

FR
11011590
16Nov 2016



Faculty of Engineering

Fuzzy Ranking Methods and Their Applications

Chai Kok Chin

**Doctor of Philosophy
2016**

Grade: pass

Please tick (✓)

Final Year Project Report

Masters

PhD

DECLARATION OF ORIGINAL WORK

This declaration is made on the 21 day of November 2016.

Student's Declaration:

I CHAI KOK CHIN, 11011590, FACULTY OF ENGINEERING
(PLEASE INDICATE STUDENT'S NAME, MATRIC NO. AND FACULTY) hereby declare that the work entitled, FUZZY RANKING METHODS AND THEIR APPLICATIONS is my original work. I have not copied from any other students' work or from any other sources except where due reference or acknowledgement is made explicitly in the text, nor has any part been written for me by another person.

29/9/2016
Date submitted

CHAI KOK CHIN (11011590)
Name of the student (Matric No.)

Supervisor's Declaration:

I TAY KAI MENG (SUPERVISOR'S NAME) hereby certifies that the work entitled, FUZZY RANKING METHODS AND THEIR APPLICATIONS (TITLE) was prepared by the above named student, and was submitted to the "FACULTY" as a * partial/full fulfillment for the conferment of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (PLEASE INDICATE THE DEGREE), and the aforementioned work, to the best of my knowledge, is the said student's work

Received for examination by: TAY KAI MENG
(Name of the supervisor)

Date: 21/11/16



Fuzzy Ranking Methods and Their Applications

Chai Kok Chin

A thesis submitted
In fulfillment of the requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations, which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that this thesis has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UNIMAS or other institutions

Signed by,



Name: Chai Kok Chin

Date: 29 September 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my most earnest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Tay Kai Meng and co-supervisor Prof. Dr. Ng Chee Khoon, for their invaluable assistance, support and supervisions during my PhD study at University Malaysia Sarawak. Besides that, I am sincerely thankful to Prof. Dr. Lim Chee Peng for his constant advice and encouragement.

Special thanks go to my best friend, Jong Chian Haur and Chang Wui Lee as well as all my research mates in the fuzzy group, for sharing the literature and knowledge, offering invaluable assistance, and for their encouragement throughout the study. I also would like to thank the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) for the financial support.

Finally, my most heartfelt gratitude goes to my family members especially my wife, Jane Chiew, for her encouragement, inspiration, understanding, and endless love throughout the entire process of my PhD research.

ABSTRACT

Fuzzy ranking is a procedure used to compare and order a sequence of fuzzy sets (FSs). It is an essential step in fuzzy decision making problems before a final decision can be drawn. While many fuzzy ranking methods are available in the literature, a generic method that can provide appropriate and satisfactory solutions across a variety of situations has yet to be developed. Many existing methods are limited to rank either type-1 fuzzy sets (T1FSs) or interval type-2 fuzzy sets (IT2FSs), and only few methods can flexibly handle both types of FSs. In particular, fuzzy ranking becomes complicated when FSs are represented by possibility distributions, which can overlap with one another. In this thesis, two new fuzzy ranking methods with different purposes are proposed. The first method ranks both T1FSs and IT2FSs by considering ranking and weighting issues, while the second ranks both T1FSs and IT2FSs by integrating decision makers' viewpoints. Besides that, it is important for a fuzzy ranking method to satisfy a set of reasonable fuzzy ordering properties. As a result, the capability of the proposed fuzzy ranking methods in fulfilling the relevant properties is analyzed and discussed. The usefulness of both methods is demonstrated using real-world applications. The results positively indicate efficacy of the proposed fuzzy ranking methods in solving fuzzy ranking problem as well as complex decision making problems in practical environments.

Keywords: Fuzzy ranking, decision viewpoint, peer assessment, failure mode and effect analysis, ordering properties, real-world applications

Kaedah Pengaturan Set Kabur dan Aplikasinya

ABSTRAK

Kedudukan kabur adalah prosedur yang digunakan untuk membandingkan dan mengatur urutan set kabur. Ia adalah satu langkah penting dalam masalah membuat keputusan dalam keadaan kabur sebelum keputusan muktamad yang boleh didapati. Walaupun banyak kaedah kedudukan kabur boleh didapati dalam kesusasteraan, kaedah generik yang boleh memberikan penyelesaian yang memuaskan dalam pelbagai situasi masih belum dibangunkan. Banyak kaedah yang sedia ada adalah terhad untuk mengendalikan set kabur jenis-1 atau set kabur jenis-2, dan hanya beberapa kaedah yang boleh mengendalikan kedua-dua jenis set kabur secara fleksibel. Khususnya kedudukan kabur menjadi rumit apabila set kabur diwakili oleh pengagihan kemungkinan, yang boleh bertindih dengan satu sama lain. Dalam tesis ini, dua kaedah kedudukan kabur baru dengan tujuan yang berbeza dicadangkan. Kaedah pertama boleh mengendalikan kedua-dua jenis set kabur dengan mempertimbangkan kedudukan dan isu pemberat, manakala alternatif kedua mengendalikan kedua-dua jenis set kabur dengan mengintegrasikan pandangan pembuat keputusan. Selain itu, ia adalah penting untuk kaedah kedudukan kabur untuk memenuhi ciri-ciri yang munasabah. Oleh itu, keupayaan kedua-dua kaedah yang dicadangkan dalam memenuhi ciri-ciri tersebut juga dianalisis dan dibincangkan. Kebergunaan kedua-dua kaedah ini juga ditunjukkan menggunakan aplikasi dunia sebenar. Keputusan positif menunjukkan keberkesanan yang dicadangkan kaedah kedudukan kabur dalam menyelesaikan masalah yang kompleks membuat keputusan dalam persekitaran yang praktikal.

Kata kunci: *Kedudukan set kabur, keputusan pandangan, penilaian rakan sebaya, Analisis kesan-kesan dan potensi kegagalan mod, aplikasi dunia sebenar*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xv
LIST OF NOTATIONS	xvii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem Formulation	4
1.3 Problem Statements	5
1.4 Research Objectives	7
1.5 Research Scopes	7
1.6 Research Methodology	8
1.7 Thesis Outline	9
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 Fuzzy Set Theory	12
2.2.1 Type-1 Fuzzy Set (TIFS)	12

2.2.2	Type-2 Fuzzy Sets (T2FS)	15
2.2.3	Interval Type-2 Fuzzy Set (IT2FS)	15
2.2.4	Arithmetic Operations of Interval Type-2 Fuzzy Sets	17
2.3	Review and Background on Fuzzy Decision Making	18
2.3.1	Single Model-based Approaches	19
2.3.2	Hybrid Model-based Approaches	19
2.3.3	Remarks	20
2.4	Review and Background on Fuzzy Ranking	25
2.4.1	Class 1	25
2.4.2	Class 2	27
2.4.3	Class 3	28
2.4.4	Reasonable Ordering Properties pertaining to Fuzzy Ranking	29
	Methods	
2.4.5	Remarks	29
2.5	Summary	30

**CHAPTER 3: A NEW FUZZY RANKING METHOD FOR RANKING
AND WEIGHTING**

3.1	Introduction	31
3.2	Background and Overview	32
3.2.1	Background of Classes 1 and 2 Fuzzy Ranking Methods	32
3.2.2	A Comparative Study	38
3.3	Procedures of Chen and Lee's Method	42
3.3.1	Ranking of Type-1 Fuzzy Sets	42
3.3.2	Ranking of Interval Type-2 Fuzzy Sets	44

3.4	A New Fuzzy Ranking Method using Fuzzy Preference Relations	45
3.5	Evaluations	51
	3.5.1 Applicability Analysis	51
	3.5.2 Properties Analysis	51
3.6	An Illustrative Example	57
3.7	Summary	58

CHAPTER 4: A NEW FUZZY RANKING METHOD WITH DECISION

MAKER'S VIEWPOINTS

4.1	Introduction	59
4.2	Background and Overview	60
	4.2.1 Background of Class 3 Fuzzy Ranking Methods	60
	4.2.2 A Comparative Study	61
4.3	Preliminaries of Dempster-Shafer Theory	63
	4.3.1 Definitions	63
	4.3.2 Interval Relations based on Dempster-Shafer Theory	65
4.4	A New Fuzzy Ranking Method using Dempster-Shafer Theory with Fuzzy Targets	68
	4.4.1 Background and Motivations	68
	4.4.2 Ranking Type-1 Fuzzy Sets	71
	4.4.3 Ranking Interval Type-2 Fuzzy Sets	75
	4.4.4 An Illustrative Example	76
4.5	Evaluations	79
	4.5.1 Applicability Analysis	79
	4.5.2 Properties Analysis	80

4.6	Comparative Studies	83
4.6.1	Comparison Study 1	84
4.6.2	Comparison Study 2	89
4.6.3	An Application Example	93
4.7	Summary	95

5.2.2 Issues Involved and Success Case pertaining to FMEA

CHAPTER 5: AN APPLICATION TO FUZZY PEER ASSESSMENT

5	METHODOLOGY	97
5.1	Introduction	97
5.2	Background	98
5.2.1	Background of Peer Assessment	99
5.2.2	An Illustration of Peer Assessment	100
5.2.3	An Overview of the Conventional Peer Assessment Methodology	103
5.3	A New Methodology for Fuzzy Peer Assessment	105
5.3.1	Motivations	105
5.3.2	The Proposed Fuzzy Peer Assessment	107
5.4	Cooperative Learning in Engineering Course at Universiti Malaysia Sarawak	113
5.4.1	Initial Survey on Assessment Grades	113
5.4.2	Results and Analysis	113
5.4.3	Detection of Possible Free Riders	118
5.5	Summary	119

CHAPTER 6: AN APPLICATION TO FAILURE MODE AND EFFECT

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

6.1	Introduction	121
6.2	Background	122
	6.2.1 Traditional Failure Mode and Effect Analysis Procedure	122
	6.2.2 Recent Trends and Research Gaps pertaining to FMEA	125
6.3	Preliminaries of Perceptual Computing	129
6.4	A Perceptual Computing -based Risk Priority Number Model	130
	6.4.1 Motivations	130
	6.4.2 The Proposed Per-C -based RPN Model	131
	6.4.3 The FMEA Procedure of The Proposed Per-C –based RPN Model	132
6.5	A Case Study on Edible Bird Nest Farming	138
	6.5.1 Background of the Case Study	138
	6.5.2 Modelling of the Linguistic Grades for Assessment	141
	6.5.3 Information and Data Gathering	142
	6.5.4 Risk Prioritization Outcomes	143
6.6	Result and Discussion	145
	6.6.1 Environmental Control (C1)	145
	6.6.2 Pest/Enemy Control (C2)	149
6.7	Summary	152

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE

WORKS

7.1	Conclusions and Contributions	154
7.2	Suggestions for Future Works	157

	REFERENCES	159
--	------------	-----

	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	182
--	----------------------	-----

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
Table 2.1	A summary of researches in fuzzy decision making	21
Table 3.1	A summary of the ranking techniques and important ranking features of the existing methods	33
Table 3.2	Ranking results of the previous studies	40
Table 3.3	Ranking results of the proposed method	51
Table 3.4	Ranking results of the proposed method	55
Table 3.5	Ranking results with Chen & Lee's method	55
Table 3.6	The aggregated outcomes as well as the analyzed outcomes	58
Table 4.1	A summary of Class 3 fuzzy ranking techniques	61
Table 4.2	Ranking results of the previous studies	62
Table 4.3	BPA's for six possible combinations of intervals a and b (summarized from (Sevastianov, 2007))	66
Table 4.4	BPA's for each α -cut level with respect to fuzzy target "optimistic"	76
Table 4.5	The combined BPA's with respect to fuzzy target "optimistic" using different combination rules	77
Table 4.6	The BPA's of A_1 for "pessimistic", "neutral", and "optimistic" fuzzy targets	78
Table 4.7	The mean of BPA's of A_1 using Murphy's combination rule	78
Table 4.8	Ranking results of the proposed method	79
Table 4.9	The results for the credal and pignistic levels with the respective fuzzy targets using a combined viewpoint	85
Table 4.10	Ranking results from Chen & Lee's, Huynh et al.'s, Zhang et al.'s methods and the proposed method	87
Table 4.11	The results from nine different methods and the proposed method.	91
Table 4.12	The aggregated outcomes from the FWA method (obtained from (Chang & Hung, 2005))	93
Table 4.13	Ranking results of the proposed method and methods in (Chen & Lee, 2010b, Huynh, 2008)	94

Table 5.1	An example of peer assessment (i.e., group #1) using the conventional method (Conway et al., 1993, Nepal, 2012)	101
Table 5.2	An example of group assessment from the instructor	102
Table 5.3	The outcomes of Group #1 using the conventional methodology	104
Table 5.4	IT2FS for linguistic terms (Mendel & Wu, 2010, Wu & Mendel, 2007)	108
Table 5.5	Peer Assessment form (Part 1: Details of Linguistic grades to each specific criterion)	109
Table 5.6	Peer Assessment form (Part 2: Evaluation Form)	110
Table 5.7	An example of peer assessment using the proposed methodology	110
Table 5.8	Interpretation of each student's contribution	112
Table 5.9	The outcomes using the conventional and proposed methodologies	115
Table 5.10	An illustrative example i.e., student #1A is assessed as "poor" for the entire assessment	118
Table 5.11	The outcomes for the illustrative example	119
Table 6.1	Scale tables for S, O, and D	135
Table 6.2	FOUs of words for S, O, and D scale tables	135
Table 6.3	FOUs of words in the scale table for RPN	136
Table 6.4	Words and the respective FOUs (Mendel & Wu, 2010)	136
Table 6.5	Swiftlet farming	139
Table 6.6	Assessment of the failure modes for EBN farming, i.e., the environmental control (C1) and pest/enemy control (C2)	143
Table 6.7	FOUs of the Per-C-RPN scores pertaining to the environmental control (C1) and the pest and enemy control (C2)	144
Table 6.8	Analyzed risk outcomes for environmental control	145
Table 6.9	Analyzed risk outcomes for pest and enemy control	150

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
Fig. 1.1:	Research methodology	8
Fig. 2.1:	Support, core and height of TIFS A	14
Fig. 2.2:	FOU of an IT2FS \tilde{A} and its parameters	16
Fig. 2.3:	Types of approach pertaining to fuzzy decision making	18
Fig. 3.1:	(a) Three triangular TIFSs (b) A triangular TIFS and generalized FS with non-linear membership function(c) Two IT2FSs	39
Fig. 3.2:	Two TIFSs A_i and A_j	42
Fig. 3.3:	(a) \tilde{A}_1 is the grey solid line curve and \tilde{A}_2 is the dotted line curve; (b) \tilde{C} is the grey solid line curve and \tilde{D} is the dotted line curve; (c) $\tilde{A}'_1 = \tilde{A}_1 + \tilde{C}$ is the grey solid line curve and $\tilde{A}'_2 = \tilde{A}_2 + \tilde{C}$ is the dotted line curve; (d) $\tilde{A}''_1 = \tilde{A}_1 \tilde{D}$ is the grey solid line curve and $\tilde{A}''_2 = \tilde{A}_2 \tilde{D}$ is the dotted line curve (adopted from (Wu & Mendel (2009)))	54
Fig. 3.4:	Time complexity versus number of discretized points	56
Fig. 4.1:	Flow chart of the proposed ranking method	71
Fig. 4.2:	Five fuzzy sets (from (Chen & Lee, 2010b, Huynh et al., 2008, Zhang et al., 2014a))	84
Fig. 4.3:	Visualization of the credal and pignistic levels of five fuzzy sets (a) different fuzzy targets; (b) the combined fuzzy target	85
Fig. 4.4:	Comparison using different fuzzy sets (Chen & Lee, 2010b, Huynh et al. 2008, Lee-Kwang & Lee, 1999)	90
Fig. 4.5:	The aggregated outcomes of the FWA method for S_1 , S_2 , and S_3	94
Fig. 5.1:	The procedure to assess an individual student's contribution in a group project (Chang & Chen, 2009)	99
Fig. 5.2:	An example of peer assessments in a group # 1 for assessing student #1A	102
Fig. 5.3:	The proposed fuzzy peer assessment framework	107
Fig. 5.4:	Linguistic grades (a) Poor; (b) Below Average; (c) Average; (d) Above Average and (e) Excellent	108
Fig. 5.5:	Aggregated results of the students in each group: (a) Group #1; (b)Group #2;(c) Group #3; (d) Group #4; (e) Group #5; (f) Group #6; (g) Group #7	114

Fig. 5.6:	Peer assessment results for 28 students using three different methods	116
Fig. 5.7:	Aggregated results of the students in Group #1 with possible free rider	118
Fig. 6.1:	Conventional FMEA procedure (Pillay & Wang, 2003, Tay & Lim, 2006)	123
Fig. 6.2:	(a) TIFSs for “low risk” from five biological invasion experts (b) FOU of a generalized IT2FS \tilde{U} and its parameters (Acosta et al., 2010)	127
Fig. 6.3:	The structure of Per-C (Han & Mendel, 2012, Mendel & Wu, 2010, Wu, 2009, Wu & Mendel, 2007, 2010)	129
Fig. 6.4:	The proposed Per-C –based RPN model	131
Fig. 6.5:	The FMEA methodology incorporating the proposed Per-C –based RPN model	134
Fig. 6.6:	Word “Medium Severity (MS)”. (a) TIFSs for MS from different FMEA users. (b) IT2FS for MS obtained using the EIA	142
Fig. 6.7:	Per-C-RPN scores for the failure modes of C1	144
Fig. 6.8:	Visualization of the credal and pignistic levels of failure modes (a) fuzzy targets; (b) combined fuzzy targets	146
Fig. 6.9:	Visualization of the credal and pignistic levels of failure modes (a) fuzzy targets; (b) combined fuzzy targets	150

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Notations	Descriptions
AHP	Analytical hierarchy Process
AI	Artificial intelligence
ANP	Analytic network process
ARAS	Additive Ratio Assessment
ART	Adaptive resonance theory
BPA	Basic probability assignment
COPRAS	Complex PROportional ASsessment method
CWW	Computing with words
DEMATEL	Decision Making Trial and Evaluation Laboratory
D	Detection
DST	Dempster-Shafer theory
EBN	Edible bird nest
EIA	Enhanced Interval Approach
EKM	Enhanced Karnik Mendel
ELECTRE	ELimination and Choice Expressing Reality
FMEA	Failure mode and effect analysis
FOU	Footprint of uncertainty
FWA	Fuzzy weighted averaging
GFS	Generalized fuzzy set
GM	Group mark
IM	Individual mark
IT2FS	Interval type-2 fuzzy set
IWF	Individual Weighting Factor
JS	Jaccard similarity
LINMAP	Linear Programming Technique for Multidimensional Analysis of Preference

LMF	Lower membership function
LWA	Linguistic weighted average
MP	Mathematical programming
MCDM	Multi-criteria decision-making
O	Occurrence
PA	Peer assessment score
Per-C	Perceptual computing
PROMETHEE	Preference Ranking Organization METHOD for Enrichment Evaluations
QUALIFLEX	QUALItative FLEXible multiple criteria
RPN	Risk Priority Numbers
S	Severity
TIFS	Type-1 fuzzy set
TBM	Transferable Belief Model
TM	Team member
TOPSIS	Technique of Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution
UMF	Upper membership function
VIKOR	ViseKriterijumska Optimizacija I Kompromisno Resenje

LIST OF NOTATIONS

Notations	Descriptions
\tilde{A}	An IT2FS
C	Set for risk factors, where $C = \{S, O, D\}$
<i>core</i>	core of a T1FS
$\hat{C}_{\tilde{A},l}$	Left centroids of \tilde{A} , $\forall \hat{C}_{\tilde{A}} \in U$
$\hat{C}_{\tilde{A},r}$	Right centroids of \tilde{A} , $\forall \hat{C}_{\tilde{A}} \in U$
F_i	Label of failure mode, where $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$
FOU	FOU of an IT2FS in the universe of discourse U
\underline{FOU}	Lower bound of FOU
\overline{FOU}	Upper bound of FOU
L	Left switch point
R	Right switch point
<i>supp</i>	support of a 1FS
T	Fuzzy targets
T_n	Neutral fuzzy target
T_o	Optimistic fuzzy target
T_p	Pessimistic fuzzy target
TM_k	An FMEA user, where $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$
U	Universe of discourse
μ	membership function of a fuzzy sets
\tilde{Y}_{F_i}	Per-C -RPN score for $F_i i=1, 2, \dots, n$ on D_Y
\tilde{Y}_{R_g}	Risk words in risk rating scale, where $R_g g=1, 2, \dots, G$
$[\overline{a_1}, \overline{a_2}, \overline{a_3}, \overline{a_4}, \overline{h}]$	Parameters in $\overline{FOU}(\overline{U})$ where $\overline{a_1}, \overline{a_2}, \overline{a_3}, \overline{a_4} \in U$ and $\overline{h} \in [0, 1]$
$[\underline{a_1}, \underline{a_2}, \underline{a_3}, \underline{a_4}, \underline{h}]$	Parameters in $\underline{FOU}(\underline{U})$ where $\underline{a_1}, \underline{a_2}, \underline{a_3}, \underline{a_4} \in U$ and $\underline{h} \in [0, 1]$

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Decision making is an essential part of everyday life. In practice, many decision making tasks take place in an environment in which the goals, constraints, and consequences of feasible options (alternatives and actions) are not known precisely (Bellman & Zadeh, 1970). As an example, “investing in stock market is *very high risk*” and “student #B is *excellent* in collaborative work”, in which words such as “*very high risk*” and “*excellent*” are imprecise and vague terms that describe the risk of investment and student’s contribution, respectively. To cope with the challenges of decision making, fuzzy set theory was introduced more than fifty years ago to model uncertain, imprecise, and vague information (Zadeh, 1965). Since then, the concepts of fuzzy set theory have received prominent attention and are well-studied across different disciplines, e.g., economy (Tiryaki & Ahlatcioglu, 2005), engineering (Wang & Elhag, 2006), and education (Chang & Chen, 2009).

When fuzzy set theory is incorporated into decision models for solving decision making problems, the overall performance measures of decision alternatives often are represented with fuzzy sets (Bellman & Zadeh, 1970). As an example, a set of decision alternatives with a common type of fuzzy set, i.e., alpha-level set, is presented in (Wang, Chin, Poon & Yang, 2009, Wang & Elhag, 2006). In a fuzzy environment, ranking of fuzzy sets (hereafter named as fuzzy ranking) is an essential step for fuzzy decision making problem in order to reach a final decision (Chen and Klein, 1997, Chen & Tang, 2008). Specifically, fuzzy ranking is a procedure used to compare and order a sequence of fuzzy sets. It is a complex and

challenging task because fuzzy sets are represented by possibility distributions, which can overlap with one another (Chang & Lee, 1994, Lee-Kwang & Lee 1999).

Fuzzy ranking methods can be categorized into three classes (Wang & Kerre, 2001a,b). The first class transforms a number of fuzzy sets into crisp numbers, and ranks the resulting crisp numbers, e.g. (Abbasbandy & Asady, 2006, Chu & Tsao, 2002, Karnik & Mendel, 2001, Wu & Mendel, 2009). The respective methods are easy and straightforward. But, it was warned that “by reducing the whole of our analysis to a single number, we are losing much of the information we have purposely been keeping throughout our calculations” (Freeling, 1980). As such, the first class is suitable when only the sequence of fuzzy sets needs to be determined. The second class ranks fuzzy sets through pairwise comparisons, e.g. (Chen & Lee, 2010a, Yuan, 2001). The respective methods analyze the preference relation of two or more fuzzy sets. As an example, fuzzy set A is larger than fuzzy set B by 60%. The methods are useful when both preference relations between fuzzy sets and their ranking orders have to be determined. They are suitable for dealing with subjective judgements, especially in areas such as social sciences (Yuan, 1991). However, it is challenging to obtain consistent fuzzy ranking results based on pairwise comparisons (Yuan, 1991). Furthermore, it is difficult to achieve certain reasonable ordering properties, as stated in (Wang and Kerre, 2001a, b). The third class maps a number of fuzzy sets to crisp numbers based on a pre-defined reference set(s) for comparison, e.g. (Chen & Lee, 2010b, Huynh, Nakamori & Lawry, 2008, Lee-Kwang & Lee, 1999). The respective methods are beneficial because a decision maker’s viewpoints can be reflected. However, it is challenging when multiple viewpoints do not lead to the same ranking outcome, while a final decision still needs to be made (Yuan, 1991).

Although many fuzzy ranking methods are available in the literature, a general solution across a variety of situations is yet to be known (Huynh, Nakamori & Lawry, 2008). Most of

the existing methods emphasize on ranking type-1 fuzzy sets (T1FSs). However, recent advances in fuzzy decision making reveal that the use of higher dimensional fuzzy sets, such as interval type-2 fuzzy sets (IT2FSs), provides better flexibility in preserving and processing linguistic uncertainties. Unfortunately, a generic fuzzy ranking method that can handle both T1FSs and IT2FSs is still new. Therefore, research in fuzzy ranking should focus on undertaking both T1FSs and IT2FSs.

Besides that, a given fuzzy decision making problem may require different fuzzy ranking methods. As an example, consider a peer assessment problem related to cooperative learning of students. It is more meaningful to obtain performance indices that reflect a student's contribution in a group (i.e., weighting) and subsequently rank the student accordingly, instead of sorting the students' achievements (represented in fuzzy sets) sequentially (Cheng & Chen, 2009). In such situation, ranking and weighting of fuzzy sets are two important criteria pertaining to a fuzzy ranking method. Another example is a two-person game involving fuzzy profit and loss, in which the players' viewpoints or attitudes need to be analyzed (Lee-Kwang & Lee, 1999). In this case, a fuzzy ranking method that integrates the decision maker's viewpoints is an important criterion.

To fill the research gaps, fuzzy ranking methods that can flexibly rank both T1FSs and IT2FSs are investigated in details in this thesis. Furthermore, important features, such as ranking and weighting, and integrating decision makers' viewpoints are examined. These are the main novelties of this research, and the main contributions of this thesis.