

Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Contents	vii
I State of Art	3
1 Multi-Criteria Decision Aid	5
1.1 Introduction to Decision Aid and Multi-Criteria Decision Aid	5
1.2 Key concepts of Multi-Criteria Decision Aid	6
1.2.1 The set of actions or alternatives	6
1.2.2 Criteria	7
1.2.3 Types of decision problems	8
1.2.4 Preference relations	8
1.2.5 Mono-criterion preference structures	9
1.2.5.1 Total preorders and total orders	10
1.2.5.2 Semiorders and interval orders	10
1.2.5.3 The pseudo-order, pseudo-criterion and generalized-criterion	11
1.2.6 A consistent family of criteria	12
1.2.7 Criteria weights	13
1.2.8 Multi-criteria preference structures and the dominance relation	13
1.3 Multi-Criteria Decision Aid methods	14
1.3.1 Aggregating methods	15
1.3.1.1 The weighted sum	15
1.3.1.2 The additive model	16
1.3.1.3 Preferential independence	16
1.3.1.4 UTA and UTASTAR methods	17
1.3.1.5 AHP	20
1.3.2 Outranking Methods	22

1.3.2.1	ELECTRE I	23
1.3.2.2	ELECTRE II	24
1.3.2.3	ELECTRE III	25
1.4	Rank Reversal	27
1.4.1	Intransitivity of the multi-criteria preferences	28
1.4.2	Rank reversal in consistent ranking methods based on intransitive pairwise preferences	29
1.5	Conclusion	30
2	PROMETHEE methods	33
2.1	Introduction	33
2.2	PROMETHEE I, PROMETHEE II and PROMETHEE III methods	34
2.2.1	Enrichment of the preference structure	34
2.2.2	Enrichment of the dominance relationship	38
2.2.3	Decision support	39
2.3	GAIA representation plane and PROMETHEE related software	41
2.4	Recent developments for the PROMETHEE methods	44
2.5	Motivation to the contributions	44
2.6	Conclusion	45
II	Contributions	47
3	New thresholds for the detection of possible rank reversals	49
3.1	Introduction	50
3.2	The General Threshold	51
3.3	The Linear Threshold	51
3.4	Comparison of the thresholds	53
3.5	Interpretation of the different thresholds according to the parameters of PROMETHEE II	56
3.6	Conclusion	57
4	A new axiomatic characterization of PROMETHEE II's net flow scores	59
4.1	Introduction	59
4.2	Main idea behind the new characterization of the net flow scores	60
4.3	The method of comparison according to All Third Alternatives	61
4.3.1	Hypotheses and lemmas	62
4.3.1.1	Hypotheses for crisp decision problems	62
4.3.1.2	Hypotheses for valued decision problems	65

4.3.1.3	Lemmas	66
4.3.2	Preference relation definition	69
4.3.2.1	Simple crisp decision problems	69
4.3.2.2	Ordinary crisp decision problems	70
4.3.2.3	Valued decision problems	71
4.3.3	Independence of the hypotheses used to define the ATA method	73
4.4	The Direct Comparison method	76
4.4.1	Hypotheses	76
4.4.2	Preference relation definition	77
4.4.3	Independence of the hypotheses used to define the DC method	78
4.5	The Combined method	78
4.5.1	Hypotheses	78
4.5.2	Preference relation determination	80
4.5.2.1	Transformation of ATA decision problems into equivalent decision problems containing only preferences of value λ	81
4.5.2.2	Transformation of ATA decision problems into equivalent decision problems containing only preferences having an arbitrary value γ	82
4.5.2.3	Combination of the simplified problems	83
4.5.3	Conclusions of the combination	85
4.6	Comments about transitivity of R and about the Rank Reversal phenomenon	86
4.7	Conclusion	87
5	Study of the incomparability relation in a PROMETHEE context	89
5.1	Introduction	89
5.2	The incomparability relation	89
5.3	Shortcomings of PROMETHEE I	91
5.3.1	Usual Criterion	91
5.3.2	Particular cases of unexpected incomparability relations	92
5.3.3	Increasing indifference threshold produces incomparability	93
5.4	PROMETHEE γ	94
5.4.1	Method presentation	95
5.4.2	Interpretation of the thresholds	96
5.4.3	Practical Examples	99
5.5	Comparison of PROMETHEE I and PROMETHEE γ	101
5.5.1	Proportion of different relations	101
5.5.2	Distances between indifferent and incomparable pairs of alternatives	101

5.5.3	Practical differences on a small dataset	102
5.6	Conclusion	105
III	Discussion	107
6	Comments on the different contributions	109
6.1	Introduction	109
6.2	New thresholds for the detection of possible rank reversals	109
6.2.1	About the legitimacy of rank reversals: the case of social choice theory	109
6.2.2	About the legitimacy of rank reversals: the aim of multi-criteria decision aid	111
6.2.3	About the indifference relation in PROMETHEE	111
6.2.4	About the different types of rank reversal	112
6.3	A new axiomatic characterization of PROMETHEE II's net flow scores	112
6.3.1	Discussion of the axioms used	112
6.3.2	Other outranking methods compared to the axioms	114
6.3.2.1	PROMETHEE I	115
6.3.2.2	PROMETHEE III	115
6.3.2.3	ELECTRE III	116
6.3.2.4	PROMETHEE γ	118
6.3.2.5	Synthesis	118
6.3.3	Hypotheses not related with the preference relation π	118
6.3.4	Rank reversal as inherent nature of PROMETHEE methods	119
6.4	Study of the incomparability relation	119
6.4.1	Discussion about the new parameters of PROMETHEE γ	119
6.4.2	Comparing PROMETHEE γ and PROMETHEE I on the basis on L_1 distances in the mono-criterion net flow space	120
6.4.3	Building a binary relation based on π instead of γ	120
6.4.4	Rank reversals in the PROMETHEE γ method	121
6.4.5	Exploitation procedure in PROMETHEE γ	121
7	Conclusions	123
IV	Appendices	125
A	Addition or modification of a third alternative	127
A.1	Addition of a third alternative	127

A.2 Modification of an existing third alternative	127
B Definition of the new Linear Threshold: case 3	129
C Datasets description	131
D Hypotheses usage	133
E Insights about the transitivity of π	135

List of Figures

1.1	Example of non transitive preferences matrix and its graphical representation.	29
1.2	Aggregating non transitive preferences in a ranking.	30
1.3	Consistent rankings when only two candidates are considered.	30
2.1	Preference function of the usual criterion.	35
2.2	Preference function for the quasi-criterion.	36
2.3	Preference function for criterion with linear preferences.	36
2.4	Preference function for level-criterion.	37
2.5	Preference function for the criterion with linear and indifference zone.	37
2.6	Preference function for the gaussian criterion.	38
2.7	Determination of the GAIA plane of a decision problem [19].	42
2.8	GAIA plane representation of a decision problem [19].	43
3.1	Quantity of pairs of alternatives according to their difference of net flow score for the TIMES dataset with q_c and p_c equal to the first and third quartiles of the difference of evaluations. The dashed line represents the threshold of [69].	55
4.2	Decomposition of the initial decision problem.	61
4.9	$a_i R^1 a_j \Leftrightarrow a_j R^2 a_i$.	66
4.10	Demonstration of Lemma II: decision problems 1 and 2	68
4.11	Demonstration of Lemma II: decision problem 3	68
4.12	Demonstration of Lemma II: decision problems 4 and 5.	68
4.14	Transformation of non isolated arcs.	71
4.15	Homogenization of an arc of value $(s + 1) \cdot \lambda$ into $s + 1$ arcs of value λ .	72
4.21	Transformation of a set of third alternatives where $v = 2$ and $w = 0$	84
5.1	Division of the graph of γ_{ij} and γ_{ji} according to the different parameters of PROMETHEE γ with the red region representing incomparable pairs of alternatives while the green region represents indifferent alternatives.	97
5.2	Division of the graph of γ_{ij} and γ_{ji} according to the different parameters of PROMETHEE γ when P_f is arbitrarily high.	98
5.3	Division of the graph of γ_{ij} and γ_{ji} according to the different parameters of PROMETHEE γ with $T_I = T_J$.	98

5.4	Division of the graph of γ_{ij} and γ_{ji} according to the different parameters of PROMETHEE γ with $T_I = 0$ and $T_J > 2$	98
5.5	Equiponderated criteria, $T_I = T_J = 0.15$ and $P_f = 1$, red, green and blue dots respectively represent couples of alternatives for which an incomparable, indifference or preference relation holds.	99
5.7	Comparison of PROMETHEE γ and PROMETHEE I on a small dataset.	103
5.8	Mono-criterion net flow scores of the 15 alternatives for each criterion of the SHA dataset. Mono-criterion net flow scores of alternatives a_2 and a_3 are highlighted in red.	104
5.9	Comparison of mono-criterion net flow scores for alternatives a_{12} , a_{13} and a_{14}	104

List of Tables

1.1	Ratio scales of importance [90] [91]. Activities can be criteria or alternatives.	20
1.2	Evaluation table of A. Tversky's example [104].	28
3.1	Evaluation of X_c according to the values of the different π^c	51
3.2	Number of couples of alternatives subject to rank reversals with q_c, p_c equal to the first and third quartiles of the differences of evaluations.	54
3.3	Number of couples of alternatives subject to rank reversals with q_c, p_c equal to the first and ninth deciles of the differences of evaluations.	55
3.4	Percentage of couples of alternatives susceptible to rank reversal occurrences with q_c, p_c equal to the first and third quartiles of the differences of evaluations.	57
4.1	Respect of the different hypothesis by the 7 proposed models.	76
5.1	Definition of the preference, indifference and incomparability relations [87], [82].	90
5.2	Second example of decision problem with PROMETHEE preference parameters.	92
5.3	Positive and negative outranking flows of a_1 and a_4 (left) and a_2 and a_3 (right).	93
5.4	Example of decision problem with PROMETHEE preference parameters. . . .	94
5.5	Positive and negative outranking flows after the application of PROMETHEE I for a_2 and a_3 when $q_2 = 1$	94
5.6	Positive and negative outranking flows after the application of PROMETHEE I for a_2 and a_3 when $q_2 = 3$	94
5.7	Percentage of couples of alternatives for each possible relation produced by PROMETHEE I and PROMETHEE γ (with $T_I = T_J = 0.15$ and $P_f = 1$) with the TIMES data set.	101
6.1	Synthesis of the respect of the hypotheses by different outranking methods. .	118
D.1	Use of the different hypotheses and lemmas for the definition of the ATA method.	133
E.1	Percentage of couples of alternatives whose pairwise preference relation π is not in accordance with their net flow score.	135

E.2 Ratio between the sum of preferences of the alternatives with worse ranks over the alternatives with better ranks compared with the sum of preferences of the alternatives with better ranks over the alternatives with worse ranks. . 136