

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

ABSTRACT

This guide is written to provide information about the different sections expected from paper proposals to be submitted to the International Symposium of the Analytic Hierarchy Process ISAHP 2018. This abstract, along with the keywords should not exceed 300 words. In addition, the total number of pages including this abstract and the following sections (including appendices) must not exceed a total of 5 pages. Also, a more detailed information about spacing, margins, font sizes, headings, references, quotations, and other stylistic features that lead to an appealing visual image is available at www.isahp.org. This formatting in this document should be used for the individual paper.

Keywords: papers, proposals, paper proposal.

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?

2. Literature Review

We do not expect an exhaustive literature review here. However, the reader would like to know which are the 3 to 5 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. Hypotheses/Objectives

Your study may be trying to prove something or at the very least will have a specific objective (e.g. development of a decision model for a particular problem). Make sure to list them here. The reader must be clear about the specific objectives or hypotheses in your study.

4. Research Design/Methodology

This is an important part of a study. If you are developing an AHP/ANP model, it is important to explain how the model came to be. Typically, a model is based on information of secondary sources (literature review), pool of experts, 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. Similarly, indicate how you addressed inconsistency problems. Otherwise your proposed model will have a bad start for lack of face validity.

5. Data/Model Analysis

If you are developing an AHP/ANP model, make sure to show the hierarchy or network respectively. Show the judgment matrices or if the model is too big, show sample matrices. Make sure to provide the key indicators (e.g. consistency indices) to ensure your model is valid. Use the graphic to include additional information such as local weights, C.I., etc. Remember the old saying that a good drawing is worth 10,000 words!

6. Limitations

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.

7. Conclusions

Now you have the opportunity to share with the world your contributions. What can you conclude from this study? What are your theoretical and/or 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 theory and/or practice of AHP/ANP.

8. Key References

List here only those 3 to 5 references that are key for the study at hand. As an example:

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.

9. 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 provided the total number of pages for your submission does not go above the limit indicated in the first page.