

## DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Abdullah A.G., Shafii M.A., Pramuditya S., Setiadipura T., Anzhar K., 2023., Multi-criteria decision making for nuclear power plant selection using fuzzy AHP: Evidence from Indonesia, *Energy and AI*, vol. 14, doi: 10.1016/j.egyai.2023.100263
- Agar D.A., Hansen P., Rudolfsson M., Blagojević B., 2023., Combining behavioural TOPSIS and six multi-criteria weighting methods to rank biomass fuel pellets for energy use in Sweden, *Energy Reports*, vol. 10, pp. 706–718, doi: 10.1016
- Ahmed I., Sultana I., Paul S., Azeem A., 2013., Employee Performance Evaluation: A Fuzzy Approach, *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, vol. 62, pp. 718–735, doi: 10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0013
- Aleksić A., Nestić S., Huber M., Ljepava N., 2022., The Assessment of the Key Competences for Lifelong Learning—The Fuzzy Model Approach for Sustainable Education, *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, vol. 14, no. 5, doi: 10.3390/su14052686
- Alireza, A., Majid, M., Rosnah, MY., 2010., Simple Additive Weighting Approach to Personnel Selection Problem, *International Journal of Innovation*, vol.1, no.5
- Anto, A.G., Mustafidah, H., Suyadi, A., 2015., Sistem Pendukung Keputusan Penilaian Kinerja Pegawai menggunakan Metode SAW, *Juita*, vol. III, no.4, pp.193-200
- Araujo J.V.G.A., *dkk.*, 2023., Selection of a vehicle for Brazilian Navy using the multi-criteria method to support decision-making TOPSIS-M, in *Procedia Computer Science*, Elsevier B.V., pp. 261–268. doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2023.07.036
- Araujo J.V.G.A., *dkk.*, 2023., Multi-criteria Decision Support Method AHP-TOPSIS-2N applied in bids to improve the control of public expenses, in *Procedia Computer Science*, Elsevier B.V., pp. 362–369. doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2023.07.049
- Arroyo P., Tommelein I., Ballard G., 2012., *Comparing Multi-Criteria Decision-Making Methods to Select Sustainable Alternatives in the AEC Industry*, doi: 10.1061/9780784412688.104
- Aulia, N.K., Achmad, N., Dyah, M., Muhammad, F.A., 2021., Artificial Data Management in Reaching Conditional Cash Transfer of Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) Utilizing Simple Additive Weighting, *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*

- Aytekin A., 2021., Comparative analysis of normalization techniques in the context of MCDM problems, *Decision Making: Applications in Management and Engineering*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 1–25, doi: 10.31181/dmame210402001a
- Baydaş M., 2022., Comparison of the Performances of MCDM Methods under Uncertainty: An Analysis on Bist SME Industry Index, *OPUS Journal of Society Research*, vol. 19, no. 46, pp. 308–326, doi: 10.26466/opusjsr.1064280
- Biswas T.K., Chaki S., 2022., Applications of Modified Simple Additive Weighting Method in Manufacturing Environment, *International Journal of Engineering, Transactions A: Basics*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 830–836, doi: 10.5829/IJE.2022.35.04A.23
- Bobar, Z., Božanić C.D., Đurić-Atanasievski, K., Pamučar, D., 2020., Ranking and Assessment of the Efficiency of social media using the Fuzzy AHP-Z Number Model-Fuzzy MABAC. *Acta Polytech. Hung.*, vol.17, no.43-70
- Çakır O., Gürler İ., Gündüzyeli B., 2022., Analysis of a Non-Discriminating Criterion in Simple Additive Weighting Deep Hierarchy, *Mathematics*, vol. 10, no. 17, doi: 10.3390/math10173192
- Chatterjee S., Chakraborty S., 2024., A study on the effects of objective weighting methods on TOPSIS-based parametric optimization of non-traditional machining processes, *Decision Analytics Journal*, vol. 11, doi: 10.1016/j.dajour.2024.100451
- Chowdhury P., and Paul S.K., 2020., Applications of MCDM methods in research on corporate sustainability, *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 385–405, doi: 10.1108/MEQ-12-2019-0284
- Dang N.C., Moreno-García M.N., De la Prieta F., 2020., Sentiment analysis based on deep learning: A comparative study, *Electronics (Switzerland)*, vol. 9, no. 3, doi: 10.3390/electronics9030483
- Darko, B., Dragan, P., Aleksandar, M., Dragan, M., Nenad, K., 2022., Modification of the Logarithm Methodology of Additive Weights (LMAW) by a Triangular Fuzzy Number and Its Application in Multi-Criteria Decision Making, MDPI
- Da Silva S.E., Fávero L.P., Moreira M.A.L., dos Santos M., 2023., Proposal of a diversified investment portfolio in stocks: An approach to AHP-Gaussian method, in *Procedia Computer Science*, Elsevier B.V., pp. 418–425. doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2023.07.056

- De Moura Pereira D.A., *dkk.*, 2023., Selection of Agroindustry Real Estate Funds, Based on the AHP-Gaussian, for an Investment Portfolio, in *Procedia Computer Science*, Elsevier B.V., pp. 718–725. doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2023.08.043
- Deng X., Chen C., 2022., Novel linear programming models based on distance measure of IFSs and modified TOPSIS method for portfolio selection, *Egyptian Informatics Journal*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 13–31, doi: 10.1016/j.eij.2022.06.002
- El-Araby A., Sabry I., El-Assal A., 2022., A Comparative Study of Using MCDM Methods Integrated with Entropy Weight Method for Evaluating Facility Location Problem, *Operational Research in Engineering Sciences: Theory and Applications*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 121–138, doi: 10.31181/oresta250322151a
- Elibal K., Özceylan E., 2022., Comparing industry 4.0 maturity models in the perspective of TQM principles using Fuzzy MCDM methods, *Technol Forecast Soc Change*, vol. 175, p. 121379, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121379>
- Endang Lestari., 2017., Kolaborasi Metode SAW dan AHP untuk Sistem Pendukung Keputusan Penilaian Kinerja Asisten Laboratorium, *Jurnal Sistem Informasi*, vol.9
- Fainshmidt S., Witt M.A., Aguilera R.V., Verbeke A., 2020., The contributions of qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) to international business research, *Palgrave Macmillan*. doi: 10.1057/s41267-020-00313-1
- Fogoroş T., Maftai M., Bişan G., and Kurth B., 2020., Study on methods for evaluating employees performance in the context of digitization, *Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence*, vol. 14, pp. 878–892, doi: 10.2478/picbe-2020-0084
- Garg H., Ali Z., Mahmood T., Ali M.R., 2023., TOPSIS-method based on generalized dice similarity measures with hamy mean operators and its application to decision-making process, *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, vol. 65, pp. 383–397, doi: 10.1016/j.aej.2022.10.043
- Ghaleb A.M., Kaid H., Alsamhan A., Mian S.H., Hidri L., 2020., Assessment and Comparison of Various MCDM Approaches in the Selection of Manufacturing Process, *Advances in Materials Science and Engineering*, vol. 2020, doi: 10.1155/2020/4039253
- Harco, L., Arif, F., Wiranto, H.U., 2020., Student Performance Prediction Using Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) method, *IAES International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, vol.9, no.1

- Haseli G., Sheikh R., Sana S.S., 2020., Base-criterion on multi-criteria decision-making method and its applications, *International Journal of Management Science and Engineering Management*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 79–88, doi: 10.1080
- Ibrahim A., Surya R.A., 2019., The Implementation of Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) Method in Decision Support System for the Best School Selection in Jambi, in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, Institute of Physics Publishing, doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1338/1/012054
- Indonesia. 2019., Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 30 Tahun 2019 tentang Penilaian Kinerja Pegawai Negeri Sipil. Jakarta
- Islam R., Rasad S.M., 2006., Employee performance evaluation by the AHP: A case study, *Asia Pacific Management Review*, vol. 11, pp. 163–176
- Irvanizam, I., 2017., Multiple attribute decision making with simple additive weighting approach for selecting the scholarship recipients at Syiah Kuala university, International Conference on Electrical Engineering and Informatics
- Josaputri, C.A., Sugiharti, E., Arifudin, R., 2016., Decision support systems with AHP and SAW method for determination of cattle with superior seeds, *Scientific Journal of Informatics*, vol.3, no.2, pp.119-128
- Jyothi K., *dkk.*, 2022., Comparative Analysis of Five Widely-Used Multi-Criteria Decision-Making Methods to Evaluate Clean Energy Technologies: A Case Study, doi: 10.3390/su
- Kabassi, K., Karydis, C., Bottonis, A., 2020., AHP, Fuzzy SAW, and Fuzzy WPM for the Evaluation of Cultural Websites, *Multimodal Technol*
- Kaliszewski I., Podkopaev D., 2016., Simple additive weighting - A metamodel for multiple criteria decision analysis methods, *Expert Syst Appl*, vol. 54, pp. 155–161, doi: 10.1016/j.eswa.2016.01.042
- Khalida R., Ramdhania K., 2024., Integration of Fuzzy AHP and TOPSIS In Decision Support System for Lecturer Academic Promotion, *PIKSEL : Penelitian Ilmu Komputer Sistem Embedded and Logic*, vol. 12, pp. 69–78, doi: 10.33558
- Kolbowicz M., Nowak M.J., Więckowski J., 2023., A multi-criteria system for performance assessment and support decision-making based on the example of Premier League top football strikers, *Physical Activity Review*, vol. 12(1), pp. 121–142, doi: 10.16926/par.2024.12.12

- Korwa I., Ibrahim M., Irawan A., Yendra Y., Lina R., 2024., Holistic Approaches to Employee Growth and Performance Improvement, *Advances: Jurnal Ekonomi & Bisnis*, vol. 2, doi: 10.60079/ajeb.v2i1.190
- Kiswanto., Benny W., Yurindra., Marini., Sarwindah., Supardi., 2022., Penerapan Logika ANFIS Sistem Penilaian Kinerja Dosen Pada Tri Dharma dan Perilaku Kerja, *Jurnal Sistem Informasi Bisnis*, vol.12
- Kshanh I., Tanaka M., 2024., Comparative analysis of MCDM for energy efficiency projects evaluation towards sustainable industrial energy management: Case study of a petrochemical complex, *Expert Syst Appl*, vol. 255, p. 124692, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2024.124692>
- Kukar, M., Vračar, P., Košir, D., 2019., AgroDSS: A Decision Support System for Agriculture and Farming, *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 161, 260-271
- Liang H., Ren J., Gao S., Dong L., Gao Z., 2023., Chapter 8 - Comparison of different multicriteria decision-making methodologies for sustainability decision making☆, in *Hydrogen Economy (Second Edition)*, A. Scipioni, A. Manzardo, and J. Ren, Eds., Academic Press, pp. 233–271. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-99514-6.00001-7>
- Marda V., 2018., Artificial Intelligence Policy in India: A Framework for Enganging the Limits of Data Driven Decision Making, *Philos. Transformational Social*, vol.379, no.2133, pp.1-19
- Mestanza, J.G., Bakhat, R., 2021., A Fuzzy AHP-MAIRCA Model for Overtourism Assessment: The Case of Malaga Province. *Sustainability*, vol.13, no.6394
- Modul-Panduan-Penyusunan-dan-Evaluasi-SKP-JPT-dan-Pimpinan-Unit-Mandiri-PermenPAN-RB-No.6-Tahun-2022
- Mohandes S.R., *dkk.*, 2020., Assessing construction labours' safety level: A fuzzy MCDM approach, *Journal of Civil Engineering and Management*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 175–188, doi: 10.3846/jcem.2020.11926
- Mohsen B.M., 2023., Multi-Criteria Decision System for the Selection of A Freight Forwarder Using AHP, in *Procedia Computer Science*, Elsevier B.V., pp. 135–144. doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2023.03.020
- Narang, M., Joshi, M.C., Pal, A.K., 2021., A hybrid fuzzy COPRAS-base-criterion method for multi-criteria decision making. *Soft Comput*, vol.25, no.8391-8399

- Nashrudin, S., dkk., 2018., Simple Additive Weighting as Decision Support System for Determining Employees Salary, *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*
- Nazim M., Wali Mohammad C., Sadiq M., 2022., A comparison between fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS methods to software requirements selection, *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, vol. 61, no. 12, pp. 10851–10870, doi: 10.1016/j.aej.2022.04.005
- Neeraj, Goraya M.S., Singh D., 2021., A comparative analysis of prominently used MCDM methods in cloud environment, *J Supercomput*, vol. 77, no. 4, pp. 3422–3449, doi: 10.1007/s11227-020-03393-w
- Noora, Q.N., Muhammad, W., Aris, T., 2020., Aplikasi Monitoring Kinerja Pegawai menggunakan Algoritma Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) di Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Pati Berbasis Mobile, *Jurnal Informatika UPGRIS*, vol.6, no.2
- Ozan C., Ibrahim G., Bora G., 2022., Analysis of a Non-Discriminating Criterion in Simple Additive Weighting Deep Hierarchy, *MDPI*
- Phan Nguyen, H., Vu Ngo, N., Tam Nguyen, C., 2022., Study on Multi-objects Optimization in EDM with Nickel Coated Electrode using Taguchi-AHP-Topsis, *International Journal of Engineering*, vol. 35, no.02
- Pramanik P.K.D., Biswas S., Pal S., Marinković D., Choudhury P., 2021., A comparative analysis of multi-criteria decision-making methods for resource selection in mobile crowd computing, *Symmetry (Basel)*, vol. 13, no. 9, doi: 10.3390/sym13091713
- Pranoto, G.T., Pebrianti, D., Darwis, M., Yaddarabullah., Krishnasari, E.D., 2022., Selection of Education Assistance Recipients Based on AHP and SAW, *International Seminar on Intelligent Technology and Its Applications*
- Pulakos E.D., Mueller-Hanson R., Arad S., 2018., Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior The Evolution of Performance Management: Searching for Value, *Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org. Guest*, doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych
- Putra, D.W.T., Punggara, A.A., 2018., Comparison analysis of simple additive weighting (SAW) and weighed product (WP) in decision support systems, *MATEC Web of Conferences*, vol. 215

- Rachman A.P., Ichwania C., Mangkuto R.A., Pradipta J., Koerniawan M.D., Sarwono J., 2024., Comparison of multi-criteria decision-making methods for selection of optimum passive design strategy, *Energy Build*, vol. 314, p. 114285, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2024.114285>
- Ramadiani R., Adithama S., Jundillah M.L., 2022., Selecting goldfish broods use the weighted product and simple additive weighting methods, *IAES International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 1405–1413, doi: 10.11591/ijai.v11.i4.pp1405-1413
- Ramadiani, D., Marissa, M.L., Jundillah., Azainil., Hatta, H.R., 2018., Simple additive weighting to diagnose rabbit disease, *E3S Web of Conferences*, vol. 31, no. 10002
- Reza Bayu Kurniawan V., Ari Susanti D., Susanto E., Nur Hasyim F., 2021., Ranking University's Academic Departments Based on Research Performance: A Comparative Study of MCDM Methods
- Rodriguez M.Z., *dkk.*, 2019., Clustering algorithms: A comparative approach, *PLoS One*, vol. 14, no. 1, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0210236
- Rufai A., Warnars D.T.S, Warnars H.L.H.S., Doucet A., 2022., Selection of Human Resources Prospective Student Using SAW and AHP Methods, in *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH, pp. 43–64. doi: 10.1007/978-981-19-2500-9\_4
- Sahoo S.K., Goswami S.S., 2023., A Comprehensive Review of Multiple Criteria Decision-Making (MCDM) Methods: Advancements, Applications, and Future Directions, *Decision Making Advances*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 25–48, doi: 10.31181/dma1120237
- Sařabun W., Watróbski J., Shekhovtsov A., 2020., Are MCDA methods benchmarkable? A comparative study of TOPSIS, VIKOR, COPRAS, and PROMETHEE II methods, *Symmetry (Basel)*, vol. 12, no. 9, doi: 10.3390
- Shokrani M., Haghighi M., Paricheh M., Shokrani M., 2019., A comparison of statistical and decision-making techniques in marketing mix evaluation, *Journal of Management Development*, vol. 38, no. 10, pp. 847–863, doi: 10.1108/JMD-08-2018-0228
- Siva Bhaskar A., Khan A., 2022., Comparative analysis of hybrid MCDM methods in material selection for dental applications, *Expert Syst Appl*, vol. 209, p. 118268, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2022.118268>

- Sujith M., Jong-Su J., 2019., Machine Learning–Based Failure Mode Recognition of Circular Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns: Comparative Study, *Journal of Structural Engineering*, vol. 145, no. 10, p. 04019104, doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-541X.0002402
- Supplemental Material for Performance Appraisal and Performance Management: 100 Years of Progress?, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2017, doi: 10.1037/apl0000085.supp
- Supriya, M.S., Syed, N.S., Neha, K.V., 2018., A Comparative Study on Software Development Life Cycle Models, *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology*, vol. 05
- Sutyawati Y., Daniawan B., 2024., Enhancing Employee Motivation: A TOPSIS-Based Decision Support System for Incentive Allocation through Performance Evaluation, *MATICS: Jurnal Ilmu Komputer dan Teknologi Informasi (Journal of Computer Science and Information Technology)*, vol. 16, pp. 13–18, doi: 10.18860/mat.v16i1.23921
- Tan T., Mills G., Papadonikolaki E., Liu Z., 2020., Combining multi-criteria decision making (MCDM) methods with building information modelling (BIM): A review, *Autom Constr*, vol. 121, p. 103451, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.103451>
- Taherdoost H., Madanchian M., 2023., Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) Methods and Concepts, *Encyclopedia*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 77–87, doi: 10.3390/encyclopedia3010006
- Tornyeviadzi H.M., Mohammed H., Seidu R., 2023., Semi-supervised anomaly detection methods for leakage identification in water distribution networks: A comparative study, *Machine Learning with Applications*, vol. 14, p. 100501, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mlwa.2023.100501>
- Vafaei N., Ribeiro R.A., Camarinha-Matos L.M., 2021., Assessing Normalization Techniques for Simple Additive Weighting Method, in *Procedia Computer Science*, Elsevier B.V., pp. 1229–1236. doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2022.01.156
- Volvo S., Victor, M., Wahyu, S.T., Maya, J., Risdalina., Abdul, H., 2021., Implementation of simple additive weighting algorithm in decision support system, *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*
- Wawan, G., Muhammad, R.F., 2020., Monitoring dan Evaluasi Kinerja Pegawai menggunakan Algoritma SAW dan *Hungarian*, *ILKOM Jurnal Ilmiah*, vol. 12, no.2

Wang Y.J., 2015., A fuzzy multi-criteria decision-making model based on simple additive weighting method and relative preference relation, *Applied Soft Computing Journal*, vol. 30, pp. 412–420, doi: 10.1016/j.asoc.2015.02.002

Widianta, R.T., Setyohadi., Riskiawan., Comparison if Multi - Criteria Decision Support Methods (AHP, TOPSIS, SAW & PROMENTHEE) for Employee Placement, *IJCST*, no. Series 953, 2018.

Wu J.J.W., Mazzuchi T.A., Sarkani S., 2023., Comparison of multi-criteria decision-making methods for online controlled experiments in a launch decision-making framework, *Inf Softw Technol*, vol. 155, p. 107115, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2022.107115>



SEKOLAH PASCASARJANA