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Abstract

Hesitant fuzzy linguistic preference relation (HFLPR) is of interest because it provides an efficient way for opinion expression under uncertainty. For enhancing the theory of decision making with HFLPR, the paper introduces an algorithm for group decision making with HFLPRs based on the acceptable consistency and consensus measurements, which involves (1) defining a hesitant fuzzy linguistic geometric consistency index (HFLGCI) and proposing a procedure for consistency checking and inconsistency improving for HFLPR; (2) measuring the group consensus based on the similarity between the original individual HFLPRs and the overall perfect HFLPR, then establishing a procedure for consensus ensuring including the determination of decision-makers’ weights. The convergence and monotonicity of the proposed two procedures have been proved. Some experiments are furtherly performed to investigate the critical values of the defined HFLGCI, and comparative analyses are conducted to show the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm. A case concerning the performance evaluation of venture capital guiding funds is given to illustrate the availability of the proposed algorithm. As an application of our work, an online decision-making portal is finally provided for decision-makers to utilize the proposed algorithms to solve decision-making problems.
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1. Introduction

Evolution and development in the global economy have heightened the need for group decision making (GDM), a procedure for optimal choice determination involving a group of decision-makers. Since it solves problems with a collective intelligence that avoids the lack of individual cognition, the relevant research of GDM has experienced unprecedented growth in the past years [1-10]. Preference relation, which depicts decision-makers’ pairwise comparisons, is a significant way to deal with GDM. Because decision-makers usually display limitations of thinking during the decision-making process [11, 12] and decision-making activities always deviate from perfect rationality [13], it is meaningful to portray the available judgments of decision-makers realistically.

Considering that linguistic terms (LTs) [14] conform to the expression habit of decision-makers, linguistic preference relation (LPR) [15] was proposed, which can be manifested as “Alternative A is better than Alternative B”, “Alternative A is slightly worse than Alternative B”, among others. With the increasing diversity and complexity of decision-making problems, the limited information and human thinking fuzziness get more noticeable. In such a situation, describing decision-makers’ evaluations more precisely is necessary for ensuring the reasonability of the outcomes. To address this point, hesitant fuzzy linguistic preference relation (HFLPR) [16], which shows decision-makers’ preferences based on consecutive LTs [17], was introduced. It is a more general concept of LPR and can flexibly represent decision-makers’ comparative opinions. An example for illustrating this concept is given as: “the superior degree of Alternative A to Alternative B is between slightly better and better”.

Recent trends in decision making under uncertainty have led to a proliferation study of HFLPRs. As for the research on the consistency of an HFLPR, Zhu and Xu [16] and Zhang and Wu [18] defined its additive consistency and multiplicative consistency and established two algorithms for consistency checking and
inconsistency improving, respectively. Li et al. [19] proposed an optimization way for measuring the pessimistic consistency and the optimistic consistency of HFLPR and estimated the corresponding range of consistency degree. Through introducing the interval consistency index for HFLPR, Li et al. [20] discussed the related consistency index measurement. By defining the least common multiple expansion principle, Wu et al. [21] proposed an additive consistency of an HLFPR, and constructed a mathematical programming model for deriving the acceptable consistent HFLPR. With the same principle, Wu et al. [22] improved the expected HFLPR concept and proved its consistency. Further, they gave a consistency index between a HFLPR and an expected HFLPR and established an automatic iterative algorithm to repair the unacceptable consistent HFLPR. Moreover, Mi et al. [23] introduced a framework of hesitant fuzzy linguistic AHP, which addresses multiplicative consistency definition, a linear programming model for prioritizations, a feedback algorithm for improving the consistency of HFLPR according to the perfect one.

To be closer to practical applications, researchers have focused on GDM with HFLPRs. With the compatibility measure between the synthetic HFLPR and the ideal HFLPR, Gou et al. [24] provided a model for weight determination and a process for group decision making with HFLPRs. Differently, Ren et al. [25] put forward a group consensus feedback model based on considering the modified extents of HFLPRs given by decision makers.

To better ensure the reasonability of the decision-making results, the consistency and consensus measures have been considered in some decision-making processes with HFLPRs. By mapping a 2-tuple linguistic (2TL) into an equivalent form, Wu and Xu [26] presented another additive consistency index for HFLPR based on the distance between 2TL and the equivalent form, and then constructed a feedback mechanism with consensus to address the GDM. With the consistency measurement of HFLPR and ordinal number, the ordinal consensus was applied to build a consensus procedure [27]. Based on the improvement
of local consistency of HFLPR, the group consensus was provided to be judged between the consensus of an individual and the group [28]. Moreover, several consensus models were put forward based on the individual HFLPRs’ consistency checking and consistency improvement [29, 30, 31].

The research on GDM with HFLPRs has great potentials in theory and practice due to the superiority of HFLPRs in portraying fuzziness under uncertainty. To enhance the decision-making theory of HFLPR and its applicability, the paper aims to study the geometric consistency index (a classical index) and support the GDM. The novelties of the paper can be summed up as follows:

(1) The paper defines the hesitant fuzzy linguistic geometric consistency index (HFLGCI) through establishing the relationships among the numerical type of preference relations and the linguistic type of preference relations (asymmetric form), which fruits the consistency theory of HFLPR.

(2) The paper proposes a consensus index based on the similarity between original individual HFLPRs and the overall perfect HFLPR. It further constructs a feedback consensus algorithm to realize the consistency and consensus-driven mechanism for GDM with HFLPRs.

(3) The paper performs experiments and applies mathematics to analyze the critical values of the defined HFLGCI with different orders of HFLPRs, which provides support for the proposed algorithm and ensures the accuracy of its application.

(4) An online decision-making portal1 is provided for decision-makers to utilize the proposed algorithms to handle decision-making problems. Also, other researchers can evaluate our work through this publicly accessible portal.

(5) The paper illustrates the practicality of the proposed algorithm by handling a case concerning the

1 http://34.92.80.18/ (username: uniman; password: friendintegrityfaith)
performance evaluation of venture capital guiding funds.

The paper can be organized as: in Section 2, we review several kinds of preference relations and the geometric consistency index (GCI) of multiplicative preference relation (MPR). Section 3 defines the concept of HFLGCI and the consensus measure of a group of HFLPRs, and then provides an algorithm for GDM with HFLPRs based on acceptable consistency and consensus measures. In Section 4, we discuss the critical values for the HFLGCI and make some comparative analyses with the existing methods. Section 5 applies the proposed algorithm to evaluate the performance of venture capital guiding funds. The online portal involving two proposed algorithms is developed as an application of our work in Section 6. The paper ends up with conclusions in Section 7.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Multiplicative Preference Relation

In this section, we review the form of MPR [32] and its consistency definitions. For a set of alternatives $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$, the definition of MPR can be presented as:

**Definition 2.1** [32]. A MPR $R$ on $X$ is expressed by $R = (r_{ij})_{n \times n} \subset X \times X$, where $r_{ij}$ is denoted by Saaty’s 1-9 scale indicating the preference degree of $x_i$ over $x_j$, and satisfies $r_{ij}r_{ji} = 1$, $\forall i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.

$r_{ij} = 1$ represents indifference between $x_i$ and $x_j$, $r_{ij} > 1$ represents $x_i$ is superior to $x_j$, where $r_{ij} < 1$ represents $x_i$ is inferior to $x_j$ [33].

Saaty [32] defined that $R$ is perfectly consistent if

$$r_{ij} = \frac{w_j}{w_i} \quad (2.1)$$

where $w = (w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n)^T$ is the priority vector derived from $R$. Furtherly, Crawford and Williams [34] proposed the GCI for $R$:
\[ GCI(R) = 1 - \frac{2}{(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i,j=k\neq f} (\log(r_{ij}) - \log(w_i) + \log(w_j)) \]  
(2.2)

2.2. Linguistic Preference Relation

Considering that linguistic messages are people’s familiar expressions, Zadeh [14] first introduced the concept of linguistic term set (LTS), and noted its basic form as \( S = \{s_{\alpha} | \alpha = 0,1,\ldots,2\tau\} \), where \( \tau \) is a positive number and \( s_{\alpha} \) is a LT. For any two LTs \( s_{\alpha} \) and \( s_{\beta} \), some operations of them are [14, 35]:

1. Addition: \( s_{\alpha} \oplus s_{\beta} = s_{\alpha+\beta} \);
2. Scalar multiplication: \( \lambda s_{\alpha} = s_{\alpha \lambda} \) (\( \lambda \geq 0 \));
3. Negation operation: \( \text{Neg}(s_{\alpha}) = s_{2\tau-\alpha} \).

The definition of LPR was furtherly proposed as:

**Definition 2.2** [15]. Let \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \) be a set of alternatives, a LPR is denoted by \( L = (l_{ij})_{n \times n} \subset X \times X \), where \( l_{ij} \) is a LT based on LTS \( S = \{s_{\alpha} | \alpha = 0,1,\ldots,2\tau\} \) indicating the preference degree of \( x_i \) over \( x_j \), and satisfying \( l_{ij} = \text{Neg}(l_{ji}) \), \( \forall i, j = 1,2,\ldots,n \).

2.3. Hesitant Fuzzy Linguistic Preference Relation

Let \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \) be a set of alternatives, then a hesitant fuzzy linguistic term set (HFLTS) [17] is an ordered finite subset of several consecutive LTs of an LTS \( S = \{s_{\alpha} | \alpha = 0,1,\ldots,2\tau\} \). Liao and Xu [36] gave its mathematical notation as

\[ b = \{b(x_i) \} | x_i \in X \} \]

where \( b(x_i) \) is called a hesitant fuzzy linguistic element.

Based on the definition, Zhu and Xu [16] defined the HFLPR as:

**Definition 2.3** [16]. Let \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \) be a set of alternatives, an HFLPR on \( X \) is represented by

\( B = (b_{y})_{n \times n} \subset X \times X \), where \( b_{y} = \{b_{y}^{1}, \ldots, b_{y}^{#b_{y}}\} \) (\( #b_{y} \) is the number of LTs in \( b_{y} \)), is a HFLTS, and...
satisfies
\[ b_{ij}^{o(l)} \oplus b_{ji}^{o(l)} = s_0, \quad b_{ii} = s_0, \quad \#b_j = \#b_{ji}, \quad b_{ij}^{o(l)} < b_{ji}^{o(l+1)}, \quad b_{ji}^{o(l+1)} < b_{ij}^{o(l)}, \quad \forall i, j = 1, 2, ..., n \quad (2.4) \]
where \( b_{ij}^{o(l)} \) is the \( l \) th LT in \( b_{ij} \), and \( b_{ij} \) denotes the hesitance preference degrees \( x_i \) over \( x_j \).

For ease of calculation, suppose that \( b^+ \) and \( b^- \) are respectively the maximum and minimum LTs of a HFLTS \( b \), then a normalization way for \( b \) was proposed to add extra LT(s) in \( B \), where the added elements are obtained by \( \tau = \zeta b^+ \oplus (1 - \zeta)b^- \) \( (0 \leq \zeta \leq 1) \) [16]. Let \( b_a = \{b^*_a| l = 1, 2, ..., z\} \) and \( b_\beta = \{b^*_\beta| l = 1, 2, ..., z\} \) be two HFLTSs with the same length, which associate with two ordered lower index sets \( I_{b\alpha} \) and \( I_{b\beta} \), then [16]:

1. Addition:
\[
I(b_a) + I(b_\beta) = \bigcup_{l=1}^{\text{ol}_a} \{I^{o(l)}(b_a) + I^{o(l)}(b_\beta)\};
\]

2. Scalar multiplication:
\[
\lambda I(b_a) = \bigcup_{l=1}^{\text{ol}_a} \{\lambda I^{o(l)}(b_a)\} \quad (\lambda \geq 0);
\]

3. Power:
\[
(I(b_a))^\lambda = \bigcup_{l=1}^{\text{ol}_a} \{(I^{o(l)}(b_a))^\lambda\} \quad (\lambda \geq 0);
\]

where \( o(l) \) is the order of \( l \) th largest LTs in \( b_a \) or \( b_\beta \).

3. Consistency and consensus driven GDM with HFLPRs

In the section, we establish the framework of GDM with HFLPRs by ensuring the geometric consistency of a HFLPR, defining a consensus reaching process, and deriving the outcomes of the problem.

3.1. Geometric consistency of a HFLPR

Geometric consistency is a method proposed by Crawford and Williams [34] for supporting decision-makers to make a decision with MPR, which is developed by utilizing the row geometric mean to
build an optimization model. To exert its property in handling preference relation, based on the linguistic GCI [37] and the feature of HFLPR, in this section, we make discussions for the GCI of HFLPR.

Motivated by the additive transitivity property of LPR [38], we can give the following concept:

**Definition 3.1.** Let \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \) be a set of alternatives, and \( B = (b_j)_{n \times n} \) be a normalized HFLPR on \( X \), where \( b_j = \{b_j^l \mid l = 1, \ldots, \#b\} \), then \( B \) is called a perfectly consistent HFLPR if

\[
\left( I^{o(i)}(b_{ik}) - \tau \right) + \left( I^{o(j)}(b_{kj}) - \tau \right) = \left( I^{o(i)}(b_{kj}) - \tau \right), \quad i, j, k = 1, 2, \ldots, n
\]

(3.1)

**Theorem 3.1.** Suppose that \( B = (b_j)_{n \times n} \) is a consistent HFLPR, where \( b_j = \{b_j^l \mid l = 1, \ldots, \#b\} \), if we let

\[
h_j = \frac{I(b_j)}{2\tau}
\]

(3.2)

then \( H = (h_j)_{n \times n} \) is a consistent hesitant fuzzy preference relation (HFPR) defined in [39], where

\[
h_j = \{h_j^l \mid l = 1, \ldots, \#h\}, \quad \#b = \#h.
\]

**Proof.** For a consistent HFLPR, by Definition 3.1, we get that \( I^{o(i)}(b_{ik}) + I^{o(j)}(b_{kj}) - \tau = I^{o(i)}(b_{kj}) \), then for a consistent HFPR \( H = (h_j)_{n \times n} \), we get

\[
h_k^i + h_j^j - 0.5 = \frac{I^{o(i)}(b_{ik})}{2\tau} + \frac{I^{o(j)}(b_{kj})}{2\tau} - \frac{\tau}{2\tau} = \frac{I^{o(i)}(b_{kj})}{2\tau} = h_j^l.
\]

Conversely, \( I^{o(i)}(b_{ik}) + I^{o(j)}(b_{kj}) = 2\tau h_k^i + 2\tau h_j^j = 2\tau h_j^j + \tau = I^{o(i)}(b_{j}) + \tau \), which completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

**Theorem 3.2.** Let \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \) be a set of alternatives, \( B = (b_j)_{n \times n} \) be a HFLPR on \( X \), then \( B \) is a consistent HFLPR if

\[
I^{o(i)}(b_{j}) \text{ or } I^{o(i)}(b_{j}) = 2\tau(\alpha(w_i - w_j) + 0.5)
\]

(3.3)

**Proof.** By Theorem 3.1, we have

\[
I^{o(i)}(b_{j}) = I^{o(i)}(b_{ik}) + I^{o(i)}(b_{kj}) - \tau.
\]

Based on a consistent hesitant multiplicative preference relation \( M = (m_j)_{n \times n} \), where \( m_j = \{m_j^l \mid l = 1, \ldots, \#m\} \)
satisfies \( \frac{w_i}{w_j} = m_{ij}^{(1)} or... or m_{ij}^{(w)} \), \( i, j = 1,2,...,n \) \[40\], and a consistent fuzzy preference relation \( A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n} \) satisfies \( a_{ij} = \alpha (w_i - w_j) + 0.5 \) \[41\], we can easily deduce that

\[
\alpha (w_i - w_j) + 0.5 = h_{ij}^1 or... or h_{ij}^n,
\]

where the parameter \( \alpha \) is determined by decision-makers for reflecting the importance to the difference between \( w_i \) and \( w_j \) satisfying \( \alpha \geq \frac{n-1}{2} \) \[42\]. Furtherly

\[
2\alpha (w_i - w_j) + 0.5 = I^{\alpha(1)}(b_j) or... or I^{\alpha(1)}(b_i),
\]

which completes the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Denote \( \varphi_j = I^{\alpha(1)}(b_j) or... or I^{\alpha(1)}(b_i) \), then based on the above work, we can deduce the GCI for a HFLPR as:

**Definition 3.2.** Let \( X = \{x_1, x_2,...,x_n\} \) be a set of alternatives, \( B = (b_{ij})_{n \times n} \) be a HFLPR on \( X \), and \( w = (w_1, w_2,...,w_n)^T \) be the priority vector derived by the row geometric mean method, then the hesitant fuzzy linguistic geometric consistency index (HFLGCI) is defined as

\[
HFLGCI = \min \left\{ \frac{2}{(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i>j} \left[ \frac{\varphi_j}{\tau} - 2\alpha (w_i - w_j) - 1 \right]^2 \right\}
\]

It is evident that \( HFLGCI = 0 \) indicates \( B \) is perfectly consistent. Furthermore, suppose that the critical value of HFLGCI is \( \overline{HFLGCI} \), then

(1) If the HFLGCI of \( B \) is greater than \( \overline{HFLGCI} \), then \( B \) is unacceptably consistent;

(2) If the HFLGCI of \( B \) is less than or equal to \( \overline{HFLGCI} \), then \( B \) is acceptably consistent.

It is noted that minimizing the inconsistency in an HFLPR and the perfect one ensures less illogical judgments.

Based on the relationship between a MPR \( R = (r_{ij})_{n \times n} \) and a FPR \( A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n} \): \( r_{ij} = 9^{2a_{ij}-1} \) \[43\], and the
relationship between a consistent FPR \( A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n} \) and a consistent LPR \( C = (c_{ij})_{n \times n} : a_{ij} = \frac{I(c_{ij}) + \tau}{2\tau} \) [37], we give the following proposition:

**Proposition 3.1.** Let \( B = (b_{ij})_{n \times n} \subset X \times X \) be a HFLPR, where \( b_{ij} = \{ b_{ij}^{(l)} \mid l = 1, \ldots, \#b \} \), then the available solutions, which follow as a collection of priority vectors \( \mathbf{w}' = (w_{1}', w_{2}', \ldots, w_{n}')^T \) \( (l = 1, \ldots, \#b) \), based on the HFLGCI, where

\[
w_{ij}' = \exp \left\{ \ln \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left( \frac{9^{\left( \frac{I(c_{ij})}{\tau} \right)}}{n} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} - \ln \left( \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{9^{\left( \frac{I(c_{ij})}{\tau} \right)}}{n} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \right\} \quad \text{for } l \in \{1, \ldots, \#b\} \quad (3.5)
\]

**Proposition 3.2.** Let \( B = (b_{ij})_{n \times n} \subset X \times X \) be a HFLPR, then based on Proposition 3.1, the optimal solutions based on the HFLGCI can be extracted as \( \mathbf{w}^* = (w_{1}^*, w_{2}^*, \ldots, w_{n}^*)^T \), which corresponds to the priority vector that makes the HFLGCI minimum.

**Proposition 3.3.** Let \( B = (b_{ij})_{n \times n} \subset X \times X \) be a HFLPR, then a perfectly consistent LPR can be derived from \( B \), denoted as \( \tilde{C} = (c_{ij})_{n \times n} \), where

\[
\tilde{c}_{ij} = I^{-1} \left( 2\tau \frac{w_{i}^*}{w_{i}^* + w_{j}^*} \right) \quad (3.6)
\]

where \( w_{i}^* \) and \( w_{j}^* \) for \( i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n \) are the priorities derived from HFLPR that corresponds to the minimum value of HFLGCI.

The procedure of consistency checking and inconsistency improving for a HFLPR \( B = (b_{ij})_{n \times n} \subset X \times X \) can be summarized as:

**Algorithm I.** Consistency procedure of a HFLPR

Input: The HFLPR \( B = (b_{ij})_{n \times n} \), where \( b_{ij} = \{ b_{ij}^{(l)} \mid l = 1, \ldots, z \} \), the critical value \( \overline{HFLGCI} \).

Output: The HFLPR \( B \) or the revised \( \hat{B} \) with acceptable consistency.

**Step 1.** Let \( t = 1 \), denote \( B = (b_{ij})_{n \times n} \) as \( B(t) = (b_{ij}(t))_{n \times n} \);
Step 2. Calculate the optimal solution of $B(t)$ by Equation (3.5) and Proposition 3.2;

Step 3. Compute HFLGCI of $B(t)$ by Equation (3.4);

Step 4. If $HFLGCI > HFLGCI$, then go the next step; otherwise, go to Step 6;

Step 5. Obtain $\bar{C}(t) = (\bar{c}_{ij}(t))_{n \times n}$ from $B(t)$ by Equation (3.6), and let $I(b^{\omega(i)}_y(t + 1)) = \beta I(b^{\omega(i)}_y(t)) + (1 - \beta)I(\bar{c}_{ij}(t))$ $(0 \leq \beta \leq 1)$, $t = t + 1$. Return to Step 2;

Step 6. Output $B(t)$.

End.

Proposition 3.4. The convergence and monotonicity hold in Algorithm I.

Proof. (1) Monotonicity:

In Step 5, the LPR derived from the modified HFLPR with the minimum consistency deviation is closer to the correspondingly perfect LPR. Then based on Eq. (3.1) and Eq. (3.4), we can get

$$HFLGCI(t) \leq HFLGCI(t - 1).$$

It indicates that the value of consensus degree holds or decreases after each step of step 5, which proves the Monotonicity of Algorithm 1.

(2) Convergence:

We assume that $\Delta$ is the minimum value change consistency degree during the $t$ th loop of Step 5, then the following equation holds

$$HFLGCI(t) \leq HFLGCI(t - 1) - \Delta,$$

where $t$ is the looping time of Step 5. Assuming $HFLGCI(0)$ is the consistency degree of the original HFLPR, then:

$$HFLGCI(t) \leq HFLGCI(t - 1) - \Delta \leq HFLGCI(t - 2) - 2\Delta \leq \ldots \leq HFLGCI(0) - t\Delta.$$

In the following, we use proof by contradiction to present the convergence of Algorithm 1.
If Algorithm 1 loops perpetually, i.e., \( t \to +\infty \), then \( HFLGCI(t) \leq HFLGCI(0) - t \Delta \leq -\infty \), which is contradictory with \( HFLGCI(t) \geq 0 \). Therefore, we can deduce that Algorithm 1 stops within finite steps, indicating the convergence of Algorithm 1 holds.

The above work completes the proof of Proposition 3.4.

### 3.2. Consensus state of HFLPRs

The section aims to introduce a consensus measure for a group of HFLPRs, and then provide a consensus procedure based on the proposed consensus measure.

**Part 1. Weight determination of decision-makers**

**Definition 3.2.** Let \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \) be a set of alternatives, \( B^h = (b_{ij}^h)_{n \times n} \subseteq X \times X \ (h = 1, 2, \ldots, k) \) be a series of HFLPRs on \( X \) assigned by \( k \) decision-makers. Suppose that their corresponding perfect HFLPRs are \( \hat{B}^h = (\hat{b}_{ij}^h)_{n \times n} \subseteq X \times X \ (h = 1, 2, \ldots, k) \), respectively, then the weight of each decision-maker can be computed by

\[
p_h = \frac{\text{sim}(B^h, \hat{B}^h)}{\sum_{k} \text{sim}(B^k, \hat{B}^k)}, \forall h = 1, 2, \ldots, k \tag{3.7}
\]

where \( \text{sim}(B^h, \hat{B}^h) \) is the similarity measure between \( B^h \) and \( \hat{B}^h \), which can be obtained by the meanings defined in Refs. [36, 44-36], and the perfect HFLPR \( \hat{B}^h \) of \( B \) can be calculated by the meanings studied in Refs. [16, 18, 29].

**Remark 3.** The gist of determining the weights of decision-makers provides more trust to the decision-maker who provides a more logical HFLPRs.

**Part 2. Consensus measure and feedback mechanism**

Since Lehrer and Wagner [47] indicated that a rational group consensus reaching is a procedure for legitimately inspiring decision-makers to change their individual preferences, rather than pooling or
aggregation, the section proposes a consensus measure and a feedback mechanism for improving the group consensus.

**Definition 3.3.** Let \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \) be a set of alternatives, \( B^h = (b^h_{ij})_{n \times n} \subset X \times X \) \((h = 1, 2, \ldots, k)\) be a series of HFLPRs on \( X \) assigned by \( k \) decision-makers. Suppose that \( \overline{B}_h = (\overline{b}_{ij})_{n \times n} \subset X \times X \) is the collective HFLPR aggregated by all perfect HFLPRs of \( B^h \) for \( h = 1, 2, \ldots, k \), then the consensus degree of the group can be measured by

\[
\text{cd} = \min_h \{ \text{sim}(B^h, \overline{B}) \}, \quad \forall h = 1, 2, \ldots, k
\]

(3.8)

**Definition 3.4.** Let \( \gamma \) be the consensus threshold assigned by decision-makers in a group decision-making problem, and \( B^h = (b^h_{ij})_{n \times n} \subset X \times X \) \((h = 1, 2, \ldots, k)\) be a series of HFLPRs on \( X \), then the group is called to be consensus achieved if

\[
\min_h \{ \text{sim}(B^h, \overline{B}) \} \geq \gamma, \quad \forall h = 1, 2, \ldots, k
\]

(3.9)

Note that Wu and Xu [26] pointed out that there is no unified rule for the determination of \( \gamma \). It should be confirmed under the specific decision-making environment.

It is apparent that in a particular problem, the condition of group consensus may be unsatisfied with the original HFLPRs of decision-makers, i.e., \( \min_h \{ \text{sim}(B^h, \overline{B}) \} < \gamma \), then a procedure is necessary to make consensus improvement.

A consensus improvement mechanism usually includes computing group consensus index, judging the consensus degree, returning information, and modifying judgments. Based on the above definitions, we make detailly explanations for the mechanism as follows:

**Question 1. Group consensus**

Before measuring the group consensus, firstly, the collective HFLPR should be calculated. Suppose that the perfectly consistent of \( B^h = (b^h_{ij})_{n \times n} \) are \( \overline{B}^h = (\overline{b}^h_{ij})_{n \times n} \) for \( h = 1, 2, \ldots, k \), then the collective HFLPR
\( \tilde{B}_y = (\tilde{b}_y)_{h=1} \) of \( \tilde{B}^h \ (h=1,2,\ldots,k) \) can be obtained by the HFLWA operator [48], where

\[
\tilde{b}_y = \bigoplus_{h=1}^k p_h \tilde{b}_y^h = \bigcup_{(b_y^h) \in \mathbb{B}_y} \left\{ \sum_{h=1}^k p_h (\tilde{b}_y^h)^{\alpha(t)} \right\} \tag{3.10}
\]

Later on, by Equation (3.8), the group consensus degree can be computed.

**Question 2. Consensus judgment**

Let \( \gamma \) be the critical value of acceptable consensus assigned by decision-makers, then

(1) if \( \min_h \{\text{sim}(B^h, \tilde{B})\} \geq \gamma \), then the group consensus is achieved;

(2) if \( \min_h \{\text{sim}(B^h, \tilde{B})\} < \gamma \), then the group consensus is unsatisfied, which should be repaired.

**Question 3. Judgment modification**

Unlike other researches, the modification here focuses on addressing the individual HFLPR on an alternative with the maximal distance from the collective HFLPR. More specifically,

(1) Find the maximal distance of HFLPR on alternative from the collective HFLPR by

\[
md = \max_h \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \text{dis}(b_y^h, \tilde{b}_y) \right\} \tag{3.11}
\]

where \( \text{dis}(b_y^h, \tilde{b}_y) \) is the distance measure between \( b_y^h \) and \( \tilde{b}_y \), which can be calculated by the means in Ref. [44].

(2) Modify the HFLPR on the alternative selected by Equation (3.11) as

\[
(b_y^h)_{\text{new}} = \zeta b_y^h \oplus (1-\zeta)\tilde{b}_y, \ 0 \leq \zeta \leq 1 \tag{3.12}
\]

(3) Let \( b_y^h \) be \( (b_y^h)_{\text{new}} \), compute \( \min_h \{\text{sim}(B^h, \tilde{B})\} \). If \( \min_h \{\text{sim}(B^h, \tilde{B})\} < \gamma \), then repeat to find the maximal distance on alternative and modify the corresponding judgment; otherwise, the group consensus is achieved, and rank alternatives based on the collective HFLPR.

### 3.3. A procedure for consistency and consensus driven GDM with HFLPRs

This section briefly concludes the GDM process with HFLPRs based on the acceptable consistency and
consensus measurements.

**Algorithm II.** GDM with HFLPRs based on the acceptable consistency and consensus measurements.

Input: The individual HFLPRs \( B^h = (b_{ij}^h)_{\alpha \alpha} \subset X \times X \) \((h = 1, 2, \ldots, k)\) given by decision-makers, where \( b_{ij}^h = \{(b_{ij}^h)^{a(l)}\} l = 1, 2, \ldots, z \), the critical value \( HFLGCI \), the critical value \( \gamma \).

Output: A ranking on \( X \).

**Step 1.** Utilize Algorithm I to obtain the acceptably consistent HFLPRs \( \bar{B}^h = (\bar{b}_{ij}^h)_{\alpha \alpha} \) of all individual HFLPRs \( B^h = (b_{ij}^h)_{\alpha \alpha} \) for \( h = 1, 2, \ldots, k \);

**Step 2.** Obtain the perfectly consistent HFLPRs \( \tilde{B}^h = (\tilde{b}_{ij}^h)_{\alpha \alpha} \) of all individual HFLPRs \( B^h = (b_{ij}^h)_{\alpha \alpha} \) for \( h = 1, 2, \ldots, k \), compute the weight of each decision-maker by Equation (3.7);

**Step 3.** Calculate the collective perfectly consistent HFLPR \( \tilde{B}_y = (\tilde{b}_{ij}^h)_{\alpha \alpha} \) by Equation (3.10). Let \( \tau = 1 \), Let \( \bar{B}^h = (\bar{b}_{ij}^h)_{\alpha \alpha} \) be \( \tilde{B}^h(\tau) = (\tilde{b}_{ij}^h(\tau))_{\alpha \alpha} \);

**Step 4.** Calculate the consensus degree of \( \tilde{B}^h(\tau) \) \((h = 1, 2, \ldots, k)\) by Equation (3.8), denoted as \( cd(\tau) \). If \( cd(\tau) > \gamma \), then go the next step; otherwise, go to Step 6;

**Step 5.** Find the maximal distance of HFLPR on alternatives by Equation (3.11), and revise the corresponding judgments on alternatives by Equation (3.12). Let \( \tau = \tau + 1 \), return to Step 4;

**Step 6.** Aggregate all \( \tilde{B}^h(\tau) = (\tilde{b}_{ij}^h(\tau))_{\alpha \alpha} \) \((h = 1, 2, \ldots, k)\) into \( B = (\tilde{b}_{ij})_{\alpha \alpha} \), get the optimal solution of \( B \) by Equation (3.5) and Proposition 3.2, and then obtain a ranking on \( X \).

**Proposition 3.5.** The convergence and monotonicity hold in Algorithm II.

**Proof.** This proof can be easily completed by the same idea as the proof for Proposition 3.4, which is omitted here.

The whole procedure can be simplified in Figure 1.
4. Discussions

4.1. Estimated critical values of HFLGCI

As presented in Algorithm I, $\overline{HFLGCI}$ is the critical value used to judge the acceptable consistency of a HFLPR, and it decides that the algorithm continues to run or not. In this section, we aim to investigate the critical values of HFLGCI in different scenarios, which provides decision support for the proposed algorithm.

To address this issue, we consider $n$ from 3 to 8 to meet common decision-making situations where the number of alternatives varies from 3 to 8. Since the undetermined parameter $\alpha$ may have an impact on $\overline{HFLGCI}$ in Algorithm I, for more general, we discuss the determination of $\overline{HFLGCI}$ under different
experiment scenarios, where the value of $\alpha$ is assigned as $(n-1)/2$, $(n-1)/2 + 0.2$, $(n-1)/2 + 0.4$, $(n-1)/2 + 0.6$, respectively. To decrease the interferences caused by specific decision-making situations, we let $\beta = 0.5$, and randomly create 1000 HFLPRs $B$ based on the LTS $S = \{ s_{\alpha} | \alpha = 0, 1, ..., 8 \}$ for each experiment scenario (each value of $n$ and each value of $\alpha$), then run Algorithm I for each created HFLPR $B$.

To obtain the critical value $HFLGCI$ under each experiment scenario, which is unknown now, we consider the acceptable consistency of the HFLPR from another aspect: if $t$ in Algorithm I is not equal to 1 and the difference between $HFLGCI_{t-1}$ and $HFLGCI_{t}$ is smaller than or equal to 0.0001, then we hold on the opinion that the HFLPR with $HFLGCI_{t-1}$ meets the requirement of acceptable consistency.

The outcomes of the above experiments with different values of $n$ and different values of $\alpha$ are presented in Table I.

**Table I.** The mean and variance of $HFLGCI_{t-1}$ derived from Algorithm I for each scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$HFLGCI_{t-1}$ $\alpha$</th>
<th>$\alpha = (n-1)/2$</th>
<th>$\alpha = (n-1)/2 + 0.2$</th>
<th>$\alpha = (n-1)/2 + 0.4$</th>
<th>$\alpha = (n-1)/2 + 0.6$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 3$</td>
<td>0.0431</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>0.1047</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 4$</td>
<td>0.0528</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.0905</td>
<td>0.0036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 5$</td>
<td>0.0595</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>0.0853</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 6$</td>
<td>0.0594</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.0837</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 7$</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.0771</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 8$</td>
<td>0.0597</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.0742</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I shows the outcomes of mean and variance of $HFLGCI_{t-1}$ for 1000 times running of Algorithm I under each value of $n$ and each value of $\alpha$, which proves that Algorithm I is feasible and has convergence in general cases. We can get from Table I that with the increase of $\alpha$, the mean of $HFLGCI_{t-1}$ increases, which correctly reflects the property presented in Ref. [42], i.e., the smaller value of $\alpha$ implies
that decision-maker is more care about the difference among alternatives (the priority difference of two alternatives is larger).

Since the determination of $\alpha$ is related to the value of $n$, we cannot directly compare each column in Table I. By Ref. [42], when the number of alternatives in HFLPR increases, the differences among alternatives decrease. Reflect in Equation (3.4), the value of $w_i - w_j$ gets smaller when $n$ increases, which means when $\alpha$ increases, the value of HFLGCI becomes less sensitive with the increase of $n$, which leads $HFLGCI_{r-1}$ being less sensitive with the increase of $n$. To intuitively reflect this situation, we let the second, the third, and the fourth columns of Table 1 subtract their previous columns and obtain Table II as follows:

**Table II. The change of $HFLGCI_{r-1}$ when $\alpha$ ascends**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The change of $HFLGCI_{r-1}$</th>
<th>$\alpha$ increases 0.2 from $(n-1)/2$</th>
<th>$\alpha$ increases 0.2 from $(n-1)/2 + 0.2$</th>
<th>$\alpha$ increases 0.2 from $(n-1)/2 + 0.4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 3$</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>0.0949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 4$</td>
<td>0.0377</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 5$</td>
<td>0.0258</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.0381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 6$</td>
<td>0.0243</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.0263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 7$</td>
<td>0.0155</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>0.0240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 8$</td>
<td>0.0145</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Table II, we could find that the changes of mean and variance of $HFLGCI_{r-1}$ becoming smaller when $n$ increases in each column. On the contrary, from each row of Table II, the change of $HFLGCI_{r-1}$ gets more sensitive with the increase of $\alpha$, indicating that the importance of the priority difference $w_i - w_j$ in Equation (3.4) decreases when $\alpha$ increases. Therefore, we recommend the decision-maker to set the value of $\alpha$ as $(n-1)/2$ in reality, which is the most effective way to emphasize the importance of the
priority differences among all alternatives. To better reflect the trend of data changes in Table II, we draw Figure 2. Furthermore, to discuss the suggestive value of $\bar{HFLGCI}$ according to the above-collected values of $HFLGCI_{r-1}$, we show the distribution density of $HFLGCI_{r-1}$ in Figure 3.

Figure 2. The change of $HFLGCI_{r-1}$ when $\alpha$ ascends

Figure 3. The distribution density of $HFLGCI_{r-1}$ when $n = 7$ (bar chart)

Figure 3 manifests the experiment scenarios that the distribution density of $HFLGCI_{r-1}$ with different values of $\alpha$ when $n = 7$. It is noted that the distribution densities of $HFLGCI_{r-1}$ with different values of
\( \alpha \) and \( n \) present similar graphical shapes. The distribution of the experiment scenario with a smaller value of \( \alpha \) is more narrow and closer to the y axis compared to other experiment scenarios in Figure 3. In order to better understand this figure, we use the polynomial curve fitting to create a distribution density curve for each \( \alpha \) and redraw Figure 3 as Figure 4.

**Figure 4.** Distribution density of \( HFLGCI_{t-1} \) when \( n = 7 \) (line chart)

By Figure 4, we could see that these four experiment scenarios' peak value moving to the left with the increase of \( \alpha \). It should be noted that the right side of each curve is similar to the normal distribution curve in Figure 4, even though the whole distribution curves are not entirely similar to the normal distribution curve. The reason is that the HFLGCI is always a positive number, and we set the stop condition as the difference between \( HFLGCI_t \) and \( HFLGCI_{t-1} \) is not greater than 0.0001. In that condition, some outcomes of \( HFLGCI_{t-1} \) which located on the right side of the mean values may not be mathematically optimal (they may have smaller values in our random experiment); some outcomes of \( HFLGCI_{t-1} \) are only convergent to zero and do not manifest as a negative number. With such analyses and according to the central limit theorem, we can still treat the right side of all distribution curves as the normal distribution curves.

Therefore, we can conclude the suggested \( HFLGCI \) of each scenario in Table I as \( \text{mean} + 3\sqrt{\text{variance}} \).
which could cover 99.73% of cases and make sure Algorithm I could stop and be convergent to a reasonable result. The suggestive values of $HFLGC\bar{I}$ are listed in Table III.

4.2. Comparative analyses

In this section, we make comparative analyses among the proposed Algorithm II and three existing similar works. Firstly, we make general comparative analyses in Table IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considering all possible LPRs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregarding some values</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding extra values</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking consistency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving consistency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking Consensus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving consensus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining decision makers’ weights</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The selection process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculating the priority weights from consistency analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency property</td>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>Multiplicative</td>
<td>Additive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection basis</td>
<td>HFL averaging operator</td>
<td>HFL averaging operator</td>
<td>Priority weight</td>
<td>HFL geometric operator and priority weight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, we apply Algorithm II to handle Example 8 in Ref. [21] proposed by Wu et al., the example in Section 5 of Ref. [26] proposed by Wu and Xu, and Example 5.1 in Ref. [29] proposed by Zhang and Chen, respectively, then the outcomes can be presented in Table V. Furthermore, from the perspectives of iteration numbers to reach consistency and consensus, we give the comparisons between Algorithm II and each above existing work in Table VI and Table VII.
Table V. The outcomes of examples obtained by different methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Weight of each decision maker</th>
<th>Priority of each alternative</th>
<th>Ranking orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wu et al.’s method [21]</td>
<td>0.2526, 0.2640, 0.2464, 0.2370</td>
<td>0.0313, 0.0477, 0.0361, 0.0571</td>
<td>$X_1 \succ X_3 \succ X_2 \succ X_4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Algorithm II</td>
<td>0.2531, 0.2520, 0.2440, 0.2409</td>
<td>0.3636, 0.1840, 0.2786, 0.1738</td>
<td>$X_1 \succ X_3 \succ X_2 \succ X_4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu and Xu’s method [26]</td>
<td>0.25, 0.25, 0.25, 0.25</td>
<td>0.0313, 0.0180, 0.0180, 0.1052</td>
<td>$X_1 \succ X_3 \succ X_2 \succ X_4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Algorithm II</td>
<td>0.2565, 0.2417, 0.2575, 0.2443</td>
<td>0.3342, 0.1814, 0.2851, 0.1893</td>
<td>$X_1 \succ X_3 \succ X_4 \succ X_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang and Chen’s method [29]</td>
<td>0.2569, 0.3716, 0.3715</td>
<td>0.3226, 0.2554, 0.2122, 0.2099</td>
<td>$X_1 \succ X_3 \succ X_4 \succ X_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Algorithm II</td>
<td>0.3285, 0.3397, 0.3319</td>
<td>0.3116, 0.3030, 0.1609, 0.2245</td>
<td>$X_1 \succ X_2 \succ X_4 \succ X_3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VI. The efficiency comparison based on the iteration numbers to reach consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Critical value of $HFLGCI$</th>
<th>Number of Iterations to adjust HFLPR with acceptable consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zhang and Chen’s method [29]</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1, 7 and 4 rounds for 3 HFLPRs respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Algorithm II</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1, 2 and 2 rounds for 3 HFLPRs respectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VII. The efficiency comparison of different methods based on the iteration numbers to reach consensus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Critical value of acceptable consensus</th>
<th>Number of iterations to reach consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wu et al.’s method [21]</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Algorithm II</td>
<td>0.85 (0.90)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu and Xu’s method [26]</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Algorithm II</td>
<td>0.85 (0.90)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Table IV-VII we can get the following results:

(1) The optimal alternatives of the example in Section 5 of Ref. [26] obtained by the proposed algorithm and
Wu and Xu’s method [26] are the same, but rankings obtained by two ways are slightly different, where the priorities of \(X_2\) and \(X_4\) obtained by the two ways are quite close.

(2) The rankings of Example 8 in Ref. [21] derived by the proposed algorithm and Wu et al.’s method [41] present the same ranking of alternatives: \(X_2 \succ X_1 \succ X_3 \succ X_4\), although the two priority vectors of alternatives are slightly different.

(3) The rankings of Example 5.1 in Ref. [29] derived by the proposed algorithm and Zhang and Chen’s method are the same except the order between \(X_3\) and \(X_4\). Zhang and Chen’s method obtains quite close priorities for alternatives \(X_3\) and \(X_4\). Due to the different methods for decision-makers’ weights determination, the values in terms of weights of decision-makers are quite different by the two methods in Table IV.

(4) Set the critical value of acceptable consistency as 0.1, then for Example 5.1 in Ref. [29], after adjusting the individual HFLPR \(B^1\) for one time, the individual HFLPR \(B^2\) for seven times, and the individual HFLPR \(B^3\) for four times, the HFLPRs with acceptable consistency can be obtained; where Algorithm 2 only need 1, 2 and 2 times to adjust the individual HFLPRs into acceptable ones. This shows that Algorithm 2 is more efficient than Zhang and Chen’s method [29].

(5) Even though both of critical values of acceptable consensus in Example 8 of Ref. [21] and Section 5 of Ref. [26] are set to 0.8, which is smaller than the critical value in Algorithm 2: 0.85, the iteration numbers of the two methods to reach consensus are 3, bigger than 1 in Algorithm 2. Furthermore, Algorithm 2 only needs 3 iterations to reach a consensus with the critical value of 0.9. These indicate that Algorithm 2 is more efficient than Wu et al.’s method [21] and Wu and Xu’s method [26].

Moreover, we can give explanations and deduce comparative conclusions for the above results as follows:
(1) Since the proposed algorithm and Wu et al.’s method [21] both compute the relative weight of a decision-maker to all decision-makers, they get quite close weights of decision-makers.

(2) The main difference between the proposed algorithm and Wu and Xu’s method [26] is that the proposed algorithm calculates each decision-maker’s weight, where Wu and Xu’s method [26] just assigned the same weight to decision-makers when aggregating the individual HFLPRs. Since different decision-makers have different knowledge and experience, different importance should be assigned to each decision-maker, and neglecting the difference may be irrational.

(3) The proposed algorithm and Zhang and Chen’s method [29] have similar aspects, such as checking and improving consistency for individual HFLPRs, determining decision-makers’ weights, and calculating the priorities for alternatives based on consistency analysis. In the proposed algorithm, we consider the similarity between a HFLPR and its perfectly consistent HFLPR when calculating decision-makers’ weights, and all HFLPRs’ consistency index is optimized enough. Comparatively, Zhang and Chen’s method [29] considers the distance (similarity) of an individual HFLPR with other individual HFLPRs and then gets a confidence degree based on the distance measure, which ignores the character that the logical judgments can be used as essential references for others.

(4) Another difference between the proposed algorithm and Zhang and Chen’s method [29] is that the proposed algorithm uses the additive consistency concepts for HFLPRs, while Zhang and Chen’s method [29] uses the multiplicative consistency and illustrates the additive consistency existing a limitation: the sum of two LTs might fall out of the predefined LTS. However, the proposed algorithm can avoid this limitation with the definitions and method shown in Section 3.

5. A case study – Performance evaluation of venture capital guiding funds
With the promotion of the economy and society, the cultivation of a strategic emerging industry has become an important target to sustain social development in China. Venture capital guiding fund, which focuses on investing in the strategic emerging industry to accelerate the concentration of high-quality venture capital, projects, technologies, and talents, can exert the effect of leverage amplification for the financial fund. In short, a venture capital guiding fund provides an efficient way for the government to conduct economic and social regulation as the market participants. In recent years, the government investment scale and the driven investment capital scale on venture capital guiding funds are thriving, which are vital for economic restructuring in China. Under such a situation, evaluating the performance of venture capital guiding fund is necessary to ensure its operational standardization and promote its prosperous development.

The first step of the evaluation issue is to determine the evaluated index system. According to the indexes discussed in Ref. [49-51], they can be selected as:

(1) Policy efficiency, which contains the aspects of leverage effect, policy implementation, among others;

(2) Economic efficiency, which includes venture capital returns, investment situation, among others;

(3) Management efficiency, which consists of management standardization, professional management techniques.

Since the method established in Section 3 have the advantages that (1) the information needed from decision-makers conforms to their expression habit and (2) the algorithm can ensure the logicality and rationality of the outcomes, in the following, we apply the proposed algorithm to deal with the performance evaluation issue, which is superior to the method used in Ref. [51].

Suppose an enterprise with three funds, denoted as \( \{A_i\}_{i=1,2,3} \), and a top management team containing four experts (\( \{D_k\}_{k=1,2,3,4} \)) needs to evaluate the three funds. Firstly, experts assign the priority vector of policy efficiency, economic efficiency, and management efficiency as \( \sigma = (0.3,0.5,0.2)^T \),
then according to the performance of the three funds, experts provide their pairwise comparisons on alternatives with respect to each index as follows:

(1) For the index of policy efficiency:

\[
B^{1, \text{index}} = \begin{bmatrix}
A_1 & A_2 & A_3 \\
\{s_1\} & \{s_4, s_5\} & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} \\
A_2 & \{s_4, s_5\} & \{s_4\} \\
A_3 & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} & \{s_4\}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( B^{k, \text{index}} \) is the judgments given by expert \( D_k \) with respect to policy efficiency.

(2) For the index of economic efficiency:

\[
B^{1, \text{index}} = \begin{bmatrix}
A_1 & A_2 & A_3 \\
\{s_1\} & \{s_3, s_5\} & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} \\
A_2 & \{s_4\} & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} \\
A_3 & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} & \{s_4\}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
B^{2, \text{index}} = \begin{bmatrix}
A_1 & A_2 & A_3 \\
\{s_4, s_5\} & \{s_4\} & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} \\
A_2 & \{s_4\} & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} \\
A_3 & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} & \{s_4\}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
B^{3, \text{index}} = \begin{bmatrix}
A_1 & A_2 & A_3 \\
\{s_4, s_5\} & \{s_4\} & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} \\
A_2 & \{s_4\} & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} \\
A_3 & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} & \{s_4\}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
B^{4, \text{index}} = \begin{bmatrix}
A_1 & A_2 & A_3 \\
\{s_4\} & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} \\
A_2 & \{s_4\} & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} \\
A_3 & \{s_4, s_5, s_6\} & \{s_4\}
\end{bmatrix},
\]
where $B^{k, \text{index} 2}$ is the judgments given by expert $D_k$ with respect to economic efficiency.

(3) For the index of management efficiency:

where $B^{k, \text{index} 3}$ is the judgments given by expert $D_k$ with respect to management efficiency, and the HFLPRs are given based on the LTS $S = \{s_0 | \alpha = 0, 1,..., 8\}$.

To solve this problem, Algorithm II needs to be applied to address the HFLPRs with respect to each index. Here we set $\alpha = 1.2$, $\beta = 0.5$ and $\gamma = 0.95$ for $n = 3$, then

**Step 1.** Input all HFLPRs $B^{h, \text{index} 1} = (b_{ij}^{h, \text{index} 1})_{3\times 3}$, $B^{h, \text{index} 2} = (b_{ij}^{h, \text{index} 2})_{3\times 3}$ and $B^{h, \text{index} 3} = (b_{ij}^{h, \text{index} 3})_{3\times 3}$.
given by decision-makers, utilize Algorithm I to obtain the acceptably consistent HFLPRs

\[ \tilde{B}^{h,\text{index}1} = (\tilde{b}_{ij}^{h,\text{index}1})_{3 \times 3}, \quad \tilde{B}^{h,\text{index}2} = (\tilde{b}_{ij}^{h,\text{index}2})_{3 \times 3} \]

and \( \tilde{B}^{h,\text{index}3} = (\tilde{b}_{ij}^{h,\text{index}3})_{3 \times 3} \) of all individual HFLPRs for

\( h = 1, 2, 3, 4 \). Thereinto \( \tilde{B}^{h,\text{index}2} = (\tilde{b}_{ij}^{h,\text{index}2})_{3 \times 3} \) are listed as follows:

\[
\tilde{B}^{1,\text{index}2} = A_1 \begin{bmatrix}
\{ s_1 \} & \{ s_5, s_{5.5041}, s_{5.3791} \} & \{ s_4 \} \\
\{ s_{2.4592}, s_{2.3342} \} & \{ s_2 \} & \{ s_{2.3707}, s_{2.4957}, s_{2.6207} \} \\
\{ s_{3.9564}, s_{3.8314}, s_{3.7064} \} & \{ s_{5.6293}, s_{5.5041}, s_{5.3791} \} & \{ s_4 \}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\tilde{B}^{2,\text{index}2} = A_1 \begin{bmatrix}
\{ s_{3.3261}, s_{3.2011} \} & \{ s_4 \} & \{ s_{3.5349}, s_{3.6599}, s_{3.7849} \} \\
\{ s_{5.5349}, s_{5.4099} \} & \{ s_{4.4651}, s_{4.3401}, s_{4.2151} \} & \{ s_4 \}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\tilde{B}^{3,\text{index}2} = A_1 \begin{bmatrix}
\{ s_{5.5386}, s_{5.2886}, s_{5.0386} \} & \{ s_4 \} & \{ s_{4.4614}, s_{4.7114}, s_{4.9614} \} \\
\{ s_{3.9168}, s_{3.6668} \} & \{ s_{4.6293}, s_{4.3799}, s_{4.1299} \} & \{ s_4 \}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\tilde{B}^{4,\text{index}2} = A_1 \begin{bmatrix}
\{ s_{2.9797}, s_{2.2987} \} & \{ s_4 \} & \{ s_{5.2013}, s_{5.7013} \} \\
\{ s_{1.3787}, s_{2.6378} \} & \{ s_{4.8622}, s_{4.3622}, s_{5.8622} \} & \{ s_4 \}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

**Step 2.** Obtain the perfectly consistent HFLPRs of individual HFLPRs with respect to each index, and compute the weight vector of experts as \( p = (0.2523, 0.2478, 0.2488, 0.2512)^T \).

**Step 3.** Calculate the collective perfect HFLPR, where the collective perfect HFLPR with respect to index 2 is shown below:

\[
\tilde{B}^{2} = A_1 \begin{bmatrix}
\{ s_4 \} & \{ s_{4.9236}, s_{5.5845}, s_{5.5822} \} & \{ s_{4.0706}, s_{4.4348}, s_{5.9647} \} \\
\{ s_{1.0764}, s_{2.4515}, s_{2.4178} \} & \{ s_4 \} & \{ s_{3.1518}, s_{3.8325}, s_{4.5011} \} \\
\{ s_{1.9294}, s_{2.5652}, s_{2.0533} \} & \{ s_{4.8482}, s_{4.1675}, s_{4.4989} \} & \{ s_4 \}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

**Step 4.** Calculate the consensus degree \( cd \) for the HFLPRs with respect to each index, and use the feedback mechanism in Algorithm II to modify the HFLPRs which are unsatisfied with the group consensus.
Output the final outcomes with respect to each index, which is listed in Table VIII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Priorities of three funds</th>
<th>Ranking of funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$w^{*,\text{index1}} = (0.3222, 0.4297, 0.2480)^T$</td>
<td>$X_2 \succ X_1 \succ X_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$w^{*,\text{index2}} = (0.4160, 0.2312, 0.3527)^T$</td>
<td>$X_1 \succ X_3 \succ X_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$w^{*,\text{index3}} = (0.4162, 0.3132, 0.2706)^T$</td>
<td>$X_1 \succ X_2 \succ X_3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the priority vector of the indexes policy efficiency, economic efficiency, and management efficiency: $\sigma = (0.3, 0.5, 0.2)^T$, we multiply this priority vector with three optimal priority vectors in Table VIII, then the final performance evaluating outcomes of the three funds are: $w^* = (0.3879, 0.3072, 0.3049)^T$, which indicates $X_1 \succ X_2 \succ X_3$. From the above outcomes, we can get that the second fund has more room to be improved at the aspect of economic efficiency. Furthermore, if the top management team pays more attention to the management performance of the third fund, it will bring more benefits to the enterprise.

6. An application of the proposed algorithms--Online portal

Suppose that decision-makers or policymakers use the proposed algorithm to solve a GDM problem. Since redoing (programming) or deploying our work costs lots of effort and resources, and the essential background knowledge and programming skills are commonly limited, we introduce an online portal that involves two proposed algorithms as an application of our work that brings convenience for users.

The portal is publicly accessible at http://34.92.80.18/ (username: uniman; password: friendintegrityfaith). It provides a path for users to utilize our work to solve the decision-making problems without knowing the detail of the internal algorithms or background knowledge of the HFLPR.

The user interface (UI) of the portal is shown in Figure 5. The red box provides detailed explanations of
how we transfer the HFLPRs to imputable formats for the convenience of users. Users could switch Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 in the “Algorithm Selection box”. The number of alternatives could be specified in the box of “Number of Alternatives”.

For Algorithm 1 (Consistency procedure of a HFLPR), after a user inputs his/her HFLPR, the inputted information is sent to the backend to process by clicking the “Submit” button. The result is shown in the box of “Final Result”.

**Decision Making by using HFLPR**

1. This work is a framework which could support and provide convenient online simulation tool for some works of hesitant fuzzy linguistic preference relation (HFLPR) [1-4] (See “Reference and note” box).
2. Their algorithms could add to the back-end of this framework no matter it programmed in MATLAB, R or Python. Here use (4)’s two algorithms (nets in MATLAB) as showcases (Please see [4] for detail about algorithms).
3. Normalized decision makers provide their hesitant fuzzy linguistic preference opinions using the following linguistic terms (1 Ts): Very Poor, Poor, Medium, Good, Very Good (Please see “Reference and note” box for more detail).
4. For the convenience of user’s input, this simulation tool simplifies the representation of the element of HFLPR to the input form below. User only needs to input the subscript of each element. Normally user need to provide all Ts for each element in HFLP, here only provide max and min Ts in each element of HFLPR. This tool will automatically generate all Hesitant Fuzzy Linguistic Term Sets (HFLTS) based on their max and min Ts and send to back-end algorithm. Based on these, we propose input rules 1&2 for this tool below.
5. The users, original HFLPR will be shown in the box of “User’s Input HFLPR” after the click of Submit or Proceed.
6. The first algorithm of [4] provides a procedure for consistency checking and inconsistency improving for HFLPR and returns a revised HFLPR with acceptable consistency. HFLPR will be shown in the area of Final Result.
7. Input Rule 1: Please input subscript number of Lt for each input box, only provides max and min Ts for each element of HFLPR, here $\text{HFLPR}_L = \text{HFLPR}_U = x_T$.
8. Input Rule 2: Your input will also be validated under following property of HFLPR: $\text{HFLPR}_L \preceq \text{HFLPR}_U \preceq x_T$.
9. Under algorithm 2, the user selects a HFLPR, from the box below: First two numbers are number of alternatives and max length of all linguistic term sets in this HFLPR.
10. Please input HFLPRs on by one, the HFLPR’s main information will be shown in the box below: the form by clicking the ‘Submit’ button. First two numbers are number of alternatives and max length of all linguistic term sets in this HFLPR.

Figure 5. The portal UI

If users select Algorithm 2 (GDM based on the acceptable consistency and consensus measurements.) to solve the GDM problem, then the UI is changed to Figure 6. Here, users could specify the consensus
threshold value, and input all HFLPRs one by one. The inputted HFLPRs are shown in the UI. If there exists a wrong HFLPR, users could delete the input HFLPRs and re-input them. Once finished, users could click the “Submit” button to get the ranking result. The ranking weight of each alternative is shown in the box of “Final Result”.

A more detailed “User Guide” file which demonstrates how to implement this portal to solve decision-making problems can be downloaded by clicking the link of “click to download”

![Figure 6. The UI of Algorithm 2](image)

7. Conclusions

As HFLPR provides a more flexible and efficient expression way for decision-makers under uncertainty, the paper has investigated an algorithm for GDM with HFLPRs based on acceptable consistency and consensus measurements. The paper has discussed the relationship between the numerical and linguistic
types of preference relations and has proposed the GCI for HFLPRs, called HFLGCI. Later on, the paper has measured the group consensus degree through the similarity of original individual HFLPRs and the overall perfect HFLPR. It has further presented a feedback algorithm for reaching group consensus with acceptably consistent HFLPRs contains the determination of decision-makers’ weights. Based on the proposed algorithm, the paper has designed experiments to discuss the critical values of HFLGCI with different orders of HFLPRs, and the critical values manifest the properties:

(1) For each order of HFLPRs, the critical value increases with the increase of $\alpha$, where $\alpha$ is a parameter in the algorithm to reconcile the difference between the priorities of any two alternatives;

(2) The changing trend of the critical value decreases with the increasing order of HFLPRs.

The paper has illustrated the practicability and effectiveness of the proposed algorithm by handling a case that evaluates the performance of venture capital guiding funds. Finally, an online decision-making portal is provided for decision-makers (users) to utilize the proposed algorithms to deal with decision-making problems.

For further work, there still exist great research prospect in the consistency and consensus theories of HFLPRs. For example, utilizing graph theory to investigate the consistency property of the HFLPR is a novel perspective, and addressing the GDM with HFLPRs when decision-makers cannot compromise their evaluations has practical significance.
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