

Application of tropical optimization for solving multicriteria problems of pairwise comparisons using log-Chebyshev approximation

N. Krivulin*

Abstract

We consider a decision-making problem to find absolute ratings of alternatives that are compared in pairs under multiple criteria, subject to constraints in the form of two-sided bounds on ratios between the ratings. Given matrices of pairwise comparisons made according to the criteria, the problem is formulated as the log-Chebyshev approximation of these matrices by a common consistent matrix (a symmetrically reciprocal matrix of unit rank) to minimize the approximation errors for all matrices simultaneously. We rearrange the approximation problem as a constrained multiobjective optimization problem of finding a vector that determines the approximating consistent matrix. The optimization problem is then represented in the framework of tropical algebra concerning the theory and applications of algebraic systems with idempotent operations. We apply methods and results of tropical optimization to handle the multiobjective optimization problem according to various principles of optimality. Complete solutions in the sense of the max-ordering, lexicographic ordering and lexicographic max-ordering optimality are obtained, which are given in a compact vector form ready for formal analysis and efficient computation. We present numerical examples of solving a multi-criteria problem of rating four alternatives from pairwise comparisons.

Keywords: idempotent semifield, tropical optimization, log-Chebyshev approximation, constrained multiobjective optimization, multiple criteria evaluation.

MSC (2020): 15A80, 90C24, 41A50, 90C29, 90B50

1 Introduction

The problem of evaluating ratings (scores, priorities, weights) of alternatives based on their pairwise comparisons under multiple criteria is a widely occur-

*Faculty of Mathematics and Mechanics, Saint Petersburg State University, 28 Universitetsky Ave., St. Petersburg, 198504, Russia, nkk@math.spbu.ru.

ring and highly demanded decision-making problem, which has been studied for decades in many researches including the classical paper by L. L. Thurstone [40]. Given results of comparisons of decision alternatives in the form of pairwise comparison matrices, the problem is to find a vector of individual ratings (scores, priorities, weights) of alternatives, which can be used to rank alternatives according to their ratings and thus provide a basis for optimal decisions.

The solution techniques available for the problem apply various heuristic procedures that do not guarantee the optimal solution, but produce acceptable results in practice, and mathematical methods that are formally justified, but may be computationally very expensive. Along with the methods based on conventional algebra, there exist solutions that use interval arithmetic, fuzzy arithmetic and tropical algebra.

One of the most prominent approach to solve multicriteria pairwise comparison problems, which is known as the analytical hierarchy process, has been proposed in the 1970s by T. L. Saaty [34, 35, 36]. The approach employs the principal eigenvalue method to derive a vector of individual ratings by calculating the normalized eigenvectors of the pairwise comparison matrices, corresponding to their maximal eigenvalues. In succeeding years the approach was extended to handle problems with interval and fuzzy pairwise comparison matrices [42, 4, 38, 39] (see also literature overviews in [16, 33]) and to implement tropical algebra [8, 9, 13, 41, 10].

Another widely used approach is the weighted geometric mean method, which is based on matrix approximation in the sense of the Euclidean metric in logarithmic scale [31, 6, 1]. Under this approach, the individual ratings are obtained from a matrix of pairwise comparisons as the vector of geometric means of elements in the rows of the matrix. For interval and fuzzy extensions of the geometric mean method one can consult [16, 33].

Different solution approaches to the pairwise comparison problems may yields results where the obtained ratings produce different or contradictory orders of alternatives [2, 1, 15, 29]. Some of the approaches offer analytical solutions with low computational complexity, whereas the other are based on numerical algorithms that may have a sufficient computational cost. As a result, the development of new effective solutions of the problem to supplement and complement existing approaches remains relevant.

A technique that applies approximation of pairwise comparison matrices in Chebyshev metric in logarithmic scale (log-Chebyshev approximation) is proposed and developed in [20, 21, 25]. The technique leads to optimization problems in the framework of tropical algebra that concerns the theory and applications of semirings and semifields with idempotent operations. Using methods and results of tropical optimization yields analytical solutions of the problem in a compact vector form ready for both formal analysis and straightforward computations. Moreover, the log-Chebyshev approximation approach can be directly extended to solve pairwise comparison problems

with constraints imposed on the individual ratings of alternatives, whereas both methods of principal eigenvector and geometric mean cannot accommodate additional constraints without considerable complication of solution.

Multicriteria pairwise comparison problems can be considered as optimization problems with multiple objectives and solved using methods and techniques available in multiobjective optimization [7, 27, 3, 30, 32]. The most common approach to solving a multiobjective optimization problem is to obtain Pareto-optimal (nondominated) solutions that, which cannot be improved for any one objective without worsening at least one other objective. To obtain Pareto-optimal solutions, various techniques are applied to reduce the problem with multiple (vector) objective function to one or more problems with ordinary (scalar) objective functions. As examples, one can consider linear scalarization used in the weighted geometric mean method and Chebyshev scalarization in the log-Chebyshev approximation method. Other examples include max-ordering, lexicographic ordering and lexicographic max-ordering techniques.

In this paper, we consider a decision-making problem to find absolute ratings of alternatives that are compared in pairs under multiple criteria, subject to constraints in the form of two-sided bounds (box-constraints) on ratios between the ratings. Given matrices of pairwise comparisons made according to the criteria, the problem is formulated as the log-Chebyshev approximation of these matrices by a common consistent matrix (a symmetrically reciprocal matrix of unit rank) to minimize the approximation errors for all matrices simultaneously. We rearrange the approximation problem as a constrained multiobjective optimization problem of finding a vector that determines the approximating consistent matrix. The optimization problem is then represented in the framework of tropical algebra. We apply methods and results of tropical optimization to handle the multiobjective optimization problem according to various principles of optimality. Complete solutions in the sense of the max-ordering, lexicographic ordering and lexicographic max-ordering optimality are obtained which are given in a compact vector form ready for formal analysis and efficient computation. We present numerical examples of solving a multi-criteria problem of rating four alternatives from pairwise comparisons as an illustration of the computational technique used.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We start with Section 2 where a constrained pairwise comparison problem with a single criterion and its solution based on the log-Chebyshev approximation is considered. In Section 3 we extend the pairwise comparison problem to take into account multiple criteria and describe various solution approaches. Section 4 offers an outline of basic definitions and results of tropical max-algebra needed below. In Section 5, we present solutions to tropical optimization problems, which are used to handle multicriteria pairwise comparison problems in Section 6. Section 7 gives numerical examples to illustrate the obtained results,

and Section 8 offers short concluding remarks.

2 Single-Criterion Pairwise Comparison Problem

Suppose that n alternatives are compared in pairs, which results in an $(n \times n)$ -matrix $\mathbf{C} = (c_{ij})$ of pairwise comparisons, where the entry $c_{ij} > 0$ shows by how many times alternative i is considered more preferable than alternative j . The pairwise comparison matrix \mathbf{C} is assumed to satisfy the condition $c_{ij} = 1/c_{ji}$ (and thus $c_{ii} = 1$) to be valid for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, which makes the matrix \mathbf{C} be symmetrically reciprocal. This condition says that if alternative i is estimated to be c_{ij} times better than j , then alternative j must be $1/c_{ij}$ better than i .

Given a pairwise comparison matrix \mathbf{C} , which presents results of relative evaluation of one alternative against another, the problem of interest is to calculate absolute ratings of alternatives in the form of an n -vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_j)$, where $x_j > 0$ represents the rating of alternative j .

A pairwise comparison matrix \mathbf{C} is referred to as consistent if the condition $c_{ij} = c_{ik}c_{kj}$ holds for all $i, j, k = 1, \dots, n$. This condition corresponds to the natural transitivity of judgments, which requires that if alternative i is considered c_{ik} times better than k , and alternative k is c_{kj} times better than j , then alternative i should be $c_{ik} \times c_{kj}$ times better than j .

For a consistent matrix \mathbf{C} , it is not difficult to verify that there exists a positive vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_j)$ whose entries determine the entries of \mathbf{C} by the relation $c_{ij} = x_i/x_j$ to be valid for all i, j , which means that the matrix \mathbf{C} is of unit rank. Indeed, the transitivity condition $c_{ij} = c_{ik}c_{kj}$ implies that any two columns j and k in \mathbf{C} are collinear, and thus we can write $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{xy}^T$ where $\mathbf{x} = (x_j)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_j)$ are positive column vectors.

Since each entry of the matrix \mathbf{C} is given by $c_{ij} = x_i y_j$ with $x_i y_i = c_{ii} = 1$, we have $y_i = 1/x_i$ for all i , which yields the above relation. Moreover, it directly follows from this relation that the vector \mathbf{x} , which is defined up to a positive factor, can be taken as a vector of absolute ratings of alternatives and thus gives the solution of the pairwise comparison problem.

The matrices of pairwise comparisons that appear in real-world problems are commonly not consistent, which makes the problem of evaluating absolute ratings nontrivial. The solution techniques available to handle the problem include various heuristic methods that offer acceptable results in many cases in practice, and approximation methods that provide mathematically justified optimal solutions.

2.1 Solution Approaches to Pairwise Comparison Problem

The heuristic methods are mainly based on aggregating columns of the pairwise comparison matrix to obtain a solution by calculating a weighted sum

of these columns [5]. In the most widely used method of principal eigenvector [34, 35, 36], the solution vector \mathbf{x} is defined as the sum of columns taken with weights that are assumed proportional to the components of \mathbf{x} . Under this assumption, the vector \mathbf{x} must satisfy the equation $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{x} = \lambda\mathbf{x}$ where λ is a coefficient of proportionality, and it is found as the principal (Perron) eigenvector of the matrix \mathbf{C} corresponding to the maximum eigenvalue.

The approximation methods reduce the problem to finding a consistent matrix \mathbf{X} that approximates a given matrix \mathbf{C} in the sense of some distance function as approximation error [5]. Then, a positive vector \mathbf{x} that determines the approximating consistent matrix is taken as a vector of absolute ratings of alternatives. The approximation problem is solved as an optimization problem of minimizing the distance between the matrices \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{X} , which provides a formal justification of the solution.

If the approximation error is measured on the standard linear scale, the approach normally leads to complex multiextremal optimization problems that are very hard to solve [37]. On the contrary, the application of the logarithmic scale (with logarithm to a base greater than 1) makes the approximation problem more tractable and even allows the solution to be derived analytically in an exact explicit form.

A widespread approximation technique to solve the pairwise comparison problem measures the error between the matrices $\mathbf{C} = (c_{ij})$ and $\mathbf{X} = (x_i/x_j)$ by using the Euclidean metric in logarithmic scale [31, 6, 1]. This technique known as the method of geometric mean, involves finding a positive vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_j)$ that solves the problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left(\log c_{ij} - \log \frac{x_i}{x_j} \right)^2.$$

The standard solution approach, which applies the first derivative test to derive the roots of the partial derivatives of the objective function with respect to all x_i , yields a solution vector \mathbf{x} with the components given in the parametric form

$$x_i = \left(\prod_{j=1}^n c_{ij} \right)^{1/n} u, \quad u > 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

After normalization (e.g. by dividing by the sum of components), this vector is taken as the optimal solution of the pairwise comparison problem.

As another approximation technique, a method of minimizing the Chebyshev distance in logarithmic scale (a log-Chebyshev approximation method) is proposed in [20, 21]. The method is to find positive vectors \mathbf{x} that solve the problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left| \log c_{ij} - \log \frac{x_i}{x_j} \right|. \quad (1)$$

We observe that the methods of principal eigenvector and geometric mean lead to unique solutions and offer efficient computational procedures of calculating the result. At the same time, the solution provided by log-Chebyshev approximation can be nonunique and thus require further analysis.

In the next subsection, the log-Chebyshev approximation solution to the pairwise comparison problem with additional constraints on absolute ratings is discussed in more detail.

2.2 Log-Chebyshev Approximation of Pairwise Comparison Matrix

Let us consider the problem of unconstrained log-Chebyshev approximation at (1). Observing that the logarithm to a base greater than 1 monotonically increases, we rewrite the objective function in the form (see, e.g. [24])

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left| \log c_{ij} - \log \frac{x_i}{x_j} \right| = \log \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{c_{ij} x_j}{x_i}.$$

Since the logarithmic function on the right-hand side attains its maximum there where its argument is maximal, we remove the logarithm from the objective function. Moreover, one can verify (see, e.g., [8, 9, 24]) that the obtained objective function is connected with the relative approximation error by the equality

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{c_{ij} x_j}{x_i} = \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{|c_{ij} - x_i/x_j|}{c_{ij}} + 1.$$

This means that the log-Chebyshev approximation of the matrix \mathbf{C} is equivalent to the approximation in the sense of relative error as well.

Consider an extension of the pairwise comparison problem where the ratings of alternatives are to be evaluated subject to some predefined constraints. Suppose the constraints imposed on the ratings are in the form of two-sided bounds on ratios between the ratings. These constraints can reflect prior knowledge about the relationship between ratings, which is obtained by different assessment techniques or resulted from the nature of alternatives.

Given a matrix $\mathbf{B} = (b_{ij})$ where $b_{ij} \geq 0$ shows that alternative i must be considered not less than b_{ij} times better than j , the constraints are given by the inequalities $b_{ij} \leq x_i/x_j \leq 1/b_{ji}$, or equivalently by the inequalities $b_{ij} x_j \leq x_i$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. Combining the latter inequalities for all j yields the system of inequalities

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} b_{ij} x_j \leq x_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

We now incorporate the above constraints into problem (1) to formulate the following problem of constrained log-Chebyshev approximation. Given a

positive $(n \times n)$ -matrix $\mathbf{C} = (c_{ij})$ of pairwise comparisons and nonnegative $(n \times n)$ -matrix $\mathbf{B} = (b_{ij})$ of constraints, the problem is to find positive n -vectors $\mathbf{x} = (x_j)$ that achieve

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{c_{ij}x_j}{x_i}; \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} b_{ij}x_j \leq x_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Note that multiplying all components of the vector \mathbf{x} by a common positive factor does not change both objective function and inequality constraints in problem (2), and hence the solutions of the problem are scale-invariant.

Finally, we observe that the methods of principal eigenvector and geometric mean cannot accommodate the above constraints in a straightforward way without considerable modification and complication of the solution. As it is shown later, the constrained problem of log-Chebyshev approximation at (2) can be directly solved to give the result in a compact vector form.

2.3 Best and Worst Differentiating Solutions

If problem (2) has a unique solution up to a positive factor, this solution is taken as the vector of absolute ratings of alternatives in question.

Suppose that the solution of (2) is not unique and denote the set of optimal solution vectors \mathbf{x} by

$$X = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \left\{ \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{c_{ij}x_j}{x_i} : \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} b_{ij}x_j \leq x_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \right\}$$

Since a nonunique solution vector of the pairwise comparison problem may make it difficult to derive an optimal decision, further analysis is needed to characterize the result by one or two vectors that are reasonably representative of the solution. An approach developed in [25] suggests to reduce the entire set of solutions to two vectors that provide the “best” and “worst” answers to the questions of which alternative has the highest rating and how much this rating differs from the ratings of other alternatives. As the best solution, we take a vector that maximally differentiates the alternatives with the highest and lowest ratings, and as the worst a vector that minimally differentiates all alternatives.

We express the difference between the alternatives by the ratio, which can be referenced to as a multiplicative version of the Hilbert (span, range) seminorm of the vector \mathbf{x} , and is given by

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i / \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} x_j = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i \times \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} x_j^{-1}.$$

The best and worst differentiating solutions are then obtained by maximizing and minimizing the Hilbert seminorm over all vectors $\mathbf{x} \in X$, which

leads to the optimization problems

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i \times \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} x_j^{-1}; \quad \min_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i \times \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} x_j^{-1};$$

As the solutions of problem (2) are invariant under multiplication by a positive factor, we can restrict ourselves to solution vectors that are normalized by dividing by the maximum component. Adding the normalization condition transforms the last two problems into the problems

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i^{-1}; & \quad \min_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i^{-1}; \\ \text{s.t. } \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i = 1; & \quad \text{s.t. } \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Finally, we note that both problems can have nonunique normalized solutions. In order to overcome this potential shortcoming, it is reasonable to concentrate only on the minimal normalized solution to the maximization problem and the maximal normalized solution to the minimization problem. A solution \mathbf{x}_0 is called minimal (maximal) if the componentwise inequality $\mathbf{x}_0 \leq \mathbf{x}$ ($\mathbf{x}_0 \geq \mathbf{x}$) holds for any solution \mathbf{x} .

Indeed, all normalized vectors, which maximize or minimize the ratio between the highest and lowest ratings, have two common components whose ratio is fixed: the maximum component equal to 1, and the minimum component less or equal to 1. In this case, the lower (higher) the ratings of the other alternatives, the better (worse) the alternative with the maximum rating is distinguishable from the others.

3 Multicriteria Pairwise Comparison Problems

We now assume that n alternatives are compared in pairs according to m criteria. For each criterion $l = 1, \dots, m$, the results of pairwise comparisons are represented by a matrix $\mathbf{C}_l = (c_{ij}^{(l)})$. The problem is to assess the alternatives by evaluating a vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_j)$ of ratings subject to constraints given by a matrix $\mathbf{B} = (b_{ij})$. Application of the log-Chebyshev approximation technique yields the multiobjective optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \left(\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{c_{ij}^{(1)} x_j}{x_i}, \dots, \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{c_{ij}^{(m)} x_j}{x_i} \right); \\ \text{s.t. } \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} b_{ij} x_j \leq x_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Suppose we have a solution to the problem, which forms a nonempty set of solution vectors. If the solution obtained is a unique vector up to a positive factor, we normalize this vector and take its entries as absolute ratings of alternatives in the pairwise comparison problem. Otherwise, the

best and worst differentiating vectors of ratings are obtained respectively as the minimal solution of the maximization problem and the maximal solution of the minimization problem at (3).

In the rest of this section, we consider three common approaches to handle problem (4), which result in different procedures to find the solution set. The solution techniques used are based on the max-ordering, lexicographic ordering and lexicographic max-ordering principles of optimality [7].

3.1 Max-Ordering Solution

The max-ordering optimization aims at minimizing the worst value of the scalar objective functions in the multiobjective problem. For each \mathbf{x} , the approach considers that function which takes the maximal (worst) value. This leads to the replacement of the vector objective function by a scalar function given by the maximum component of the vector function, which is known as the Chebyshev scalarization approach in multiobjective optimization [30].

The solution of the constrained problem at (4) starts with the introduction of the feasible solution set X_0 given by the constraints as

$$X_0 = \left\{ \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0} : \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} b_{ij} x_j \leq x_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \right\}. \quad (5)$$

We apply the Chebyshev scalarization and use the associativity of the maximum operation to form the scalar objective function

$$\max_{1 \leq l \leq m} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{c_{ij}^{(l)} x_j}{x_i} = \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{a_{ij} x_j}{x_i}, \quad a_{ij} = \max_{1 \leq l \leq m} c_{ij}^{(l)}.$$

Then, the problem reduces to the minimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in X_0} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{a_{ij} x_j}{x_i}, \quad (6)$$

which is solved to obtain the max-ordering solution in the form of the set

$$X_1 = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in X_0} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{a_{ij} x_j}{x_i}.$$

Note that the solution obtained by the max-ordering optimization is known to be weak Pareto-optimal and become Pareto-optimal if unique [30].

If the solution is not unique (up to a positive factor), we further reduce the solution set by extracting the best and worst differentiating vectors of ratings given by the minimal and maximal normalized solutions of problems (3) over the set X_1 .

3.2 Lexicographic Ordering Solution

The lexicographic optimization considers the scalar objective functions in a hierarchical order based on certain ranking of objectives. Suppose the objectives are numbered in such a way that objective 1 has the highest rank, objective 2 has the second highest and so on until objective m having the lowest rank. The lexicographic approach first solves the problem of minimizing function 1 and examines the set of optimal solutions obtained. If the solution is unique, it is taken as the solution of the overall multiobjective problem. Otherwise function 2 is minimized over all solutions of the first problem, and the procedure continues until a unique solution is obtained or the problem with function m is solved.

To apply this approach to problem (4), we first take the initial feasible solution set X_0 given by (5), and then successively obtain the solution set X_s for each problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in X_{s-1}} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{c_{ij}^{(s)} x_j}{x_i}, \quad s = 1, \dots, m. \quad (7)$$

The solution procedure stops at step $s \leq m$ if the set X_s consists of a single solution vector. The last found set X_s is taken as the lexicographic solution for the entire problem.

In the same way as before, if the solution given by X_s is not unique, it is reduced to the minimal and maximal solutions of problems (3) over X_s .

3.3 Lexicographic Max-Ordering Solution

This approach combines the lexicographic ordering and max-ordering into one procedure that improves the accuracy of the assessment provided by the max-ordering approach. The procedure consists of several steps, each of which finds the max-ordering solution of a reduced problem that has a lower multiplicity of objectives and smaller feasible set. The first solution step coincides with the above described max-ordering solution of the constrained problem with m objectives, and the feasible solution set given by the constraints. Each subsequent step takes the solution from the previous step as the current feasible set and selects objectives that can be further minimized over this set, to incorporate into a current vector objective function. A scalar objective function is included if it has its minimum value over the current feasible set below the minimum of the objective function at the previous step.

We denote by I_s the set of indices of scalar objective functions that form components of the vector objective function, and by X_s the solution set obtained at step s . We initially set $I_0 = \{1, \dots, m\}$ and define X_0 as in (5).

We find a solution set X_s by solving the problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in X_{s-1}} \max_{l \in I_{s-1}} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{c_{ij}^{(l)} x_j}{x_i}, \quad s = 1, \dots, m. \quad (8)$$

With the minimum value of the objective function at step s denoted by θ_s , we define the index set as follows:

$$I_s = \left\{ l \in I_{s-1} : \theta_s > \min_{\mathbf{x} \in X_s} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{c_{ij}^{(l)} x_j}{x_i} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

The procedure is completed at step $s \leq m$ if either the set X_s reduces to a single solution vector or the condition $I_s = \emptyset$ holds. We additionally solve optimization problems (3) if the final set X_s provides a nonunique solution.

Below we show how the solutions offered by the above three approaches can be directly represented in explicit analytical form using methods and result of tropical mathematics.

4 Preliminary Algebraic Definitions, Notation and Results

In this section, we offer a brief overview of definitions, notation and results of tropical algebra that are used in the sequel. For further detail on the theory and application of tropical mathematics, one can consult the recent monographs and textbooks [11, 14, 12, 28].

4.1 Idempotent Semifield

Consider the set \mathbb{R}_+ of nonnegative reals with two binary operations: addition denoted by \oplus and defined as maximum, and multiplication denoted and defined as usual. Both operations are associative and commutative, and multiplication distributes over addition. Addition is idempotent since $x \oplus x = \max(x, x) = x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and thus it is not invertible. Idempotent addition induces a partial order by the rule: $x \leq y$ if and only if $x \oplus y = y$, which is in agreement with the natural linear order on \mathbb{R}_+ . The algebraic system $\langle \mathbb{R}_+, 0, \oplus \rangle$ presents a linearly ordered idempotent Abelian semigroup with identity.

The system $\langle \mathbb{R}_+, 1, \times \rangle$ has the structure of an Abelian group where powers with rational (and even real) exponents are well defined, which means that this system is radicable (algebraically complete). In what follows, the multiplication sign \times is omitted as in the standard algebra to save writing. Under the above properties, the algebraic system $\langle \mathbb{R}_+, 0, 1, \oplus, \times \rangle$ is usually classified as a linearly ordered idempotent radicable semifield and commonly referred to as max-algebra.

Both addition and multiplication are monotone in each argument: if the inequality $x \leq y$ holds for some $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then the inequalities $x \oplus z \leq y \oplus z$ and $xz \leq yz$ are valid for any $z \in \mathbb{R}_+$ as well. Furthermore, it results from the inequality $x \leq y$ that $x^q \geq y^q$ if $q \leq 0$ and $x^q \leq y^q$ if $q > 0$.

4.2 Matrix and Vector Algebra

Matrices over max-algebra are introduced in the usual way; addition and multiplication of compatible matrices follow the standard entrywise rules where the arithmetic addition $+$ is replaced by $\oplus = \max$ (whereas the multiplication does not change). The monotonicity of scalar operations extends to the matrix operations, where the inequalities are understood entrywise.

The transpose of a matrix \mathbf{A} is denoted by \mathbf{A}^T . The matrices which consist of one column are vectors, and of one row are transposed vectors. The set of matrices of m rows and n columns is denoted by $\mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$, and the set of column vectors with n entries is by \mathbb{R}_+^n .

The zero matrix denoted by $\mathbf{0}$ and the identity matrix denoted by \mathbf{I} are defined in the same way as in conventional algebra. A matrix without zero rows (columns) is called row-regular (column-regular), and a vector without zero entries is called regular. The matrices without zero entries and regular vectors are also called positive.

A vector \mathbf{y} is collinear to vector \mathbf{x} , if $\mathbf{y} = c\mathbf{x}$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

For any matrix $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij})$ from the set $\mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$, its (multiplicative) conjugate transpose is the matrix $\mathbf{A}^- = (a_{ij}^-)$ in $\mathbb{R}_+^{n \times m}$ where $a_{ij}^- = a_{ji}^{-1}$ if $a_{ji} \neq 0$, and $a_{ij}^- = 0$ otherwise. If a matrix \mathbf{A} is row-regular, then the following inequality obviously holds:

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^- \geq \mathbf{I}.$$

For any vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_j)$ from \mathbb{R}_+^n , its conjugate transpose is the row vector $\mathbf{x}^- = (x_j^-)$ where $x_j^- = x_j^{-1}$ if $x_j \neq 0$, and $x_j^- = 0$ otherwise. If a vector \mathbf{x} is regular (positive), then the following matrix inequality and scalar equality are valid:

$$\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^- \geq \mathbf{I}, \quad \mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{x} = 1$$

(where the equality holds for any nonzero vector \mathbf{x}).

For any square matrix $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij})$ from $\mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$, the nonnegative integer powers represent repeated multiplication of the matrix by itself, defined by $\mathbf{A}^0 = \mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{A}^p = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^{p-1}$ for all integer $p > 0$. The trace of \mathbf{A} is given by

$$\text{tr } \mathbf{A} = a_{11} \oplus \cdots \oplus a_{nn} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n a_{kk}.$$

For any matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$, a trace function is introduced as a tropical

analogue of the matrix determinant in the form

$$\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}) = \text{tr } \mathbf{A} \oplus \cdots \oplus \text{tr } \mathbf{A}^n = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \text{tr } \mathbf{A}^k.$$

If the condition $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}) \leq 1$ holds, then the Kleene star operator is defined to map the matrix \mathbf{A} into the matrix

$$\mathbf{A}^* = \mathbf{I} \oplus \mathbf{A} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbf{A}^{n-1} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{A}^k.$$

Moreover, under the condition $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}) \leq 1$, the inequality

$$\mathbf{A}^* \geq \mathbf{A}^p,$$

is valid for all integer $p \geq 0$, from which it follows directly that

$$\mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{A}^* = \mathbf{A}^*.$$

The spectral radius of a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$ is given by

$$\lambda = \text{tr } \mathbf{A} \oplus \cdots \oplus \text{tr}^{1/n}(\mathbf{A}^n) = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \text{tr}^{1/k}(\mathbf{A}^k).$$

Consider a matrix $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij})$ in $\mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$ and vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_j)$ in \mathbb{R}_+^n . With the notation $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^T$, tropical analogues of the matrix and vector norms are defined as

$$\|\mathbf{A}\| = \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{1} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \bigoplus_{j=1}^n a_{ij}, \quad \|\mathbf{x}\| = \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{1} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^n x_j.$$

4.3 Vector Inequalities

We conclude the overview with two inequalities that appear in the derivation of the solution of optimization problems in what follows. Suppose $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$ is a given matrix and $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ is a vector, and consider the problem to find all vectors $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ that satisfy the inequality

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{d}. \tag{10}$$

Solutions of (10) are known under various assumptions in different forms. We use a solution suggested by the following assertion (see, e.g. [18]).

lemma 1. *For any column-regular matrix \mathbf{A} and regular vector \mathbf{d} , all solutions of inequality (10) are given by the inequality $\mathbf{x} \leq (\mathbf{d}^- \mathbf{A})^-$.*

As a consequence of the lemma, the solution of the equation $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{d}$ can be represented as a family of solutions each defined by the vector inequality $\mathbf{x} \leq (\mathbf{d}^- \mathbf{A})^-$ where one scalar inequality is replaced by an equality.

Assume that for a given square matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$, we need to find all regular solutions $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ to the inequality

$$\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}. \quad (11)$$

A complete solution of (11) can be obtained as follows [18, 19].

lemma 2. *For any matrix \mathbf{B} , the following statements are true.*

1. *If $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \leq 1$, then all regular solutions of inequality (11) are given in parametric form by $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{u}$ where $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}$ is a vector of parameters.*
2. *If $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) > 1$, then there is no regular solution.*

5 Tropical Optimization Problems

We are now concerned with optimization problems formulated and solved in the framework of tropical mathematics. We offer direct solutions to the problems, given in analytical form to provide the basis for the solution of multicriteria pairwise comparison problems in what follows. Note that the solutions presented below are valid for a general linearly ordered radicable tropical semifield, and not only for the max-algebra, which is actually used to handle the multicriteria problems under consideration.

5.1 Conjugate Quadratic Optimization Problems

We start with a problem to minimize a multiplicative conjugate quadratic (or pseudoquadratic) vector form subject to a linear constraint on the solution vectors. Given matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$, the problem is to find regular vectors $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ that attain the minimum

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}; \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B} \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Complete solutions to the problem and its variations are proposed in [18, 19, 23]. We use a solution in the form of the next statement.

Theorem 3. *Let \mathbf{A} be a matrix with nonzero spectral radius and \mathbf{B} be a matrix such that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \leq 1$. Then, the minimum value of the objective function in problem (12) is equal to*

$$\theta = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \bigoplus_{0 \leq i_1 + \dots + i_k \leq n-k} \text{tr}^{1/k}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^{i_1} \dots \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^{i_k}), \quad (13)$$

and all regular solutions of the problem are given in the parametric form

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{G} = (\theta^{-1}\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{B})^*, \quad (14)$$

where $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}$ is a vector of parameters.

The following result plays a key role in the solution of optimization problems in subsequent sections.

Theorem 4. *Let \mathbf{A} be a matrix with nonzero spectral radius, \mathbf{B} a matrix such that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \leq 1$, and θ be the minimum value of the objective function in problem (12), given by (13). Then, the following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) \mathbf{x} is a regular solution of problem (12).

(ii) \mathbf{x} is a regular solution of the inequality

$$(\theta^{-1}\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{B})\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}.$$

(iii) \mathbf{x} is a regular vector given in the parametric form

$$\mathbf{x} = (\theta^{-1}\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{B})^*\mathbf{u},$$

where $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}$ is a vector of parameters.

Proof. The proof of this equivalence theorem is readily obtained by combining the result of Theorem 3 with that of Lemma 2. \square

5.2 Maximization and Minimization of Hilbert Seminorm

Assume $\mathbf{x} = (x_j)$ is an unknown vector and $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^T$ the vector of ones. Let us examine optimization problems with an objective function that can be represented in the form

$$\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^{-1} \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{x}^{-1} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x} = \|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{x}^{-1}\|.$$

We note that this function given in terms of max-algebra, is expressed in the conventional algebra setting as $\max_i x_i / \min_j x_j$. Since the last expression can be considered as a multiplicative version of the Hilbert (span, range) seminorm of the vector \mathbf{x} , we refer to this function as a tropical representation of the multiplicative Hilbert seminorm or simply as the Hilbert seminorm.

First, we suppose that given a matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$, we need to find regular solutions $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ of the constrained maximization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathbf{x}^{-1} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x}; \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

A solution to problem (15) can be obtained as follows (see [22, 25]).

lemma 5. For any matrix \mathbf{B} without zero entries and with $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \leq 1$, the maximum in problem (15) is equal to $\|\mathbf{B}^*(\mathbf{B}^*)^{-}\|$, and all regular solutions of the problem are given in the parametric form

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{B}^*(\mathbf{B}_{l_k}^*)^{-}\mathbf{B}^* \oplus \mathbf{B}^*, \quad \mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0},$$

where $\mathbf{B}_{l_k}^*$ is a matrix obtained from the matrix $\mathbf{B}^* = (\mathbf{b}_j^*)$ with columns $\mathbf{b}_j^* = (b_{ij}^*)$ by setting to 0 all entries except the entry b_{lk}^* with indices given by

$$k = \arg \max_j \|\mathbf{b}_j^*\| \|(\mathbf{b}_j^*)^{-}\|, \quad l = \arg \min_i b_{ik}^*.$$

Next, we consider the problem to determine regular vectors \mathbf{x} that achieve the minimum

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathbf{x}^{-}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T\mathbf{x}; \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The statement below offers a solution to problem (16), obtained by applying Theorem 3 with substitution $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T$ (see [26] for a solution of the problem with an extended system of constraints).

lemma 6. For any matrix \mathbf{B} with $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \leq 1$, the minimum value of the objective function in problem (16) is equal to $\|\mathbf{B}^*\|$, and all regular solutions are given in the parametric form

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{G} = \bigoplus_{0 \leq i+j \leq n-1} \|\mathbf{B}^*\|^{-1} \mathbf{B}^i \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^j \oplus \mathbf{B}^*, \quad \mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

Assume that we add to both problems (15) and (16) a normalization constraint on the solution vector \mathbf{x} in the form

$$\mathbf{1}^T\mathbf{x} = \|\mathbf{x}\| = 1.$$

We now concentrate on finding extremal (minimal and maximal) normalized solutions. We refer to a solution \mathbf{x}_0 as maximal if $\mathbf{x}_0 \geq \mathbf{x}$ and as minimal if $\mathbf{x}_0 \leq \mathbf{x}$ for any solution \mathbf{x} of the problem.

To solve the problems with the normalization constraint, one can refine the results of Lemmas (5) and (6) and then find the extremal solutions. Below we offer direct solutions to the problems, which use less specific assumptions and seem to involve less complicated and cumbersome calculations.

We start with finding the minimal solution of the maximization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathbf{x}^{-}\mathbf{1}; \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{1}^T\mathbf{x} = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

We proof the following statement.

lemma 7. For any matrix \mathbf{B} with $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \leq 1$, the maximum value of the objective function in problem (17) is equal to $\|\mathbf{B}^*(\mathbf{B}^*)^-\|$, and the minimal solutions are determined by the set of normalized columns in the matrix $\mathbf{B}^* = (\mathbf{b}_j^*)$, given by

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}_k^* \|\mathbf{b}_k^*\|^{-1}, \quad k = \arg \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \|\mathbf{b}_j^*\| \|(\mathbf{b}_j^*)^-\|.$$

If a vector of the set is dominated by the other vectors (the minimal vector) or is the only vector in the set, it uniquely determines the minimal solution of the problem. Otherwise, the minimal solution is not uniquely defined.

Proof. We solve the inequality constraint in problem (17) by using Lemma 2 to write $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{u}$ where $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}$, and then represent the problem in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}} \quad & (\mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{u})^- \mathbf{1}; \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{u} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the equality constraint that $\mathbf{u} \leq (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^-$, where at least for one component of the vector \mathbf{u} , the inequality is satisfied as an equality.

Suppose that the equality holds for some $k = 1, \dots, n$, which defines the components of $\mathbf{u} = (u_j)$ by the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} u_k &= (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{b}_k^*)^{-1} = \|\mathbf{b}_k^*\|^{-1}, \\ u_j &\leq (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{b}_j^*)^{-1} = \|\mathbf{b}_j^*\|^{-1}, \quad j \neq k. \end{aligned}$$

Under this assumption, we use properties of idempotent addition to bound the objective function from above as follows:

$$(\mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{u})^- \mathbf{1} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (b_{i1}^* u_1 \oplus \dots \oplus b_{in}^* u_n)^{-1} \leq \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (b_{ik}^* u_k)^{-1} = \|(\mathbf{b}_k^*)^-\| \|\mathbf{b}_k^*\|.$$

Note that the above inequality becomes an equality if for all $j \neq k$, we put $u_j = 0$ since in this case, we have $(b_{i1}^* u_1 \oplus \dots \oplus b_{in}^* u_n)^{-1} = (b_{ik}^* u_k)^{-1}$.

Furthermore, the maximum value of the objective function is attained if the index k is chosen as

$$k = \arg \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \|\mathbf{b}_j^*\| \|(\mathbf{b}_j^*)^-\|,$$

which yields this maximum equal to $\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^* (\mathbf{B}^*)^- \mathbf{1} = \|\mathbf{B}^* (\mathbf{B}^*)^-\|$.

For each index k that provides the above maximum, we take as a solution to the maximization problem, the vector \mathbf{u} with the components

$$\begin{aligned} u_k &= \|\mathbf{b}_k^*\|^{-1}, \\ u_j &= 0, \quad j \neq k. \end{aligned}$$

Since the equality $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{u}$ holds, this vector \mathbf{u} produces the vector

$$\mathbf{x} = u_1 \mathbf{b}_1^* \oplus \cdots \oplus u_n \mathbf{b}_n^* = \mathbf{b}_k^* \|\mathbf{b}_k^*\|^{-1}.$$

We observe that the solution vector obtained has the form of a normalized column of the matrix \mathbf{B}^* , and that for a fixed k , it is the minimal solution due to monotonicity of the matrix operations.

Finally, in the case of several indices k that yield the maximum value of the objective function, we combine the corresponding solution vectors in a set. If there is the minimal vector among them, we take this vector as the unique minimal solution. Otherwise, the minimal solution cannot be uniquely determined, and it is given by multiple vectors. \square

We now turn to the derivation of the maximal solution to the constrained minimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{1}; \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x} = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

A complete solution of the problem is given by the next statement.

lemma 8. *For any matrix \mathbf{B} with $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \leq 1$, the minimum value of the objective function in problem (18) is equal to $\|\mathbf{B}^*\|$, and the maximal solution is given by*

$$\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^-.$$

Proof. Similarly as before, we replace the inequality $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}$ by its solution $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{u}$ with $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}$. Combining with the constraint $\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x} = 1$ yields the equality $\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{u} = 1$, from which the inequality $\mathbf{u} \leq (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^-$ follows.

After multiplication of the last inequality by \mathbf{B}^* from the left, we arrive at a constraint on \mathbf{x} in the form

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{B}^* (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^-.$$

Next, we verify the equality $\mathbf{B}^* (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^- = (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^-$ (see also [17]). Indeed, since $\mathbf{B}^* \geq \mathbf{I}$, the inequality $\mathbf{B}^* (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^- \geq (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^-$ holds.

To show the opposite inequality $\mathbf{B}^* (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^- \leq (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^-$, we note that the identity $\mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{B}^* = \mathbf{B}^*$ is valid according to the properties of the Kleene star matrix. An application of the properties of conjugate transposition yields

$$(\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^* \geq \mathbf{I}, \quad \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{B}^* (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{B}^*)^- = 1.$$

We combine these relations to obtain the desired inequality as follows:

$$\mathbf{B}^* (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^- = \mathbf{B}^* (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{B}^*)^- \leq (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{B}^* (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{B}^*)^- = (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^-.$$

As a result, the inequality constraint on the vector \mathbf{x} reduces to

$$\mathbf{x} \leq (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^-.$$

Furthermore, we examine the vector $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^-$, which is the maximal solution of the last inequality, to verify that this vector satisfies both constraints of the problem. Since $\mathbf{B}^* \geq \mathbf{B}$, we can write

$$\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^- \leq \mathbf{B}^*(\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^- = (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^- = \mathbf{x},$$

and thus this vector \mathbf{x} satisfies the inequality constraint. Moreover, we have

$$\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{1}^T (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^- = \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^* (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^- = 1,$$

which means that the equality constraint holds as well.

After conjugate transposition of both sides of the inequality $\mathbf{x} \leq (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^-$ and multiplication by $\mathbf{1}$, we obtain a lower bound on the objective function

$$\mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{1} \geq \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^* \mathbf{1} = \|\mathbf{B}^*\|.$$

It is clear that the maximal feasible solution $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{B}^*)^-$ attains this bound, which means that $\|\mathbf{B}^*\|$ is the minimum of the objective function.

Note that the solution obtained is unique and can be represented as

$$\mathbf{x} = (\|\mathbf{b}_1^*\|^{-1} \quad \dots \quad \|\mathbf{b}_n^*\|^{-1})^T,$$

which is the vector of inverse maximum column elements in \mathbf{B}^* . \square

6 Solution of Multicriteria Pairwise Comparison Problems

Consider the multiobjective optimization problem (4), which arises in the solution of the constrained multicriteria pairwise comparison problem using the log-Chebyshev approximation approach. After rewriting the objective functions and inequality constraints in terms of tropical max-algebra, the problem can be formulated in vector form as follows.

Given $(n \times n)$ -matrices \mathbf{C}_l of pairwise comparisons of n alternatives for criteria $l = 1, \dots, m$, and nonnegative $(n \times n)$ -matrix \mathbf{B} of constraints, find positive n -vectors \mathbf{x} of ratings that solve the multiobjective problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & (\mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{C}_m \mathbf{x}); \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

In this section, we offer max-ordering, lexicographic and lexicographic max-ordering optimal solutions to these problems. If the solution obtained is not a unique vector of ratings, this solution is reduced to two the best and worst solution vectors, which most and least differentiate between the alternatives with the highest and lowest ratings.

6.1 Max-Ordering Solution

We start with the max-ordering solution technique, which leads to the solution of problem (6) over the feasible set X_0 given by (5).

In terms of max-algebra, the set X_0 is the set of regular vectors \mathbf{x} that solve the inequality $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}$. The objective function at (6) takes the form

$$\max_{1 \leq l \leq m} \mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{C}_l \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{A} = \bigoplus_{l=1}^m \mathbf{C}_l.$$

Combining the objective function with the inequality constraint leads to the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B} \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the problem takes the form of (12), we apply Theorem 3 to find the minimum value θ of the objective function, which is given by (13). Next, we obtain the solution set X_1 of the problem as the set of vectors

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{B}_1^* \mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{B}_1 = \theta^{-1} \mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{B} \quad \mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

If the columns in the generating matrix $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{B}_1^*$ are collinear, then any column after normalization can be taken as the unique solution. Otherwise, we observe that by Theorem (4), the set X_1 coincides with the set of regular solutions to the inequality

$$\mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}.$$

It remains to obtain the best and worst differentiating solutions in the set, which are the minimal and maximal solutions of the respective problems

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{1}; & \min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{1}; \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}, & \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}, \\ & \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x} = 1, & & \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{x} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

By applying Lemma 7, we find the best differentiating solutions represented in terms of the columns of the matrix $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{g}_j)$ as the set of vectors

$$\mathbf{x}^{\text{best}} = \mathbf{g}_k \|\mathbf{g}_k\|^{-1}, \quad k = \arg \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \|\mathbf{g}_j\| \|(\mathbf{g}_j)^-\|.$$

If there is a minimal solution in the set, it is taken as the unique minimal best differentiating solution; otherwise, the minimal solution cannot be uniquely determined.

By Lemma 8, the maximal worst differentiating solution is obtained as

$$\mathbf{x}^{\text{worst}} = (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{G})^-.$$

The next statement combines the results of the derivation of all max-ordering solution vectors for problem (19) with the calculation of the best and worst differentiating vectors among them.

Theorem 9. Let C_l for all $l = 1, \dots, m$ be matrices with nonzero spectral radii and \mathbf{B} be a matrix such that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \leq 1$. Define

$$\theta = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \bigoplus_{0 \leq i_1 + \dots + i_k \leq n-k} \text{tr}^{1/k}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^{i_1} \dots \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^{i_k}), \quad \mathbf{A} = \bigoplus_{l=1}^m \mathbf{C}_l,$$

$$\mathbf{B}_1 = \theta^{-1} \mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{B}.$$

Then, with the notation $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{B}_1^*$, the following statements hold:

(i) All lexicographic max-ordering solutions of problem (19) are given by the matrix $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{g}_j)$ in the parametric form

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{u} > \mathbf{0}.$$

(ii) The minimal normalized best differentiating solution is given by

$$\mathbf{x}^{\text{best}} = \mathbf{g}_k \|\mathbf{g}_k\|^{-1}, \quad k = \arg \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \|\mathbf{g}_j\| \|\mathbf{g}_j^-\|.$$

(iii) The maximal normalized worst differentiating solution is

$$\mathbf{x}^{\text{worst}} = (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{G})^-.$$

We observe that if the generating matrix produces a unique solution, then the minimal best and maximal worst differentiating solutions obviously coincide. This allows one not to check whether all columns in the generating matrix are collinear or not. Instead one can directly calculate the best and worst solutions, which provide a common result if the solution is unique.

Finally, note that the above result is valid for the unconstrained problem which is obtained by setting $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{0}$. In this case, the minimum value θ of the objective function is reduced to the spectral radius of the matrix \mathbf{A} .

6.2 Lexicographic Ordering Solution

Consider the implementation of the lexicographic ordering technique, which involves a series of problems (7). We solve problem (19) in no more than m steps each consisting in the minimization of a scalar objective function over a feasible set given by the solutions of the previous step.

At step $s = 1$, we use the symbol $\mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{B}$ and formulate the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{x}; \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B}_0 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

To solve the problem, we apply Theorem 3 to calculate the minimum

$$\theta_1 = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \bigoplus_{0 \leq i_1 + \dots + i_k \leq n-k} \text{tr}^{1/k}(\mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{B}_0^{i_1} \dots \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{B}_0^{i_k}).$$

Then, we find the solution set, which is given in parametric form by

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{B}_1^* \mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{B}_1 = \theta_1^{-1} \mathbf{C}_1 \oplus \mathbf{B}_0, \quad \mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0},$$

or according to Theorem 4, as the set of solutions of the inequality

$$\mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}.$$

We take the last inequality as a constraint that determines the set X_1 and formulate the problem of step $s = 2$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathbf{x}^{-1} \mathbf{C}_2 \mathbf{x}; \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

The minimum in the problem is given by

$$\theta_2 = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \bigoplus_{0 \leq i_1 + \dots + i_k \leq n-k} \text{tr}^{1/k}(\mathbf{C}_2 \mathbf{B}_1^{i_1} \dots \mathbf{C}_2 \mathbf{B}_1^{i_k}),$$

and the set of solutions X_2 is defined as

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{B}_2^* \mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{B}_2 = \theta_2^{-1} \mathbf{C}_2 \oplus \mathbf{B}_1, \quad \mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

We repeat the procedure for each step $s = 3, \dots, m$. Upon completion of step $s = m$, we arrive at the lexicographic solution given by

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{B}_m^* \mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

If the solution obtained is not unique (up to a positive factor), we calculate the best and worst differentiating solution vectors.

We summarize the above computational scheme in the following form.

Theorem 10. *Let \mathbf{C}_l for all $l = 1, \dots, m$ be matrices with nonzero spectral radii and \mathbf{B} be a matrix such that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \leq 1$. Denote $\mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{B}$ and define the recurrence relations*

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_s &= \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \bigoplus_{0 \leq i_1 + \dots + i_k \leq n-k} \text{tr}^{1/k}(\mathbf{C}_s \mathbf{B}_{s-1}^{i_1} \dots \mathbf{C}_s \mathbf{B}_{s-1}^{i_k}), \\ \mathbf{B}_s &= \theta_s^{-1} \mathbf{C}_s \oplus \mathbf{B}_{s-1}, \quad s = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned}$$

Then, with the notation $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{B}_m^*$, the following statements hold:

- (i) *All lexicographic ordering solutions of problem (19) are given by the matrix $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{g}_j)$ in the parametric form*

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{G} \mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

(ii) The minimal normalized best differentiating solution is given by

$$\mathbf{x}^{\text{best}} = \mathbf{g}_k \|\mathbf{g}_k\|^{-1}, \quad k = \arg \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \|\mathbf{g}_j\| \|\mathbf{g}_j^-\|.$$

(iii) The maximal normalized worst differentiating solution is

$$\mathbf{x}^{\text{worst}} = (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{G})^-.$$

Suppose that for some step $s < m$, all columns in the matrix \mathbf{B}_s^* are collinear, and thus the matrix generates a unique solution vector. In this case, further steps cannot change the obtained solution and thus can be avoided to stop the procedure.

Note that if a matrix \mathbf{B}_s^* generates a unique solution, then both the minimal best and maximal worst normalized vectors obtained from \mathbf{B}_s^* are the same. As a result, we can calculate these vectors to check whether the solution at step s is unique. The procedure is stopped if these vectors are different or continued otherwise.

6.3 Lexicographic Max-Ordering Solution

We now describe a solution technique based on the lexicographic max-ordering optimality principle. Similar to the lexicographic ordering solution, we handle problem (19) by solving a series of problems, where each problem has a scalar objective function and inequality constraint provided by the solution of the previous problem. According to the computational scheme given by formulas (5), (8) and (9), the solution involves no more than m steps, which are described in the framework of max-algebra as follows.

We set $\mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{B}$ and define $X_0 = \{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0} \mid \mathbf{B}_0 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}\}$, $I_0 = \{1, \dots, m\}$.

The step $s = 1$ starts with calculating the matrix

$$\mathbf{A}_1 = \bigoplus_{l \in I_0} \mathbf{C}_l = \mathbf{C}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{C}_m.$$

The purpose of this step is to solve the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{x}; \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B}_0 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

We apply Theorem 3 to find the minimum of the objective function

$$\theta_1 = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \bigoplus_{0 \leq i_1 + \dots + i_k \leq n-k} \text{tr}^{1/k}(\mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{B}_0^{i_1} \dots \mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{B}_0^{i_k}),$$

and then obtain all solutions in the parametric form

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{B}_1^* \mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{B}_1 = \theta_1^{-1} \mathbf{A}_1 \oplus \mathbf{B}_0, \quad \mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

By Theorem 4 these solutions can be defined by the inequality $\mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}$ to provide the new feasible set

$$X_1 = \{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0} : \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}\}.$$

To prepare the next step, we find the minimums

$$\theta_{1l} = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in X_1} \mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{C}_l \mathbf{x} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \bigoplus_{0 \leq i_1 + \dots + i_k \leq n-k} \text{tr}^{1/n}(\mathbf{C}_l \mathbf{B}_1^{i_1} \dots \mathbf{C}_l \mathbf{B}_1^{i_k}), \quad l \in I_0.$$

At the step $s = 2$, we form the matrix

$$\mathbf{A}_2 = \bigoplus_{l \in I_1} \mathbf{C}_l, \quad I_1 = \{l \in I_0 : \theta_1 > \theta_{1l}\},$$

and then solve the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}} \quad & \mathbf{x}^- \mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{x}; \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

The minimum in the problem is given by

$$\theta_2 = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \bigoplus_{0 \leq i_1 + \dots + i_k \leq n-k} \text{tr}^{1/k}(\mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{B}_1^{i_1} \dots \mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{B}_1^{i_k}),$$

and the set of solutions by

$$X_2 = \{\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0} : \mathbf{B}_2 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{x}\}, \quad \mathbf{B}_2 = \theta_2^{-1} \mathbf{A}_2 \oplus \mathbf{B}_1.$$

To complete this step, we calculate the values

$$\theta_{2l} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \bigoplus_{0 \leq i_1 + \dots + i_k \leq n-k} \text{tr}^{1/n}(\mathbf{C}_l \mathbf{B}_2^{i_1} \dots \mathbf{C}_l \mathbf{B}_2^{i_k}), \quad l \in I_1,$$

and then define

$$\mathbf{A}_3 = \bigoplus_{l \in I_2} \mathbf{C}_l, \quad I_2 = \{l \in I_1 : \theta_2 > \theta_{2l}\}.$$

We repeat the procedure for all remaining steps $s \leq m$. The procedure stops at step s if $I_s = \emptyset$ or the set X_s consists of a single solution (all columns in the matrix \mathbf{B}_s are collinear).

The above solution scheme can be summarized as follows.

Theorem 11. Let C_l for all $l = 1, \dots, m$ be matrices with nonzero spectral radii and \mathbf{B} be a matrix such that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) \leq 1$. Denote $\mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{B}$ and $I_0 = \{1, \dots, m\}$, and define the recurrence relations

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_s &= \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \bigoplus_{0 \leq i_1 + \dots + i_k \leq n-k} \text{tr}^{1/k}(\mathbf{A}_s \mathbf{B}_{s-1}^{i_1} \dots \mathbf{A}_s \mathbf{B}_{s-1}^{i_k}), & \mathbf{A}_s &= \bigoplus_{l \in I_{s-1}} C_l, \\ \mathbf{B}_s &= \theta_s^{-1} \mathbf{A}_s \oplus \mathbf{B}_{s-1}, & I_s &= \{l \in I_{s-1} : \theta_s > \theta_{sl}\}, \\ \theta_{sl} &= \bigoplus_{k=1}^n \bigoplus_{0 \leq i_1 + \dots + i_k \leq n-k} \text{tr}^{1/n}(C_l \mathbf{B}_s^{i_1} \dots C_l \mathbf{B}_s^{i_k}), & l \in I_{s-1}, & s = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned}$$

Then, with the notation $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{B}_m^*$, the following statements hold:

- (i) All lexicographic max-ordering solutions of problem (19) are given by the matrix $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{g}_j)$ in the parametric form

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{u} > \mathbf{0}.$$

- (ii) The minimal normalized best differentiating solution is given by

$$\mathbf{x}^{\text{best}} = \mathbf{g}_k \|\mathbf{g}_k\|^{-1}, \quad k = \arg \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \|\mathbf{g}_j\| \|\mathbf{g}_j^-\|.$$

- (iii) The maximal normalized worst differentiating solution is

$$\mathbf{x}^{\text{worst}} = (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{G})^-.$$

7 Illustrative Example

In this section, we present numerical examples intended to illustrate the solution techniques developed. We consider a constrained multicriteria problem of pairwise comparisons, which is formulated as a multiobjective optimization problem of constrained log-Chebyshev matrix approximation, and then solved in the framework of tropical optimization.

Suppose that there are $n = 4$ alternatives that are compared in pairs according to $m = 4$ criteria. The results of comparisons are given by the following pairwise comparison matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 1/2 & 1 & 3 & 2 \\ 1/3 & 1/3 & 1 & 1/3 \\ 1/4 & 1/2 & 3 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{C}_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 1/2 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 1/3 & 1/2 & 1 & 2 \\ 1/4 & 1/3 & 1/2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{C}_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 3 & 2 & 3 \\ 1/3 & 1 & 2 & 4 \\ 1/2 & 1/2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1/3 & 1/4 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{C}_4 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 \\ 1/2 & 1 & 1/2 & 3 \\ 1/2 & 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1/3 & 1/2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The problem is to evaluate the vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)^T$ of individual ratings of alternatives subject to the constraint $x_3 \geq x_4$, which specifies that the rating of alternative 3 cannot be less than the rating of alternative 4.

In terms of max-algebra, the problem takes the form of (19) where the constraint matrix is given by

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that a straightforward analysis of the pairwise comparison matrices shows that according to the matrices, alternatives 1 and 2 should respectively receive the first and second highest ratings. Alternatives 3 and 4 have lower ratings and must satisfy the constraint specified in the problem.

Below we describe solutions obtained for the problem according to the max-ordering, lexicographic ordering and lexicographic max-ordering principles of optimality.

7.1 Max-Ordering Solution

To obtain the max-ordering solution, we apply Theorem 9. Under the same notation as in this theorem, we calculate

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 3 & 3 & 4 \\ 1/2 & 1 & 3 & 4 \\ 1/2 & 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1/2 & 3 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \theta = 3.$$

Furthermore, we form the matrices

$$\mathbf{B}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/3 & 1 & 1 & 4/3 \\ 1/6 & 1/3 & 1 & 4/3 \\ 1/6 & 2/3 & 1/3 & 1 \\ 1/3 & 1/6 & 1 & 1/3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{B}_1^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 4/3 & 4/3 \\ 4/9 & 1 & 4/3 & 4/3 \\ 1/3 & 2/3 & 1 & 1 \\ 1/3 & 2/3 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Evaluation of the minimal normalized best differentiating and maximal normalized worst differentiating solutions from the matrix \mathbf{G} gives

$$\mathbf{x}^{\text{best}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 4/9 \\ 1/3 \\ 1/3 \end{pmatrix} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1.0000 \\ 0.4444 \\ 0.3333 \\ 0.3333 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{x}^{\text{worst}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 3/4 \\ 3/4 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.0000 \\ 1.0000 \\ 0.7500 \\ 0.7500 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We can combine both solutions in a vector where some entries are given

in interval form as follows:

$$\mathbf{x} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1.0000 \\ 0.4444 \dots 1.0000 \\ 0.3333 \dots 0.7500 \\ 0.3333 \dots 0.7500 \end{pmatrix}.$$

7.2 Lexicographic Ordering Solution

According to Theorem 10, the lexicographic ordering solution consists of several steps and proceeds as follows. First, we calculate

$$\theta_1 = 3,$$

and then obtain the matrices

$$\mathbf{B}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/3 & 2/3 & 1 & 4/3 \\ 1/6 & 1/3 & 1 & 2/3 \\ 1/9 & 1/9 & 1/3 & 1 \\ 1/12 & 1/6 & 1 & 1/3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B}_1^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2/3 & 4/3 & 4/3 \\ 1/6 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1/9 & 1/6 & 1 & 1 \\ 1/9 & 1/6 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

To check whether the matrix \mathbf{B}_1^* generates a nonunique solution, we find the corresponding best and worst differentiating solution vectors

$$\mathbf{x}_1^{\text{best}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1/6 \\ 1/9 \\ 1/9 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{x}_1^{\text{worst}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 3/4 \\ 3/4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since these vectors are different, we continue to the next step to evaluate

$$\theta_2 = 2.$$

Further calculations lead to the matrices

$$\mathbf{B}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 1 & 3/2 & 2 \\ 1/4 & 1/2 & 1 & 3/2 \\ 1/6 & 1/4 & 1/2 & 1 \\ 1/8 & 1/6 & 1 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B}_2^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 \\ 1/4 & 1 & 3/2 & 3/2 \\ 1/6 & 1/4 & 1 & 1 \\ 1/6 & 1/4 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The best and worst differentiating solution vectors given by \mathbf{B}_2^* are

$$\mathbf{x}_2^{\text{best}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1/4 \\ 1/6 \\ 1/6 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{x}_2^{\text{worst}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1/2 \\ 1/2 \end{pmatrix},$$

which shows that these vectors do not coincide.

Because the solution is not unique, we perform the next step and calculate

$$\theta_3 = 6^{1/3} \approx 1.8171.$$

Furthermore, we use the above result to obtain the matrices

$$\mathbf{B}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/\theta_3 & 3/\theta_3 & 3/2 & 2 \\ 1/4 & 1/\theta_3 & 2/\theta_3 & 4/\theta_3 \\ 1/2\theta_3 & 1/2\theta_3 & 1/\theta_3 & 1 \\ 1/3\theta_3 & 1/6 & 1 & 1/\theta_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B}_3^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 3/\theta_3 & 2\theta_3 & 2\theta_3 \\ \theta_3/3 & 1 & 4/\theta_3 & 4/\theta_3 \\ 1/2\theta_3 & \theta_3/4 & 1 & 1 \\ 1/2\theta_3 & \theta_3/4 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

After evaluation of the best and worst solutions from \mathbf{B}_3^* , we have

$$\mathbf{x}_3^{\text{best}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \theta_3/3 \\ 1/2\theta_3 \\ 1/2\theta_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{x}_3^{\text{worst}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \theta_3/3 \\ 1/2\theta_3 \\ 1/2\theta_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since both solutions coincide, we complete the procedure. As the unique final solution, we take the vector

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \theta_3/3 \\ 1/2\theta_3 \\ 1/2\theta_3 \end{pmatrix} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1.0000 \\ 0.6057 \\ 0.2752 \\ 0.2752 \end{pmatrix}.$$

7.3 Lexicographic Max-Ordering Solution

At the first step of this solution, we set $\mathbf{I}_0 = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and then obtain

$$\mathbf{A}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 3 & 3 & 4 \\ 1/2 & 1 & 3 & 4 \\ 1/2 & 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1/2 & 3 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \theta_1 = 3.$$

Furthermore, we calculate the matrices

$$\mathbf{B}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/3 & 1 & 1 & 4/3 \\ 1/6 & 1/3 & 1 & 4/3 \\ 1/6 & 2/3 & 1/3 & 1 \\ 1/3 & 1/6 & 1 & 1/3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B}_1^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 4/3 & 4/3 \\ 4/9 & 1 & 4/3 & 4/3 \\ 1/3 & 2/3 & 1 & 1 \\ 1/3 & 2/3 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Evaluation of the best and worst differentiating vectors yields

$$\mathbf{x}_1^{\text{best}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 4/9 \\ 1/3 \\ 1/3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{x}_1^{\text{worst}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 3/4 \\ 3/4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We observe that these vectors do not coincide and further calculate

$$\theta_{11} = 3, \quad \theta_{12} = 2, \quad \theta_{13} = 8/3, \quad \theta_{14} = 8/3.$$

Since $\theta_{12}, \theta_{13}, \theta_{14} < \theta_1$, we have the index set $I_1 = \{2, 3, 4\}$.

We turn to the next step and use the set I_1 to calculate

$$\mathbf{A}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 3 & 3 & 4 \\ 1/2 & 1 & 2 & 4 \\ 1/2 & 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1/3 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \theta_2 = 8^{1/2} \approx 2.8284.$$

To describe the solution set for this step, we form the matrices

$$\mathbf{B}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/\theta_2 & 3/\theta_2 & 3/\theta_2 & 4/\theta_2 \\ 1/2\theta_2 & 1/\theta_2 & 1 & 4/\theta_2 \\ 1/2\theta_2 & 2/\theta_2 & 1/\theta_2 & 1 \\ 1/\theta_2 & 1/6 & 1 & 1/\theta_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B}_2^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 3/\theta_2 & 3/2 & 3/2 \\ 1/2 & 1 & 4/\theta_2 & 4/\theta_2 \\ 1/\theta_2 & 2/\theta_2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1/\theta_2 & 2/\theta_2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and then obtain the vectors

$$\mathbf{x}_2^{\text{best}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1/2 \\ 1/\theta_2 \\ 1/\theta_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{x}_2^{\text{worst}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \theta_2/3 \\ 2/3 \\ 2/3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Next, we calculate the minimums

$$\theta_{22} = 3 \cdot 8^{1/2}/4, \quad \theta_{23} = 8^{1/2}, \quad \theta_{24} = 8^{1/2},$$

which leads to the index set $I_2 = \{2\}$.

According to the set I_2 , we define

$$\mathbf{A}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 1/2 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 1/3 & 1/2 & 1 & 2 \\ 1/4 & 1/3 & 1/2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \theta_3 = 3 \cdot 8^{1/2}/4 \approx 2.1213.$$

Furthermore, we calculate the matrices

$$\mathbf{B}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/\theta_3 & \theta_3/2 & 4/\theta_3 & 4/\theta_3 \\ \theta_3/9 & 1/\theta_3 & 1 & 3/\theta_3 \\ \theta_3/12 & \theta_3/3 & 1/\theta_3 & 1 \\ \theta_3/6 & 1/6 & 1 & 1/\theta_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{B}_3^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 4/3 & \theta_3/2 & 4/\theta_3 \\ 1/2 & 1 & 3/\theta_3 & 3/\theta_3 \\ \theta_3/6 & \theta_3/3 & 1 & 1 \\ \theta_3/6 & \theta_3/3 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The best and worst differentiating vectors are given by

$$\mathbf{x}_3^{\text{best}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1/2 \\ \theta_3/6 \\ \theta_3/6 \end{pmatrix} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1.0000 \\ 0.5000 \\ 0.3536 \\ 0.3536 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{x}_3^{\text{worst}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 3/4 \\ \theta_3/4 \\ \theta_3/4 \end{pmatrix} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1.0000 \\ 0.7500 \\ 0.5303 \\ 0.5303 \end{pmatrix}.$$

These equal vectors determine a unique solution to the problem. We can couple both vectors into one vector with interval entries as

$$\mathbf{x} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1.0000 \\ 0.5000 \dots 0.7500 \\ 0.3536 \dots 0.5303 \\ 0.3536 \dots 0.5303 \end{pmatrix}.$$

To conclude we observe that all solutions result in the same preference order of alternatives in the form (1) \succ (2) \succ (3) \equiv (4), whereas the individual ratings of alternatives may differ. We note that this order is in agreement with the above conclusions based on straightforward analysis of pairwise comparison matrices, and satisfies the constraint imposed on the ratings.

8 Conclusion

We have considered a decision-making problem of evaluating ratings of alternatives, based on pairwise comparisons under multiple criteria, subject to constraints imposed on ratings. The problem was reduced to constrained log-Chebyshev approximation of pairwise comparison matrices by a common consistent matrix that directly determines the vector of ratings. We have represented the approximation problem as a constrained multiobjective optimization problem in terms of tropical max-algebra, where the addition is defined as maximum. We have applied methods and results of tropical optimization to solve the multiobjective problem according to max-ordering, lexicographic ordering and lexicographic max-ordering principles of optimality. Direct analytical solutions have been obtained in a compact vector form, which can be used for further analysis and immediate computation.

The implications of the obtained results are twofold. First, new direct solutions are provided for the topical multicriteria pairwise comparison problem, which supplement and complement existing approaches. The solutions take into account constraints and allow one to handle constrained pairwise comparison problems that seem to be not well studied in the literature. As the second outcome, new solution methods and practical applications are developed to extend the formal instruments and broaden the application scope of tropical optimization.

Possible lines of further investigation include extension of the results to solve multicriteria pairwise comparison problems under different types of constraints and according to different principles of optimality.

References

- [1] J. Barzilai, W. Cook, and B. Golany. Consistent weights for judgements matrices of the relative importance of alternatives. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 6(3):131–134, 1987. doi:10.1016/0167-6377(87)90026-5.
- [2] V. Belton and T. Gear. On a short-coming of saaty’s method of analytic hierarchies. *Omega*, 11(3):228–230, 1983. doi:10.1016/0305-0483(83)90047-6.
- [3] H. P. Benson. Multi-objective optimization: Pareto optimal solutions, properties. In C. A. Floudas and P. M. Pardalos, editors, *Encyclopedia of Optimization*, pages 2478–2481. Springer, 2 edition, 2009. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-74759-0_426.
- [4] J. J. Buckley. Fuzzy hierarchical analysis. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 17(3):233–247, 1985. doi:10.1016/0165-0114(85)90090-9.
- [5] E. U. Choo and W. C. Wedley. A common framework for deriving preference values from pairwise comparison matrices. *Comput. Oper. Res.*, 31(6):893–908, 2004. doi:10.1016/S0305-0548(03)00042-X.
- [6] G. Crawford and C. Williams. A note on the analysis of subjective judgment matrices. *J. Math. Psych.*, 29(4):387–405, 1985. doi:10.1016/0022-2496(85)90002-1.
- [7] M. Ehrgott. *Multicriteria Optimization*. Springer, Berlin, 2 edition, 2005. doi:10.1007/3-540-27659-9.
- [8] L. Elsner and P. van den Driessche. Max-algebra and pairwise comparison matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 385(1):47–62, 2004. doi:10.1016/S0024-3795(03)00476-2.
- [9] L. Elsner and P. van den Driessche. Max-algebra and pairwise comparison matrices, II. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 432(4):927–935, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2009.10.005.
- [10] M. Gavalec, J. Ramík, and K. Zimmermann. *Decision Making and Optimization*, volume 677 of *Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems*. Springer, Cham, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-08323-0.
- [11] J. S. Golan. *Semirings and Affine Equations Over Them*, volume 556 of *Mathematics and Its Applications*. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2003. doi:10.1007/978-94-017-0383-3.
- [12] M. Gondran and M. Minoux. *Graphs, Dioids and Semirings*, volume 41 of *Operations Research/ Computer Science Interfaces*. Springer, New York, 2008. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-75450-5.

- [13] B. B. Gursoy, O. Mason, and S. Sergeev. The analytic hierarchy process, max algebra and multi-objective optimisation. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 438(7):2911–2928, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2012.11.020.
- [14] B. Heidergott, G. J. Olsder, and J. van der Woude. *Max Plus at work*. Princeton series in applied mathematics. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 2006.
- [15] A. Ishizaka and M. Lusti. How to derive priorities in AHP: a comparative study. *Cent. Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 14(4):387–400, 2006. doi:10.1007/s10100-006-0012-9.
- [16] J. Krejčí. *Pairwise Comparison Matrices and their Fuzzy Extension*. Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing. Springer, Cham, 2018. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-77715-3.
- [17] N. Krivulin. Complete solution of a constrained tropical optimization problem with application to location analysis. In P. Höfner, P. Jipsen, W. Kahl, and M. E. Müller, editors, *Relational and Algebraic Methods in Computer Science*, volume 8428 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 362–378. Springer, Cham, 2014. arXiv:1311.2795, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-06251-8_22.
- [18] N. Krivulin. Extremal properties of tropical eigenvalues and solutions to tropical optimization problems. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 468:211–232, 2015. arXiv:1311.0442, doi:10.1016/j.laa.2014.06.044.
- [19] N. Krivulin. A multidimensional tropical optimization problem with a non-linear objective function and linear constraints. *Optimization*, 64(5):1107–1129, 2015. arXiv:1303.0542, doi:10.1080/02331934.2013.840624.
- [20] N. Krivulin. Rating alternatives from pairwise comparisons by solving tropical optimization problems. In Z. Tang, J. Du, S. Yin, L. He, and R. Li, editors, *2015 12th Intern. Conf. on Fuzzy Systems and Knowledge Discovery (FSKD)*, pages 162–167. IEEE, 2015. arXiv:1504.00800, doi:10.1109/FSKD.2015.7381933.
- [21] N. Krivulin. Using tropical optimization techniques to evaluate alternatives via pairwise comparisons. In A. H. Gebremedhin, E. G. Boman, and B. Ucar, editors, *2016 Proc. 7th SIAM Workshop on Combinatorial Scientific Computing*, pages 62–72. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2016. arXiv:1503.04003, doi:10.1137/1.9781611974690.ch7.
- [22] N. Krivulin. Algebraic solution of tropical optimization problems via matrix sparsification with application to scheduling. *J. Log. Algebr. Methods Program.*, 89:150–170, 2017. arXiv:1504.02602, doi:10.1016/j.jlamp.2017.03.004.

- [23] N. Krivulin. Direct solution to constrained tropical optimization problems with application to project scheduling. *Comput. Manag. Sci.*, 14(1):91–113, Jan 2017. arXiv:1501.07591, doi:10.1007/s10287-016-0259-0.
- [24] N. Krivulin. Using tropical optimization techniques in bi-criteria decision problems. *Comput. Manag. Sci.*, 17(1):79–104, 2020. arXiv:1810.08662, doi:10.1007/s10287-018-0341-x.
- [25] N. Krivulin and S. Sergeev. Tropical implementation of the Analytical Hierarchy Process decision method. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 377:31–51, 2019. arXiv:1802.01989, doi:10.1016/j.fss.2018.10.013.
- [26] N. K. Krivulin and S. A. Gubanov. Algebraic solution of a problem of optimal project scheduling in project management. *Vestnik St. Petersburg Univ. Math.*, 54(1):58–68, 2021. doi:10.1134/S1063454121010088.
- [27] D. T. Luc. Pareto optimality. In A. Chinchuluun, P. M. Pardalos, A. Migdalas, and L. Pitsoulis, editors, *Pareto Optimality, Game Theory and Equilibria*, pages 481–515. Springer, New York, 2008. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-77247-9_18.
- [28] D. Maclagan and B. Sturmfels. *Introduction to Tropical Geometry*, volume 161 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. AMS, Providence, RI, 2015. doi:10.1090/gsm/161.
- [29] J. Mazurek, R. Perzina, J. Ramík, and D. Bartl. A numerical comparison of the sensitivity of the geometric mean method, eigenvalue method, and best–worst method. *Mathematics*, 9(5), 2021. doi:10.3390/math9050554.
- [30] H. Nakayama, Y. Yun, and M. Yoon. *Sequential Approximate Multi-objective Optimization Using Computational Intelligence*. Vector Optimization. Springer, Berlin, 2009. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-88910-6.
- [31] R. Narasimhan. A geometric averaging procedure for constructing supertransitive approximation to binary comparison matrices. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 8(1):53–61, 1982. doi:10.1016/0165-0114(82)90029-X.
- [32] R. Ramesh and S. Zionts. Multiple criteria decision making. In S. I. Gass and M. C. Fu, editors, *Encyclopedia of Operations Research and Management Science*, pages 1007–1013. Springer, Boston, MA, 2013. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-1153-7_653.
- [33] J. Ramík. *Pairwise Comparisons Method*, volume 690 of *Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems*. Springer, Cham, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-39891-0.

- [34] T. L. Saaty. A scaling method for priorities in hierarchical structures. *J. Math. Psych.*, 15(3):234–281, 1977. doi:10.1016/0022-2496(77)90033-5.
- [35] T. L. Saaty. *The Analytic Hierarchy Process*. RWS Publications, Pittsburgh, PA, 2 edition, 1990.
- [36] T. L. Saaty. On the measurement of intangibles: A principal eigenvector approach to relative measurement derived from paired comparisons. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 60(2):192–208, 2013. doi:10.1090/noti944.
- [37] T. L. Saaty and L. G. Vargas. Comparison of eigenvalue, logarithmic least squares and least squares methods in estimating ratios. *Math. Modelling*, 5(5):309–324, 1984. doi:10.1016/0270-0255(84)90008-3.
- [38] T. L. Saaty and L. G. Vargas. Uncertainty and rank order in the analytic hierarchy process. *European J. Oper. Res.*, 32(1):107–117, 1987. doi:10.1016/0377-2217(87)90275-X.
- [39] A. A. Salo and R. P. Hämäläinen. Preference programming through approximate ratio comparisons. *European J. Oper. Res.*, 82(3):458–475, 1995. doi:10.1016/0377-2217(93)E0224-L.
- [40] L. L. Thurstone. A law of comparative judgment. *Psychological Review*, 34(4):273–286, 1927. doi:10.1037/h0070288.
- [41] N. M. Tran. Pairwise ranking: Choice of method can produce arbitrarily different rank order. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 438(3):1012–1024, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2012.08.028.
- [42] P. J. M. van Laarhoven and W. Pedrycz. A fuzzy extension of saaty’s priority theory. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 11(1):229–241, 1983. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0114(83)80082-7.