

OUTLINE FOR PAPERS SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM OF THE ANALYTIC HIERARCHY PROCESS

ABSTRACT

I would like to acknowledge the organizers of ISAHP2020 who prepared the earlier version of this guide. That guide is modified by me and is written to provide information about the different sections expected from papers to be submitted as a term project of MHY530E class. This abstract, along with the keywords should not exceed 300 words.

Keywords: decision making, application area, methods used, interesting keywords.

1. Introduction

Provide here the context for your study. What motivated you to do this work? What is your research question or overall goal with this study? Why is this important? Your study will have specific aims. Make sure to list them here.

2. Literature Review

We expect an exhaustive literature review here. The reader would like to know which are the key articles that have informed your study and also your conclusion of what we know (or don't) about the topic and how this study will fill in that gap.

3. Methodology

This is an important part of a study. As you are developing a decision model, it is important to explain how the model came to be. Submit the flow of the decision framework.

Typically, a model is based on information of secondary sources (literature review), pool of experts / decision makers, user surveys, or a combination of sources. It is important that you explain how goal, criteria, alternatives, influences and judgments were obtained. In particular, if the opinion of different people were aggregated, explain how this aggregation took place. Indicate how you addressed the problems you confront.

4. Analysis / Application / Case Study

Make sure to show the decision matrix, hierarchy, or network. Show the judgments of the experts / decision makers. Represent the findings of the research and all corresponding details. Use figures and tables to include information.

5. Limitations / Discussions

Given the reality of our physical world, no study is perfect. Please, indicate which are those aspects of the study you could not solve satisfactorily and that could weaken the value of your model. What you would different should you have the opportunity to start over? These considerations are important to assess the context of your model validity and also as a way to mentor colleagues interested in this stream of scholarship.

6. Conclusions

Now you have the opportunity to share with the world your contributions. What can you conclude from this study? What are your practical contributions? How can you be certain of your achievements (e.g. is the model being used?) What are the next studies you would propose in this line of scholarship? How does your contribution fit or differs into (or from) the current stream of scholarship? Make sure that your conclusions are based on the current study and that clearly show an important contribution to the practice of MCDM.

References

As examples:

Mu, E. (2006). A unified framework for site selection and business forecasting using ANP. *Journal of Systems Science and Systems Engineering*, 15(2), 178–188.

Saaty, T.L., & Peniwati, K. (2007). *Group decision-making: Drawing out and reconciling differences*. Pittsburgh, PA: RWS Publications.

Saaty, T.L., & Shang, J.S. (2007). Group decision-making: Head-count versus intensity of preference. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 41, 22–37.

7. Appendices

Occasionally, you may want to include appendices such as a survey sample (if data was collected via survey), a picture (e.g. a particular geographical site), etc. Appendices are not needed but if you believe they can improve the readability of your submission, they can be included here.