

Received April 14, 2022, accepted May 4, 2022, date of publication May 10, 2022, date of current version May 17, 2022.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3174058

Analysis of Environmental Priorities for Green Project Investments Using an Integrated q-Rung Orthopair Fuzzy Modeling

HASAN DİNÇER^{1,2}, SERHAT YÜKSEL¹, ALEXEY MIKHAYLOV³,
SERGEY EVGENIEVICH BARYKIN⁴, TAMER AKSOY², AND ÜMİT HACIOĞLU²

¹School of Business, Istanbul Medipol University, 34810 Istanbul, Turkey

²School of Business, Ibn Haldun University, 34480 Istanbul, Turkey

³Monetary Relations Research Center, Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation, 125167 Moscow, Russia

⁴Graduate School of Service and Trade, Peter the Great St. Petersburg Polytechnic University, 195251 St. Petersburg, Russia

Corresponding authors: Serhat Yüksel (serhatyukse@medipol.edu.tr) and Alexey Mikhaylov (alexeyfa@yandex.ru)

The work of Sergey Evgenievich Barykin was supported in part by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation under The Strategic Academic Leadership Program 'Priority 2030' under Agreement 075-15-2021-1333 dd 30.09.2021.

ABSTRACT Green energy projects contribute to sustainable economic development of countries with the employment of environmentally friendly energy production strategies. However, environmental priorities should be examined for this situation. Therefore, priority analysis should be executed for the environmental issues while implementing green investment projects. Accordingly, this study aims at proposing a unique decision-making model based on orthopair fuzzy sets and the golden cut degrees for the environmental priorities of green project investments. The main novelty of the study stems from its proposed integrated model by equipping the Multi-SWARA, and TOPSIS based on the q-ROFSs technique with the golden cut. A set of criteria is identified for measuring the green projects' environmental priorities while several project alternatives are also determined with the supporting literature. Appropriately, the extensions of Multi-SWARA and TOPSIS methods have been applied for weighting and ranking the factors, respectively, in the integrated approach. Additionally, a comparative evaluation is performed with the help of VIKOR method to rank the alternatives. Besides, the sensitivity analysis is applied to illustrate the coherency of the weighting results in the decision-making approach. Accordingly, 5 cases are considered to measure the effects of changing weight results. It is defined that this model is coherent and could be extended for further studies. It is concluded that the reduction of emissions is the most essential item for the environmental priorities of green project investments. Pollution control, waste management and eco-friendly transportation activities are the most critical alternatives. Therefore, this study recommends that investors of green projects should prioritize the strategies of minimizing carbon emissions problem. In this context, investing in renewable energy technologies will help green project investors solve this problem.

INDEX TERMS Environmental priorities, green project, q-rung orthopair fuzzy sets, the golden cut.

I. INTRODUCTION

Green projects have a very high significance for the development of countries. This is because they support the development of alternative energy types to fossil fuels, such as the use of renewable energy. Therefore, owing to these projects, carbon emission rates can be minimized. On the other side, green projects also focus on energy efficiency and savings

The associate editor coordinating the review of this manuscript and approving it for publication was Vivek Kumar Sehgal.

for businesses. For instance, in some of these projects, studies are carried out to increase efficiency in electric motors. Furthermore, green energy projects aim to effectively manage waste [1]. In this way, measures should be taken to protect the environment during the production process. So, it is possible to achieve economic development with environmentally friendly energy production owing to green projects.

Hence, green energy investments projects should be improved. However, environmental priorities should be evaluated for this condition. For instance, green energy projects

can focus on the appropriateness of land use. In addition to this issue, a variety of the renewable energy sources can also minimize the risks in this process. Since each type of renewable energy has its disadvantages, diversifying these types will contribute to more effective management of these problems [2]. Green energy project investments may also aim to reduce carbon emissions. For this purpose, necessary investments should be made for renewable energy or carbon capture technologies. Moreover, there should be water and waste control systems in green project investments.

Priority analysis should be made for the environmental issues while implementing green investment projects. This situation helps the investors to use the budget more efficiently. Otherwise, making different improvements simultaneously create high costs for the companies that threaten the Sustainability of these projects. Therefore, multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) approaches were considered by various scholars for criteria weighting and alternative ranking [3]. For instance, AHP and DEMATEL methods were used with the aim of finding the SWARA model was also considered for the same purposes [6]. On the other side, some researchers also used TOPSIS and VIKOR models to rank alternatives [7], [8].

In this study, environmental priorities are evaluated for green project investments. Hence, it is aimed to identify the most significant environmental issues for the green project investors. In this scope, a unique model is generated using orthopair fuzzy sets and the golden cut membership and non-membership degrees. First, criteria are examined with the MSWARA based on the q-ROFSs with the golden cut. After that, in the second stage, six alternatives are ranked for green project investments with the help of TOPSIS methodology by q-ROFSs with the golden cut.

Additionally, a comparative evaluation has also been performed with the help of the VIKOR method to rank the alternatives. Besides, the sensitivity analysis has also been applied to illustrate the weighting results' coherency in the decision-making approach. Accordingly, 5 cases are considered to measure the effects of changing weight results. Therefore, the novelty of this study is its ability to create an integrated model by considering the Multi-SWARA, TOPSIS and VIKOR based on the q-ROFSs with the golden cut.

Identifying environmental priorities for green energy projects is a complex and critical issue. Hence, a comprehensive evaluation should be conducted to reach this objective. Because of this issue, different factors should be considered simultaneously, such as appropriateness of land use, variety of renewable energy sources, ecological protection, and reduction of emission. However, more essential items should also be defined in this regard. Otherwise, it will be very costly for green energy investors to take appropriate action. Thus, it is identified that there is a strong need to create a novel decision-making model to weigh this situation's criteria. Due to these reasons, in this study, a new decision-making model is constructed by considering M-SWARA, TOPSIS and VIKOR approaches based on q-ROFS and the golden cut.

The proposed model also has some advantages by comparing previously generated models in the literature. In this model, a new technique is created by the name of M-SWARA while making some significant improvements to the classical SWARA methodology. Owing to these new improvements, the causal evaluation among the items can also be identified in addition to the criteria weighting. This situation provides a vital superiority for this proposed model compared with previous similar models. Furthermore, in the calculation process of the degrees in q-ROFSs, the golden cut consideration. This situation has a decisive contribution to the originality of the proposed model. Additionally, uncertainty in the decision-making process can be handled more appropriately.

Moreover, q-ROFSs are generated by integrating IFS and PFS. They also consider a wider space in decision-making process to reach more effective solutions while comparing other models generated with IFS or PFS [4]. Moreover, the main reason of selecting the TOPSIS is its ability to rank the alternatives considering both negative and positive solutions [7]. This situation helps to make a more comprehensive evaluation compared to some other literature models. On the other side, a comparative evaluation has also been performed with the help of the VIKOR method to rank the alternatives. Hence, the coherency of the analysis results can be checked. Additionally, the sensitivity analysis has also been applied for illustrating the reliability of the weighting results in the decision-making approach by considering five different cases.

This paper organizes as follows; the second part reviews the conceptual background and empirical studies that shed a light on linkage between theory and practice. The third part introduces the background information on research and methodology. Following the analysis and findings of the study, authors provide discussions. Finally, this paper concludes with key points, recommendations, future research directions and limitations.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The subject of green energy projects has comprehensive literature. Some of these studies evaluated the importance of energy efficiency in these projects. Energy efficiency plays a pivotal role in considering environmental issues. In this framework, energy efficiency is the goal of reducing the amount of energy required to provide products and services [9]. It is important to use machines that consume less energy within this scope. In this way, the same process can be done with less energy consumption [10]. In this way, less energy will be used, which will help less damage to the environment. Li *et al.* [11] focused on the energy efficiency in China by using data envelopment methodology. They discussed that green project investors should mainly give information to increase energy efficiency. Liu *et al.* [12] evaluated the relationship between energy efficiency and renewable energy generation. Jin *et al.* [13] aimed to define appropriate strategies for the sustainable green economy. It is concluded that

companies should consider energy efficiency for the effectiveness of green project investments.

The variety of renewable energy sources is also a significant issue concerning the environmental priorities of green project investments. They have a positive influence on solving environmental problems [14]. For instance, the carbon emissions problem mainly caused by fossil fuels can be minimized by using renewable energy sources. However, renewable energy types also have some disadvantages [15]. In this framework, lower energy is produced with solar energy when the sun goes down.

Similarly, the energy generation from the wind panels is not stable because it depends on the power of the wind. Because of these uncertainties, green project investors should focus on diversifying the renewable energy usage [16]. Owing to this situation, it will be easier to ensure stability in clean energy production. Pillai *et al.* [17] aimed to evaluate energy usage in buildings. They claimed that for the effectiveness of the green project investments, clean energy should be considered, and the verification of this energy should be provided. Fusco [18] focused on the robust techniques in smart grid control. In this study, it is also highlighted that green project investors should give importance to the diversification of the renewable energy usage. Falvo *et al.* [19] evaluated the Italian energy market. They also concluded that the verification of clean energy usage should be provided for the success of green energy investment projects.

Another important subject regarding the environmental prioritization for green project investment is carbon emission problem. The carbon emission is one of the most critical problems of today [20]. The carbon emissions cause an increase in the problem of global warming. It leads to the deterioration of the climate balance of the world [21]. One of the most important reasons for carbon emissions is the preference of fossil fuels in energy production. Therefore, care should be taken to minimize carbon emissions in green project investments [22]. In this context, renewable energy types can be used instead of fossil fuels. In addition, thanks to carbon capture and capture technologies, it is possible to reduce the carbon emissions problem [23]. Rupp *et al.* [24] determined that the carbon emissions problem should be solved for the success of clean project investments. Yang *et al.* [25] tried to examine the agriculture carbon emissions problem in China. They determined that renewable energy technology investments should be improved to take the cast advantage so that carbon emission problem can be solved more effectively. Wang *et al.* [26] also reached a similar conclusion in their analysis.

Furthermore, raising concerns on the climate change and global warming spotlighted the importance of green project investments. Studies mainly focused on these items to improve the performance of these investments. Nevertheless, there is a need for a new analysis that considers environmental priorities for green project investments. This analysis can be constructive for the investors to focus on more significant issues to increase the performance of these projects.

Therefore, this manuscript aims to create a unique approach based on orthopair fuzzy sets and golden cut degrees for the environmental priorities of green project investments.

III. METHODOLOGY

This section introduces a hybrid model of q-ROFs with the golden cut, M-SWARA, TOPSIS and VIKOR approaches, containing the details on its design, procedures and computations.

A. Q-ROFS WITH THE GOLDEN CUT

IFS uses membership $\mu_I(\vartheta)$ and non-membership $n_I(\vartheta)$ degrees in the decision-making process with the condition of $0 \leq \mu_I(\vartheta) + n_I(\vartheta) \leq 1$. These sets are shown in Equation (1) [27].

$$I = \{(\vartheta, \mu_I(\vartheta), n_I(\vartheta)) / \vartheta \in U\} \tag{1}$$

PFS also considers membership and non-membership parameters (μ_P and n_P) to cope with uncertainty problems effectively. Equation (2) states the details of these sets [28].

$$P = \{(\vartheta, \mu_P(\vartheta), n_P(\vartheta)) / \vartheta \in U\} \tag{2}$$

Equation (3) demonstrates the condition.

$$0 \leq (\mu_P(\vartheta))^2 + (n_P(\vartheta))^2 \leq 1 \tag{3}$$

q-ROFSs are generated by extending I and P to reach better solution in this process by using parameters of μ_Q and n_Q . The details are given in Equation (4) [29].

$$Q = \{(\vartheta, \mu_Q(\vartheta), n_Q(\vartheta)) / \vartheta \in U\} \tag{4}$$

The condition is demonstrated in Equation (5).

$$0 \leq (\mu_Q(\vartheta))^q + (n_Q(\vartheta))^q \leq 1, \quad q \geq 1 \tag{5}$$

Equation (6) states the degree of indeterminacy [30].

$$\pi_Q(\vartheta) = \left((\mu_Q(\vartheta))^q + (n_Q(\vartheta))^q - (\mu_Q(\vartheta))^q (n_Q(\vartheta))^q \right)^{1/q} \tag{6}$$

Operations are shown in Equations (7)-(11) [31].

$$Q_1 = \{(\vartheta, Q_1(\mu_{Q_1}(\vartheta), n_{Q_1}(\vartheta))) / \vartheta \in U\} \quad \text{and} \tag{7}$$

$$Q_2 = \{(\vartheta, Q_2(\mu_{Q_2}(\vartheta), n_{Q_2}(\vartheta))) / \vartheta \in U\} \tag{7}$$

$$Q_1 \oplus Q_2 = \left(\left(\mu_{Q_1}^q + \mu_{Q_2}^q - \mu_{Q_1}^q \mu_{Q_2}^q \right)^{1/q}, n_{Q_1} n_{Q_2} \right) \tag{8}$$

$$Q_1 \otimes Q_2 = \left(\mu_{Q_1} \mu_{Q_2}, \left(n_{Q_1}^q + n_{Q_2}^q - n_{Q_1}^q n_{Q_2}^q \right)^{1/q} \right) \tag{9}$$

$$\lambda Q = \left(\left(1 - \left(1 - \mu_Q^q \right)^\lambda \right)^{1/q}, (n_Q)^\lambda \right), \quad \lambda > 0 \tag{10}$$

$$Q^\lambda = \left(\left(1 - \left(1 - \mu_Q^q \right)^\lambda \right)^{1/q}, (n_Q)^\lambda \right), \quad \lambda > 0 \tag{11}$$

Defuzzification is made by Equation (12).

$$S(\vartheta) = (\mu_Q(\vartheta))^q - (n_Q(\vartheta))^q \tag{12}$$

However, one of the most prominent issues in the fuzzy decision-making models is to determine the degrees properly. Fuzzy preferences are generally defined by only considering the important limitations of the selected fuzzy methodology, such as the sum of membership and non-membership degrees. Indeed, the optimal rate and sum of degrees for the fuzzy sets could be explained by using the assumptions of the golden ratio more accurately. The golden ratio is also known as the golden cut and gives information about the specific patterns of geometry problems. The Greek mathematicians and the latter theoreticians in the ancient times investigated the golden cut has been firstly to discover the ratio of geometrical figures. The following academicians have redefined the golden cut by associating the Fibonacci numbers with the golden ratio [32], [33]. The golden cut can be defined with the division of extreme and mean ratio in a straight line including the large and small quantities as in Equation (13).

$$\varphi = \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} = 1.618 \dots \tag{13}$$

The golden cut-based member μ_G and non-membership n_G degrees could be defined as in Equation (14).

$$\varphi = \frac{\mu_G}{n_G} \tag{14}$$

Accordingly, the q-rung orthopair fuzzy sets with the golden cut can be revitalized by Equations (15) and (16). In these equations, μ_{Q_G} and n_{Q_G} are the q-rung orthopair membership and non-membership degrees with the golden cut, respectively.

$$Q_G = \{(\vartheta, \mu_{Q_G}(\vartheta), n_{Q_G}(\vartheta)) / \vartheta \in U\} \tag{15}$$

$$0 \leq (\mu_{Q_G}(\vartheta))^q + (n_{Q_G}(\vartheta))^q \leq 1, \quad q \geq 1 \tag{16}$$

B. M-SWARA METHOD WITH Q-ROFSS

The SWARA approach is used to weight the factors. In this context, the hierarchical priorities of the experts with the significance ratio are considered to evaluate the items. This study proposes multi-SWARA (an extension of SWARA) to identify the weights and relation degrees. First, a relation matrix is generated with the evaluations of the experts [34]. Second, the relations matrix is constructed as in Equation (17).

$$Q_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & Q_{12} & \dots & \dots & Q_{1n} \\ Q_{21} & 0 & \dots & \dots & Q_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \dots & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ Q_{n1} & Q_{n2} & \dots & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{17}$$

Third, q-ROFSSs are developed and score functions are calculated. Fourth, s_j , k_j , q_j , and w_j values are computed by

Equations (18)-(20). Within this scope, k_j indicates coefficient, s_j represents comparative importance rate, w_j states the weights and q_j identifies the recalculated weight.

$$k_j = \begin{cases} 1 & j = 1 \\ s_j + 1 & j > 1 \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

$$q_j = \begin{cases} 1 & j = 1 \\ \frac{q_{j-1}}{k_j} & j > 1 \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{If } s_{j-1} = s_j, \quad q_{j-1} = q_j; \quad \text{If } s_j = 0, \quad k_{j-1} = k_j \\ & w_j = \frac{q_j}{\sum_{k=1}^n q_k} \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Fifth, stables values in the matrix are determined. For this purpose, the matrix is limited and transposed to the power of $2t+1$. Sixth, with the threshold values, impact directions are defined.

C. TOPSIS WITH Q-ROFSS

TOPSIS ranks alternatives by considering the weights of the factors. First, expert evaluations are obtained [35]. Second, the decision matrix is created with Equation (21).

$$X_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & X_{12} & \dots & \dots & X_{1m} \\ X_{21} & 0 & \dots & \dots & X_{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \dots & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ X_{n1} & X_{n2} & \dots & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{21}$$

Third, q-ROFSSs are developed and score functions are calculated. Fourth, normalized values are defined as in Equation (22).

$$r_{ij} = \frac{X_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m X_{ij}^2}} \tag{22}$$

Weighted values are computed by Equation (23) [36].

$$v_{ij} = w_{ij} \times r_{ij} \tag{23}$$

Equations (24) and (25) show the calculation of positive and negative (A^+ , A^-) solutions.

$$A^+ = \{v_{1j}, v_{2j}, \dots, v_{mj}\} = \{\max v_{1j} \text{ for } \forall j \in n\}, \tag{24}$$

$$A^- = \{v_{1j}, v_{2j}, \dots, v_{mj}\} = \{\min v_{1j} \text{ for } \forall j \in n\}. \tag{25}$$

Equations (26) and (27) are used to calculate the distances to the best (D_i^+) and worst solutions.

$$D_i^+ = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (v_{ij} - A_j^+)^2} \tag{26}$$

$$D_i^- = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (v_{ij} - A_j^-)^2} \tag{27}$$

Relative closeness to the ideal solutions (RC_i) is computed in formula (28) [37].

$$RC_i = \frac{D_i^-}{D_i^+ + D_i^-} \tag{28}$$




FIGURE 1. The flowchart.

D. VIKOR WITH Q-ROFSS

VIKOR is considered with the aim of ranking different alternatives. In the calculation process, fuzzy best and worst values $(\tilde{f}_j^*, \tilde{f}_j^-)$ are taken into consideration. Equation (29) gives information about the details of these values [38].

$$\tilde{f}_j^* = \max_i \tilde{x}_{ij}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{f}_j^- = \min_i \tilde{x}_{ij} \quad (29)$$

Mean group utility (\tilde{S}_i) and maximal regret (\tilde{R}_i) are calculated in the next process. For this purpose, Equations (30) and (31) are considered. Within this framework, \tilde{w}_j refers to the fuzzy

weights [5].

$$\tilde{S}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{w}_j \frac{(|\tilde{f}_j^* - \tilde{x}_{ij}|)}{(|\tilde{f}_j^* - \tilde{f}_j^-|)} \quad (30)$$

$$\tilde{R}_i = \max_j \left[\tilde{w}_j \frac{(|\tilde{f}_j^* - \tilde{x}_{ij}|)}{(|\tilde{f}_j^* - \tilde{f}_j^-|)} \right] \quad (31)$$

Equation (32) gives information about the computation of the \tilde{Q}_i . In this context, v represents the strategy weights. On the

TABLE 1. Selected criteria.

| Items | Literature |
|---|------------|
| Appropriateness of land use (Criterion 1) | [15] |
| Variety of renewable energy sources (Criterion 2) | [13] |
| Ecological protection (Criterion 3) | [11] |
| Reduction of emission (Criterion 4) | [12] |
| Water and waste control (Criterion 5) | [16] |

TABLE 2. Linguistic scales.

| Scales for Criteria | Scales for Alternatives | Membership Degrees | Non-membership Degrees |
|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| no (n) | worst (w) | .40 | .25 |
| some (s) | low (p) | .45 | .28 |
| medium (m) | normal (f) | .50 | .31 |
| high (h) | powerful (g) | .55 | .34 |
| very high (vh) | perfect (b) | .60 | .37 |

TABLE 3. Evaluations.

| Expert 1 | | | | | |
|----------|----|----|----|----|----|
| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| C1 | | N | VH | H | M |
| C2 | N | | M | VH | VH |
| C3 | M | VH | | N | M |
| C4 | M | VH | VH | | VH |
| C5 | VH | M | M | VH | |
| Expert 2 | | | | | |
| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| C1 | | N | M | H | M |
| C2 | M | | VH | M | M |
| C3 | VH | VH | | VH | VH |
| C4 | M | VH | VH | | VH |
| C5 | VH | M | M | VH | |
| Expert 3 | | | | | |
| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| C1 | | S | S | H | S |
| C2 | M | | VH | M | M |
| C3 | VH | VH | | VH | VH |
| C4 | M | VH | VH | | S |
| C5 | S | M | S | VH | |

other side, 1-v demonstrates regret.

$$\tilde{Q}_i = v \left(\tilde{S}_i - \tilde{S}^* \right) / \left(\tilde{S}^- - \tilde{S}^* \right) + (1 - v) \times \left(\tilde{R}_i - \tilde{R}^* \right) / \left(\tilde{R}^- - \tilde{R}^* \right) \quad (32)$$

These values are used for the purpose of ranking different alternatives.

TABLE 4. Average values.

| | C1 | | C2 | | C3 | | C4 | | C5 | |
|----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|
| | μ | v | μ | v | μ | v | μ | v | μ | v |
| C1 | | | .42 | .26 | .52 | .32 | .55 | .34 | .48 | .30 |
| C2 | .47 | .29 | | | .57 | .35 | .53 | .33 | .53 | .33 |
| C3 | .57 | .35 | .60 | .37 | | | .53 | .33 | .57 | .35 |
| C4 | .50 | .31 | .60 | .37 | .60 | .37 | | | .55 | .34 |
| C5 | .55 | .34 | .50 | .31 | .48 | .30 | .60 | .37 | | |

TABLE 5. Linguistic scales.

| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
|----|------|------|------|------|------|
| C1 | .000 | .055 | .105 | .127 | .086 |
| C2 | .078 | .000 | .139 | .116 | .116 |
| C3 | .139 | .165 | .000 | .116 | .139 |
| C4 | .095 | .165 | .165 | .000 | .127 |
| C5 | .127 | .095 | .086 | .165 | .000 |

IV. ANALYSIS RESULTS

Environmental priorities of green project investments are examined in this manuscript. For this purpose, a new model is constructed by considering the Multi-SWARA, TOPSIS based on q-ROFSs with the golden cut. The details are illustrated in Figure 1.

A. STAGE 1: WEIGHTING THE ENVIRONMENTAL PRIORITIES FOR GREEN PROJECT INVESTMENTS

1) STEP 1: SELECTING THE FACTORS

First, the criteria are selected in Table 1.

Source: The criteria are adapted from the Green Project Mapping of ICMA at <https://www.icmagroup.org/assets/documents/Sustainable-finance/2021-updates/Green-Project-Mapping-June-2021-100621.pdf>

Appropriateness of land use is an essential environmental priority for green project investments. Additionally, renewable energy sources can be varied to achieve this objective. Next, ecological protection plays a vital role in this respect. Then, reduction of the emission has a positive contribution to this issue. Finally, water and waste control help to achieve this objective.

2) STEP 2: EVALUATIONS ARE OBTAINED

After that, expert opinions are provided. In this scope, the expert team includes three different people who have more than 21-year experience. Moreover, they have coordinated various projects regarding the environmental priorities for the green project investments. For this purpose, linguistic scales stated in Table 2 are used.

Table 3 includes evaluations.

3) STEP 3: AVERAGE VALUES ARE CALCULATED

Average values are given in Table 4.

TABLE 6. $s_j, k_j, q_j,$ and w_j .

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| C 1 | Sj | kj | qj | wj | C 2 | Sj | kj | qj | wj |
| C 4 | .12 7 | 1.0 00 | 1.0 00 | .28 4 | C 3 | .13 9 | 1.0 00 | 1.0 00 | .27 6 |
| C 3 | .10 5 | 1.1 05 | .90 5 | .25 7 | C 4 | .11 6 | 1.1 16 | .89 6 | .24 7 |
| C 5 | .08 6 | 1.0 86 | .83 3 | .23 6 | C 5 | .11 6 | 1.1 16 | .89 6 | .24 7 |
| C 2 | .05 5 | 1.0 55 | .78 9 | .22 4 | C 1 | .07 8 | 1.0 78 | .83 2 | .22 9 |
| C 3 | Sj | kj | qj | wj | C 4 | Sj | kj | qj | wj |
| C 2 | .16 5 | 1.0 00 | 1.0 00 | .28 2 | C 2 | .16 5 | 1.0 00 | 1.0 00 | .27 0 |
| C 1 | .13 9 | 1.1 39 | .87 8 | .24 8 | C 3 | .16 5 | 1.1 65 | 1.0 00 | .27 0 |
| C 5 | .13 9 | 1.1 39 | .87 8 | .24 8 | C 5 | .12 7 | 1.1 27 | .88 7 | .24 0 |
| C 4 | .11 6 | 1.1 16 | .78 7 | .22 2 | C 1 | .09 5 | 1.0 95 | .81 0 | .21 9 |
| C 5 | Sj | kj | qj | wj | | | | | |
| C 4 | .16 5 | 1.0 00 | 1.0 00 | .29 0 | | | | | |
| C 1 | .12 7 | 1.1 27 | .88 7 | .25 8 | | | | | |
| C 2 | .09 5 | 1.0 95 | .81 0 | .23 5 | | | | | |
| C 3 | .08 6 | 1.0 86 | .74 6 | .21 7 | | | | | |

TABLE 7. Relation matrix.

| | | | | | |
|----|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| C1 | | .224 | .257 | .284 | .236 |
| C2 | .229 | | .276 | .247 | .247 |
| C3 | .248 | .282 | | .222 | .248 |
| C4 | .219 | .270 | .270 | | .240 |
| C5 | .258 | .235 | .217 | .290 | |

TABLE 8. Stable matrix.

| | | | | | |
|----|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| C1 | .192 | .192 | .192 | .192 | .192 |
| C2 | .202 | .202 | .202 | .202 | .202 |
| C3 | .203 | .203 | .203 | .203 | .203 |
| C4 | .207 | .207 | .207 | .207 | .207 |
| C5 | .195 | .195 | .195 | .195 | .195 |

4) STEP 4: SCORE FUNCTION VALUES ARE CALCULATED
Table 5 states the score function values.




FIGURE 2. Impact-relation map.

TABLE 9. Comparative weighting priorities.

| | | | |
|----|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| | IFSs | PFSs | q-ROFSs |
| C1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| C2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| C3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| C4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| C5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |

TABLE 10. Selected alternatives.

| Factors | References |
|--|-------------------|
| Energy generation and efficiency (Alternative 1) | [20] |
| Land use and ecological protection (Alternative 2) | [19] |
| Pollution control and waste management (Alternative 3) | [17] |
| Eco-friendly transportation activities (Alternative 4) | [21] |
| Technologies of circular manufacturing (Alternative 5) | [18] |
| Green buildings (Alternative 6) | [16] |

5) STEP 5: THE VALUES OF $s_j, k_j, q_j,$ AND w_j ARE COMPUTED

Next, Table 6 includes the values of $s_j, k_j, q_j,$ and w_j .

6) STEP 6: RELATION MATRIX IS CREATED
Relation matrix is created in Table 7.

7) STEP 7: STABLE MATRIX IS CONSTRUCTED
Table 8 includes the stable matrix

8) STEP 8: WEIGHTING PRIORITIES ARE DEFINED
Figure 2 explains impact-relation.

Weighted priorities are given in Table 9.

The ranking results are similar for both q-ROFs, IFSs and PFSs. It is seen that the findings are coherent. It is concluded that the reduction of emissions is an essential item for the environmental priorities of green project investments.

TABLE 11. Evaluations.

| Expert 1 | | | | | |
|----------|----|----|----|----|----|
| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| A1 | B | W | W | P | G |
| A2 | W | P | F | F | B |
| A3 | P | F | B | B | W |
| A4 | B | W | P | F | B |
| A5 | G | W | F | B | F |
| A6 | B | F | W | B | F |
| Expert 2 | | | | | |
| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| A1 | B | W | W | F | B |
| A2 | W | F | F | F | B |
| A3 | F | F | B | B | W |
| A4 | B | W | P | B | B |
| A5 | B | W | F | B | F |
| A6 | B | F | W | B | F |
| Expert 3 | | | | | |
| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| A1 | B | W | W | F | B |
| A2 | F | F | F | F | B |
| A3 | F | F | B | F | W |
| A4 | B | W | F | B | B |
| A5 | F | W | F | B | F |
| A6 | F | F | W | B | F |

TABLE 12. Evaluations.

| | C1 | | C2 | | C3 | | C4 | | C5 | |
|----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|
| | μ | v | μ | v | μ | v | μ | v | μ | v |
| A1 | .60 | .37 | .40 | .25 | .40 | .25 | .48 | .30 | .58 | .36 |
| A2 | .43 | .27 | .48 | .30 | .50 | .31 | .50 | .31 | .60 | .37 |
| A3 | .48 | .30 | .50 | .31 | .60 | .37 | .50 | .31 | .40 | .25 |
| A4 | .60 | .37 | .40 | .25 | .40 | .25 | .50 | .31 | .60 | .37 |
| A5 | .55 | .34 | .40 | .25 | .50 | .31 | .60 | .37 | .50 | .31 |
| A6 | .57 | .35 | .50 | .31 | .40 | .25 | .60 | .37 | .50 | .31 |

Furthermore, ecological protection also plays a key role in this situation. However, the appropriateness of land use has the lowest weight.

B. STAGE 2: ALTERNATIVES ARE RANKED

1) STEP 9: EVALUATIONS ARE PROVIDED

In the second stage, alternatives are ranked for green project investments. In this context, selected alternatives are shown in Table 10.

TABLE 13. Score functions.

| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
|----|------|------|------|------|------|
| A1 | .165 | .049 | .049 | .086 | .152 |
| A2 | .062 | .086 | .095 | .095 | .165 |
| A3 | .086 | .095 | .165 | .139 | .049 |
| A4 | .165 | .049 | .078 | .139 | .165 |
| A5 | .127 | .049 | .095 | .165 | .095 |
| A6 | .139 | .095 | .049 | .165 | .095 |

TABLE 14. Normalized matrix.

| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
|----|------|------|------|------|------|
| A1 | .519 | .270 | .206 | .260 | .484 |
| A2 | .195 | .476 | .403 | .288 | .527 |
| A3 | .271 | .527 | .696 | .420 | .156 |
| A4 | .519 | .270 | .327 | .420 | .527 |
| A5 | .399 | .270 | .403 | .498 | .305 |
| A6 | .437 | .527 | .206 | .498 | .305 |

TABLE 15. Weighted matrix.

| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
|----|------|------|------|------|------|
| A1 | .100 | .055 | .042 | .054 | .095 |
| A2 | .038 | .096 | .082 | .060 | .103 |
| A3 | .052 | .107 | .141 | .087 | .031 |
| A4 | .100 | .055 | .067 | .087 | .103 |
| A5 | .077 | .055 | .082 | .103 | .060 |
| A6 | .084 | .107 | .042 | .103 | .060 |

TABLE 16. D+, D-, RCi values.

| Alternatives | D+ | D- | RCi |
|--------------|------|------|------|
| A1 | .123 | .089 | .421 |
| A2 | .097 | .093 | .489 |
| A3 | .088 | .118 | .572 |
| A4 | .093 | .104 | .529 |
| A5 | .093 | .080 | .462 |
| A6 | .110 | .090 | .451 |

For the effectiveness of the green project investments, companies can focus on energy generation and efficiency. Also, land use and ecological protection t can be considered. Pollution control and waste management are the other alternatives for this purpose. Furthermore, eco-friendly transportation activities can be another significant green project investment alternative. Companies can also improve the technologies of circular manufacturing. Finally, companies may create green buildings. Table 11 identifies the evaluations.

2) STEP 10: AVERAGE VALUES ARE COMPUTED

Average values are shown in Table 12.

3) STEP 11: SCORE FUNCTION VALUES ARE DEFINED

Table 13 includes the details of score functions.

TABLE 17. Comparative ranking results.

| Alternatives | q-ROF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | PF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | IF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | q-ROF Multi SWARA-VIKOR | PF Multi SWARA-VIKOR | IF Multi SWARA-VIKOR |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| A1 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| A2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| A3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| A4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| A5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| A6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |

4) STEP 12: MATRIX IS NORMALIZED

The values are normalized as in Table 14.

5) STEP 13: WEIGHTED MATRIX IS CREATED

Table 15 states weighted matrix.

6) STEP 14: THE VALUES OF D^+ , D^- , RCi ARE DETERMINED

D^+ , D^- , RCi values are computed as in Table 16.

7) STEP 15: COMPARATIVE RANKING IS PERFORMED

Ranking results of the green project investments are indicated in Table 17.

The comparative rankings result with the TOPSIS and VIKOR are very similar for all models. Therefore, it is identified that the results are reliable. The findings demonstrate that pollution control, waste management and eco-friendly transportation activities are critical alternatives. Energy generation, efficiency and green buildings take place on the last ranks.

Additionally, the sensitivity analysis is applied to illustrate the weighting results' coherency in the decision-making approach. Accordingly, 5 cases are considered to measure the effects of changing weight results, and the consecutive ranking performances are represented for both the extended methods of TOPSIS and VIKOR in Table 18.

As seen in Table 18, the sensitivity analysis results are also consistent in the case of changing weights of criteria consecutively. This is clear evidence that the proposed decision-making approach could be applicable for the further extensions of the complex fuzzy-based modelling.

V. DISCUSSIONS

Green project investors should prioritize the strategies to minimize the carbon emissions problem. Within this framework, they should focus on improvement of the renewable energy projects. The carbon emissions resulting from fossil fuels pose a severe threat to the world. Environmental pollution caused by this problem causes critical health problems. It is also possible to highlight the catastrophic effects of both social and economic problems on sustainable development. The high number of people with health problems leads to

a significant decrease in growing economies' workforce. Consequently, it will adversely affect the economic growth and stability. On the other hand, this situation also leads to an increase in overall health expenditures, causing a burden on the budgets of the countries. Therefore, it would be appropriate for investors to focus primarily on this problem in green projects. The use of renewable energy dramatically reduces the carbon emission problem. However, high costs also hinder the development of these projects. In this context, investing in renewable energy technologies will help green project investors to solve this problem.

In the literature, some scholars also underlined the importance of this issue. Within this framework, different suggestions are provided to minimize the carbon emissions problem. Tan *et al.* [39] aimed to examine energy efficiency based on data-driven approach. They discussed that carbon emission problem should be primarily solved for the effectiveness of green project investments. They stated that carbon capture technologies should be improved. Garavey *et al.* [40] focused on the scenarios for net-zero emissions in the UK steel sector. They claimed that necessary investments should be made for carbon capture and storage technologies. Thus, the success of green project investments can be increased.

On the other side, Pillai *et al.* [41] reviewed the building integrated photovoltaic systems. They concluded that companies should give significance to the renewable energy technology investments so that green projects can become more successful. Similarly, Kou *et al.* [42] aimed to create innovative carbon emission strategies. In this scope, solar energy-based transportation projects were taken into consideration. They discussed that companies should mainly prioritize the solar energy systems so that carbon emissions caused by the transportation industry can be minimized. Zhang *et al.* [43] and Dinçer *et al.* [44] also explained the significance of clean energy investment projects intending to minimize the carbon emissions. They mainly identified that companies should make investments in renewable energy technologies. In summary, carbon capture technologies and renewable energy technology investments play a pivotal role in decreasing carbon emissions, according to the studies in the literature.

TABLE 18. Sensitivity analysis results.

| Case 1 | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Alternatives | q-ROF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | PF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | IF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | q-ROF Multi SWARA-VIKOR | PF Multi SWARA-VIKOR | IF Multi SWARA-VIKOR |
| A1 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| A2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| A3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| A4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| A5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| A6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Case 2 | | | | | | |
| Alternatives | q-ROF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | PF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | IF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | q-ROF Multi SWARA-VIKOR | PF Multi SWARA-VIKOR | IF Multi SWARA-VIKOR |
| A1 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| A2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| A3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| A4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| A5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| A6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Case 3 | | | | | | |
| Alternatives | q-ROF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | PF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | IF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | q-ROF Multi SWARA-VIKOR | PF Multi SWARA-VIKOR | IF Multi SWARA-VIKOR |
| A1 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| A2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| A3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| A4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| A5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| A6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Case 4 | | | | | | |
| Alternatives | q-ROF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | PF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | IF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | q-ROF Multi SWARA-VIKOR | PF Multi SWARA-VIKOR | IF Multi SWARA-VIKOR |
| A1 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| A2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| A3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| A4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| A5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| A6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Case 5 | | | | | | |
| Alternatives | q-ROF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | PF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | IF Multi SWARA-TOPSIS | q-ROF Multi SWARA-VIKOR | PF Multi SWARA-VIKOR | IF Multi SWARA-VIKOR |
| A1 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| A2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| A3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| A4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| A5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| A6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |

VI. CONCLUSION

In this study, a set of criteria is identified to evaluate the environmental priorities of green projects. Moreover, several

project alternatives are determined with the supporting literature. Also, the extensions of Multi-SWARA and TOPSIS are applied for weighting and ranking the factors, respectively,

in the integrated model. The analysis results indicate that the integrated approach is coherent and reliable. It is defined that the reduction of the carbon emissions is an essential item for the environmental priorities of green project investments. Pollution control, waste management, and eco-friendly transportation activities are the most critical alternatives.

This study generated a novel analytics model integrating the MSWARA, TOPSIS based on the q-ROFSs with the golden cut. However, the main limitation of the study stems from the lack of project-based empirical data, which led researchers rely on the expert judgments with linguistic variables on general grounds for evaluation. For future studies, more specific examinations can be performed. For instance, a comprehensive evaluation can be executed to investigate appropriate strategies for minimizing the ruinous impact of the carbon emissions. The proposed model in this study also provides many benefits for policy makers, practitioners and investors as compared with the previous generated models employing traditional methods. Nonetheless, different MCDM models can also be used in the analysis process. For instance, intuitionistic fuzzy due methodology can be considered in this regard [45].

REFERENCES

- U. S. Bhutta, A. Tariq, M. Farrukh, A. Raza, and M. K. Iqbal, "Green bonds for sustainable development: Review of literature on development and impact of green bonds," *Technol. Forecasting Social Change*, vol. 175, Feb. 2022, Art. no. 121378.
- S. Karic and S. Losacker, "How can green events accelerate urban sustainability transitions? Insights from eight German regional garden shows," *Urban Res. Pract.*, pp. 1–33, Nov. 2021.
- P. Heydari, M. Babamiri, L. Tapak, R. Golmohammadi, and O. Kalatpour, "Weighing and prioritization of individual factors affecting the performance of industries firefighters," *Fire Saf. J.*, vol. 127, Jan. 2022, Art. no. 103512.
- M. A. Bhuiyan, H. Dinçer, S. Yüksel, A. Mikhaylov, M. S. S. Danish, G. Pinter, D. D. Uych, and D. Stepanova, "Economic indicators and bioenergy supply in developed economies: QROF-DEMATEL and random forest models," *Energy Rep.*, vol. 8, pp. 561–570, Nov. 2022.
- W. Dong, G. Zhao, S. Yüksel, H. Dinçer, and G. G. Ubay, "A novel hybrid decision making approach for the strategic selection of wind energy projects," *Renew. Energy*, vol. 185, pp. 321–337, Feb. 2022.
- K. Almutairi, "Determining the appropriate location for renewable hydrogen development using multi-criteria decision-making approaches," *Int. J. Energy Res.*, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 5876–5895, 2021.
- Y.-P. Xu, Z.-H. Lin, T.-X. Ma, C. She, S.-M. Xing, L.-Y. Qi, S. G. Farkoush, and J. Pan, "Optimization of a biomass-driven Rankine cycle integrated with multi-effect desalination, and solid oxide electrolyzer for power, hydrogen, and freshwater production," *Desalination*, vol. 525, Mar. 2022, Art. no. 115486.
- T. K. Biswas, A. Abbasi, and R. K. Chakraborty, "A two-stage VIKOR assisted multi-operator differential evolution approach for influence maximization in social networks," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 192, Apr. 2022, Art. no. 116342.
- O. B. Adekoya, J. A. Oliyide, M. G. Asl, and S. Jalalifar, "Financing the green projects: Market efficiency and volatility persistence of green versus conventional bonds, and the comparative effects of health and financial crises," *Int. Rev. Financial Anal.*, vol. 78, Nov. 2021, Art. no. 101954.
- A. Rehman, I. U. Z. Ullah, M. Zeeshan, A. Hussain, and H. U. Rahman, "Adoption of green banking practices and environmental performance in Pakistan: A demonstration of structural equation modelling," *Environ., Develop. Sustainability*, vol. 23, pp. 13200–13220, Jan. 2021.
- H. Li, Z. Ma, and J. Sun, "Efficiency evaluation of energy in northeastern China based on data envelopment analysis," *Discrete Dyn. Nature Soc.*, vol. 2021, pp. 1–9, Dec. 2021.
- Z. Liu, J. Xu, Y. Wei, A. A. Hatab, and J. Lan, "Nexus between green financing, renewable energy generation, and energy efficiency: Empirical insights through DEA technique," *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.*, pp. 1–14, Nov. 2021.
- Y. Jin, Y. M. Tang, K. Y. Chau, and M. Abbas, "How government expenditure mitigates emissions: A step towards sustainable green economy in belt and road initiatives project," *J. Environ. Manage.*, vol. 303, Feb. 2022, Art. no. 113967.
- R. Rahimilarki, Z. Gao, N. Jin, and A. Zhang, "Convolutional neural network fault classification based on time-series analysis for benchmark wind turbine machine," *Renew. Energy*, vol. 185, pp. 916–931, Feb. 2022.
- R. Ramadhar Singh, R. M. Clarke, and X. T. Chadee, "Transitioning from 100 percent natural gas power to include renewable energy in a hydrocarbon economy," *Smart Energy*, vol. 5, Feb. 2022, Art. no. 100060.
- F. Badr, A. Radwan, M. Ahmed, and A. M. Hamed, "An experimental study of the concentrator photovoltaic/thermoelectric generator performance using different passive cooling methods," *Renew. Energy*, vol. 185, pp. 1078–1094, Feb. 2022.
- D. S. Pillai, V. Shabunko, and A. Krishna, "A comprehensive review on building integrated photovoltaic systems: Emphasis to technological advancements, outdoor testing, and predictive maintenance," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 156, Mar. 2022, Art. no. 111946.
- G. Fusco, "On the use of robust techniques in smart grid control," *Energies*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2021.
- M. C. Falvo, S. Panella, M. Caprabanca, and F. Quaglia, "A review on unit commitment algorithms for the Italian electricity market," *Energies*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2021.
- M. E. Bulak and M. Kucukvar, "How ecoefficient is European food consumption? A frontier-based multi-regional input–output analysis," *Sustain. Develop.*, pp. 1–16, Dec. 2021.
- S. Guo, G. Song, M. Li, X. Zhao, Y. He, A. Kurban, W. Ji, and J. Wang, "Multi-objective bi-level quantity regulation scheduling method for electric-thermal integrated energy system considering thermal and hydraulic transient characteristics," *Energy Convers. Manage.*, vol. 253, Feb. 2022, Art. no. 115147.
- B. Lin and R. Ma, "Green technology innovations, urban innovation environment and CO₂ emission reduction in China: Fresh evidence from a partially linear functional-coefficient panel model," *Technol. Forecasting Social Change*, vol. 176, Mar. 2022, Art. no. 121434.
- L. T. Phan, H. Schaar, E. Saracevic, J. Krampe, and N. Kreuzinger, "Effect of ozonation on the biodegradability of urban wastewater treatment plant effluent," *Sci. Total Environ.*, vol. 812, Mar. 2022, Art. no. 152466.
- M. Rupp, M. Buck, R. Klink, M. Merkel, and D. K. Harrison, "Additive manufacturing of steel for digital spare parts—A perspective on carbon emissions for decentral production," *Cleaner Environ. Syst.*, vol. 4, Mar. 2022, Art. no. 100069.
- H. Yang, X. Wang, and P. Bin, "Agriculture carbon-emission reduction and changing factors behind agricultural eco-efficiency growth in China," *J. Cleaner Prod.*, vol. 334, Feb. 2022, Art. no. 130193.
- H. Wang, Y. Wang, H. Mi, J. Zang, and S. Wang, "Analysis of carbon emission energy inventory from refrigerant production and recycling carbon compensation," *Appl. Sci.*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 1, Dec. 2021.
- K. T. Atanassov, "Intuitionistic fuzzy sets," *Fuzzy Sets Syst.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 87–96, Aug. 1986.
- R. R. Yager, "Pythagorean fuzzy subsets," in *Proc. Joint IFSA World Congr. NAFIPS Annu. Meeting (IFSA/NAFIPS)*, Jun. 2013, pp. 57–61.
- R. R. Yager, "Generalized orthopair fuzzy sets," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 1222–1230, Oct. 2017.
- K. Kumar and A. Sharma, "q-rung orthopair fuzzy entropy measure and its application in multi-attribute decision-making," in *Meta-Heuristic Optimization Techniques: Applications in Engineering*, vol. 10. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter, 2022, p. 117.
- A. R. Mishra and P. Rani, "A q-rung orthopair fuzzy ARAS method based on entropy and discrimination measures: An application of sustainable recycling partner selection," *J. Ambient Intell. Hum. Comput.*, pp. 1–22, Nov. 2021.
- R. A. Dunlap, *The Golden Ratio and Fibonacci Numbers*. Singapore: World Scientific, 1997.
- M. Livio, *The Golden Ratio: The Story of Phi, the World's Most Astonishing Number*. New York, NY, USA: Crown, 2008.
- M. Ronaghi and M. H. Ronaghi, "Investigating the impact of economic, political, and social factors on augmented reality technology acceptance in agriculture (livestock farming) sector in a developing country," *Technol. Soc.*, vol. 67, Nov. 2021, Art. no. 101739.

- [35] L. Sun, D. Niu, M. Yu, M. Li, X. Yang, and Z. Ji, "Integrated assessment of the sustainable water-energy-food Nexus in China: Case studies on multi-regional sustainability and multi-sectoral synergy," *J. Cleaner Prod.*, vol. 334, Feb. 2022, Art. no. 130235.
- [36] X. Huang, B. Xu, P.-A. Zhong, H. Yao, H. Yue, F. Zhu, Q. Lu, Y. Sun, R. Mo, Z. Li, and W. Liu, "Robust multiobjective reservoir operation and risk decision-making model for real-time flood control coping with forecast uncertainty," *J. Hydrol.*, vol. 605, Feb. 2022, Art. no. 127334.
- [37] A. Pınar, B. D. Rouyendegh, and Y. S. Özdemir, "q-rung orthopair fuzzy TOPSIS method for green supplier selection problem," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 2, p. 985, 2021.
- [38] Y. D. Uslu, H. Dinçer, S. Yüksel, E. Gedikli, and E. Yılmaz, "An integrated decision-making approach based on q-rung orthopair fuzzy sets in service industry," *Int. J. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–11, Dec. 2022.
- [39] J. Tan, S. Xie, W. Wu, P. Qin, and T. Ouyang, "Evaluating and optimizing the cold energy efficiency of power generation and wastewater treatment in LNG-fired power plant based on data-driven approach," *J. Cleaner Prod.*, vol. 334, Feb. 2022, Art. no. 130149.
- [40] A. Garvey, J. B. Norman, and J. Barrett, "Technology and material efficiency scenarios for net zero emissions in the UK steel sector," *J. Cleaner Prod.*, vol. 333, Jan. 2022, Art. no. 130216.
- [41] D. S. Pillai, V. Shabunko, and A. Krishna, "A comprehensive review on building integrated photovoltaic systems: Emphasis to technological advancements, outdoor testing, and predictive maintenance," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 156, Mar. 2022, Art. no. 111946.
- [42] G. Kou, S. Yüksel, and H. Dinçer, "Inventive problem-solving map of innovative carbon emission strategies for solar energy-based transportation investment projects," *Appl. Energy*, vol. 311, Apr. 2022, Art. no. 118680.
- [43] Y. Zhang, Y. Zhang, C. Gong, H. Dinçer, and S. Yüksel, "An integrated hesitant 2-tuple Pythagorean fuzzy analysis of QFD-based innovation cost and duration for renewable energy projects," *Energy*, vol. 248, Jun. 2022, Art. no. 123561.
- [44] H. Dinçer, S. Yüksel, and L. Martínez, "Collaboration enhanced hybrid fuzzy decision-making approach to analyze the renewable energy investment projects," *Energy Rep.*, vol. 8, pp. 377–389, Nov. 2022.
- [45] A. Taghipour, B. D. Rouyendegh, A. Ünal, and S. Piya, "Selection of suppliers for speech recognition products in IT projects by combining techniques with an integrated fuzzy MCDM," *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 3, p. 1777, Feb. 2022.



HASAN DİNÇER received the B.A. degree in financial markets and investment management from Marmara University and the Ph.D. degree in finance and banking with his thesis titled "The Effect of Changes on the Competitive Strategies of New Service Development in the Banking Sector." He is currently a Professor of finance at the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Istanbul Medipol University, Istanbul, Turkey. He has work experience in the finance

industry as a portfolio specialist and his major academic studies focusing on financial instruments, performance evaluation, and economics. He has about 200 scientific articles and some of them is indexed in SSCI, SCI-Expanded, and Scopus. In addition to them, he is also an editor of many different books published by Springer and IGI Global. He is the Founder Member of the Society for the Study of Business and Finance (SSBF). He is the Executive Editor of the *International Journal of Finance and Banking Studies* (IJFBS).



SERHAT YÜKSEL received the B.S. degree in business administration (in English) from Yeditepe University, in 2006, with full scholarship, the master's degree in economics from Boğaziçi University, in 2008, and the Ph.D. degree in banking from Marmara University, in 2015. He is currently an Associate Professor of finance at İstanbul Medipol University. Before this position, he worked as a Senior Internal Auditor at Finansbank, Istanbul, Turkey, for seven years; and an

Assistant Professor at Konya Food and Agriculture University, for one year. He has more than 200 scientific articles and some of them are indexed in SSCI, SCI, Scopus, and EconLit. His research interests include energy economics, banking, finance, and financial crisis. He is an editor of some books that will be published by Springer and IGI Global.



ALEXEY MIKHAYLOV is currently the Deputy Director of the Monetary Relations Research Center, Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russian. He is also the Head of the Laboratory of Financial Markets and Banks Department, Financial University, under the Government of the Russian Federation. He is an author of 30 scientific publications and conference papers indexed in SCOPUS and Web of Science, an author of more than 80 scientific publications indexed in relevant scientific databases, and an author of eight scientific monographs. His research interests include energy; economics, econometrics, and finance; business, management, and accounting; environmental science; materials science; mathematics; computer science; psychology; social sciences; and neuroscience.



SERGEY EVGENIEVICH BARYKIN received the Ph.D. degree in economics, in 2000, and the Doctor of Sciences degree in economics, in 2010. He is currently working as a Professor at the Graduate School of Service and Trade, Institute of Industrial Management, Economics and Trade, Peter the Great St. Petersburg Polytechnic University, Russia. He has distinction by serving on editorials of impact factors journal and having a very innovative list of publications to his credit. His research interests include logistics, smart supply chain, energy, and digital economy.



TAMER AKSOY received the B.A. degree in economics from the Faculty of Political Sciences, Ankara University, the M.A. degree in economics from Hacettepe University, and the Ph.D. degree in international banking from Gazi University. He is currently a Professor of accounting and finance at the School of Business, Ibn Haldun University. He has also a long and extensive work experience spanning over 33 years. He has worked at Citicorp Investment Bank, Zürich, Switzerland, for a short time. He has worked as an Internal Auditor, an Inspector (for ten years), and the Chief Audit Executive (CAE) at the Group's Internal Audit Function (for 23 years) of OYAK. He has worked at the Group of OYAK Maritime and Port Management Inc., as an Advisor to the CEO. Besides, he also acted as a member of board of directors of various leading commercial companies in different sectors, such as Adana Cement; Bolu Cement; Goodyear Tyres, Turkey; Omsan Logistics; Oysa Cement; and Oyak Bank. Furthermore, including the Global Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) in USA, he undertook many duties on voluntary-basis for local/international professional foundations as a Committee Member, the Head of Committee, and a member of BODs/advisory boards. Moreover, he has also international professional licenses of a CPA, a CFE, an Independent Auditor (BD), the CRMA. His research interests include strategic auditing, internal control, financial accounting, financial management, corporate risk management, and international banking.



ÜMİT HACIOĞLU received the Ph.D. degree in finance and banking from Kadir Has University, in 2005. He is currently a Professor of applied business and finance at Ibn Haldun University, Istanbul, Turkey. His research interests include applied business strategies, blockchain economics, digital business strategies, and financial decision making. He is a Founding Member of the Society for the Study of Business and Finance (SSBF) and the Managing Director of the Bussecon International Academy, Istanbul. He had editorial roles in international journals. He is nowadays serving as a Managing Editor for the *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* and the *International Journal of Business Ecosystem and Strategy*.