Neutrosophic Sets and Systems

Volume 16 | Article 10

1-1-2017

# Neutrosophic Cubic MCGDM Method Based on Similarity Measure

Surapati Pramanik

Shyamal Dalapati

Shariful Alam

Tapan Kumar Roy

NSS University of New Mexico

# Neutrosophic Cubic MCGDM Method Based on Similarity Measure

**Surapati Pramanik[1], Shyamal Dalapati[2], Shariful Alam[3], Tapan Kumar Roy[4], Florentin Smarandache[5]**

[1] Department of Mathematics, Nandalal Ghosh B.T. College, Panpur, P.O.-Narayanpur, District –North 24 Parganas, Pin code-743126, West Bengal, India. E-mail: sura_pati@yahoo.co.in

[2] Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Engineering Science and Technology, Shibpur, P.O.-Botanic Garden, Howrah-711103, West Bengal, India. E-mail: dalapatishyamal30@gmail.com

[3] Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Engineering Science and Technology, Shibpur, P.O.-Botanic Garden, Howrah-711103, West Bengal, India. E-mail: salam50@yahoo.co.in

[4] Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Engineering Science and Technology, Shibpur, P.O.-Botanic Garden, Howrah-711103, West Bengal, India. E-mail: roy_t_k@yahoo.co.in

[5] University of New Mexico. Mathematics & Science Department, 705 Gurley Ave., Gallup, NM 87301, USA. Email:fsmarandache@gmail.com

**Abstract.** The notion of neutrosophic cubic set is originated from the hybridization of the concept of neutrosophic set and interval valued neutrosophic set. We define similarity measure for neutrosophic cubic sets and prove some of its basic properties. We present a new multi criteria group decision making method with linguistic variables in neutrosophic cubic set environment. Finally, we present a numerical example to demonstrate the usefulness and applicability of the proposed method.

**Keywords:** Cubic set, Neutrosophic cubic set, similarity measure, multi criteria group decision making.

## 1. Introduction

In practical life we frequently face decision making problems with uncertainty that cannot be dealt with the classical methods. Therefore sophisticated techniques are required for modification of classical methods to deal decision making problems with uncertainty. L. A. Zadeh [1] first proposed the concept of fuzzy set to deal non-statistical uncertainty called fuzziness. K. T. Atanassov [2, 3] introduced the concept of intuitionistic fuzzy set (IFS) to deal with uncertainty by introducing the non-membership function as an independent component. F. Smarandache [4, 5, 6, 7, 8] introduced the notion of neutrosophic set by introducing indeterminacy as independent component. The theory of neutrosophic sets is a powerful tool to deal with incomplete, indeterminate and inconsistent information involed in real world decision making problem. Wang et al. [9] defined single valued neutrosophic set (SVNS) which is an instance of neutrosophic set. SVNS can independently express a truth-membership degree, an indeterminacy-membership degree and non-membership (falsity-membership) degree. SVNS is capable of representing human thinking due to the imperfection of knowledge received from real world problems. SVNS is obviously suitable for representing incomplete, inconsistent and indeterminate information.

Neutrosophic sets and SVNSs have become hot research topics in different areas of research such as conflict resolution [10], clustering analysis [11, 12], decision making [13-41], educational problem [42, 43], image processing [44, 45, 46], medical diagnosis [47], optimization [48-53], social problem [54, 55].

By combining neutrosophic sets and SVNS with other sets, several neutrosophic hybrid sets have been proposed in the literature such as neutrosophic soft sets [56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61], neutrosophic soft expert set [62, 63], single valued neutrosophic hesitant fuzzy sets [64, 65, 66, 67, 68], interval neutrosophic hesitant sets [69], interval neutrosophic linguistic sets [70], single valued neutrosophic linguistic sets [71], rough neutrosophic set [72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79], interval rough neutrosophic set [80, 81, 82], bipolar neutrosophic set [83, 84], bipolar rough neutrosophic set [85] Tri-complex rough neutrosophic set[ 86], hyper complex rough neutrosophic set [87]. Neutrosophic refined set [88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93], Bipolar neutrosophic refined sets [94], rough complex set neutrosophic cubic set [95].

Jun et al. [96] put forward the concept of cubic set in fuzzy environment and defined external and internal cubic set. Ali et al. [95] proposed neutrosophic cubic set and defined external and internal neutrosophic cubic sets and their basic properties.

Similarity measure is a vital topic in fuzzy set theory, Chen and Hsiao [97] presented comparisons of similarity measures of fuzzy sets. Pramanik and Mondal [98] studied weighted fuzzy similarity measure based on tangent function and presented its application to medical diagnosis. Hwang and Yang [99] constructed a new similarity measure between intuitionistic fuzzy sets based on lower, upper and middle fuzzy sets. Pramanik and Mondal [100] developed tangent similarity measures in intuitionistic fuzzy environment and applied to medical diagnosis. Ren and Wang [101] proposed similarity measures in interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy environment and applied it to multi attribute decision making problems. Baccour et al. [102] presented survey of similarity measures for intuitionistic fuzzy sets. Baroumi and Smarandache [103] disicussed several similarity measures of neutrosophic sets. Mondal and Pramanik [104] extended the concept of intuitionistic tangent similarity measure to neutrosophic environment. Biswas et al. [105] studied cosine similarity measure with trapezoidal fuzzy neutrosophic number and its applied to multi attribute decision making problems. Pramanik and Mondal [106] proposed cosine similarity measure of rough neutrosophic set and applied it to medical diagnosis problems. Pramanik and Mondal [107]developed ccotangent similarity measure of rough neutrosophic sets and its application to medical diagnosis J. Ye [108] proposed a similarity measures under interval neutrosophic domain using hamming distance and Euclidean distance. P. Majumdar and S. K. Samanta [109] introduced some measures of similarity and entropy of single valued neutrosophic sets. Ali aydogdu [110] proposed similarity and entropy measure of single valued neutrosophic sets. Ali aydogdu [111] also defined entropy and similarity measures of interval neutrosophic sets. Mukherjee and Sarkar [112] proposed similarity measures, weighted similarity measure and developed an algorithm in interval valued neutrosophic soft set setting for supervised pattern recognition problem. In neutrosophic cubic set environment, similarity measure is yet to appear.

In this paper we define similarity measures in neutrosophic cubic set environment and develop a multi criteria group decision making (MCGDM) method in neutrosophic cubic set setting. The decision makers' weights and criteria (attributes) weights are described by neutrosophic cubic numbers using linguistic variables. The ranking of alternatives is presented in descending order. Finally, illustrate numerical example MCGDM problem in neutrosophic cubic set environment is dolved to show the effectiveness of the proposed method.

Rest of the paper is presented as follows. Section 2 presents some basic definition of fuzzy sets, interval-valued fuzzy sets, neutrosophic sets, interval valued neutrosophic sets, cubic set, neutrosophic cubic sets and their basic operations. Section 3 is devoted to prove the basic properties of similarity measure for neutrosophic cubic sets. Section 4 presents a MCGDM method based on similarity measure in neutrosophic cubic set environment. Section 5 presents a numerical example for a MCGDM problem. Finally, section 6 presents conclusion and future scope of research.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall some basic definitions which are relevant to develop the paper.

### Definition 2.1 [1] Fuzzy set

Let U be a universal set. Then a fuzzy set Z over U is defined by $Z = \{(u, \mu_Z(u)): u \in U\}$

Where $\mu_Z : U \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is called membership function of Z and $\mu_Z(u)$ specifies the grade or degree to which any element u in Z, $\mu_Z(u) \in [0, 1]$. Larger values of $\mu_Z(u)$ indicate higher degrees of membership.

### Definition 2.2 [113] Interval valued fuzzy set

Let U be a universal set, then an interval valued fuzzy set $\tilde{Z}$ over U is defined by $\tilde{Z} = \{[Z^-(u), Z^+(u)] /u: u \in U\}$, where $Z^-(u)$, $Z^+(u)$ represent respectively the lower and upper degrees of membership values for $u \in U$ and $0 \leq Z^-(u) + Z^+(u) \leq 1$.

### Definition 2.3 [96] Cubic set

Let G be a non-empty set. A cubic set C (G) in G is defined by

$C(G) = \{g, \tilde{Z}(g), Z(g)/g \in G\}$

Where $\tilde{Z}(g)$ and Z (g) be the interval valued fuzzy set and fuzzy set in G.

### Definition 2.4 [4] Neutrosophic set (NS)

Let U be a space of points (objects) with a generic element in U denoted by u i.e. $u \in U$. A neutrosophic set R in U is characterized by truth-membership function $t_R$, a indeterminacy membership function $i_R$ and falsity-membership function $f_R$. Where $t_R$, $i_R$, $f_R$ are the functions from U to $]^-0, 1^+[$ i.e. $t_R, i_R, f_R: U \rightarrow\ ]^-0, 1^+[$ that means $t_R(u), i_R(u), f_R(u)$ are the real standard or non-standard subset of $]^-0, 1^+[$. Neutrosophic set can be expressed as R = {<u, ( $t_R(u), i_R(u), f_R(u)$)>: $u \in U$}. Since $t_R(u), i_R(u), f_R(u)$ are the subset of $]^-0, 1^+[$ then the sum ($t_R(u) + i_R(u) + f_R(u)$) lies between $^-0$ and $3^+$, where $^-0 = 0 - \varepsilon$ and $3^+ = 3 + \varepsilon$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

**Definition 2.5 [9] Single valued neutrosophic set**

Let U be a space of points (objects) with a generic element in U denoted by u. A single valued neutrosophic set H in U is expressed by H = {<u, ( $t_H(u), i_H(u), f_H(u)$)>, $u \in U$},where $t_H(u), i_H(u), f_H(u): U \rightarrow [0, 1]$

Therefore for each $u \in U$, $t_H(u), i_H(u), f_H(u) \in [0, 1]$ and $0 \le t_H(u) + i_H(u) + f_H(u) \le 3$.

**Definition 2.6 [4] Complement of neutrosophic set**

The complement of neutrosophic set R denoted by $R'$ and defined as $R'$ = {< u, $t_{R'}(u), i_{R'}(u), f_{R'}(u)$>: $u \in U$}, where $t_{R'}(u) = f_R(u)$, $i_{R'}(u) = \{1^+\} - i_R(u)$, $f_{R'}(u) = t_R(u)$.

**Definition 2.7 [8]Containment**

A neutrosophic set $R_1$ is contained in another neutrosophic set $R_2$ i.e. $R_1 \subseteq R_2$ iff $t_{R_1}(u) \le t_{R_2}(u)$, $i_{R_1}(u) \le i_{R_2}(u)$ and $f_{R_1}(u) \ge f_{R_2}(u)$, $\forall u \in U$.

**Definition 2.8 [4] Equality**

Two single valued neutrosophic set $R_1$ and $R_2$ are equal iff $R_1 \subseteq R_2$ and $R_2 \subseteq R_1$.

**Definition 2.9 [4] Union**

The union of two single valued neutrosophic set $R_1$ and $R_2$ is a neutrosophic set $R_3$ (say) written as $R_3 = R_1 \cup R_2$.

$t_{R_3}(u) = \max\{t_{R_1}(u), t_{R_2}(u)\}$, $i_{R_3}(u) = \max\{i_{R_1}(u), i_{R_2}(u)\}$, $f_{R_1}(u) = \min\{f_{R_1}(u), f_{R_2}(u)\}$, $\forall u \in U$.

**Definition 2.10 [4] Intersection**

The intersection of two single valued neutrosophic set $R_1$ and $R_2$ denoted by $R_4$ and written as $R_4 = R_1 \cap R_2$defined by $t_{R_4}(u) = \min\{t_{R_1}(u), t_{R_2}(u)\}$, $i_{R_4}(u) = \min\{i_{R_1}(u), i_{R_2}(u)\}$

$f_{R_4}(u) = \max\{f_{R_1}(u), f_{R_2}(u)\}$, $\forall u \in U$.

**Definition 2.11 [114] Interval neutrosophic set (INS)**

Let G be a non-empty set. An interval neutrosophic set $\tilde{G}$ in G is characterized by truth-membership function $t_{\tilde{G}}$, the indeterminacy function $i_{\tilde{G}}$ and falsity membership function $f_{\tilde{G}}$. For each $g \in G$, $t_{\tilde{G}}(g)$, $i_{\tilde{G}}(g)$, $f_{\tilde{G}}(g) \subseteq [0, 1]$ and $\tilde{G}$ defined as

$\tilde{G}$ = {<g; $[t^-_{\tilde{G}}(g), t^+_{\tilde{G}}(g)]$, $[i^-_{\tilde{G}}(g), i^+_{\tilde{G}}(g)]$, $[f^-_{\tilde{G}}(g), f^+_{\tilde{G}}(g)]$: $g \in G$}.

**Definition 2.12 [114] Containment**

Let $G_1$ and $G_2$ be two interval neutrosophic set defined by $\tilde{G}_1$ = {<g, $[t^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g), t^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g)]$, $[i^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g), i^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g)]$, $[f^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g), f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g)]$>: $g \in G$}

and $\tilde{G}_2$ = {<g, $[t^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g), t^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)]$, $[i^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g), i^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)]$, $[f^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g), f^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)]$>: $g \in G$}

then, (i) $\tilde{G}_1 \subseteq \tilde{G}_2$ defined as

$t^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g) \le t^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)$, $t^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g) \le t^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)$

$i^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g) \le i^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)$, $i^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g) \le i^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)$

$f^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g) \ge f^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)$, $f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g) \ge f^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)$ for all $g \in G$.

**Definition 2.13 [114] Equality**

$\tilde{G}_1 = \tilde{G}_2$ iff $\tilde{G}_1 \subseteq \tilde{G}_2$ and $\tilde{G}_2 \subseteq \tilde{G}_1$ that means $t^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g) = t^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)$, $t^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g) = t^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)$, $i^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g) = i^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)$, $i^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g) = i^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)$, $f^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g) = f^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)$, $f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g) = f^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g)$ for all $g \in G$.

**Definition 2.14 [114] Compliment**

Compliment of an interval neutrosophic set $\tilde{G}_1$ denoted by $\tilde{G}_1'$ and defined by

$\tilde{G}_1'$ = {<g, $[t^-_{\tilde{G}_1'}(g), t^+_{\tilde{G}_1'}(g)]$, $[i^-_{\tilde{G}_1'}(g), i^+_{\tilde{G}_1'}(g)]$, $[f^-_{\tilde{G}_1'}(g), f^+_{\tilde{G}_1'}(g)]$>: $g \in G$},Where, $t^-_{\tilde{G}_1'}(g) = f^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g)$, $t^+_{\tilde{G}_1'}(g) = f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g)$, $i^-_{\tilde{G}_1'}(g) = \{1\} - i^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g)$, $i^+_{\tilde{G}_1'}(g) = \{1\} - i^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g)$,

$f^-_{\tilde{G}_1'}(g) = t^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g)$, $f^+_{\tilde{G}_1'}(g) = f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g)$.

**Definition 2.15 [114] Union**

The union of two interval neutrosophic sets $\tilde{G}_1$, and $\tilde{G}_2$ is denoted by $\tilde{G}_3 = \tilde{G}_1 \cup \tilde{G}_2$ and defined as

$\tilde{G}_3$ = {<g, [max { $t^-_{\tilde{G}_1}$ (g), $t^-_{\tilde{G}_2}$ (g)},max { $t^+_{\tilde{G}_1}$ (g), $t^+_{\tilde{G}_2}$ (g)}], [max { $i^-_{\tilde{G}_1}$ (g), $i^-_{\tilde{G}_2}$ (g)}, max { $i^+_{\tilde{G}_1}$ (g), $i^+_{\tilde{G}_2}$ (g)}], [min { $f^-_{\tilde{G}_1}$ (g), $f^-_{\tilde{G}_2}$ (g)}, min { $f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}$ (g), $f^+_{\tilde{G}_2}$ (g)}]>: g $\in$ G}.

**Definition 2.16 [114] Intersection**

The intersection of two interval neutrosophic set $\tilde{G}_1$, $\tilde{G}_2$ is denoted by $\tilde{G}_4 = \tilde{G}_1 \cap \tilde{G}_2$ and defined as

$\tilde{G}_4$ = {<g, [min { $t^-_{\tilde{G}_1}$ (g), $t^-_{\tilde{G}_2}$ (g)},min { $t^+_{\tilde{G}_1}$ (g), $t^+_{\tilde{G}_2}$ (g)}], [min { $i^-_{\tilde{G}_1}$ (g), $i^-_{\tilde{G}_2}$ (g)}, min { $i^+_{\tilde{G}_1}$ (g), $i^+_{\tilde{G}_2}$ (g)}], [max { $f^-_{\tilde{G}_1}$ (g), $f^-_{\tilde{G}_2}$ (g)}, max { $f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}$ (g), $f^+_{\tilde{G}_2}$ (g)}]>: g $\in$ G}.

**Definition 2.17 [95] Neutrosophic cubic set (NCS)**

A neutrosophic cubic set Q (N) in a universal set G is defined as

Q (N) = {<g, $\tilde{G}$ (g), R (g)>: g $\in$ G}, where $\tilde{G}$ is an interval neutrosophic set and R is a neutrosophic set in G. In this paper,we represent neutrosophic cubic set in the following form:

Q (N) = < $\tilde{G}$ , R > as order pair, set of all neutrosophic cubic sets in G, we denote it by NCS (G).

**Definition 2.18 Another definition of neutrosophic cubic set**

Let G be a universal set, then the neutrosophic cubic set Q (N) in G is expressed as the pair

< $\tilde{G}$ , R > , where $\tilde{G}$ and R be the mappings represented by $\tilde{G}$ : G $\rightarrow$ INS (G), R: $\rightarrow$ NS (G)

Combining the two mappings, NCS can be expressed as Q (N) = $\tilde{G}^R$ : G $\rightarrow$ [INS (G), NS (G)] and defined as Q (N) = $\tilde{G}^R$ = {< g/ < $\tilde{G}$ (g), R (g)>>: g $\in$ G}.

**Definition 2.19 [95] Containment**

Let $Q_1$ (N) = ( $\tilde{G}_1^{R_1}$ ) and $Q_2$ (N) = ( $\tilde{G}_2^{R_2}$ ) be any two NCSs in G, then $Q_1$ (N) contained in $Q_2$ (N) i.e. $Q_1$ (N) $\subseteq$ $Q_2$ (N) iff $\tilde{G}_1 \subseteq \tilde{G}_2$ and $R_1 \subseteq R_2$.

**Definition 2.20 [95] Equality**

Assume that $Q_1$ (N) = ( $\tilde{G}_1^{R_1}$ ) and $Q_2$ (N) = ( $\tilde{G}_2^{R_2}$ ) be the two NCSs in G. They are said to be equal iff $Q_1$ (N) $\subseteq$ $Q_2$ (N) and $Q_2$ (N) $\subseteq$ $Q_1$ (N) that means $\tilde{G}_1 = \tilde{G}_2$ and $R_1 = R_2$.

**Definition 2.21 [95] Union**

The union of two NCSs $Q_1$ (N) = ( $\tilde{G}_1^{R_1}$ ) and $Q_2$ (N) = ( $\tilde{G}_2^{R_2}$ ) in G is denoted by

$Q_1$ (N) $\cup$ $Q_2$ (N) = $Q_3$ (N) (say) and defined as

$Q_3$ (N) = {<g, ( $\tilde{G}_1 \cup \tilde{G}_2$ ) (g), ($R_1 \cup R_2$) (g)>: g $\in$ G}.

**Definition 2.22 [95] Intersection**

The intersection of two NCS $Q_1$ (N) = ( $\tilde{G}_1^{R_1}$ ) and $Q_2$ (N) = ( $\tilde{G}_2^{R_2}$ ) in G is denoted by $Q_1$ (N) $\cup$ $Q_2$ (N) = $Q_4$ (N) (say) and defined as $Q_4$ (N) = {<g, ( $\tilde{G}_1 \cap \tilde{G}_2$ ) (g), ($R_1 \cap R_2$) (g)>: g $\in$ G}.

**Definition 2.23 [95]Complement**

Let $Q_1$ (N) be a NCS. Then complement of $Q_1$ (N) is denoted by $Q'_1$ (N) = {<g, $\tilde{G}_1'$ (g), $\tilde{R}_1'$ (g)>: g $\in$ G}.

## 3 Similarity measure of NCS

We define similarity measure for neutrosophic cubic set.

**Definition3.1**

Let $Q_1$ and $Q_2$ be two NCSs in G. Similarity measure for $Q_1$and $Q_2$ is defined as a mapping

SM: NCS (G) × NCS (G) $\rightarrow$ [0, 1] that satisfies the following conditions:

(1) $0 \leq$ SM ($Q_1$, $Q_2$) $\leq 1$
(2) SM ($Q_1$, $Q_2$) = 1 iff $Q_1 = Q_2$
(3) SM ($Q_1$, $Q_2$) = SM ($Q_2$, $Q_1$)
(4) If $Q_1 \subseteq Q_2 \subseteq Q_3$ then SM ($Q_1$, $Q_3$) $\leq$ SM ($Q_1$, $Q_2$) and SM ($Q_1$, $Q_3$) $\leq$ SM ($Q_2$, $Q_3$) for all $Q_1$, $Q_2$, $Q_3$ $\in$ NCS (G).

Similarity measure for two NCSs $Q_1$ and $Q_2$ expressed as

$$SM(Q_1, Q_2) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(1 - \frac{D_i}{9}\right),$$

where $D_i$ = ( $|t^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - t^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |t^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - t^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |i^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - i^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |i^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - i^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |f^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - f^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - f^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |t_{R_1}(g_i) - t_{R_2}(g_i)| + |i_{R_1}(g_i) - i_{R_2}(g_i)| + |f_{R_1}(g_i) - f_{R_2}(g_i)|$ ).

We now prove that the similarity measure satisfies the four stated conditions:

(1) $0 \leq$ SM ($Q_1$, $Q_2$) $\leq 1$

**Proof:** If $D_i$ has extreme value i.e. $D_i = 0$ or 9, then SM $(Q_1, Q_2) = 1$ or 0 (1)

If $D_i$ lies between 0 and 9 i.e$0<D_i<9$, then $0<\frac{D_i}{9}<1$

$\Rightarrow 0> -\frac{D_i}{9} > -1$

Adding 1 each part of the above inequality, we obtain

$0< \; 1-\frac{D_i}{9} <1$

$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}0 < \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-\frac{D_i}{9}) < \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}1 = 1$

$\Rightarrow 0<\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-\frac{D_i}{9})<1$

$\Rightarrow 0<SM\,(Q_1, Q_2)<1$ (2)

Combining (1) and (2), we get $0\leq SM\,(Q_1, Q_2)\leq 1$

(2) SM $(Q_1, Q_2) = 1$ iff $Q_1 = Q_2$

**Proof:**

If $Q_1 = Q_2$, then $D_i = 0$ by the definition of equality.

SM $(Q_1, Q_2) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-\frac{D_i}{9}) = 1.$

(3) SM $(Q_1, Q_2)$ = SM $(Q_2, Q_1)$

**Proof:** SM $(Q_1, Q_2) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-\frac{D_i}{9})$ ,

where $D_i(Q_1, Q_2) = (|t^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - t^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |t^+_{\tilde{G}1}(g_i) - t^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |i^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - i^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |i^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - i^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |f^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - f^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - f^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |t_{R_1}(g_i) - t_{R_2}(g_i)| + |i_{R_1}(g_i) - i_{R_2}(g_i)| + |f_{R_1}(g_i) - f_{R_2}(g_i)|)$

since, $|t^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - t^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| = |t^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i) - t^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i)|$, $|t^+_{\tilde{G}1}(g_i) - t^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| = |t^+_{\tilde{G}2}(g_i) - t^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i)|$, $|i^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - i^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| = |i^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i) - i^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i)|$, $|i^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - i^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| = |i^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i) - i^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i)|$, $|f^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - f^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| = |f^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i) - f^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i)|$, $|f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - f^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| = |f^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i) - f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i)|$, $|t_{R_1}(g_i) - t_{R_2}(g_i)| = |t_{R_2}(g_i) - t_{R_1}(g_i)|$, $|i_{R_1}(g_i) - i_{R_2}(g_i)| = |i_{R_2}(g_i) - i_{R_1}(g_i)|$, $|f_{R_1}(g_i) - f_{R_2}(g_i)| = |f_{R_2}(g_i) - f_{R_1}(g_i)|$.

$\Rightarrow D_i(Q_1, Q_2) = D_i(Q_2, Q_1)$

Therefore, SM $(Q_1, Q_2)$ = SM $(Q_2, Q_1)$.

(4) If $Q_1 \subseteq Q_2 \subseteq Q_3$ , then SM $(Q_1, Q_3) \leq$ SM $(Q_1, Q_2)$ and SM $(Q_1, Q_3) \leq$ SM $(Q_2, Q_3)$ for all $Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 \in$ NCS (G).

**Proof:**

Let $Q_1 \subseteq Q_2 \subseteq Q_3$ then ,

$t^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) \le t^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i) \le t^-_{\tilde{G}_3}(g_i)$ , $t^+_{\tilde{G}1}(g_i) \le t^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i) \le t^+_{\tilde{G}_3}(g_i)$, $i^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) \le i^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i) \le i^-_{\tilde{G}_3}(g_i)$ $i^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) \le i^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)$, $\le i^+_{\tilde{G}_3}(g_i)$, $f^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) \geq f^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i) \geq f^-_{\tilde{G}_3}(g_i)$, $f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) \geq f^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i) \geq f^+_{\tilde{G}_3}(g_i)$ $t_{R_1}(g_i) \leq t_{R_2}(g_i) \leq t_{R_3}(g_i)$, $i_{R_1}(g_i) \leq i_{R_2}(g_i) \leq i_{R_3}(g_i)$, $f_{R_1}(g_i) \geq f_{R_2}(g_i) \geq f_{R_3}(g_i)$ (3)

Now $D_i(Q_1, Q_2) = (|t^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - t^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |t^+_{\tilde{G}1}(g_i) - t^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |i^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - i^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |i^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - i^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |f^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - f^-_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - f^+_{\tilde{G}_2}(g_i)| + |t_{R_1}(g_i) - t_{R_2}(g_i)| + |i_{R_1}(g_i) - i_{R_2}(g_i)| + |f_{R_1}(g_i) - f_{R_2}(g_i)|)$

And $D_i(Q_1, Q_3) = (|t^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - t^-_{\tilde{G}_3}(g_i)| + |t^+_{\tilde{G}1}(g_i) - t^+_{\tilde{G}_3}(g_i)| + |i^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - i^-_{\tilde{G}_3}(g_i)| + |i^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - i^+_{\tilde{G}_3}(g_i)| + |f^-_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - f^-_{\tilde{G}_3}(g_i)| + |f^+_{\tilde{G}_1}(g_i) - f^+_{\tilde{G}_3}(g_i)| + |t_{R_1}(g_i) - t_{R_2}(g_i)| + |i_{R_1}(g_i) - i_{R_3}(g_i)| + |f_{R_1}(g_i) - f_{R_3}(g_i)|)$

From (3), we conclude that

$D_i(Q_1, Q_3) \geq D_i(Q_1, Q_2)$

$\Rightarrow \frac{D_i(Q_1,Q_3)}{9} \geq \frac{D_i(Q_1,Q_2)}{9}$

$\Rightarrow -\frac{D_i(Q_1,Q_3)}{9} \leq -\frac{D_i(Q_1,Q_2)}{9}$

$\Rightarrow [1-\frac{D_i(Q_1,Q_3)}{9}] \leq [1-\frac{D_i(Q_1,Q_2)}{9}]$

$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}[1-\frac{D_i(Q_1,Q_3)}{9}] \leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}[1-\frac{D_i(Q_1,Q_3)}{9}]$

$\Rightarrow$ SM $(Q_1, Q_3) \leq$ SM $(Q_1, Q_2)$

Similarly we can shows that SM $(Q_1, Q_3) \leq$ SM $(Q_2, Q_3)$, hence the proof.

## 4 MCGDM methods based on similarity measure in NCS environment

In this section we propose a new MCGDM method based on similarity measure in NCS environment. Assume that

$\alpha=\{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3,...,\alpha_n\}$ be a set of n alternatives with criteria $\beta=\{\beta_1,\beta_2,\beta_3,...,\beta_m\}$ and $\gamma=\{\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\gamma_3,...,\gamma_r\}$ be the r decision makers. Let $\Psi=\{\Psi_1,\Psi_2,\Psi_3,...,\Psi_r\}$ be the weight vestor of decision makers, where $\Psi_k>0$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{r}\Psi_k=1$. Proposed MCGDM method is presented using the following steps.

**Step1. Formation of ideal NCS decision matrix**

Ideal NCS decision matrix is an important matrix for similarity measure of MCGDM. Here we construct an ideal NCS matrix in the form

$$M=\begin{pmatrix} & \beta_1 & \beta_2 & \dots\dots & \beta_m \\ \alpha_1 & Q_{11} & Q_{12} & \dots & Q_{1m} \\ \alpha_2 & Q_{21} & Q_{22} & & Q_{2m} \\ . & . & & \dots & . \\ \alpha_n & Q_{n1} & Q_{n2} & \dots & .Q_{nm} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

Where $Q_{ij}=\langle G_{ij}, R_{ij}\rangle$, i = 1, 2, 3,…, n. j = 1, 2, 3, …, m.

**Step 2. Construction of NCS decision matrix**

Since r decision makers are involved in the decision making process, the k-th (k = 1, 2, 3,…, r) decision maker provides the evaluation information of the alternative $\alpha_i$ (i= 1, 2, 3,…, n) with respect to criteria $\beta_j$ (j= 1, 2, 3,…, m) in terms of the NCS. The k-th decision matrix denoted by $M^k$ (See eq. (5)) is constreucted as follows:

$$M^k=\langle Q_{ij}^k\rangle=\begin{pmatrix} & \beta_1 & \beta_2 & \dots\dots & \beta_m \\ \alpha_1 & Q_{11}^k & Q_{12}^k & \dots & Q_{1m}^k \\ \alpha_2 & Q_{21}^k & Q_{22}^k & & Q_{2m}^k \\ . & . & & \dots & . \\ \alpha_n & Q_{n1}^k & Q_{n2}^k & \dots & .Q_{nm}^k \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

Where k = 1, 2, 3,…, r. i = 1, 2, 3,…, n. j = 1, 2, 3,…, m.

**Step 3. Determination of attribute weight**

All attribute are not equally important in decision making situation. Every decision maker provides their own opinion regarding to the attribute weight in terms of linguistic variables that can be converted into NCS. Let $w_k(\beta_j)$ be the attribute weight for the attribute $\beta_j$ given by the k-th decision maker in term of NCS. We convert $w_k(\beta_j)$ into fuzzy number as follows:

$$w_k^F(\beta_j)=\begin{cases}(1-\sqrt{\dfrac{V_{kj}}{9}}), \text{if } \beta_j\in\beta \\ 0 \qquad \text{otherwise}\end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $V_{kj}$ =

$$\sqrt{\left\{\begin{array}{c}(1-t_k^-(\beta_j))^2+(1-t_k^+(\beta_j))^2+(i_k^-(\beta_j))^2+(i_k^+(\beta_j))^2 \\ +(f_k^-(\beta_j))^2+(f_k^+(\beta_j))^2+(1-t_k(\beta_j))^2 \\ +(i_k(\beta_j))^2+(f_k(\beta_j))^2\end{array}\right\}}.$$

Then aggregate weight for the criteria $\beta_j$ can be determined as:

$$W_j=\frac{(1-\prod_{k=1}^{r}(1-w_k^F(\beta_j))}{\sum_{k=1}^{r}(1-\prod_{k=1}^{r}(1-w_k^F(\beta_j))} \quad (7)$$

Here $\sum_{k=1}^{r}W_j=1$.

**Step 4. Calculation of weighted similarity measure**

We now calculate weighted similarity measure between idel matrix M and $M^k$ as follows:

$$S^w(M,M^k)=\langle\lambda_i^k\rangle$$

$$=\left(\lambda_1^k,\lambda_2^k,...,\lambda_n^k\right)^T=\left(\frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^{m}(1-\frac{D_{ij}^k}{9})W_j\right)_{i=1}^{n} \quad (8)$$

Here, k =1, 2, 3,…, r.

**Step 5. Ranking of alternatives**

In order to rank alternatives, we propose the formula (see eq.9):

$$\rho_i=\sum_{k=1}^{r}\psi_k\lambda_i^k \quad (9)$$

We arrange alternatives according to the descending order values of $\rho_i$. The highest value of $\rho_i$ (i= 1, 2, 3,…, n) reflects the best alternative.

**5 Numerical example**

We solve a MCGDM problem adapted from [108] to demonstrate the applicability and effectiveness of the proposed method. Assume that an investment company wants to invest a sum of money in the best option. The investment company forms a decision making committee comprising of three members ($k_1$, $k_2$, $k_3$) to make a panel of four alternatives to invest money. The alternatives are Car company ($\alpha_1$), Food company ($\alpha_2$), Computer company

( $\alpha_3$ ) and Arm company ( $\alpha_4$ ). Decision makers take decision based on the criteria namely, risk analysis ( $\beta_1$ ), growth analysis ( $\beta_2$ ), environment impact ( $\beta_3$ ) and criterion weights are provided by the decision makers in terms of linguistic variables that can be converted into NCS.(See Table 1).

**Table 1: Linguistic term for rating of attribute/ criterion**

| Linguistic terms | NCS |
|---|---|
| Very important (VI) | <[.7, .9], [.1, .2], [.1, .2], (.9, .2,.2)> |
| Important (I) | <[.6, .8], [.2, .3], [.2, .4], (.8, .3, .4)> |
| Medium (M) | <[.4, .5], [.4, .5], [.4, .5], (.5, .5, .5)> |
| Unimportant (UI) | <[.3, .4], [.5, .6], [.5, .7], (.4, .6, .7)> |
| Very unimportant (VUI) | <[.1, .2], [.6, .8], [.7, .9], (.2, .8, .9)> |

**Step1. Formation of ideal NCS decision matrix**

We construct ideal NCS decision matrix (see eq.(10).

$$M=\begin{pmatrix} & \beta_1 & \beta_2 & \beta_3 \\ \alpha_1 & <[1,1],[0,0],[0,0],(1,0,0)> & <[1,1],[0,0],[0,0],(1,0,0)> & <[1,1],[0,0],[0,0],(1,0,0)> \\ \alpha_2 & <[1,1],[0,0],[0,0],(1,0,0)> & <[1,1],[0,0],[0,0],(1,0,0)> & <[1,1],[0,0],[0,0],(1,0,0)> \\ \alpha_3 & <[1,1],[0,0],[0,0],(1,0,0)> & <[1,1],[0,0],[0,0],(1,0,0)> & <[1,1],[0,0],[0,0],(1,0,0)> \\ \alpha_4 & <[1,1],[0,0],[0,0],(1,0,0)> & <[1,1],[0,0],[0,0],(1,0,0)> & <[1,1],[0,0],[0,0],(1,0,0)> \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

**Step 2. Construction of NCS decision matrix**

The NCS decision matrices are constructed for four alternatives with respect to the three criteria.

**Decision matrix for $k_1$ in NCS form**

$M^1$ =

$$M^1=\begin{pmatrix} & \beta_1 & \beta_2 & \beta_3 \\ \alpha_1 & <[.7,.9],[.1,.2],[.1,.2],(.9,.2,.2)> & <[.7,.9],[.1,.2],[.1,.2],(.9,.2,.2)> & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> \\ \alpha_2 & <[.6,.8],[.2,.3],[.2,.4],(.8,.3,.4)> & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> & <[.7,.9],[.1,.2],[.1,.2],(.9,.2,.2)> \\ \alpha_3 & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> & <[.6,.8],[.2,.3],[.2,.4],(.8,.3,.4)> & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> \\ \alpha_4 & <[.3,.4],[.5,.6],[.5,.7],(.4,.6,.7)> & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> & <[.7,.9],[.1,.2],[.1,.2],(.9,.2,.2)> \end{pmatrix}$$

**Decision matrix for $k_2$ in NCS form**

$M^2$ =

$$\begin{pmatrix} & \beta_1 & \beta_2 & \beta_3 \\ \alpha_1 & <[.3,.4],[.5,.6],[.5,.7],(.4,.6,.7)> & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> & <[.7,.9],[.1,.2],[.1,.2],(.9,.2,.2)> \\ \alpha_2 & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> & <[.7,.9],[.1,.2],[.1,.2],(.9,.2,.2)> \\ \alpha_3 & <[.7,.9],[.1,.2],[.1,.2],(.9,.2,.2)> & <[.7,.9],[.1,.2],[.1,.2],(.9,.2,.2)> & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> \\ \alpha_4 & <[.6,.8],[.2,.3],[.2,.4],(.8,.3,.4)> & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> & <[.7,.9],[.1,.2],[.1,.2],(.9,.2,.2)> \end{pmatrix}$$

**Decision matrix for $k_3$ in NCS form**

$M^3$ =

$$\begin{pmatrix} & \beta_1 & \beta_2 & \beta_3 \\ \alpha_1 & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> & <[.7,.9],[.1,.2],[.1,.2],(.9,.2,.2)> \\ \alpha_2 & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> & <[.7,.9],[.1,.2],[.1,.2],(.9,.2,.2)> & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> \\ \alpha_3 & <[.7,.9],[.1,.2],[.1,.2],(.9,.2,.2)> & <[.6,.8],[.2,.3],[.2,.4],(.8,.3,.4)> & <[.6,.8],[.2,.3],[.2,.4],(.8,.3,.4)> \\ \alpha_4 & <[.7,.9],[.1,.2],[.1,.2],(.9,.2,.2)> & <[.4,.5],[.4,.5],[.4,.5],(.5,.5,.5)> & <[.3,.4],[.5,.6],[.5,.7],(.4,.6,.7)> \end{pmatrix}$$

**Step 3. Determination of attribute weight**

The linguistic terms shown in Table 1 are used to evaluate each attribute. The importance of each attribute for every decision maker is rated with linguistic terms shown in Table 2. Linguistic terms are converted into NCS (See Table 3.) .

**Table 2. Attribute rating in linguistic variables**

| | $\beta_1$ | $\beta_2$ | $\beta_3$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| $K_1$ | VI | M | I |
| $K_2$ | VI | VI | M |
| $K_3$ | M | VI | M |

**Table 3. Attribute rating in NCS**

| | $\beta_1$ | $\beta_2$ | $\beta_3$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| $K_1$ | <[.7, .9], [.1, .2], [.1, .2], (.9, .2,.2)> | <[.4, .5], [.4, .5], [.4, .5], (.5, .5, .5)> | <[.6, .8], [.2, .3], [.2, .4], (.8, .3, .4)> |
| $K_2$ | <[.7, .9], [.1, .2], [.1, .2], (.9, .2,.2)> | <[.7, .9], [.1, .2], [.1, .2], (.9, .2,.2)> | <[.4, .5], [.4, .5], [.4, .5], (.5, .5, .5)> |
| $K_3$ | <[.4, .5], [.4, .5], [.4, .5], (.5, .5, .5)> | <[.7, .9], [.1, .2], [.1, .2], (.9, .2,.2)> | <[.4, .5], [.4, .5], [.4, .5], (.5, .5, .5)> |

Using eq. (6) and eq. (7), we obtain the attribute weights as follows: $w_1 = .36, w_2 = .37, w_3 = .27$ . (11)

**Step 4. Calculation of weighted similarity measures**

We now calculate weighted similarity measures using the formula (8).

$$S^w(M,M^1) = \begin{pmatrix} .25 \\ .22 \\ .19 \\ .24 \end{pmatrix}, S^w(M,M^2) = \begin{pmatrix} .18 \\ .20 \\ .25 \\ .22 \end{pmatrix}, S^w(M,M^3) = \begin{pmatrix} .20 \\ .21 \\ .25 \\ .20 \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

**Step 5. Ranking of alternatives**

We rank the alternatives according to the descending value of $\rho_i$ (i = 1, 2, 3, 4) using eq.(10), eq.(11), and eq. (12).

We obtain $\rho_1 = .202, \rho_2 = .206, \rho_3 = .232, \rho_4 = .216$ , Therefore the ranking order is

$\rho_3 > \rho_4 > \rho_2 > \rho_1 \Rightarrow \alpha_3 > \alpha_4 > \alpha_2 > \alpha_1$.

Hence Computer company ($\alpha_3$) is the best alternative for money investment.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper we have defined similarity measure between neutrosophic cubic sets and proved its basic properties . We have developed a new multi criteria group decision making method basd on the proposed similarity measure. We also provide an illustrative example for multi criteria group decision making method to show its applicability and effectiveness. We have employed linguistic variables to present criteria weights and presented conversion of linguistic variables into neutrosophic cubic numbers. We have also proposed a conversion formula for neutrosophic cubic number into fuzzy number. The poposed method can be applied to other MCGDM making problems in neutrosophic cubic set environment such as banking system, engineering problems, school choice problems, teacher selection problem, etc. We also hope that the proposed method will open up a new direction of research work in neutrosophic cubic set environment.

## References

1. L. A. Zadeh. Fuzzy sets. Information and Control, 8(3) (1965), 338-353.
2. K. T. Atanassov. Intuitionistic fuzzy sets. Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 20(1986), 87-96.
3. K. T. Atanassov. On intuitionistic fuzzy set theory Studies in fuzziness and soft computing. Springer-verlg, Berlin (2012).
4. F. Smarandache. A unifying field of logics. Neutrosophy: neutrosophic probability, set and logic, American Research Press, Rehoboth, (1998).
5. F. Smarandache. Linguistic paradoxes and tautologies, Libertas Mathematica, University of Texas at Arlington, IX (1999), 143-154.
6. F. Smarandache. A unifying field in logics: neutrosophic logics. Multiple Valued Logic, 8(3) (2002), 385-438.
7. F. Smarandache. Neutrosophic set – a generalization of intuitionistic fuzzy sets. International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 24(3) (2005), 287-297.
8. F. Smarandache. Neutrosophic set – a generalization of intuitionistic fuzzy set. Journal of Defense Resources Management, 1(1) (2010), 107-116.
9. H. Wang, F. Smarandache, Y. Zhang, and R. Sunderraman. Single valued Neutrosophic Sets. Multi-space and Multi-structure, 4 (2010), 410-413.
10. S. Pramanik, and T. K. Roy. Neutrosophic game theoretic approach to Indo-Pak conflict over Jammu-Kashmir. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 2 (2014) 82-101.
11. J. Ye. Single valued neutrosophic minimum spanning tree and its clustering method. Journal of Intelligent Systems, 23(2014), 311–324.
12. J. Ye. Clustering methods using distance-based similarity measures of single-valued neutrosophic sets. Journal of Intelligent Systems, 23(2014), 379–389.
13. P. Biswas, S. Pramanik, and B. C. Giri. Entropy based grey relational analysis method for multi-attribute decision making under single valued neutrosophic assessments. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems 2((2014a)), 102–110.
14. P. Biswas, S. Pramanik, and B. C. Giri. A new methodology for neutrosophic multi-attribute decision making with unknown weight information. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems 3 (2014b), 42–52.
15. P. Biswas, S. Pramanik, and B. C. Giri. TOPSIS method for multi-attribute group decision-making under single valued neutrosophic environment. Neural Computing and Applications, 27 (3) (2016), 727-737. doi: 10.1007/s00521-015-1891-2.
16. P. Biswas, S. Pramanik, and B. C. Giri. Aggregation of triangular fuzzy neutrosophic set information and its application to multi-attribute decision making. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 12 (2016a), 20-40.
17. P. Biswas, S. Pramanik, and B. C. Giri. Value and ambiguity index based ranking method of single-valued trapezoidal neutrosophic numbers and its application to multi-attribute decision making. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems 12 (2016b), 127-138.
18. P. Biswas, S. Pramanik, and B. C. Giri. Multi-attribute group decision making based on expected value of neutrosophic trapezoidal numbers. New Trends in Neutrosophic Theory and Applications-Vol-II. Pons Editions, Brussels (2017a). In Press.
19. P. Biswas, S. Pramanik, and B. C. Giri. Non-linear programming approach for single-valued neutrosophic TOPSIS method. New Mathematics and Natural Computation, (2017b). In Press.
20. I. Deli, and Y. Subas. A ranking method of single valued neutrosophic numbers and its applications to multi-attribute decision making problems. International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics, (2016), doi:10.1007/s13042016-0505-3.
21. P. Ji, J. Q. Wang, and H. Y. Zhang. Frank prioritized Bonferroni mean operator with single-valued neutrosophic sets and its application in selecting third-party logistics providers. Neural Computing and Applications, (2016). doi:10.1007/s00521-016-2660-6.
22. A. Kharal. A neutrosophic multi-criteria decision making method. New Mathematics and Natural Computation, 10 (2014), 143–162.
23. R. X. Liang, J. Q. Wang, and L. Li. Multi-criteria group decision making method based on interdependent inputs of single valued trapezoidal neutrosophic information. Neural Computing and Applications, (2016), doi:10.1007/s00521-016-2672-2.
24. R. X. Liang, J. Q. Wang, and H. Y. Zhang. A multi-criteria decision-making method based on single-valued trapezoidal neutrosophic preference relations with

complete weight information. Neural Computing and Applications, (2017). Doi: 10.1007/s00521-017-2925-8.
25. P. Liu, Y. Chu, Y. Li, and Y. Chen. Some generalized neutrosophic number Hamacher aggregation operators and their application to group decision making. International Journal of Fuzzy System, 16(2) (2014), 242–255.
26. P. D. Liu, and H. G. Li. Multiple attribute decision-making method based on some normal neutrosophic Bonferroni mean operators. Neural Computing and Applications, 28 (2017), 179–194.
27. P. Liu, and Y. Wang. Multiple attribute decision-making method based on single-valued neutrosophic normalized weighted Bonferroni mean. Neural Computing and Applications, 25(7) (2014), 2001–2010.
28. J. J. Peng, J. Q. Wang, J. Wang, H. Y. Zhang, and X. H. Chen. Simplified neutrosophic sets and their applications in multi-criteria group decision-making problems. International Journal of Systems Science, 47 (10) (2016), 2342-2358.
29. J. Peng, J. Wang, H. Zhang, and X. Chen. An outranking approach for multi-criteria decision-making problems with simplified neutrosophic sets. Applied Soft Computing, 25:336–346.
30. S. Pramanik, D. Banerjee, and B. C. Giri. Multi – criteria group decision making model in neutrosophic refined set and its application. Global Journal of Engineering Science and Research Management 3(6) (2016), 12-18.
31. S. Pramanik, S. Dalapati, and T. K. Roy. Logistics center location selection approach based on neutrosophic multi-criteria decision making. New Trends in Neutrosophic Theories and Applications, Pons-Editions, Brussels, 2016, 161-174.
32. R. Sahin, and M. Karabacak. A multi attribute decision making method based on inclusion measure for interval neutrosophic sets. International Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences, 2(2) (2014):13–15.
33. R. Sahin, and A. Kucuk. Subsethood measure for single valued neutrosophic sets. Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy System, (2014), doi:10.3233/IFS-141304.
34. R. Sahin, and P. Liu. Maximizing deviation method for neutrosophic multiple attribute decision making with incomplete weight information. Neural Computing and Applications, (2015), doi: 10.1007/s00521-015-1995-8.
35. S. Pramanik, P. Biswas, and B. C. Giri. Hybrid vector similarity measures and their applications to multi-attribute decision making under neutrosophic environment. Neural Computing and Applications, 28 (5) (2017), 1163-1176.
36. J. Ye. Multicriteria decision-making method using the correlation coefficient under single-valued neutrosophic environment. International Journal of General Systems,42 (2013a), 386–394.
37. J. Ye. Single valued neutrosophic cross-entropy for multi criteria decision making problems. Applied Mathematical Modelling, 38 (3) (2013b), 1170–1175.
38. J. Ye. A multi criteria decision-making method using aggregation operators for simplified neutrosophic sets. Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems, 26 (2014a), 2459–2466.
39. J. Ye. Trapezoidal neutrosophic set and its application to multiple attribute decision-making. Neural Computing and Applications, 26 (2015a),1157–1166.
40. J. Ye. Bidirectional projection method for multiple attribute group decision making with neutrosophic number. Neural Computing and Applications, (2015d), doi: 10.1007/s00521-015-2123-5.
41. J. Ye. Projection and bidirectional projection measures of single valued neutrosophic sets and their decision – making method for mechanical design scheme. Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Artificial Intelligence, (2016), doi:10.1080/0952813X.2016.1259263.
42. K. Mondal, and S. Pramanik. Multi-criteria group decision making approach for teacher recruitment in higher education under simplified Neutrosophic environment. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 6 (2014), 28-34.
43. K. Mondal, and S. Pramanik. Neutrosophic decision making model of school choice. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 7 (2015), 62-68.
44. H. D. Cheng, and Y. Guo. A new neutrosophic approach to image thresholding. New Mathematics and Natural Computation, 4 (2008), 291–308.
45. Y. Guo, and H. D. Cheng. New neutrosophic approach to image segmentation. Pattern Recognition, 42 (2009), 587–595.
46. Y. Guo, A. Sengur, and J. Ye. A novel image thresholding algorithm based on neutrosophic similarity score. Measurement, 58 (2014), 175–186.
47. J. Ye. Improved cosine similarity measures of simplified neutrosophic sets for medical diagnoses. Artificial Intelligence in Medicine, 63 (2015b), 171–179.
48. M. Abdel-Baset, I.M. Hezam, and F. Smarandache. Neutrosophic goal programming, Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 11 (2016), 112-118.
49. P. Das, and T. K. Roy. Multi-objective non-linear programming problem based on neutrosophic optimization technique and its application in riser design problem. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 9 (2015), 88-95.
50. I.M. Hezam, M. Abdel-Baset, and F. Smarandache. Taylor series approximation to solve neutrosophic multiobjective programming problem. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 10 (2015), 39-45.

51. S. Pramanik. Neutrosophic multi-objective linear programming. Global Journal of Engineering Science and Research Management, 3(8) (2016), 36-46.
52. S. Pramanik. Neutrosophic linear goal programming, Global Journal of Engineering Science and Research Management, 3(7) (2016), 01-11.
53. R. Roy, and P. Das. A multi-objective production planning roblem based on neutrosophic linear rogramming approach. Internal Journal of Fuzzy Mathematical Archive, 8(2) (2015), 81-91.
54. K. Mondal, and S. Pramanik. A study on problems of Hijras in West Bengal based on neutrosophic cognitive maps. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 5(2014), 21-26.
55. S. Pramanik, and S. Chakrabarti. A study on problems of construction workers in West Bengal based on neutrosophic cognitive maps. International Journal of Innovative Research in Science. Engineering and Technology, 2(11) (2013), 6387-6394.
56. P. K. Maji. Neutrosophic soft set. Annals of Fuzzy Mathematics and Informatics, 5 (2012), 157–168.
57. P. K. Maji. Neutrosophic soft set approach to a decision-making problem. Annals of Fuzzy Mathematics and Informatics, 3 (2013), 313–319.
58. R. Sahin, and A. Kucuk. Generalized neutrosophic soft set and its integration to decision-making problem. Applied Mathematics and Information Science, 8 (2014), 2751–2759.
59. P.P. Dey, S. Pramanik, and B.C. Giri. Neutrosophic soft multi-attribute decision making based on grey relational projection method. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 11(2016c), 98-106.
60. P.P. Dey, S. Pramanik, and B.C. Giri. Neutrosophic soft multi-attribute group decision making based on grey relational analysis method. Journal of New Results in Science, 10 (2016a), 25-37.
61. P.P. Dey, S. Pramanik, and B.C. Giri. Generalized neutrosophic soft multi-attribute group decision making based on TOPSIS. Critical Review, 11 (2015), 41-55.
62. M. Şahin, S. Alkhazaleh, and V. Uluçay. Neutrosophic soft expert sets. Applied Mathematics, 6 (2015), 116-127.
63. S. Pramanik, P. P. Dey, and B. C. Giri. TOPSIS for single valued neutrosophic soft expert set based multi-attribute decision making problems. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 10 (2015), 88-95.
64. J. Ye. Multiple-attribute decision-making method under a single-valued neutrosophic hesitant fuzzy environment. Journal of Intelligence Systems, 24(2015), 23–36.
65. R. Sahin, and P. D. Liu. Correlation coefficient of single-valued neutrosophic hesitant fuzzy sets and its applications in decision-making. Neural Computing and Applications, 2016, DOI 10.1007/s00521-015-2163-x.
66. R. Sahin, and P. D. Liu. Distance and similarity measures for multiple attribute decision making with single-valued neutrosophic hesitant fuzzy information. New Trends in Neutrosophic Theory and Applications, Pons Editions, Brussels, 2016, 35-54.
67. P. Biswas, S. Pramanik, and B. C. Giri. Some distance measures of single valued neutrosophic hesitant fuzzy sets and their applications to multiple attribute decision making. New Trends in Neutrosophic Theory and Applications, Pons Editions, Brussels, 2016, 27-34.
68. P. Biswas, S. Pramanik, and B. C. GRA method of multiple attribute decision making with single valued neutrosophic hesitant fuzzy set Information. New Trends in Neutrosophic Theory and Applications, Pons Editions, Brussels, 2016, 55-63.
69. P. D. Liu, and L. L. Shi. The generalized hybrid weighted average operator based on interval neutrosophic hesitant set and its application to multiple attribute decision-making. Neural Computing and Applications, 26 (2015), 457–471.
70. J. Ye. Some aggregation operators of interval neutrosophic linguistic numbers for multiple attribute decision-making. Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems, 27 (2014), 2231–2241.
71. J. Ye. An extended TOPSIS method for multiple attribute group decision-making based on single valued neutrosophic linguistic numbers. Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems, 28 (2015), 247–255.
72. S. Broumi, F. Smarandache, and M. Dhar. Rough neutrosophic sets. Italian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 32 (2014), 493-502.
73. S. Broumi, F. Smarandache, and M. Dhar. Rough neutrosophic sets. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 3(2014), 60-66.
74. H. L. Yang, C. L. Zhang, Z. L. Guo, Y. L. Liu, and X. Liao. A hybrid model of single valued neutrosophic sets and rough sets: single valued neutrosophic rough set model, Soft Computing, (2016) 1-15, doi:10.1007/s00500-016-2356-y.
75. K. Mondal, and S. Pramanik. Rough neutrosophic multi-attribute decision-making based on grey relational analysis. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 7(2015b), 8-17.
76. K. Mondal, and S. Pramanik. Rough neutrosophic multi-attribute decision-making based on rough accuracy score function. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 8 (2015c), 14-21.
77. K. Mondal, S. Pramanik, and F. Smarandache. Several trigonometric Hamming similarity measures of rough neutrosophic sets and their applications in decision making. New Trends in Neutrosophic Theory and Application, 2016, 93-103.
78. K. Mondal, S. Pramanik, and F. Smarandache. Multi-attribute decision making based on rough neutrosophic variational coefficient similarity measure. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 13 (2016b), 3-17.

79. K. Mondal, S. Pramanik, and F. Smarandache. Rough neutrosophic TOPSIS for multi-attribute group decision making. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 13(2016c), 105-117.
80. S. Broumi, and F. Smarandache. Interval neutrosophic rough sets. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 7 (2015), 23-31I.
81. K. Mondal, and S. Pramanik. Decision making based on some similarity measures under interval rough neutrosophic environment. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems 10 (2015), 46-57.
82. S. Pramanik, and K. Mondal. Interval neutrosophic multi-Attribute decision-making based on grey relational analysis, Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 9 (2015), 13-22.
83. M. Deli, and F. Smarandache. Bipolar neutrosophic sets and their application based on multi-criteria decision making Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Advanced Mechatronic Systems, Beiging, China, August, 20-24, 2015, 249-254.
84. P. P. Dey, S. Pramanik, and B. C. Giri. TOPSIS for solving multi-attribute decision making problems under bi-polar neutrosophic environment. New Trends in Neutrosophic Theory and Applications, Pons Editions, Brussels, 2016, 65-77.
85. S. Pramanik, and K. Mondal. Rough bipolar neutrosophic set. Global Journal of Engineering Science and Research Management, 3(6) (2016),71-81.
86. K. Mondal, and S. Pramanik. Tri-complex rough neutrosophic similarity measure and its application in multi-attribute decision making. Critical Review, 11(2015g), 26-40.
87. K. Mondal, S. Pramanik, and F. Smarandache. Rough neutrosophic hyper-complex set and its application to multi-attribute decision making. Critical Review, 13 (2016), 111-126.
88. S. Broumi, and F. Smarandache. Neutrosophic refined similarity measure based on cosine function. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 6 (2014), 42-48.
89. S. Broumi, and I. Deli. Correlation measure for neutrosophic refined sets and its application in medical diagnosis. Palestine Journal of Mathematics, 5 (2016), 135–143.
90. K. Mondal, and S. Pramanik. Neutrosophic refined similarity measure based on tangent function and its application to multi attribute decision making. Journal of New theory, 8 (2015), 41-50.
91. K. Mondal, and S. Pramanik. Neutrosophic refined similarity measure based on cotangent function and its application to multi-attribute decision making. Global Journal of Advanced Research, 2(2) (2015), 486-494.
92. S. Pramanik, D. Banerjee, and B.C. Giri. Multi – criteria group decision making model in neutrosophic refined set and its application. Global Journal of Engineering Science and Research Management, 3 (6) (2016), 1- 10.
93. S. Pramanik, D. Banerjee, and B.C. Giri. TOPSIS approach for multi attribute group decision making in refined neutrosophic environment. New Trends in Neutrosophic Theory and Applications, Pons Editions, Brussels, 2016, 79-91.
94. Y. Subas, and I. Deli. Bipolar neutrosophic refined sets and their applications in medical diagnosis. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Natural Science and Engineering (ICNASE’16), Kilis, Turkey, 19–20 March 2016; pp. 1121–1132.
95. M. Ali, I. Deli, and F. Smarandache. The theory of neutrosophic cubic sets and their applications in pattern recognition. Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems, 30 (2016), 1957-1963.
96. Y. B. Jun, C. S. Kim, and K. O. Yang. Cubic sets. Annals of Fuzzy Mathematics and Informatics, 4(1) (2012), 83–98.
97. S. M. Chen, and P. H. Hsiao. A comparison of similarity measures of fuzzy values. Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 72 (1995), 79-89.
98. S. Pramanik, and K. Mondal. Weighted fuzzy similarity measure based on tangent function and its application to medical diagnosis. International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology, 4 (2) (2015), 158-164.
99. C. M. Hwang, and S. M. Yang. A new construction for similarity measures between intuitionistic fuzzy sets based on lower, upper and middle fuzzy sets. International Journal of Fuzzy Systems, 15 (2013), 371-378.
100. K. Mondal, and S. Pramanik. Intuitionistic fuzzy similarity measure based on tangent function and its application to multi-attribute decision. Global Journal of Advanced Research, 2(2) (2015), 464-471.
101. H. Ren, and G. Wang. An interval- valued intuitionistic fuzzy MADM method based on a new similarity measure. Information, 6(2015), 880-894; doi: 10.3390/info6040880.
102. L. Baccour, A. M. Alimi, and R. I. John. Similarity measures for intuitionistic fuzzy sets: state of the art. Journal of Intelligent Fuzzy Systems, 24 (2013), 37-49.
103. S. Broumi, and F. Smarandache. Several similarity measures of neutrosophic sets and their decision making. arXiv: 1301. 0456vI [math. LO] 3 Jan (2013).
104. K. Mondal, and S. Pramanik. Neutrosophic tangent similarity measure and its application to multiple attribute decision making. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 9 (2015), 80-87.
105. P. Biswas, S. Pramanik, and B.C. Giri. Cosine similarity measure based multi attribute decision-making with

trapezoidal fuzzy neutrosophic numbers. Neutrosophic Sets and System, 8 (2015), 47-58.
106. K. Mondal, and S. Pramanik. Cosine similarity measure of rough neutrosophic sets and its application in medical diagnosis. Global Journal of Advanced Research, 2(1) (2015), 212-220.
107. S. Pramanik, and K. Mondal. Cotangent similarity measure of rough neutrosophic sets and its application to medical diagnosis. Journal of New Theory, 4 (2015), 90-102.
108. J. Ye. Similarity measures between interval neutrosophic sets and their multicriteria decision-making method. Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy systems, 26 (2014), 165-172.
109. P. Majumder, and S. K. Samanta. On similarity and entropy of neutrosophic sets. Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems, 26 (2014), 1245–1252.
110. A. Aydogdu. On similarity and entropy of single valued neutrosophic sets. General Mathematics Notes, 29(1) (2015), 67-74.
111. A. Aydogdu. On entropy and similarity measure of interval neutrosophic sets. Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, 9 (2015), 47-49.
112. A. Mukherjee, and S. Sarkar. Supervised pattern recognition using similarity measure between two interval valued neutrosophic soft sets. Annals of Fuzzy Mathematics and Informatics, 12 (4) (2016), 491-499.
113. I. B. Turksen. Interval-valued fuzzy sets based on normal forms. Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 20 (1986), 191-210.
114. H. Wang, F. Smarandache, Y. Q. Zhang, and R. Sunderraman. Interval neutrosophic sets and logic: theory and applications in computing. Hexis; Neutrosophic book series, No. 5 (2005).

Received: May 18, 2017. Accepted: May 31, 2017.