar & Ćirović, 2015), MAIRCA (Pamučar et al., 2014), MARCOS (Stević et al., 2020), MOORA (Brauers & Zavadskas, 2006), NDS (Deb et al., 2002), PROMETHEE (Brans & Vincke, 1985), SAW (Churchman & Ackoff, 1954; Triantaphyllou & Mann, 1989), TOPSIS (Hwang & Yoon, 1981), VIKOR (Opricovic, 1998; Opricovic & Tzeng, 2002), WASPAS (E. K. Zavadskas et al., 2012), and WPM (Triantaphyllou & Mann, 1989) for multiple-criteria tools. This list of selected methods includes both classical (TOPSIS, ELECTRE, PROMETHEE, etc.) and modern (COCOSO, MABAC, MARCOS, etc.) tools of the relevant literature.

The package also performs DEA for Data Envelopment Analysis (Charnes et al., 1978) and includes a method for zero-sum game solver. Although these methods may seem different from the methods mentioned above, they are basically members of the same method family and solve similar problems. DEA differs from the above methods in that it is not an outranking method but compares efficiencies of decision units. Zero-sum game is also a multi-criteria

78 decision-making problem, but this time, unlike outranking methods, both the rows and columns
79 of the decision matrix show alternative strategies.

80 The full set of other tools and utility functions are listed and documented in the source code
81 as well as in the online documentation.

82 Installation and basic usage

83 JMCDM can be downloaded and installed using the Julia package manager by typing

```
julia> using Pkg
julia> Pkg.add("JMCDM")
```

84 and can be loaded before using any functions by typing

```
julia> using JMCDM
```

85 in Julia REPL.

86 Suppose a decision problem is given in the table below.

Criteria	Age	Size	Price	Distance	Population
Weights	0.35	0.15	0.25	0.20	0.05
Functions	min	max	min	min	max
A_1	6	140	150000	950	1500
A_2	4	90	100000	1500	2000
A_3	12	140	75000	550	1100

87 In this sample problem, a decision maker is subject to select an apartment by considering
88 age of the building, size (in m^2 s), price (in \$), distance to city centre (in ms), and nearby
89 population. The data can be entered as a two-dimensional array (matrix) or as a DataFrame
90 object:

```
julia> using JMCDM
julia> df = DataFrame(
:age      => [6.0, 4, 12],
:size     => [140.0, 90, 140],
:price    => [150000.0, 100000, 75000],
:distance => [950.0, 1500, 550],
:population => [1500.0, 2000, 1100]);
```

91 The weight vector w , vector of directions fns , and `topsis()` function call can be performed
92 using the Julia REPL.

```
julia> w = [0.35, 0.15, 0.25, 0.20, 0.05];
julia> fns = makeminmax([minimum, maximum, minimum, minimum, maximum]);
julia> result = topsis(df, w, fns);
julia> result.scores
3-element Array{Float64,1}:
0.5854753145549456
0.6517997936899308
```

0.41850223305822903

```
julia> result.bestIndex
2
```

In the output above, it is shown that the alternative A_2 has a score of 0.65179 and it is selected as the best. The same analysis can be performed using `saw()` for the method of Simple Additive Weighting

```
julia> result = saw(df, w, fns);
julia> result.bestIndex
2
```

as well as using `wpm` for the method of Weighted Product Method

```
julia> result = wpm(df, w, fns);
julia> result.bestIndex
2
```

For any method, `?methodname` shows the documentation as in the same way in other Julia packages.

References

- Adams, W., & Saaty, R. (2003). Super decisions software guide. In *Super Decisions* (Vol. 9, p. 43). https://superdecisions.com/sd_resources/v28_man01.pdf
- Bana e Costa, C. A., Corte, J.-M. de, & Vansnick, J.-C. (2011). *MACBETH (measuring attractiveness by a categorical based evaluation technique)*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470400531.eorms0970>
- Bezanson, J., Edelman, A., Karpinski, S., & Shah, V. B. (2017). Julia: A fresh approach to numerical computing. *SIAM Review*, 59(1), 65–98. <https://doi.org/10.1137/141000671>
- Brans, J.-P., & Vincke, P. (1985). Note—a preference ranking organisation method: (the PROMETHEE method for multiple criteria decision-making). In *Management science* (No. 6; Vol. 31, pp. 647–656). INFORMS.
- Brauers, W. K., & Zavadskas, E. K. (2006). The MOORA method and its application to privatization in a transition economy. In *Control and cybernetics* (Vol. 35, pp. 445–469).
- Charnes, A., Cooper, W. W., & Rhodes, E. (1978). Measuring the efficiency of decision making units. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2(6), 429–444. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217\(78\)90138-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217(78)90138-8)
- Churchman, C. W., & Ackoff, R. L. (1954). An approximate measure of value. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of America*, 2(2), 172–187. <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2.2.172>
- Deb, K., Pratap, A., Agarwal, S., & Meyarivan, T. (2002). A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: NSGA-II. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 6(2), 182–197. <https://doi.org/10.1109/4235.996017>
- Diakoulaki, D., Mavrotas, G., & Papayannakis, L. (1995). Determining objective weights in multiple criteria problems: The critic method. *Computers & Operations Research*, 22(7), 763–770. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-0548\(94\)00059-h](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-0548(94)00059-h)

- 124 Gabus, A., & Fontela, E. (1972). World problems, an invitation to further thought within the
125 framework of DEMATEL. In *Battelle Geneva Research Center, Geneva, Switzerland* (pp.
126 1–8).
- 127 Ghorabae, M. K., Zavadskas, E. K., Olfat, L., & Turskis, Z. (2015). Multi-criteria inventory
128 classification using a new method of evaluation based on distance from average solution
129 (EDAS). *Informatica*, 26(3), 435–451. <https://doi.org/10.15388/informatica.2015.57>
- 130 Greco, S., Figueira, J., & Ehrgott, M. (2016). *Multiple criteria decision analysis* (Vol. 37).
131 Springer.
- 132 Hwang, C.-L., & Yoon, K. (1981). Methods for multiple attribute decision making. In
133 *Multiple attribute decision making* (pp. 58–191). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-48318-9_3
- 134 Jablonsky, J. (2014). MS excel based software support tools for decision problems with
135 multiple criteria. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 12, 251–258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671\(14\)00342-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671(14)00342-6)
- 136 Ju-Long, D. (1982). Control problems of grey systems. *Systems & Control Letters*, 1(5),
137 288–294. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-6911\(82\)80025-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-6911(82)80025-x)
- 140 Keshavarz Ghorabae, M., Zavadskas, E. K., Turskis, Z., & Antucheviciene, J. (2016). A
141 new combinative distance-based assessment (CODAS) method for multi-criteria decision-
142 making. In *Economic Computation and Economic Cybernetics Studies and Research* (No.
143 3; Vol. 50, pp. 25–44). Academy of Economic Studies in Bucharest. <http://www.ecocyb.ase.ro/nr20163/02>
- 144 Mareschal, B., & Smet, Y. D. (2009, December). Visual PROMETHEE: Developments of
145 the PROMETHEE - GAIA multicriteria decision aid methods. *2009 IEEE International
146 Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ieem.2009.5373124>
- 147 Opricovic, S. (1998). Multicriteria optimization of civil engineering systems. In *Faculty of
148 Civil Engineering, Belgrade* (No. 1; Vol. 2, pp. 5–21).
- 149 Opricovic, S., & Tzeng, G.-H. (2002). Multicriteria planning of post-earthquake sustainable
150 reconstruction. *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 17(3), 211–220.
151 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8667.00269>
- 152 Pamučar, D., & Čirović, G. (2015). The selection of transport and handling resources in
153 logistics centers using multi-attributive border approximation area comparison (MABAC).
154 *Expert Systems with Applications*, 42(6), 3016–3028. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2014.11.057>
- 155 Pamučar, D., Vasin, L., & Lukovac, L. (2014). Selection of railway level crossings for investing
156 in security equipment using hybrid TEL-MARICA model. *XVI International Scientific-
157 Expert Conference on Railway, Railcon*, 89–92.
- 158 Roy, B. (1968). Classement et choix en présence de points de vue multiples. *RAIRO -
159 Operations Research - Recherche Opérationnelle*, 2(V1), 57–75. <https://doi.org/10.1051/ro/196802v100571>
- 160 Saaty, T. L. (1977). A scaling method for priorities in hierarchical structures. *Journal of Math-
161 ematical Psychology*, 15(3), 234–281. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-2496\(77\)90033-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-2496(77)90033-5)
- 162 Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical
163 Journal*, 27(3), 379–423. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x>
- 164 Stević, Željko, Pamučar, D., Puška, A., & Chatterjee, P. (2020). Sustainable supplier selec-
165 tion in healthcare industries using a new MCDM method: Measurement of alternatives
166 and ranking according to COMpromise solution (MARCOS). *Computers & Industrial En-
167 gineering*, 140, 106231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2019.106231>

- 172 Triantaphyllou, E., & Mann, S. H. (1989). An examination of the effectiveness of multi-
173 dimensional decision-making methods: A decision-making paradox. *Decision Support Sys-*
174 *tems*, 5(3), 303–312. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-9236\(89\)90037-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-9236(89)90037-7)
- 175 Yadav, V., Karmakar, S., Kalbar, P. P., & Dikshit, A. K. (2019). PyTOPS: A python based
176 tool for TOPSIS. *SoftwareX*, 9, 217–222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.softx.2019.02.004>
- 177 Yazdani, M., Zarate, P., Zavadskas, E. K., & Turskis, Z. (2019). A combined compromise
178 solution (CoCoSo) method for multi-criteria decision-making problems. *Management De-*
179 *cision*, 57(9), 2501–2519. <https://doi.org/10.1108/md-05-2017-0458>
- 180 Zavadskas, Edmundas Kazimieras, Kaklauskas, A., & Sarka, V. (1994). The new method of
181 multicriteria complex proportional assessment of projects. In *Technological and economic*
182 *development of economy* (No. 3; Vol. 1, pp. 131–139).
- 183 Zavadskas, Edmundas Kazimieras, & Turskis, Z. (2010). A new additive ratio assessment
184 (ARAS) method in multicriteria decision-making. In *Technological and Economic Devel-*
185 *opment of Economy* (No. 2; Vol. 16, pp. 159–172). Taylor & Francis.
- 186 Zavadskas, E. K., Turskis, Z., & Antucheviciene, J. (2012). Optimization of weighted
187 aggregated sum product assessment. *Electronics and Electrical Engineering*, 122(6).
188 <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.eee.122.6.1810>
- 189 Zhu, J. (2014). *Quantitative models for performance evaluation and benchmarking*. Springer
190 International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-06647-9>