Сучасний стан наукових досліджень та технологій в промисловості. 2020. № 4 (14) ISSN 2522-9818 (print)
ISSN 2524-2296 (online)

UDC 004.9: 519.81 DOI: https://doi.org/10.30837/ITSSI.2020.14.013

V. BESKOROVAINYI

COMBINED METHOD OF RANKING OPTIONS IN PROJECT DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEMS

The **subject** of research in the article is the process of ranking options in project decision support systems. The **goal** of the work is to create a method for ranking options to improve the efficiency of decision support systems by coordinating the interaction between automatic and interactive procedures of computer-aided design systems. The following **tasks** are solved in the article: review and analysis of the current state of the problem of ranking options in design decision support systems; decomposition of the problem of project decision support; development of a combined method of ranking options, which combines the procedures of technologies of ordinalistic and cardinalistic ordering; development of a method of minimax selection of options from a set of effective for the procedure of expert evaluation. The following **methods** are used: systems theory, utility theory, optimization and operations research. **Results.** As a result of the analysis of the modern methodology of decision support, the existence of the problem of correct reduction of subsets of effective design options for ranking, taking into account factors that are difficult to formalize, knowledge and experience of the decision maker (DM), has been established. The decomposition of the problem of supporting the making of design decisions into the tasks of determining the goal of designing an object, forming a universal set of design decisions, identifying sets of admissible and effective decisions, ranking and choosing the best design option for decision makers has been performed. A combined method for ranking options has been developed, which combines the procedures of ordinalistic and cardinalistic ordering technologies and allows you to correctly reduce subsets of effective design solutions for ranking decision makers. A method of minimax selection of options from a set of effective ones for the expert evaluation procedure of decision makers has been developed, which allows improving the quality of the assessment. **Conclusions.** The developed method expands the methodological foundations of automation of processes for supporting multi-criteria design decisions, allows for the correct reduction of the set of effective alternatives for the final choice, taking into account factors that are difficult to formalize, knowledge and experience of decision makers. The practical use of the results obtained due to the proposed procedure for determining the set of effective solutions will reduce the time and capacitive complexity of decision support, and due to the use of the maximin procedure for selecting options in the synthesis of the estimation model – to improve the quality of design solutions.

Keywords: design automation; multicriteria evaluation; effective solutions; comparative identification; project decision support; utility theory.

Introduction

Increasing the requirements for the functional characteristics of anthropogenic objects, which are operated in various spheres of human activity, leads to the complexity of technologies and means of their design [1]. Within the methodology of the system approach to obtain effective and sustainable design solutions, it is advisable to jointly solve the problems of structural, parametric and technological optimization of objects at all major stages of their life cycles [2]. However, most of these problems are combinatorial in nature and are solved by a set of functional and cost indicators in terms of incomplete definition of goals and data [3-4].

The most complex objects of design and management are organizational and technical systems, which are characterized by significant structural complexity and contain, along with traditional technical components, active (organizational) elements [5]. In territorially distributed technical and organizational-technical objects (service systems, logistics, telecommunications, monitoring, etc.) cost and functional characteristics are significantly dependent on their topology (territorial organization) [6-7]. The processes of design, development planning or reengineering of such objects are even more complex due to the fact that they include in addition to the above traditional synthesis problems the problem of their topological optimization [8-10]. This leads to the need to generate and analyze super-powerful sets of alternatives. However, the vast majority of decisions generated using automatic procedures are inefficient, and the choice of the implementation of the design object is made by the decision maker (DM), who is able to analyze and make a choice among only a few options [11].

At the same time, it is often not possible to substantiate a single scalar criterion for assessing efficiency, which would fully characterize the alternatives. Based on this, DM evaluates the effectiveness of the alternative as a whole based on the analysis of some set of contradictory criteria, each of which characterizes some of its partial properties [12-14]. Evaluation of the effectiveness of alternatives is traditionally carried out using the theory of utility. The decision-making process for choosing the best project option is carried out using the methods of individual or collective expert evaluation [15-17]. The above raises problems of coordination of interaction between automatic and interactive design procedures of computer-aided design systems. One of them is the problem of forming and correctly reducing the set of effective alternatives for the final choice, taking into account factors that are difficult to formalize, knowledge and experience of DM.

Analysis of the problem and methods of its solution

In the first stages of formalization, the essence of the problem of project decision-making can be represented by the logical expression "necessary s^o" or formally $<-, s^o>$ (where s^o is the optimal project decision) [18]. In this case, the decision-making situation d (formally $<d, ->$) is usually not defined clearly enough. To move to the decision-making task of the form, the problem is decomposed into a set of auxiliary problems of the form: "given $<d,->$, necessary $<d,s^o>$", i.e. $<<d,->,<d,s^o>>$, or "given $<-,s^o>$, necessary $<d,s^o>$", ie $<<-,s^o>,<d,s^o>>$.

In the subsequent stages, the problem of making design decisions can be presented as a system Pr, consisting of the set of tasks [19]:

$$Pr=<Tasks,Rels>,\ Tasks=\{Task_i\},\ i=\overline{1,6}, \qquad (1)$$

where $Tasks$ – the set of tasks obtained as a result of decomposition of the problem; $Rels$ – the set of relationships between tasks that determine the scheme of their relationships on input and output data; $Task_1$ – goal setting; $Task_2$ – formation of a universal set of design solutions S^U; $Task_3$ – selection of a set of valid solutions $S\subseteq S^U$; $Task_4$ – selection of a subset of effective solutions $S^E\subset S\subset S^U$; $Task_5$ –decisions $s\in S^E$ ranking; $Task_6$ – choosing the best design solution $s^o\in S^E$.

The task of determining the goal $Task_1$ is to establish the set and importance of indicators (partial criteria) of effectiveness $k_i(s)$, $i=\overline{1,m}$, which adequately characterize the design solutions [6, 20]. It determines the relationship between functional $k_j(s)\in Q(s)$ and costly $k_l(s)\in C(s)$ characteristics $k_i(s)$, $i=\overline{1,m}$ of the design solutions. The generalized functional effect $\overline{Q}(s)$ of the object S in the general case is a non-decreasing function of the amount of resources to achieve it (cost) $\overline{Q}(s)=F[\overline{C}(s)]$ (where $\overline{Q}(s)$ and $\overline{C}(s)$ are generalized scalar estimates of the effect and costs S; F is an operator that reflects the strategy of resource use, which is determined by the construction option of the S object).

The problem of determining the universal set of design solutions S^U ($Task_2$) is combinatorial in nature and can have computational complexity from $O[2^n]$ to $O[n!]$. Its solution is carried out based on the specifics of the projected object and the design task. In practice, methods of directed search are widely used, which allow to significantly reduce the set of alternative solutions that are generated and analyzed in the process of designing objects [21].

The problem of determining the set of admissible solutions $S\subseteq S^U$ ($Task_3$) is to remove from the universal set S^U of a subset of solutions $\overline{S}$ that do not satisfy the constraint of the problem to be solved $S=S^U\setminus\overline{S}$ [6]:

$$k_j(s)\,\substack{\ge\\ \le}\,k_j^*\quad \forall k_j(s)\in Q(s),\ k_l(s)\le k_l^*\ \ \forall k_l(s)\in Q(s).\ (2)$$

The task of selecting a subset of effective design solutions $S^E\subset S$ ($Task_4$) is to remove from the admissible set $S\subset S^U$ of subsets of inefficient solutions $\overline{S}^E\subset S$. Thus the variant of the design decision $s^E\in S^E$ is called effective if on a set S of admissible design decisions there is no decision $s\in S$ for which inequalities would be fair [22]:

$$k_i(s)\ge k_i(s^E),\ \text{if}\ k_i(s)\to max, \qquad (3)$$

$$k_i(s)\le k_i(s^E),\ \text{if}\ k_i(s)\to min \qquad (4)$$

and at least one of them was strict.

Depending on the features of the problem, methods are used to solve it: discrete choice, weight [23], pairwise comparisons, Carlin, Hermeyer [22], evolutionary search [24-26].

Methods of discrete choice and pairwise comparisons allow to correctly select subsets of effective solutions, but have a relatively high time complexity.

A subset of effective variants $S^E\subset S$ by the Carlin method is found by combining solutions s_i^o and $i=\overline{1,m}$ that optimize each of the partial criteria by solving a set of parametric programming problems [22, 27]:

$$s_i^o=arg\ \max_{s\in S}\{P(s)=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\lambda_i\xi_i(s)\}, \qquad (5)$$

$$\lambda_i\in\Lambda=\{\lambda_i:\lambda_i>0\ \ \forall i=\overline{1,m},\ \sum_{i=1}^{m}\lambda_i=1\}, \qquad (6)$$

where $\xi_i(s)$ – the value of the utility function (normalized value) of the i-th partial criterion; λ_i – weighting factor of the i-th partial criterion.

The subset of effective design solutions $S^E\subset S$ by the Hermeyer method is determined by combining options s_i^o, $i=\overline{1,m}$ that optimize each of the local criteria by solving a set of parametric programming problems [22-27]:

$$s_i^o=arg\ \max_{s\in S}\{P(s)=\min_i\lambda_i\xi_i(s)\}, \qquad (7)$$

$$\lambda_i\in\Lambda=\{\lambda_i:\lambda_i>0\ \ \forall i=\overline{1,m},\ \sum_{i=1}^{m}\lambda_i=1. \qquad (8)$$

To reduce the time complexity of the methods of pairwise comparisons, Carlin and Hermeyer use procedures for selecting subsets of suboptimal Pareto solutions S' for which the condition is satisfied $S^E\subseteq S'\subseteq S$ [28]. They are implemented by the methods of "sector" or "segment" and provide for a set of acceptable solutions $S=\{s\}$ to pre-determine the best options for each of the partial criteria k_i^+, $i=\overline{1,m}$. Hyperplanes are drawn through the points k_i^+, $i=\overline{1,m}$ lying on the boundary of the set of admissible solutions $S=\{s\}$ in the area of partial criteria. Hyperplanes will divide variants into subsets that fall into a sector $S_1'\supseteq S^E$ or segment $S_2'\supseteq S^E$, respectively, and those that are inefficient in the sense of (3)-(4):

$$S = S_1' \bigcup \overline{S}^E , \quad S_1' \bigcap \overline{S}^E = \varnothing ; \tag{9}$$

$$S = S_2' \bigcup \overline{S}^E , \quad S_2' \bigcap \overline{S}^E = \varnothing . \tag{10}$$

Among evolution, the most popular method is based on a genetic algorithm with non-dominant sorting NSGA-II [29]. It is used to determine the Pareto front on acceptable sets of ultra-large size and has the ability to give convergence to the front and a good distribution of solutions across the front. To accelerate the rate of convergence of genetic algorithms to the Pareto front, a method of reducing the number of target functions based on the principal components method is used [30].

The ranking of solutions ($Task_5$) and the choice of the best design solution $s^o \in S^E$ ($Task_6$) is based on the paradigm of utility maximization within the framework of ordinalistic or cardinalistic approaches [23]. When using the ordinalistic approach, the ordering of a small set of effective solutions $s \in S^E$ is carried out by DM. When using the cardinalistic approach, a generalized efficiency criterion $P(s)$ is formed; it is used for scalar evaluation and selection of the best design solution:

$$s^o = \arg \max_{s \in S^E} P(s) . \tag{11}$$

At the same time, in both approaches, it is considered that each of the design solutions is assigned a value of some of its value $P(s)$, which determines their order [19]:

$$\begin{gathered} \forall s, v \in S : \ s \sim v \leftrightarrow P(s) = P(v) ; \\ s \succ v \leftrightarrow P(s) > P(v) ; \\ s \succsim v \leftrightarrow P(s) \geq P(v) . \end{gathered} \tag{12}$$

To solve these problems, methods of comparative identification [11, 19] or expert collective assessment [31-35] are used, which give quite satisfactory results on a set of effective low-power solutions. In this case, the model of generalized utility based on the Kolmogorov-Gabor polynomial is used as a universal one [11, 19, 36].

Research results

According to the results of the review of the current state of the problem of project decision support, it is established that:

- most design tasks are multi-criteria and have a combinatorial nature;
- the process of solving them involves the generation and automatic analysis of huge numbers of design solutions;
- the vast majority of solutions generated in the design process are ineffective according to Pareto;
- methods of allocating subsets of effective solutions have a high time and capacitive complexity and, based on the peculiarities of design tasks, give subsets of enormous power;
- evaluation of the effectiveness of design solutions is traditionally carried out using the theory of utility;
- the process of making a final decision is carried out using the methods of expert evaluation, in the process of which only a small number of project decisions can be analyzed.

There is a need to correctly reduce subsets of effective design solutions for ranking, taking into account factors that are difficult to formalize, knowledge and experience of DM.

The aim is to develop a combined method of ranking options in project decision support systems, which will be based on the procedures of ordinalistic and cardinalistic ordering.

As a result of decomposition of the problem of obtaining stable and effective system solutions for complex design objects at the l-th (lower) level, we will highlight the tasks [6]: $Task_1^l$ – definition of the principles of object construction; $Task_2^l$ – choice of object structure; $Task_3^l$ – determination of the topology of elements and connections; $Task_4^l$ – choice of operating technology; $Task_5^l$ – determination of parameters of elements and connections; $Task_6^l$ – evaluation of efficiency and selection of design solutions.

The scheme of system optimization of the object on the selected set of tasks can be presented in the form of a tuple [37]:

$$SysOptS = \ < Tasks, InDat, Res, DesDec, ProcDec > , \tag{13}$$

where: $Tasks = < Task_i^l >$, $i = \overline{1,6}$ – an ordered set of tasks; $InDat$ – set of input data tasks; Res is a set of task constraints; $DesDec$ is a set of design optimization solutions; $ProcDec$ – a decisive procedure that assigns a non-empty subset $\{ DesDec_i^2 \}$, $i = \overline{1,6}$ to each pair $< InDat_i^2 , Res_i^2 >$.

The number of design solutions $Card(S^U)$ increases nonlinearly with increasing dimension of the problem (the number of partial criteria for evaluating solutions m, the number of elements of the design object n, the number of types of elements, the number of possible locations of elements, etc.). It is known that the power of a set of effective solutions is much less than the power of a set of acceptable solutions $Card(S^E) << Card(S)$.

Table 1 shows examples of increasing the capacity of the universal set of acceptable $Card(S^U)$, subsets of effective design solutions $Card(S^E)$ and reducing the relative capacity of the subset of effective solutions $\delta S = Card(S^E) / Card(S^U)$ in the task of structural and topological optimization of a three-level centralized object on four indicators ($m = 4$).

Table 1. *Estimation of capacities of sets of admissible and effective design decisions*

n	15	20	25	30	35	40
$Card\ (S^U)$	$3{,}27\cdot10^4$	$1{,}04\cdot10^6$	$3{,}35\cdot10^7$	$1{,}07\cdot10^9$	$3{,}44\cdot10^{10}$	$1{,}09\cdot10^{12}$
$Card\ (S^E)$	$7{,}53\cdot10^2$	$9{,}12\cdot10^3$	$5{,}7\cdot10^4$	$1{,}18\cdot10^6$	$2{,}06\cdot10^7$	$8{,}79\cdot10^7$
δS	0,023	0,0087	0,0017	0,0011	0,0006	0,00008

To solve the problem of ranking solutions from the sets $S=\{s\}$ acceptable in design automation systems, a combined expert-machine method is proposed. It involves the sequential implementation of the following stages: selection on the set of allowable subsets of effective options $S^E \subseteq S$, $Card(S^E) << Card(S)$; determining the preferences of experts on the importance of different properties of options $s \in S^E$, which are assessed by partial criteria $k_i(s)$, $i=\overline{1,m}$; parametric synthesis of the generalized utility function $P(s)$; ranking of options using the synthesized generalized utility function $P(s) > P(v) \leftrightarrow s \succ v\ \forall s,v \in S^E$; selection on a subset S^E of a subset of some of the most effective options $S' \subseteq S^E$, $card(S') << card(S^E)$; determining the ranks of a subset of the most effective options.

Taking into account the limitations of the problem and the use of directed search methods can significantly reduce the set of acceptable solutions S relative to the universal set of solutions S^U, which leads to a corresponding reduction of the subset of effective solutions S^E. However, in practice, the allocation of a subset of effective solutions $S^E \subset S$, storage and processing of information about it is quite problematic.

Based on this, it is proposed not to select a subset S^E of the set of acceptable solutions, but to form it in the process of generating options. This allows not only to significantly reduce the amount of memory to store the characteristics of options for a set of indicators $k_i(s)$, $i=\overline{1,m}$, but also the computer time to install a subset of effective solutions.

It is proposed to determine the advantages of DM by parametric synthesis of the generalized utility function of solution variants based on the Kolmogorov-Gabor polynomial. [11, 19]:

$$P(s)=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\lambda_i\xi_i(s)+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=i}^{m}\lambda_{ij}\xi_i(s)\xi_j(s)+ \\ +\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=i}^{m}\sum_{l=j}^{m}\lambda_{ijl}\xi_i(s)\xi_j(s)\xi_l(s)+\ldots, \qquad (14)$$

$$\xi_i(s)=\bar{k}_i(s)=\frac{k_i(s)-k_i^-}{k_i^+-k_i^-}, \quad i=\overline{1,m}, \qquad (15)$$

where $P(s)$ – generalized scalar assessment of the effectiveness of the solution $s \in S^E$; m – number of partial criteria; λ_i, λ_{ij}, λ_{ijl} – coefficients of importance of criteria $k_i(s)$, $i=\overline{1,m}$ and product of criteria $k_i(s)$, $k_j(s)$, $k_l(s)$; $0<\xi_i(s)<1$, $i=\overline{1,m}$ – the value of the utility function of the partial criterion $k_i(s)$, $i=\overline{1,m}$ for a solution *s*; $k_i(s)$, k_i^+, k_i^- – accordingly, the value of the partial criterion for the solution s, the best and worst value of the criterion $k_i(s)$, $i=\overline{1,m}$.

Function (15) requires a minimum number of machine operations to calculate its values among common functions [20]. For a more accurate nonlinear (*S*- and *Z*-shaped) approximation of estimates of the usefulness of the values of partial criteria, it is proposed to use a universal gluing function, which is the best in terms of the complex indicator "accuracy-complexity" among the common [38]:

$$\xi(s)=\begin{cases}\bar{a}(b_1+1)\left(1-\left(b_1/\left(b_1+\dfrac{\bar{k}(s)}{\bar{k}_a}\right)\right)\right), 0\le\bar{k}(s)\le\bar{k}_a; \\ \bar{a}+(1-\bar{a})(b_2+1)\times\times\left(1-\left(b_2/\left(b_2+\dfrac{\bar{k}(s)-\bar{k}_a}{1-\bar{k}_a}\right)\right)\right), \bar{k}_a<\bar{k}(s)\le 1,\end{cases} \qquad (16)$$

where $\xi(s)=\bar{k}(s)$; $\bar{k}_a, \bar{a}$ – normalized values of the coordinates of the gluing point, $0\le\bar{k}_a\le 1$, $0\le\bar{a}\le 1$; b_1, b_2 – coefficients that determine the type of dependence on the initial and final segments of the function.

The value k_i^-, $i=\overline{1,m}$ for (15) should be determined on the whole set of admissible solutions $S=\{s\}$. Their definition only on a subset of effective S^E leads to the fact that the worst values of the utility functions of partial criteria $\xi_i(s)$, $i=\overline{1,m}$ (15) and (16) will be equal to 0 [11]. In this case, the property of universality of the model constructed on the basis of the Kolmogorov-Gabor polynomial (14) disappears and it is transformed into the classical additive model.

The number of summonds N in model (14) is determined by the required accuracy of restoring the benefits of DM. To determine the parameters of model (14) we will use the technology of comparative identification [11, 36].

The unreasonable choice of solutions for the parametric synthesis of model (14) reduces the accuracy of determining the advantages of DM, which is given by the values of the weight coefficients, λ_i, λ_{ij}, λ_{ijl},…. To increase the accuracy of identifying the advantages of DM, we select among the effective subset of a given number of the best options $S' \subseteq S^E$ by criterion:

$$s' = arg \max_{s \in S^E} \min_{1 \le i \le m} \xi_i(s). \qquad (17)$$

DM on the basis of requirements to the design decision and subjective estimations forms the binary relation of strict advantage on pairs of options [39]:

$$R(S') = \{ <s,v>: \ s,v \in S', \ s \succ v \}. \qquad (18)$$

Given the possibility of scalar estimation of solutions (14), for relation (18) we make a system of inequalities:

$$P(\lambda,s) > P(\lambda,v), \ s,v \in R(S'), \qquad (19)$$

where λ – the desired vector of parameters of the generalized utility model (14).

Let's enter the notation:

$$\xi_1(x)\cdot\xi_1(x) = \xi_{m+1}(x), \ \lambda_{1,1} = \lambda_{m+1}, \ \xi_1(x)\cdot\xi_2(x) = \xi_{m+2}(x),$$
$$\lambda_{1,2} = \lambda_{m+2}, \ \dots . \qquad (20)$$

The maximum number of terms of model (14) is $N = C^n_{m+n} - 1$ (where n is the given degree of the polynomial). Taking into account the accepted notation (20), model (14) can be presented in the classical additive form:

$$P(\lambda,s) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \, \xi_i(s). \qquad (21)$$

Then the problem of parametric synthesis of the generalized utility function (21) is reduced to determining the vector of weight coefficients $[\lambda_i]$, $i = \overline{1,N}$, which satisfies the formed system of inequalities and normalizing conditions:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i = 1, \ \lambda_i \ge 0, \ \ i = \overline{1,N}. \qquad (22)$$

Taking into account (21) we present a system of inequalities (19) and equations (22), in the form:

$$\eta_j(\lambda) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \, \xi_i(s) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \, \xi_i(v) > 0, \ \ <s,v> \in R(S'),$$
$$j = \overline{1,n'}, \qquad (23)$$

$$\eta_{n_S+1}(\lambda) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i = 1, \ \lambda_i \ge 0, \ i = \overline{1,N},$$

where $n' = Card \ R(S')$ – the power of the set of the established ratio of strict advantage (19).

The first part of the system (23) are homogeneous inequalities defining the set of planes that pass through the origin, and the second part acts as a normalizing condition and defines the cutting plane.

The obtained system of inequalities and equations (23) can have innumerable solutions or be incompatible (if there are contradictions in the advantages of DM). The problem of determining stable estimates of the vector of weights of model (21) can be reduced to finding the Chebyshev point [11, 19, 39].

Let's introduce an additional variable λ_{N+1} in the system of constraints (23) and require that the conditions $\eta_j(\lambda) \le \lambda_{N+1}$, $j = \overline{1,n'}$ are satisfied. Then the search for the Chebyshev point of system (23) is reduced to solving the problem:

$$\lambda_{N+1} \to \min;$$

$$\begin{cases} \eta_j(\lambda) + \lambda_{N+1} > 0, & j = \overline{1,n'}, \\ \eta_{n'+1}(\lambda) \equiv \sum\limits_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i = 1, & \lambda_i \ge 0, \quad i = \overline{1,N}. \end{cases} \qquad (24)$$

If the system of inequalities (24) is compatible, then the indicator variable is

$$r = \min_{\lambda} \max_{j} \eta_j(\lambda) \le 0, \qquad (25)$$

and the obtained solution λ^o will be as resistant as possible to possible shifts of the constraint planes (variations of DM advantages). If the system of constraints (24) is incompatible, then $r > 0$. In this case, for the system of DM advantages, given by the binary relation $R(S')$ (18), there is no vector of weight coefficients of partial criteria $[\lambda_i]$ that satisfies the conditions (24).

At the next stage, the values of the generalized utility function $P(\lambda^o, s)$ (21) are calculated for all effective variants $s \in S^E$ with the set values of weight coefficients $[\lambda_i^o]$, $i = \overline{1,N}$. This allows the ranking of the whole set of effective options using the values of the synthesized generalized utility function.

At the last stage, based on the quantitative evaluation of options $P(\lambda^o, s)$, $s \in S^E$, a subset $S^o \in S^E$ of a given number n^o of the best options is selected. With $Card(S^o) << Card(S^E)$. After that, DM, using the methods of expert evaluation or lexicographic optimization, makes the final choice of the best option $s^o \in S^o$.

Conclusions

In the process of analyzing the problem of project decision support, it was found that most design tasks are multi-criteria and combinatorial, and the final decision-making processes are carried out using expert evaluation methods by analyzing only a small number of options. In practice, this leads to the problem of correctly reducing subsets of effective design solutions for ranking, taking into account factors that are difficult to formalize, knowledge and experience of DM. As a result of decomposition of the problem of support of design decisions the tasks of definition of the purpose of designing of object, formation of universal set of design decisions, allocation of sets of admissible and effective decisions, ranking and a choice of the best design decision are allocated.

To coordinate the interaction between automatic and interactive design procedures of automated design and control systems, a combined method of ranking options is proposed, which combines the procedures of ordinalistic and cardinalistic ordering technologies. It involves the sequential implementation of the stages of formation of a subset of effective options, determining the preferences of experts on the importance of individual properties of options, which are evaluated by partial criteria, parametric synthesis of generalized utility function, ranking options using synthesized generalized utility function, selection of subsets of multiple options and several ranks of the options selected in this way. Parametric synthesis of the generalized utility function, built on the basis of the Kolmogorov-Gabor polynomial, is proposed to be carried out using the method of comparative identification on a set of alternatives with maximum values of indicators.

The developed method expands the methodological principles of automation of support processes for multi-criteria design solutions, allows to correctly reduce the set of effective alternatives for the final choice, taking into account factors that are difficult to formalize, knowledge and experience of DM. The practical use of the obtained results due to the proposed procedure for determining the set of effective decisions will reduce the time and capacity complexity of decision support, and through the use of maximum selection in the synthesis of the evaluation model that is to improve the quality of design decisions.

References

1. Kossiakoff, A., Sweet, W. N., Seymour, S. J., Biemer, S. M. (2011), *Systems Engineering Principles and Practice*, Hoboken, New Jersey : A John Wiley & Sons, 599 p.
2. Timchenko, A. A. (2004), *Fundamentals of system design and analysis of complex objects: Fundamentals of system approach and system analysis of objects of new technology* [*Osnovy systemnoho proektuvannya ta analizu skladnykh ob'yektiv: Osnovy systemnoho pidkhodu ta systemnoho analizu ob'yektiv novoyi tekhniky*], Ed. by Yu. G. Legi, Kyiv, Lybid, 288 p.
3. Greco, S., Ehrgott, M., Figueira, J. R. (2016), *Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis – State of the Art Surveys*, New York : USA, Springer, 1346 p.
4. Kaliszewski, I., Kiczkowiak, T., Mirofori-dis, J. (2016), "Mechanical design, Multiple Criteria Decision Making and Pareto optimality gap", *Engineering Computations*, Vol. 33 (3), P. 876–895.
5. Putyatin, V. G. (2015), "Choosing a rational option for the technical implementation of a complex organizational and technical system in the context of multi-criteria" ["Vibor ratsional'nogo varianta tekhnicheskoy realizatsii slozhnoy organizatsionno-tekhncheskoy sistemi v usloviyakh mnogokriterial'nosti"], *Restratsiya, zberigannya and i obrobka danih*, Vol. 17, No. 4, P. 71–92.
6. Beskorovainyi, V. V. (2002), "Systemological analysis of the problem of structural synthesis of geographically distributed systems" ["Sistemologicheskiy analiz problemy strukturnogo sinteza territorial'no raspredelennykh sistem"], Automated control systems and automation devices, Issue 120, P. 29–37.
7. Beskorovainyi, V., Kuropatenko, O., Gobov, D. (2019), "Optimization of transportation routes in a closed logistics system", *Innovative Technologies and Scientific Solutions for Industries*, No. 4 (10), P.24–32. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30837/2522-9818.2019.10.024
8. Under total. ed. Vasilieva, S. N., Zvirkuna, A. D. (2019), "Managing the Development of Large-Scale Systems" ["Upravleniye razvitiyem krupnomasshtabnykh sistem"], *Proceedings of the 12th Int. Conference (MLSD'2019), 1-3 Oct. 2019*, Moscow, IPU RAN, 1294 p.
9. Yelizyeva, A., Artiukh, R., Persiyanova, E. (2019), "Target and system aspects of the transport infrastructure development program", *Innovative Technologies and Scientific Solutions for Industries*, No. 3 (9), P. 81–90. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30837/2522-9818.2019.9.081
10. Kosenko, V., Gopejenko, V., Persiyanova, E. (2019), "Models and applied information technology for supply logistics in the context of demand swings", *Innovative Technologies and Scientific Solutions for Industries*, No. 1 (7), P. 59–68. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30837/2522-9818.2019.7.059
11. Petrov, K. E., Deineko, A. A., Chalaya, O. V., Panferova, I. Y. (2020), "Method of ranking options in the procedure of collective expert evaluation" ["Metod ranzhyrovanyya variantiv pry provedenyy protsedury kollektyvnoho ékspertnoho otsenyvanyya"], *Radioelectronics, Informatics, Management*, No. 2, P. 84–94.
12. Bernasconi, M., Choirat, C., Seri, R. (2014), "Empirical properties of group preference aggregation methods employed in AHP: Theory and evidence", *European Journal of Operational Research*, No. 232, P. 584–592.
13. Podolyaka, O. A., Podolyaka, A. N. (2015), "Application of ordinal normalization and scrambling of criteria for solving multicriteria problems" ["Prymenenye poryadkovoy normalyzatsyy y skremblyrovanyya kryteryev dlya reshenyya mnohokryteryalʹnykh zadach"], *Automotive and Electronics. Modern technologies*, No. 8, P. 60–69.
14. Ataei, M., Shahsavany, H., Mikaeil, R. (2013), "Monte Carlo Analytic Hierarchy Process (MAHP) approach to selection of optimum mining method", *International Journal of Mining Science and Technology*, No. 23, P. 573–578.
15. Bagočius, V., Zavadskas, E. K., Turskis, Z. (2014), "Multi-person selection of the best wind tur-bine based on the multi-criteria integrated additive-multiplicative utility function", *Journal of Civil Engineering and Management*, No. 20, P. 590–599.
16. Baky, I. A. (2014), "Interactive TOPSIS algorithms for solving multi-level non-linear multi-objective decision-making problems", *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, No. 38, P. 1417–1433.
17. Baky, I., Abo-Sinna, M. (2013), "ATOPSIS for bi-level MODM problems", *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, No, 37, P. 1004-1015.
18. Vilkas, E. Y., Mayminas, E. Z. (1981), *Solution: theory, information, modeling* [*Resheniye: teoriya, informatsiya, modelirovaniye*], Moscow : Radio and Communication, 328 p.

19. Petrov, E. G., Brynza, N. A., Kolesnik, L. V., Pisklakova, O. A. (2014), *Methods and models of decision making in conditions of multicriteria and uncertainty* [*Metody i modeli prinyatiya resheniy v usloviyakh mnogokriterial'nosti i neopredelennosti*], Kherson : Grin D. S., 192 p.

20. Beskorovainyi, V., Berezovskyi, G. (2017), "Estimating the properties of technological systems based on fuzzy sets", *Innovative Technologies and Scientific Solutions for Industries*, No. 1 (1), P. 14–20. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30837/2522-9818.2017.1.014

21. Beskorovainyi, V., Podolyaka, K. (2015), "Modifications of the directed search method for reengineering the topological structures of large-scale monitoring systems" ["Modifikatsii metoda napravlennogo perebora dlya reinzhiniringa topologicheskikh struktur sistem krupnomasshtabnogo monitoringa"], *Radioelectronics and Informatics*, No. 3 (70), P. 55–62.

22. Beskorovainyi, V., Petryshyn, L, Shevchenko, O. (2020), "Specific subset effective option in technology design decisions", *Applied Aspects of Information Technology*, Vol. 3, No. 1, P. 443–455.

23. Bezruk, V. M., Chebotareva, D. V., Skorik, Yu. V. (2017), *Multicriteria analysis and choice of telecommunication means* [*Mnogokriterial'nyy analiz i vybor sredstv telekommunikatsiy*], Kharkiv : Ukraine, FOP Koryak S. F., 268 p.

24. Deb, K., Deb, D. (2014), "Analysing mutation schemes for real-parameter genetic algorithms", *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Soft Computing*, No. 4 (1), P. 1–28.

25. Deb, K., Himanshu, J. (2014), "An evolutionary many-objective optimization algorithm using reference-point-based nondominated sorting approach, part I: Solving problems with box constraints", *IEEE Trans. Evolutionary Computation*, No. 18 (4), P. 577–601.

26. Kalyanmoy, D. (2011), "Multi-objective optimization using evolutionary algorithms: an introduction", *In Multi-objective evolutionary optimization for product design and manufacturing*, Springer, P. 3–34.

27. Mikhalevich, V. S., Volkovich, V. L. (1982), *Computational methods of research and design of complex systems* [*Vychislitel'nyye metody issledovaniya i proyektirovaniya slozhnykh sistem*], Moscow : Nauka, 288 p.

28. Beskorovainyi, V., Krasko, A. (2017), "Automation of processes for choosing effective solutions in the automated design of control and automation systems" ["Avtomatizatsiya protsessov vybora effektivnykh resheniy pri avtomatizirovannom proyektirovanii sistem upravleniya i avtomatiki"], *Bulletin of the Kherson National Technical University*, No. 4 (27), P. 208–212.

29. Deb, K., Pratap, A., Agarwal, S., Meyarivan, T. (2002), "A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: NSGA-II", *IEEE transactions on evolutionary computation*, Vol. 6 (2), P. 182–197.

30. Shadura, O. (2019), "Modification of genetic algorithms based on the method of non-centered principal components and standard tests" ["Modyfikatsiya henetychnykh alhorytmiv na osnovi metodu netsetrovanykh holovnykh komponent ta standartni testy"], *World Science*, No. 4 (44), P. 4–11.

31. Bernasconi, M., Choirat, C., Seri, R. (2014), "Empirical properties of group preference aggrega-tion methods employed in AHP: Theory and evidence", *European Journal of Operational Research*, No. 232, P. 584–592.

32. Saaty, T. L. (2016), "The Analytic Hierarchy and Analytic Network Processes for the Measurement of Intangible Criteria and for Decision-Making", *Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis. International Series in Operations Research & Management Science*, New York : Springer, Vol. 233, P. 363–419.

33. Figueira J., Mousseau, V., Roy, B. (2016), "ELECTRE Methods", *Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis. International Series in Operations Research & Management Science*, New York : Springer, Vol. 233, P. 155–185.

34. Brans, J. P., De, S. Y. (2016), "PROMETHEE Methods Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis", *International Series in Operations Research & Management Science*, New York : Springer, Vol. 233, P. 187–219.

35. Papathanasiou, J., Ploskas, N. (2018), "TOPSIS", *Multiple Criteria Decision Aid. Springer Optimization and Its Applications*, Cham : Springer, Vol. 136, P. 1−30.

36. Beskorovainyi, V., Trofimenko, I. V. (2006), "Structural-parametric identification of multifactor estimation models" [Strukturno-parametrychna identyfikatsiya modeley bahatofaktornoho otsinyuvannya"], *Weapons systems and military equipment*, No. 3 (7), P. 56–59.

37. Beskorovainyi, V., Imanhulova, Z. (2017), "Technology of large-scale objects system optimization", *ECONTECHMOD*, Vol. 06, No. 4, P. 3–8.

38. Beskorovainyi, V., Berezovskyi, H. (2017), "Identification of preferences in decision support systems", *ECONTECHMOD*, Vol. 06, No. 4, P. 15–20.

39. Beskorovainyi, V. (2017), "Parametric synthesis of models for multicriterial estimation of technological systems", *Innovative Technologies and Scientific Solutions for Industries*, No. 2 (2), P. 5–11. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30837/2522-9818.2017.2.005

Received 22.11.2020

Відомості про авторів / Сведения об авторах / About the Authors

Безкоровайний Володимир Валентинович – доктор технічних наук, професор, Харківський національний університет радіоелектроніки, професор кафедри системотехніки, Харків, Україна; email: vladimir.beskorovainyi@nure.ua; ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7930-3984.

Бескоровайный Владимир Валентинович – доктор технических наук, профессор, Харьковский национальный университет радиоэлектроники, профессор кафедры системотехники, Харьков, Украина.

Beskorovainyi Vladimir – Doctor of Sciences (Engineering), Professor, Kharkiv National University of Radio Electronics, Professor of the Department of System Engineering, Kharkiv, Ukraine.

КОМБІНОВАНИЙ МЕТОД РАНЖУВАННЯ ВАРІАНТІВ У СИСТЕМАХ ПІДТРИМКИ ПРИЙНЯТТЯ ПРОЄКТНИХ РІШЕНЬ

Предметом дослідження в статті є процес ранжування варіантів у системах підтримки прийняття проєктних рішень. **Мета** роботи – створення методу ранжування варіантів для підвищення ефективності систем підтримки прийняття рішень за рахунок узгодження взаємодії між автоматичними й інтерактивними процедурами систем автоматизованого проєктування. У статті вирішуються наступні **завдання**: огляд і аналіз сучасного стану проблеми ранжування варіантів у системах підтримки прийняття проєктних рішень; декомпозиція проблеми підтримки прийняття проєктних рішень; розробка комбінованого методу ранжування варіантів, який об’єднує процедури технологій ординалістичного та кардиналістичного впорядкування; розробка методу мінімаксного вибору варіантів з множини ефективних для процедури експертного оцінювання. Використовуються такі **методи**: теорії систем, теорії корисності, оптимізації та дослідження операцій. Результати. За результатами аналізу сучасної методології підтримки прийняття рішень встановлено існування проблеми коректного скорочення підмножин ефективних проєктних варіантів для ранжування з урахуванням факторів, що важко піддаються формалізації, знань і досвіду особи, що приймає рішення (ОПР). Виконана декомпозиція проблеми підтримки прийняття проєктних рішень на задачі визначення мети проєктування об’єкта, формування універсальної множини проєктних рішень, виділення множин допустимих та ефективних рішень, ранжування та вибору ОПР найкращого проєктного варіанту. Розроблено комбінований метод ранжування варіантів, який об’єднує процедури технологій ординалістичного та кардиналістичного впорядкування та дозволяє коректно скорочувати підмножин ефективних проєктних рішень для ранжування ОПР. Розроблено метод мінімаксного вибору варіантів з множини ефективних для процедури експертного оцінювання особою, що приймає рішення, який дозволяє підвищувати якість оцінювання. **Висновки.** Розроблений метод розширює методологічні засади автоматизації процесів підтримки багатокритеріальних проєктних рішень, дозволяє здійснювати коректне скорочення множини ефективних альтернатив для остаточного вибору з урахуванням факторів, що важко піддаються формалізації, знань і досвіду ОПР. Практичне використання отриманих результатів за рахунок запропонованої процедури визначення множини ефективних рішень дозволить скорочувати часову й ємнісну складності підтримки прийняття рішень, а за рахунок використання максимінного відбору варіантів при синтезі моделі оцінювання – підвищити якість проєктних рішень.

Ключові слова: автоматизація проєктування; багатокритеріальне оцінювання; ефективні рішення; компараторна ідентифікація; підтримка прийняття проєктних рішень; теорія корисності.

КОМБИНИРОВАННЫЙ МЕТОД РАНЖИРОВАНИЯ ВАРИАНТОВ В СИСТЕМАХ ПОДДЕРЖКИ ПРИНЯТИЯ ПРОЕКТНЫХ РЕШЕНИЙ

Предметом исследования в статье является процесс ранжирования вариантов в системах поддержки принятия проектных решений. **Цель** работы – создание метода ранжирования вариантов для повышения эффективности систем поддержки принятия решений за счет согласования взаимодействия между автоматическими и интерактивными процедурами систем автоматизированного проектирования. В статье решаются следующие **задачи:** обзор и анализ современного состояния проблемы ранжирование вариантов в системах поддержки принятия проектных решений; декомпозиция проблемы поддержки принятия проектных решений; разработка комбинированного метода ранжирования вариантов, который объединяет процедуры технологий ординалистичного и кардиналистичного упорядочения; разработка метода минимаксного выбора вариантов из множества эффективных для процедуры экспертного оценивания. Используются такие методы: теории систем, теории полезности, оптимизации и исследования операций. **Результаты.** В результате анализа современной методологии поддержки принятия решений установлено существование проблемы корректного сокращения подмножеств эффективных проектных вариантов для ранжирования с учетом факторов, трудно поддающихся формализации, знаний и опыта лица, принимающего решения (ЛПР). Выполнена декомпозиция проблемы поддержки принятия проектных решений на задачи определения цели проектирования объекта, формирования универсального множества проектных решений, выделения множеств допустимых и эффективных решений, ранжирования и выбора ЛПР лучшего проектного варианта. Разработан комбинированный метод ранжирования вариантов, который объединяет процедуры технологий ординалистичного и кардиналистичного упорядочения и позволяет корректно сокращать подмножества эффективных проектных решений для ранжирования ЛПР. Разработан метод минимаксного выбора вариантов из множества эффективных для процедуры экспертного оценивания ЛПР, который позволяет повысить качество оценивания. **Выводы.** Разработанный метод расширяет методологические основы автоматизации процессов поддержки многокритериальных проектных решений, позволяет осуществлять корректное сокращение множества эффективных альтернатив для окончательного выбора с учетом факторов, трудно поддающихся формализации, знаний и опыта ЛПР. Практическое использование полученных результатов за счет предложенной процедуры определения множества эффективных решений позволит сокращать временную и емкостную сложности поддержки принятия решений, а за счет использования максиминной процедуры отбора вариантов при синтезе модели оценивания – повысить качество проектных решений.

Ключевые слова: автоматизация проектирования; многокритериальная оценка; эффективные решения; компараторна идентификация; поддержка принятия проектных решений; теория полезности.

Бібліографічні описи / Bibliographic descriptions

Безкоровайний В. В. Комбінований метод ранжування варіантів у системах підтримки прийняття проєктних рішень. *Сучасний стан наукових досліджень та технологій в промисловості*. 2020. № 4 (14). С. 13–20. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30837/ITSSI.2020.14.013

Beskorovainyi, V. (2020), "Combined method of ranking options in project decision support systems", *Innovative Technologies and Scientific Solutions for Industries*, No. 4 (14), P. 13–20. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30837/ITSSI.2020.14.013