

Methods and Models for Decision Making

Alberto Colorni – Dipartimento INDACO, Politecnico di Milano Alessandro Lué – Consorzio Poliedra, Politecnico di Milano

MMDM – Lesson 6

God in 7 steps:

- MCDM: a logical path
- Definition of the alternatives
- Choice of the attributes
- Determination of the utility functions
- Preference structure and weights
- Ranking + sensitivity analysis

Index:

- (1) Introduction
- (3) Mental models
- (5) Classification
- (7) Ranking-2, multicriteria
- (9) Rating problems
- (11) Group decision
- (13) Conclusions

- (2) Tools & frame
- (4) Design & decision
- (6) Ranking-1, risk analysis
- (8) A tentative case

(10) Seminar M. Henig

(12) Research topics

Summary

- 1. Rating (sorting)
- 2. An example
- 3. Definition of...
- 4. Comparison between objects and profiles
- 5. When $K S P_{ij}$
- 6. Thresold α (and winning coalitions)
- 7. Students (A, B, C, D)
- 8. Rating revised
- 9. About the method
- 10. More concerning winning coalitions
- 11. Test and conclusions

Rating (sorting)



An example

• Objects to be rated \rightarrow the PhD students of MMDM

 Categories (levels) → Lev-a = excellent Lev-b = good Lev-c = sufficient Lev-d = insufficient

• What procedure ? \rightarrow the logical (& subjective) steps

Definition of...



Comparison between objects and profiles



When K S Pij

- i. Reasons in favor (concordance) \rightarrow HIGH ($\geq \alpha$)
- ii. Reasons aganinst (discordance) \rightarrow
- iii. Strong opposition (veto) \rightarrow NOT PRESENT



- i. Σ weights in favor of $K \ge \alpha$ (threshold to be fixed)
- ii. (not defined in this case)
- iii. If number of lessons < 4 \rightarrow veto K S P_{cd} (so K in Lev-d)

LOW ($\leq \beta$)

Threshold α (and winning coalitions)



Student



Student A



Student B



Student C



C vs P_{ab}
$$\longrightarrow$$
 P_{ab} S C
C vs P_{bc} \longrightarrow it is $\langle \begin{array}{c} C & S & P_{bc} \\ P_{bc} & S & C \end{array}$

Pab

Student D



Rating revised

- 0. Data \rightarrow the categories-levels (4) and the objects (40)
- 1. Choice of indicators-criteria (4)
- 2. Choice of wieghts (48, 30, 7, 15)
- 3. Definition of profiles (profiles = levels -1)
- 4. Definition of relations between K and P_{ij} (threshold, veto, ...)
- 5. Performances of students (A, B, C, D, ...)
- 6. Comparison between K and P_{ij} rating of K

About the method



- The main idea \rightarrow outranking \rightarrow reasons \langle con (weak)
- Concordance, discordance, veto (high) (low) (no)
- Four cases: $A \rightarrow B$, $A \leftarrow B$, A = B, A ? B
- The importance of incomparability
- Threshold (α, β, veto) and sensitivity
- \rightarrow what happens if α decreases ?

pro (strong)

Subjectivity (where ?)

Winning coalition (more...)

- Three parties → Left 48%
 Center 3%
 Right 49%
- Threshold = $50\% + \varepsilon$
- What is the power of each party ?
- Coalitions:

| L | С | R | % | |
|---|---|---|-----|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 49 | |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 52* | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 48 | |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 97* | |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 51* | |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 100 | |
| | | | | |

* = minimal coalition





The groups: • North (N) • Irish (I) • Editors (E)

• Telefonica (T) 30%

39% 10% 21% Г) 30%



POLITECNICO DI MILANO

Coalitions...





Coalitions

- Winning coalition (WC): a coalition between some DM that permits the governance (that means the coalition overcomes the fixed threshold, usually 50% + ε)
- Critical WC (CWC): a WC in which the defection of some DM – but only some – doesn't permit the governance
- Swing vote (SW): in a CWC a SW is a vote that, if modified, determine the failure of the coalition (that means the impossibility of governance).

See also:

Shapley index (1953)

Banzhaf index (1965)

Holler index (public goods, 1982)

$N \rightarrow 39\%$, $I \rightarrow 10\%$, $E \rightarrow 21\%$, $T \rightarrow 30\%$

Threshold =50%+ε

| N | I | E | Т | % | Coa liz. | | N | I | E | Т | % | Coa liz. |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----|-------------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----|-------------|
| <u>39</u> | <u>10</u> | <u>21</u> | <u>30</u> | | | | <u>39</u> | <u>10</u> | <u>21</u> | <u>30</u> | | |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | | | | 0 | 0 | | 69 | CVC |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 21 | | | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 60 | сус |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 1 | 51 | CVC | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 90 | (CV) |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 49 | |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 40 | | | | 1 | 0 | - | 79 | CVC |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 31 | | | 1 | 1 | | 0 | 70 | CVC |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 61 | сус | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 100 | (CV) |

 $N \rightarrow \dots, I \rightarrow \dots, \qquad E \rightarrow \dots, \qquad T \rightarrow \dots$

$N \rightarrow 40\%$, $I \rightarrow 10\%$, $E \rightarrow 20\%$, $T \rightarrow 30\%$

Threshold =50%+ε

| Ν | | E | Т | % | Coa liz. | | Ζ | - | E | Т | % | Coa liz. |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----|-------------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----|-------------|
| <u>40</u> | <u>10</u> | <u>20</u> | <u>30</u> | | | | <u>40</u> | <u>10</u> | <u>20</u> | <u>30</u> | | |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | | | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 70 | CVC |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 20 | | | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 60 | CVC |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 50 | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 90 | (CV) |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 50 | |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 40 | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 80 | CVC |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 30 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 70 | сус |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 60 | сус | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 100 | (CV) |

 $N \rightarrow \dots, I \rightarrow \dots, \qquad E \rightarrow \dots, \qquad T \rightarrow \dots$