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Abstract: In this paper we revise in a critical way the procedures used to summarize the pairwise winning indices results. Pairwise winning indices are provided by Stochastic Multicriteria Acceptability Analysis and they represent the frequency with which an alternative is preferred to another on the basis of same sampled instances of the assumed preference model compatible with the preferences provided by the Decision Maker. The scoring procedures provide a single value to each alternative being representative of the goodness of the alternative itself taking into account the frequency with which it is preferred to the others or, vice versa, the others are preferred to it. The score given to the alternatives gives the possibility to rank them from the best to the worst. A comparison between different methods is performed to look at their strong and weak points.

Keywords: Pairwise Winning Indices, Scoring, Ranking

1. Introduction

2. Giving a score to the alternatives on the basis of the pairwise winning indices

In this section we shall describe in detail the new proposal aiming to build an additive value function $U : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the following type

$$U(a) = U(g_1(a), \ldots, g_m(a)) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} u_j(g_j(a))$$

summarizing the information provided by the pairwise winning indices. In particular, the considered value function should have the following characteristics:

- assuming that, without loss of generality, all criteria have an increasing direction of preference, each marginal value function $u_j$ should be non-decreasing in $X_j = \{x_j^0, \ldots, x_j^{n_j}\}$, where $x_j^k$, $k = 0, \ldots, n_j$, are the different evaluations got by the alternatives in $A$ on criterion $g_j$. Formally,

$$u_j(x_j^k) \leq u_j(x_j^{k+1}) \text{ for all } g_j \in G \text{ and for all } k = 0, \ldots, n_j - 1,$$

- $U$ should be normalized so that $u_j(x_j^0) = 0$ for all $g_j \in G$, and $\sum_{j=1}^{m} u_j(x_j^{n_j}) = 1$, that is, the marginal utility of the worst possible evaluation has to be equal to 0 for each criterion and the global utility of an alternative having the best evaluation on all criteria has to be equal to 1.
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• if \( a \) is preferred to \( b \) w.r.t. the preferences of the Decision Maker (DM) (we shall write \( a \succ_{DM} b \)), then \( U(a) > U(b) \) and this constraint is translated into the weak inequality \( U(a) - U(b) \geq \eta \) by using the auxiliary variable \( \eta \),

• if \( a \) is at least as good as \( b \) w.r.t. the preferences of the DM (\( a \succeq_{DM} b \)), then \( U(a) \geq U(b) \),

• if \( a \) is indifferent to \( b \) w.r.t. the preferences of the DM (\( a \sim_{DM} b \)), then \( U(a) = U(b) \)

Let us observe that it is possible taking into consideration other types of preferences. For example, preferences between alternatives on single criteria or subsets of criteria as well as preferences between alternatives on criteria structured in a hierarchical way can also be considered \cite{Figueira2009, Corrente2012}.

The cause of this infeasibility could be detected by using one of the approaches proposed in Mousseau et al. (2003).

To check for an additive value function having, therefore, all the characteristics mentioned above, the following LP problem, denoted by \( LP_0 \), should be solved:

\[
\begin{align*}
\max \eta, \text{ subject to,} \\
U(a) - U(b) & \geq \eta \cdot (p(a,b) - 0.5), \ \forall (a,b) \in A \times A : p(a,b) > 0.5, \\
U(a) - U(b) & \geq \eta, \text{ if } a \succ_{DM} b, \\
U(a) - U(b) & = 0, \text{ if } a \succeq_{DM} b, \\
U(a) - U(b) & = 0, \text{ if } a \sim_{DM} b, \\
u_j(x_j^k) & \leq u_j(x_j^{k+1}), \ \forall g_j \in G \text{ and } k = 0, \ldots, n_j - 1, \\
u_j(x_j^0) & = 0, \ \forall g_j \in G, \\
\sum_{j=1}^m u_j(x_j) & = 1.
\end{align*}
\]

If \( E_{DM}^\eta \) is feasible and \( \eta^* > 0 \), where \( \eta^* = \max \eta \) subject to \( E_{DM}^\eta \), then there is at least one value function compatible with the information provided by the DM and summarizing the results of the pairwise winning indices. In the opposite case (\( E_{DM}^\eta \) is infeasible or \( \eta^* \leq 0 \)), then there is not any additive value function satisfying all constraints in \( E_{DM}^\eta \) with a positive value of \( \eta \). The cause of this infeasibility could be detected by using one of the approaches proposed in Mousseau et al. (2003).

Let us assume that \( E_{DM}^\eta \) is feasible and \( \eta^* > 0 \) and let us denote by \( \mathcal{U} \) the set of value functions satisfying all constraints in \( E_{DM}^\eta \) with \( \eta = \eta^* \). In the following, we shall call a function belonging to \( U \in \mathcal{U} \) a compatible function. In this case, more than one compatible function exists and each of them is composed of marginal value functions having different characteristics. It is therefore important from the explainability point of view, looking at the characteristics of the considered compatible value functions. One could be therefore interested into checking if there is at least one function in \( \mathcal{U} \) such that:

\footnote{Following \cite{Branke2017}, the indifference between \( a \) and \( b \) could also be translated into the constraint \( |U(a) - U(b)| \leq \delta \) where \( \delta \) is a small positive number}
Each criterion \( g_j \in G \) gives a contribution to \( U(a) \): one is looking for a function \( U \in \mathcal{U} \) such that \( u_j \left( x_j^{n_j} \right) > 0 \) for each \( g_j \in G \). To this aim, the following LP problem, denoted by \( LP_1 \), has to be solved:

\[
\text{max } h, \quad \text{subject to,} \\
\eta = \eta^*, \\
u_j \left( x_j^{n_j} \right) \geq h, \quad \forall g_j \in G, \\
E_{\text{AllContr}}^{DM}. \\
\]

If \( E_{\text{AllContr}}^{DM} \) is feasible and \( h^* > 0 \), where \( h^* = \max h \), subject to \( E_{\text{AllContr}}^{DM} \), then, there is at least one compatible function in which all criteria contribute to \( U \). In the opposite case, in all compatible functions, at least one marginal value function is such that \( u_j \left( x_j^{n_j} \right) = 0 \) and, therefore, \( g_j \) is not contributing to the global utility \( U \). Let us denote by \( \mathcal{U}_{\text{AllContr}} \) the subset of \( \mathcal{U} \) composed of all compatible functions in which all criteria contribute to the global utility of each alternative.

Each marginal value function \( u_j \) is increasing in \( X_j \): We are therefore looking at a compatible function where all evaluations \( x_j^k \) have a marginal utility lower than the marginal utility of \( x_j^q \) iff \( q > k \). To check for the existence of a compatible function having the mentioned characteristic, one has to solve the following LP problem denoted by \( LP_2 \):

\[
\text{max } \varepsilon, \quad \text{subject to,} \\
\eta = \eta^*, \\
u_j \left( x_j^k \right) + \varepsilon \leq u_j \left( x_j^{k+1} \right), \quad \forall g_j \in G \quad \text{and} \quad \forall k = 0, \ldots, n_j - 1, \\
E_{\text{AllInc}}^{DM}. \\
\]

If \( E_{\text{AllInc}}^{DM} \) is feasible and \( \varepsilon^* > 0 \), where \( \varepsilon^* = \max \varepsilon \) subject to \( E_{\text{AllInc}}^{DM} \), then there is at least one compatible function in which all marginal value functions are increasing, while, in the opposite case \( (E_{\text{AllInc}}^{DM} \) infeasible or \( \varepsilon^* \leq 0 \)), then this is not the case. Let us denote by \( \mathcal{U}_{\text{AllInc}} \) the subset of \( \mathcal{U} \) composed of the compatible functions in which all marginal value functions are increasing.

**Note 2.1.** Let us observe that \( \mathcal{U}_{\text{AllInc}} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\text{AllContr}} \) and, therefore, if \( \mathcal{U}_{\text{AllInc}} \neq \emptyset \) then \( \mathcal{U}_{\text{AllContr}} \neq \emptyset \), while the opposite is not true. This means that the existence of a compatible function in which all marginal functions contribute to the global utility does not imply the existence of a compatible function in which all marginal value functions are increasing.

As already underlined above, in \( \mathcal{U} \), \( \mathcal{U}_{\text{AllContr}} \) or \( \mathcal{U}_{\text{AllInc}} \) more than one compatible function could exist and each of them has its own characteristics. For this reason, it is important to propose a procedure aiming to discover all compatible value functions. Let us observe that an additive value function \( U \), as the one shown in eq. \([1]\), is uniquely defined by the marginal values assigned to the evaluations \( x_j^k \) from each marginal value function \( u_j \), that is, \( u_j \left( x_j^k \right) \) for all \( g_j \in G \) and for all \( k = 0, \ldots, n_j \). Denoting by \( u_j^k \) the values \( u_j \left( x_j^k \right) \), an additive value function \( U \) can also be represented by the vector \( U = \left[ u_j^k \right]_{g_j \in G} \). In the following, we shall describe in detail the procedure used to find all compatible functions in \( \mathcal{U} \). However, the same procedure could be easily applied to find all compatible functions in \( \mathcal{U}_{\text{AllContr}} \) or \( \mathcal{U}_{\text{AllInc}} \).

Let us assume that \( \mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset \), and let us consider \( U^1 = \left[ u_j^{k,1} \right] \) the compatible function obtained solving \( LP_0 \) and restoring \( \eta = \eta^* \). Another compatible function \( U \in \mathcal{U} \) is different from \( U^1 \) if \( u_j^k \neq u_j^{k,1} \) for at least a criterion \( g_j \in G \) and for at least one \( k \in \{0, \ldots, n_j\} \). Therefore, a second
compatible function can be checked by solving the following MILP problem that we shall denote by MILP-1:

\[
\begin{align*}
  z^*_2 &= \min \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=0}^{n_j} \left[ y_{j,1}^{k,1} + y_{j,2}^{k,1} \right] \\
  \eta &= \eta^*, \\
  E^{DM}, \\
  u_j^k &\geq u_j^{k,1} + \delta - M y_{j,1}^{k,1}, \quad \forall k = 0, \ldots, n_j, \\
  u_j^k + \delta &\leq u_j^{k,1} + M y_{j,2}^{k,1}, \quad \forall k = 0, \ldots, n_j, \\
  y_{j,1}^{k,1}, y_{j,2}^{k,1} &\in \{0, 1\}, \\
  \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=0}^{n_j} \left[ y_{j,1}^{k,1} + y_{j,2}^{k,1} \right] &\leq 2 \cdot \sum_{g_j \in G} (n_j + 1) - 1
\end{align*}
\]

where

- \( M \) is a big positive number, while \( \delta \) is a fixed positive number used to impose that \( u_j^k > u_j^{k,1} \) or \( u_j^k < u_j^{k,1} \).

- \( u_j^k \geq u_j^{k,1} + \delta - M y_{j,1}^{k,1} \) translates the constraint \( u_j^k > u_j^{k,1} \). In particular, if \( y_{j,1}^{k,1} = 1 \), then the constraint is always satisfied and, therefore, \( u_j(k) \leq u_j^{k,1} \). If, instead, \( y_{j,1}^{k,1} = 0 \), then the constraint is reduced to \( u_j^k \geq u_j^{k,1} + \delta \) and, therefore, \( u_j^k > u_j^{k,1} \).

- \( u_j^k + \delta \leq u_j^{k,1} + M y_{j,2}^{k,1} \) translates the constraint \( u_j^k < u_j^{k,1} \). In particular, if \( y_{j,2}^{k,1} = 1 \), then the constraint is always satisfied and, therefore, \( u_j(k) \geq u_j^{k,1} \). If, instead, \( y_{j,2}^{k,1} = 0 \), then the constraint is reduced to \( u_j^k + \delta \leq u_j^{k,1} \) and, therefore, \( u_j^k < u_j^{k,1} \).

- the constraint \( \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=0}^{n_j} \left[ y_{j,1}^{k,1} + y_{j,2}^{k,1} \right] \leq 2 \cdot \sum_{g_j \in G} (n_j + 1) - 1 \) is used to impose that at least one binary variable is equal to 0 and, consequently, at least one \( u_j^k \) is such that \( u_j^k \neq u_j^{k,1} \).

\footnote{Let us observe that the choice of the value assigned to \( \delta \) influences the obtained value function. Indeed, since the \( u_j^k \) values are in the interval \([0, 1]\), if \( \delta \) is a quite small positive value (for example, \( \delta = 10^{-5} \)), then it is easy to find another value function different from the one previously obtained by slightly modifying at least one \( u_j^k \) even if, indeed, the obtained function is not very different from the previous one. It is therefore necessary to perform a sensitivity analysis changing the value assigned to \( \delta \) and verifying if, indeed, the obtained compatible functions have all different characteristics.}
\[ z^*_2 = \min \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=0}^{n_j} \left[ y_{j,1}^{k,1} + k_{j,2}^{k,2} \right] + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=0}^{n_j} \left[ y_{j,1}^{k,2} + k_{j,2}^{k,2} \right] \right\} \text{ subject to,} \]

\[ \eta = \eta^*, \]
\[ E^{DM}, \]
\[ u_j^k \geq u_j^{k,1} + \delta - My_j^{k,1}, \forall k = 0, \ldots, n_j, \]
\[ u_j^k + \delta \leq u_j^{k,2} + My_j^{k,2}, \forall k = 0, \ldots, n_j, \]
\[ y_{j,1}^{k,1}, y_{j,2}^{k,1} \in \{0, 1\}, \]
\[ \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=0}^{n_j} \left[ y_{j,1}^{k,1} + y_{j,2}^{k,1} \right] \leq 2 \cdot \sum_{g_j \in G} (n_j + 1) - 1 \]

Solving MILP \(-1\), two cases can occur:

**case 1)** MILP \(-1\) is feasible: there is at least another compatible function different from \(U_1\) and the marginal values \(u_j^k\) obtained solving MILP \(-1\) define such a function. We shall denote by \(U^2 = \left[ u_j^{k,2} \right]\) the marginal values defining the new function;

**case 2)** MILP \(-1\) is infeasible: the function obtained solving LP\(_0\) is the unique compatible value function in \(U\).

In case 1) one can proceed in an iterative way to find all possible compatible value functions. Assuming that \(t\) value functions (apart from the one obtained solving LP\(_0\)) have been already computed, the \((t + 1)th\) is obtained solving the following MILP problem

\[ z^*_{t+1} = \min \sum_{r=1}^{t} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=0}^{n_j} \left[ y_{j,1}^{k,r} + y_{j,2}^{k,r} \right] \text{ subject to,} \]

\[ \eta = \eta^*, \]
\[ E^{DM}, \]
\[ E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \cdots \cup E_t \]

and \(E_r\) is, in general, the set composed of the following constraints:

\[ u_j^k \geq u_j^{k,r} + \delta - My_j^{k,r}, \]
\[ u_j^k + \delta \leq u_j^{k,r} + My_j^{k,r}, \]
\[ y_{j,1}^{k,r}, y_{j,2}^{k,r} \in \{0, 1\}, \]
\[ \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k=0}^{n_j} \left[ y_{j,1}^{k,r} + y_{j,2}^{k,r} \right] \leq 2 \cdot \sum_{g_j \in G} (n_j + 1) - 1. \]
3. Case study

In this section, we shall apply the procedure described in the previous section showing its main characteristics and comparing its performances with other methodologies used in the literature to deal with the same type of problem. For this reason, we shall consider a financial problem in which 7 funds are evaluated on five criteria as shown in Table 1 and presented in the following lines:

- $g_1$: Sharpe Ratio (SR)
- $g_2$: Traynor Ratio (TR)
- $g_3$: Average Value-at-Risk Ratio (AV aR)
- $g_4$: Jensen Alpha (JA)
- $g_5$: Morningstar Risk-Adjusted Return (MRAR)

Table 1: Evaluation of the 7 alternatives on the five criteria at hand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$g_1(\cdot)$</th>
<th>$g_2(\cdot)$</th>
<th>$g_3(\cdot)$</th>
<th>$g_4(\cdot)$</th>
<th>$g_5(\cdot)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a_1$</td>
<td>Allianz Multipartner Multi20</td>
<td>0.0403</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>-0.0155</td>
<td>-0.0030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_2$</td>
<td>Amundi Bilanciato Euro C</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>-0.0103</td>
<td>-0.0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_3$</td>
<td>Arca Te - Titoli Esteri</td>
<td>0.0322</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>-0.0133</td>
<td>-0.0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_4$</td>
<td>Bancoposta Mix 2 A Cap</td>
<td>0.0193</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>-0.0080</td>
<td>-0.0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_5$</td>
<td>Etica Rendita Bilanciata I</td>
<td>0.0334</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>-0.0150</td>
<td>-0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_6$</td>
<td>Eurizon Pir Italia 30 I</td>
<td>0.0219</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>-0.0088</td>
<td>-0.0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_7$</td>
<td>Pramerica Global Multiasset 30</td>
<td>-0.0018</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>-0.0010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before applying our methodology, to put all performances on the same scale, we normalized the data on the different criteria by using a standardization technique used in Greco et al. (2018). Applying the mentioned standardization technique to all criteria, we obtained the values shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Normalized values of the 7 alternatives on the five criteria at hand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\overline{g}_1(\cdot)$</th>
<th>$\overline{g}_2(\cdot)$</th>
<th>$\overline{g}_3(\cdot)$</th>
<th>$\overline{g}_4(\cdot)$</th>
<th>$\overline{g}_5(\cdot)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a_1$</td>
<td>Allianz Multipartner Multi20</td>
<td>0.6940</td>
<td>0.7349</td>
<td>0.3370</td>
<td>0.1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_2$</td>
<td>Amundi Bilanciato Euro C</td>
<td>0.5157</td>
<td>0.4869</td>
<td>0.4924</td>
<td>0.5268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_3$</td>
<td>Arca Te - Titoli Esteri</td>
<td>0.5943</td>
<td>0.6939</td>
<td>0.4013</td>
<td>0.3492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_4$</td>
<td>Bancoposta Mix 2 A Cap</td>
<td>0.4370</td>
<td>0.3980</td>
<td>0.5596</td>
<td>0.5926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_5$</td>
<td>Etica Rendita Bilanciata I</td>
<td>0.6102</td>
<td>0.4950</td>
<td>0.3522</td>
<td>0.6333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_6$</td>
<td>Eurizon Pir Italia 30 I</td>
<td>0.4694</td>
<td>0.4342</td>
<td>0.5357</td>
<td>0.5926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_7$</td>
<td>Pramerica Global Multiasset 30</td>
<td>0.1793</td>
<td>0.2571</td>
<td>0.8219</td>
<td>0.6184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us assume now that a weighted sum is used to aggregate the preference of the DM such that

$$WS(a) = WS(g_1(a), \ldots, g_m(a)) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j \cdot \overline{g}_j(a)$$
where \( w_j \) are the weights of criteria \( g_j \) and they are such that \( w_j > 0 \) for all \( g_j \in G \) and \( \sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j = 1 \), while \( \bar{y}_j(a) \) are the normalized evaluations in Table 2. Let us assume, for the sake of simplicity and without loss of generality, that there is not any preference information provided by the DM and let us sample 100,000 weight vectors \((w_1, \ldots, w_m)\) from the space \( W \) defined as

\[
W = \{(w_1, \ldots, w_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m : w_j > 0, \forall j = 1, \ldots, m, \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j = 1\}.
\]

Computing the weighted sum of all alternatives (the considered funds) for each of the 100,000 weight vectors, we were able to obtain the pairwise winning indices shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Pairwise winning indices of the considered alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( p(\cdot, \cdot) )</th>
<th>( a_1 )</th>
<th>( a_2 )</th>
<th>( a_3 )</th>
<th>( a_4 )</th>
<th>( a_5 )</th>
<th>( a_6 )</th>
<th>( a_7 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( a_1 )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>42.614</td>
<td>40.816</td>
<td>52.372</td>
<td>40.703</td>
<td>36.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_2 )</td>
<td>58.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59.283</td>
<td>40.742</td>
<td>55.768</td>
<td>36.729</td>
<td>36.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_3 )</td>
<td>57.386</td>
<td>40.717</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.498</td>
<td>54.815</td>
<td>39.685</td>
<td>37.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_4 )</td>
<td>59.184</td>
<td>59.258</td>
<td>59.502</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55.949</td>
<td>45.695</td>
<td>35.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_5 )</td>
<td>47.628</td>
<td>44.232</td>
<td>45.185</td>
<td>44.051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41.449</td>
<td>39.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_6 )</td>
<td>59.297</td>
<td>63.271</td>
<td>60.315</td>
<td>54.305</td>
<td>58.551</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_7 )</td>
<td>63.266</td>
<td>63.194</td>
<td>62.713</td>
<td>64.143</td>
<td>60.673</td>
<td>61.841</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aim of the proposed procedure is, therefore, to build an additive value function such as the one shown in Eq. 1 summarizing the contained in the pairwise winning indices table. In this case, since all alternatives have different performances on the considered criterion, following the notation introduced in Section 2, we have \( n_j = 6 \), for all \( j = 1, \ldots, 5 \). Consequently, an additive utility function is defined by five marginal value functions assigning values to seven different performances denoted, therefore, by \( u^k_j \), with \( j = 1, \ldots, 5, k = 0, \ldots, 6 \).

Solving the \( LP_0 \) problem, we find that \( E^{DM} \) is feasible and \( \eta^* = 2.0513 \). Therefore, there is at least one compatible function and the one obtained solving \( LP_0 \), denoted by \( U^1 \), is shown in Table 4 while the global utility of the seven funds considering this function is given in Table 5.

Table 4: The additive value function obtained solving the \( LP_0 \) problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( x^0_1 )</th>
<th>( x^0_2 )</th>
<th>( u^{0,1}_{1,1} = 0 )</th>
<th>( u^{0,2}_{1,1} = 0 )</th>
<th>( u^{0,3}_{1,1} = 0 )</th>
<th>( u^{0,4}_{1,1} = 0 )</th>
<th>( u^{0,5}_{1,1} = 0 )</th>
<th>( u^{0,6}_{1,1} = 0 )</th>
<th>( u^{0,7}_{1,1} = 0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( x^0_2 )</td>
<td>( x^0_3 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,1}_{2,2} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,2}_{2,2} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,3}_{2,2} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,4}_{2,2} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,5}_{2,2} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,6}_{2,2} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,7}_{2,2} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x^0_3 )</td>
<td>( x^0_4 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,1}_{3,3} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,2}_{3,3} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,3}_{3,3} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,4}_{3,3} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,5}_{3,3} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,6}_{3,3} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,7}_{3,3} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x^0_4 )</td>
<td>( x^0_5 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,1}_{4,4} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,2}_{4,4} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,3}_{4,4} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,4}_{4,4} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,5}_{4,4} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,6}_{4,4} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,7}_{4,4} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x^0_5 )</td>
<td>( x^0_6 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,1}_{5,5} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,2}_{5,5} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,3}_{5,5} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,4}_{5,5} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,5}_{5,5} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,6}_{5,5} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,7}_{5,5} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x^0_6 )</td>
<td>( x^0_7 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,1}_{6,6} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,2}_{6,6} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,3}_{6,6} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,4}_{6,6} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,5}_{6,6} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,6}_{6,6} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,7}_{6,6} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x^0_7 )</td>
<td>( x^0_8 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,1}_{7,7} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,2}_{7,7} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,3}_{7,7} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,4}_{7,7} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,5}_{7,7} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,6}_{7,7} = 0 )</td>
<td>( u^{0,7}_{7,7} = 0 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values in Table 5 provide therefore, a following ranking of the seven funds:

\[
a_7 > a_6 > a_4 > a_2 > a_3 > a_1 > a_5.
\]

Dealing with this type of problems, the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) (Charnes et al., 1978; Cooper et al., 2004) is generally used. DEA checks the efficiency of each alternative \( a \in A \) solving the following LP problem:
Table 5: Global utility of the seven funds applying the utility function $U^1$ obtained solving $LP_0$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>$U^1(\cdot)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a_1$</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_2$</td>
<td>0.4789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_3$</td>
<td>0.2885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_4$</td>
<td>0.6688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_5$</td>
<td>0.0883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_6$</td>
<td>0.7571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_7$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$U^*(a) = \max U(a)$ subject to,

$$
\begin{align*}
&u_j(x_j^k) \leq u_j(x_j^{k+1}), \quad \forall g_j \in G \text{ and } \forall k = 0, \ldots, n_j - 1, \\
&u_j(x_j^0) = 0, \quad \forall g_j \in G, \\
&\sum_{j=1}^m u_j(x_j^n) = 1.
\end{align*}
$$

(2)

An alternative $a$ is considered efficient iff $U^*(a) = 1$, while, in the opposite case, it is not efficient. Let us observe that, because, the constraints are such that $U(a) \in [0, 1]$ for all $a \in A$, $U^*(a) = 1$ implies that $U(a) \geq U(b)$ for all $b \in A$ and, therefore, the efficiency of $a$ is equivalent to the fact that $a$ is at least as good as all other alternatives in $A$. In the opposite case, there is at least one function for which at least one alternative $b \in A$ is such that $U(b) > U(a)$.

Knowing if an alternative is efficient does not solve the decision problem since, in our case, solving the $LP_0$ problem, all funds are efficient and, therefore, all indifferent among them. Our procedure does a step forward with respect to DEA since it is able to give a comprehensive ranking of the alternatives at hand summarizing also the results contained in the pairwise winning indices table.

3.1. Compatible functions with different characteristics and checking for other compatible functions

As already described above, solving the $LP_0$ problem we found that $U \neq \emptyset$ since $\eta^* > 0$ and, therefore, there exists at least one value function compatible able to summarize the information contained in the pairwise winning indices Table 3. As one can see from the compatible function $U^1$ shown in Table 5, only the last three criteria are giving a contribution to the global utility, while the marginal utility attached to the best performances on the first two criteria, that is $x_1^6 = 0.694$ and $x_2^6 = 0.7349$ is zero. For this reason, following the procedure shown in Section 2, one can wonder if there is a compatible function such that all criteria give a contribution to the global utility of the alternatives at hand. Solving, therefore, $LP_1$, we find that $E_{AllContr}^{DM}$ is feasible and $h^* = 0$. This means that each function in $U$ is such that at least one marginal value function gives value 0 to the best performance on the considered criterion and, consequently, $U_{AllContr} = \emptyset$. Because of the Note 2.1, we find that also $U_{AllInc} = \emptyset$ and, therefore, there is not any compatible function such that all marginal value functions are monotone in their domain.

Since $U \neq \emptyset$, one can wonder if there is another compatible function different from $U^1$ and, in this case, if the contribution given by each marginal value function to the global utility is different with respect to the one given in $U^1$. For this reason, we will solve iteratively the MILP problems described in Section 2 obtaining, therefore, in addition to the compatible function found solving $LP_0$, other 25 different compatible functions. In Figure 1 we have shown the marginal utilities with respect to
criteria $g_3$ and $g_5$ of the function found solving $LP_0$ and of the five most different functions among the remaining 25. In particular, we have shown only the marginal utilities corresponding to these two criteria since the first two criteria ($g_1$ and $g_2$) do not give any contribution in all considered compatible functions and the fourth criterion contributes in the same way in all functions because $u_k = 0$ for $k = 0, \ldots, 3$, while $u_k = 0.0883$ for all $k = 4, \ldots, 6$.

![Figure 1: Marginal utility functions for criteria $g_3$ and $g_5$](image)

Looking at the marginal value functions corresponding to criteria $g_3$ and $g_5$, one can observe that the six considered functions are quite different with respect to the importance assigned to two mentioned criteria. For example, in $U^2$ (red line) and $U^3$ (orange line) the two marginal functions contribute in a completely different way. On one hand, $g_3$ slightly contributes to the global utility $U^3$ since $u_3 = 0.1889$, while $g_5$ has a very great importance since $u_5 = 0.7227$. On the other hand, the opposite behavior can be observed with respect to $U^2$, for which $g_3$ gives a quite high contribution since $u_3 = 0.7747$, while $g_5$ contributes very marginally since $u_5 = 0.1369$.
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3We computed the euclidean distance ($d$) between each pair of functions and, then, we applied the following procedure to select the 5 more dispersed functions. At the beginning, we have chosen the two functions $f_1$ and $f_2$ being the most distant (for which $d(f_1, f_2)$ is the greatest) and, consequently, $P = \{f_1, f_2\}$. Then, in an iterative way, we added to $P$ the function $f_k$ presenting the maximum $\min_{f_p \in P} \{d(f_k, f_p)\}$, that is, the one presenting the $\max - \min$ distance from the functions in $P$.  
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