

# A Comparison of Strengths and Weaknesses for Analytical Hierarchy Process

R. Karthikeyan<sup>1\*</sup>, K.G.S. Venkatesan<sup>1</sup>, A. Chandrasekar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of C.S.E Bharath University.

<sup>2</sup> Dept of C.S.E St Joseph College of Engineering, Chennai

\*Corresponding author: E-Mail: rkarthikeyan1678@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

This paper manages choice making utilizing the Decision making for (MCDM) and Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP), presented Saaty 1980. This clarifies the qualities, shortcomings, reactions and disadvantages of AHP in choice making.

**KEY WORDS:** Strength, weakness, MCDM, AHP.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Process (AHP) is an effortlessly justifiable, discerning and a deliberate for MCDM strategy, this is presented by Saaty in 1980. In the method comprises of pairs of adages, this characterizes an arrangement in dependable networks, It decreases a colossal complex issue into a more organized organization of simple perception and encourages a more functional methodology.

**Genesis of AHP:** The Professor Saaty's (1980) tremendous spending plan empowered him to contract specialists in distinctive fields including lawyers. The knowledge he picked up from the frustrating results empowered him to figure out that the specialists, their mastery in any case, couldn't make a down to earth way to deal with the issue nor could settle on a choice, maybe because of their correspondence challenges and alternate points of view. This sharp perception made him genuinely consider measurement of conclusions and incited him to build up an orderly system that would offer the normal individuals some assistance with making even convoluted choice, which prompted of (AHP).

**Axioms of AHP:** The maxims are proposals in which were characterized by:

Maxim 1 nominated in the method are followed by the mathematical notation are followed by, If  $A=nB$ , then B is  $(1/n)$  times as vast as A.  $B = (1/n)A$ . i.e.,  $a_{ij} = 1/a_{ji}$ , where i characterizes the line, and j characterizes the section of the lattice.

Maxim 2, named as the homogeneity aphorism, expresses this is the components to be thought about ought to vary by just a couple elements; generally, there will be certainly a blunder in the judgment

Maxim3, named as the desire aphorism, expresses this is the last result to be the view of the chief's mastery.

### Algorithm of AHP:

Step (1): It is the issue choice pecking order containing the aim, Criteria and Chances.

Step (2): Prepare the nxn Matrix pairs.

Step (3): Calculate the weights for every basis, progression of result utilizing a solitary pairwise correlation of every standard.

Step (4): Determine the most extreme Eigen esteem ( $\lambda_{max}$ ) of a network, by the summation of the result of every segment, and the relating geometric mean of every column of the lattice.

Step (5): To calculate the value in R.I

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
0.00	0.00	0.58	0.90	1.12	1.24	1.32	1.41	1.45	1.49	1.51	1.48	1.56	1.57	1.59

**Strengths of AHP:** In this AHP is broadly spread in the scholastic group and connected in distinctive fields like Engineering, Medicine and other sciences. The qualities incorporate

(i) Its usability

(ii) It is an effortlessly reasonable system

(iii) It disentangles a troublesome issue by separating it into littler steps.

(iv) It does not require authentic information sets.

The structure of AHP yields a simple route for a scholastic individual to take care of complex issues.

**Weaknesses:** AHP utilizations accurate qualities for judgments.

i.e., in useful cases, the human emotions are obscure and the chiefs may be not able fix the careful numerical qualities to the examination judgments. For this situation AHP is not material.

It can settle just direct models. i.e., one whose yield is specifically corresponding to its information.

It can't unravel non straight models. i.e., one whose yield is not straightforwardly corresponding to its info. For e.g: Weather gauge.

The AHP can acknowledge just free criteria for making pairwise correlations. The AHP can't consider uncertainty and dangers when a chief is settling on a choice, on the grounds that for all intents and purposes, nature is conflicting, and choice making is construct just with respect to the present circumstance and leader's intuition.

The AHP is exceptionally delicate, in light of the fact that

(a) if there is any expansion or erasure of an option or rule, then the request of the rank may differ.

(b) The leader ought to precisely inspect by filling the definite qualities in the network, generally there will be an irregular result.

The choice making can be simply in view of the past experience of the leader, i.e., the chief's mastery. The preferential judgment of the leader and change of the scale can impact the last consequence of an AHP. For  $n$  criteria,  $n(n-1)/2$  correlations are required. On the off chance that the estimation of  $n$  increments, then the quantity of pairwise correlations increments, which prompts irregularity or disappointment of an AHP algorithm; then the last result may be inexact. (e.g.) for  $3 \times 3$  lattice, Saaty's irregularity proportion is 5%, and for  $4 \times 4$  framework it is 8 %.

The significant criteria can be utilized as a part of the AHP for pairwise Comparisons. Generally the span of the lattice increments, which prompts abnormality or a mistake in making judgments.

Input information are gotten from the pairwise examination of two criteria or two choices. In any case, the pairwise examination is thought to be defective on account of an excessive amount of repetition in the correlations. AHP permits irregularity as a result of absence of data about criteria and choices, and absence of fixation amid pairwise examinations and speakin

**Drawbacks:** There is inconsistency in positioning when including or erasing options utilized as a part of the information set. Rank conservation is unrealistic when utilizing distinctive variations of AHP, for example, Normal AHP or Ideal Mode AHP (RAHP) or Multiplicative AHP (MAHP). This rank inversion is free of the consistency of the matrices. The yield must be simply reliant on the scale utilized, if the same chief uses an alternate scale (say, Balanced Scale or Geometric Scale and so forth) then the last result may be liable to change.

**Criticisms of AHP:** The first AHP characterized by Saaty called verifiable AHP is likewise called typical AHP or a conventional AHP or distributive mode AHP. Be that as it may, rank inversion exists while honing the above technique. This was modified by Belton and Gear (1983), who recommended that when evaluating the last judgment grid, every segment of the framework is to be partitioned by the greatest passage of that segment, and afterward perform utilizing the equation demonstrated as a part of step-12 of the calculation given in segment –IV of this paper. This is thought to be the alteration of the first AHP called updated AHP (RAHP). Saaty (1994), acknowledged the changed AHP, now called an Ideal Mode AHP or BG-AHP. As indicated by Ido Millet & Thomas Saaty (2000), recommends a shut framework i.e., no option can be included or uprooted. At that point the first AHP ought to be best. For an open framework i.e., option can be included or evacuated, the Ideal mode or Revised AHP (RAHP) is suggested. He (1983 and 1987) introduced an arrangement of aphorisms and standards (which are shown in area – III of this paper). The need of a framework can be inferred in light of the info information produced by the pairwise correlation of the network. The info information are determined by utilizing a scale called Saaty scale (direct Scale).

Furthermore the scale is nonsensical as indicated by Holder & Dyer (1990), presents the accompanying two contentions against the utilization of AHP i.e., The sayings of an AHP are defective and the rank created by this system depends on an individual's affair. i.e., Decision Maker's mastery. Notwithstanding the above, Dyer exhibits a sample where a chief inclines toward A three times more than B ( $A=3B$ ) and B five times more than C ( $B=5C$ ), which would infer that A is 15 times more favored than C for, ( $A=3(5C)=15C$ ). In any case, with a scale settled by 9 this reliable judgment is not allowed. In any case, the conclusion, in view of the feedback from Dyer (1990), given by Harker and Vargas, showed that scale depends on the trial perceptions and the hypothesis just requires a settled proportion scale and the choices are homogenous regarding the scale. As per Buede and Maxwell (1995), Rank inversion exists when a disconnected option is included or erased from the dataset. As indicated by Jonathan Barzilai (2001), AHP is not a legitimate technique, it is tormented by numerous blemishes and the maxims of an AHP are significance less. To Marvin Troutt, Suresh Tadisina, Parag Pendharkar (2009), rank inversion might exist when an option is included or expelled from the current option set. Joaquin Perez, Jose Jimeno, Ethel Mokotoff (2006) opine that rank inversion might exist when an option is included or expelled from the current options and every one of the uses of the AHP are conceivably defective. The study by Antoniestam, Pedro Duarte Silva (2003) unmistakably demonstrates that added substance AHP and Multiplicative Analytic Hierarchy Process (MAHP) both show rank inversion however the likelihood of occurrence of rank inversion in MAHP is less when contrasted and added substance AHP. Multiplicative AHP, as indicated by Barzilai and Lootsma (1994), adjusts WPM and produces rank inversion. As per Robert Winkler (1990), the option for an AHP is the Utility hypothesis yet Utility hypothesis is not last arrangement; it depends on the leader's own judgments. The scale utilized is a proportion scale as indicated by Saaty. For all intents and purposes the last yield (worldwide need) demonstrates rank inversion. In any case, the proportion scale has an outright zero with settled length. Starting here of perspective, the scale utilized is not a proportion scale. The last output (global need) shows rank reversal. This is a noteworthy disadvantage one

experiences when utilizing this system. Hubbard & Evans (2010), proclaimed that the pairwise correlations are flawed due to repetition in examinations. In any case, psychologically, this a lot of excess can be overcome by the past experience (expertise or instinct) of the lea.

## 2. CONCLUSION

In this paper can be thought to be a valuable guide in choice making technique. In any case, in genuine circumstances rank inversion exists. This paper unmistakably demonstrates that the last result is specifically relative to scale utilized. In this scale the human emotions are changed over into numerical numbers. Human emotions vary for individual to individual. Mentally, human emotions can't measure. Taking into account certain disadvantages, this strategy can't be precluded in light of the fact that this procedure gives a simple, justifiable, appropriate, efficient and important technique for scholarly group to settle on better choices.

## REFERENCES

- Achudhan M, Prem Jayakumar M, Mathematical modeling and control of an electrically-heated catalyst, *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, 9 (23), 2014, 23013.
- Alessio Ishizaka, Ashraf Labib, Analytic Hierarchy Process & Expert Choice, Benefits & Limitations, *ORInsight*, 22 (4), 2009, 201 – 220.
- Alessio Ishizaka, Ashraf Labib, Review of the main developments in the Analytic Hierarchy Process', *Expert Systems with applications*, 38 (11), 2011, 14336-14345.
- Alessio Ishizaka, Balken borg D, and Kaplan T, Influence of Aggregation and measurement scale on ranking a compromise alternative in AHP', *Journal of operational Research Society*, 62 (4), 2011, 700-710.
- Amos Tversky, Advances in Prospect Theory: Cumulative Representation of uncertainty', *Journal of Risk and uncertainty*, 5, 1992, 297-323
- Antoniastam A, Pedro Duarte Silva, On multiplicative priority rating methods for the AHP', *European Journal of Operational Research*, 145, 2003, 92-108.
- Belton V and Gear T, On a shortcoming of Saaty's method of analytic hierarchies, *Omega*, 11, 1983, 228-230.
- Bozoki S, Rapcsak T, On Saaty's and Koczkodaj's inconsistencies of pairwise comparison matrices', *Journal of Global Optimization*, 42 (2), 2008, 157-175.
- Brugha C, Structuring and Weighting Criteria in Multi Criteria Decision Making (MCDM)', *Trends in Multicriteria Decision Making* : Springer- Verlag, 1998, 229 – 242.
- Gopalakrishnan K, Sundeep Aanand J, Udayakumar R, Electrical properties of doped azopolyester, *Middle - East Journal of Scientific Research*, 20 (11), 2014, 1402-1412.
- Gopinath S, Sundararaj M, Elangovan S, Rathakrishnan E, Mixing characteristics of elliptical and rectangular subsonic jets with swirling co-flow, *International Journal of Turbo and Jet Engines*, 32 (1), 2015, 73-83.
- Ilayaraja K, Ambica A, Spatial distribution of groundwater quality between injambakkam-thiruvannamiyur areas, south east coast of India, *Nature Environment and Pollution Technology*, 14 (4), 2015, 771-776.
- Kerana Hanirex D, Kaliyamurthi KP, Kumaravel A, Analysis of improved tdtr algorithm for mining frequent itemsets using dengue virus type 1 dataset: A combined approach, *International Journal of Pharma and Bio Sciences*, 6 (2), 2015, 288-295.
- Lingeswaran K, Prasad Karamcheti SS, Gopikrishnan M, Ramu G, Preparation and characterization of chemical bath deposited cds thin film for solar cell, *Middle - East Journal of Scientific Research*, 20 (7), 2014, 812-814.
- Premkumar S, Ramu G, Gunasekaran S, Baskar D, Solar industrial process heating associated with thermal energy storage for feed water heating, *Middle - East Journal of Scientific Research*, 20 (11), 2014, 1686-1688.
- Sundar Raj M, Saravanan T, Srinivasan V, Design of silicon-carbide based cascaded multilevel inverter, *Middle - East Journal of Scientific Research*, 20 (12), 2014, 1785-1791.
- Thooyaman KP, Khanaa V, Udayakuma R, Wide area wireless networks-IETF, *Middle - East Journal of Scientific Research*, 20 (12), 2014, 2042-2046.
- Thooyamani KP, Khanaa V, Udayakumar R, Using integrated circuits with low power multi bit flip-flops in different approach, *Middle - East Journal of Scientific Research*, 20 (12), 2014, 2586-2593.

Thooyamani KP, Khanaa V, Udayakumar R, Application of pattern recognition for farsi license plate recognition, Middle - East Journal of Scientific Research, 18 (12), 2013, 1768-1774.

Thooyamani KP, Khanaa V, Udayakumar R, Efficiently measuring denial of service attacks using appropriate metrics, Middle - East Journal of Scientific Research, 20 (12), 2014, 2464-2470.

Thooyamani KP, Khanaa V, Udayakumar R, Partial encryption and partial inference control based disclosure in effective cost cloud, Middle - East Journal of Scientific Research, 20 (12), 2014, 2456-2459.

Thooyamani KP, Khanaa V, Udayakumar R, Virtual instrumentation based process of agriculture by automation, Middle - East Journal of Scientific Research, 20 (12), 2014, 2604-2612.

Udayakumar R, Kaliyamurthi KP, Khanaa, Thooyamani KP, Data mining a boon: Predictive system for university topper women in academia, World Applied Sciences Journal, 29 (14), 2014, 86-90.