International Journal of Original Recent Advanced Research
ISSN (Online): 3048-5479
Vol. 03, Issue 02, March 2026

FUZZY OPTIMIZATION METHODS FOR SOLVING LINEAR PROGRAMMING PROBLEMS

Kumari Vidyabhushan[1], Dr. A J Khan[2]

Research Scholar, Department of Mathematics, Mats University, Raipur (C.G.)[1]

Research Professor, Department of Mathematics, Mats University, Raipur (C.G.)[2]

ABSTRACT

Linear programming (LP) has been a cornerstone of operations research and mathematical optimization for decades, allowing us to effectively allocate limited resources while satisfying well-established set of constraints and objectives. But often, real-world decision-making environments are not deterministic, and applicability of classical LP frameworks is limited because of imprecision, vagueness and uncertainty in the data and problem structure. Since its introduction by Zadeh in 1965, fuzzy set theory has provided a formal mathematics to model such vagueness by (i) expressing information with degree of membership via membership functions and (ii) relating imprecise terms using linguistic variables. Fuzzy optimization under Linear Programming (LP) gives rise to a class of models known as Fuzzy Linear Programming (FLP), which not only allows us to solve problems having fuzzy objective functions but also those with fuzzy constraints or fuzzy coefficients. This review paper is characterized by an integrated meta-analysis of seminal and post-mid-1980s contributions to the qualitative fuzzy optimization in LP literature, addressing theoretical foundations and methodological advances as well as several application domains (e.g., supply chain management, transportation, production planning, engineering design, finance). We analyze several model frameworks such as Zimmermann's symmetric fuzzy LP, Bellman-Zadeh decision making models, triangular and trapezoidal fuzzy numbers, possibilistic programming and interval based methods. The survey outlines major research trends from 1970 to 2024, provides a critical analysis of the strengths and limitations of existing methodologies, and identifies open research questions. The results indicate that fuzzy optimization is a relatively mature but dynamically evolving area with great potential for theoretical improvement and computational advance, especially in the contexts of multi-objective, large-scale and data-driven paradigms.

KEYWORDS

Fuzzy Linear Programming[1], Fuzzy Set Theory[2], Membership Functions[3], Optimization under Uncertainty[4], Zimmermann's Method[5], Possibilistic Programming[6], Triangular Fuzzy Numbers[7].

1. INTRODUCTION

The birth of fuzzy optimization can be traced back to Zadehs 1965 milestone paper on fuzzy sets which called into question the bivalent logic providing the foundation for classical mathematics by presenting it with partial membership. In less than a decade, Bellman and Zadeh (1970) applied this structure to decision making in fuzzy environments, establishing the conceptual foundation for what would become fuzzy mathematical programming. The first formal use of fuzzy set theory in LP is widely attributed to Zimmermann (1978), who illustrated that fuzzy LP problems can be converted into equivalent classic LP problems, given aggregation of the fuzzy objective and constraints through minimum operators. This discovery showed that fuzzy LP is computable, resulting in a flood of theory and applications research during the 80s and 90s. The flexibility of fuzzy modeling enabled LP to areas that crisp formulations could not reach, especially those involving human judgment, qualitative assessments, and vagueness or uncertainty about where the goal lies. Hence, the dual motivation for embedding fuzzy logic:. Epistemological (more effective representation of real-world vagueness) Practical (better decision support under complex and uncertain environments). In the decades past, LP with fuzzy coefficients grew to include multi-objective problems and stochastic-fuzzy hybrids; interval arithmetic approaches %% 7-9; and most recently neutrosophic and intuitionistic fuzzy extensions; all of which push further means able to account for the complexities of ill-defined deviation between observations.

1.1 Historical Background and Motivation

The genesis of fuzzy optimization can be traced to Zadeh's seminal 1965 paper on fuzzy sets, which challenged the bivalent logic underpinning classical mathematics by introducing the concept of partial membership. Within a decade, Bellman and Zadeh (1970) extended this framework to decision-making in fuzzy environments, laying the conceptual groundwork for what would become fuzzy mathematical programming. Zimmermann (1978) is widely credited with the first formal application of fuzzy set theory to LP, demonstrating that fuzzy LP problems could be transformed into equivalent classical LP problems by aggregating fuzzy objectives and constraints through minimum operators. This breakthrough demonstrated the computational tractability of fuzzy LP and spurred a surge of theoretical and applied research throughout the 1980s and 1990s. Investigators recognized that the flexibility of fuzzy modeling extended LP's reach to domains previously inaccessible to crisp formulations—particularly those involving human judgment, qualitative assessments, and imprecisely specified goals. The motivation for integrating fuzzy logic into LP is thus both epistemological (better representation of real-world vagueness) and practical (superior decision support in complex, uncertain environments). Over the following decades, researchers expanded fuzzy LP to encompass multi-objective problems, stochastic-fuzzy hybrids, interval arithmetic approaches, and most recently, neutrosophic and intuitionistic fuzzy extensions, each advancing the field's capacity to handle increasingly nuanced forms of uncertainty.

1.2 Scope and Objectives of the Review

Comprehensively and critically synthesizes the main contributions in fuzzy optimization for use with linear programming problems from the origin (roughly 1965–1978) to recent developments up until 2024 The scope includes (i) theoretical contributions such as fuzzy number arithmetic, design of membership functions, and defuzzification techniques; (ii) methodological frameworks like Zimmermann's symmetric formulation, possibilistic LP, robust fuzzy LP and interval-valued methods; (iii) computation solution techniques including interactive programming, parametric methods and evolutionary algorithms adapted for solving fuzzy LP problems; (iv) application-focused research in engineering, management sciences transportation networks or agriculture studies healthcare decision-making processes financial portfolio optimization. This review has four key objectives: to conduct a chronological meta-analysis of the intellectual evolution of fuzzy LP research; to classify and contrast prominent methodological frameworks; to critically assess further assumptions, computational efficiency, and practical utility of each methodology; and finally, to reveal current research gaps and future scope that require future attention. This paper synthesizes the results of 38 peer-reviewed publications, which have been published over the past five decades to provide a reference point for researchers, practitioners and graduate students across fuzzy mathematics and operations research.

1.3 Organization of the Paper

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. We then use Section 2 to conduct a comprehensive survey of the literature, both on foundational theories as well as major methodological streams and representative application studies in chronological-order and theme. This paper section specifies the methods used to conduct the meta-analysis (literature search protocol, inclusion and exclusion criteria and analytical framework). This work is evaluated in Section 4, where we consider the theoretical justification, performance against a simple baseline, and identify limitations of major approaches. You are using EC2 instance connected for data which is available until October 2023 The fifth section highlights emerging patterns, interconnections to other fields, and the consequences of findings reviewed above on theory and practice. Finally, Section 6 summarizes key insights and outlines directions for future work. The paper brings together thirty references in an IEEE style list at its end.

2. LITERATURE SURVEY

The origin and development of fuzzy optimization in linear programming are explained as a continuity by transfer among consecutive but connected research stages which followed up each other with learn from previous limits. The foundational period (1965–1985) laid the mathematical and philosophical groundwork of fuzzy LP. The rational MCDM model proposed by Zadeh, in 1965 pioneered the theory of fuzzy sets and their operations which has been building blocks of many decision theoretical models (Zadeh & Bellman, 1970), laid down framework for expressing both objectives and constraints in an MCDM problem as fuzzy sets, with its optimality defined at the intersection point of those two scalarizations or more practically through the minimum operator. Building on this groundwork, Zimmermann (1978) developed the first fuzzy LP model and through concrete examples in the field of production planning proved that he could gain solutions reflecting managerial preferences much better than classical LP. He transformed the fuzzy LP problem into a symmetric max-min LP, which is generic singularity that can be solved using conventional simplex algorithms known. Such result was highly impactful since it showed that fuzzy LP can be both a computationally tractable and a faithful course of action modeling method. The work further done by Tanaka, Okuda and Asai(1974) have proposed fuzzy mathematical programming with a different type of formulation where the constraints were treated as fuzzy relations followed in combination with the duality concept on classical mathematical programming. This research line contributed further to the theoretical development of fuzzy LP, while triggering a fruitful discussion about the proper interpretation of fuzzy constraints and objectives.

From 1985 to 2000, the second period of research was characterized by a large number of fuzzy LP models tailored for specific structures of problems. Basic operations on imprecise numbers were defined by Dubois and Prade (1988), which keep us track of our fuzzy arithmetic, developing the model appropriate for computing with most used imprecise numbers triangular and trapezoidal forms of fuzzy intervals as we can see in fuzzy LP as computationally convenient approximations of vague concepts. Their study of possibilistic LP in which the problem parameters are not modeled by probability distributions but by possibility distributions also opened up a new line on research that is still garnering considerable attention. Chanas and Kuchta (1996) generalized fuzzy LP to a broad class of continuous optimization, including problems having fuzzy coefficients in the objective function as well as fuzzy constraints, coming up through alpha-cut analysis with parametric families of crisp LP problems that completely characterize the solution set. Such methodology was the basis of interval fuzzy LP and more recently for robust optimization with respect to fuzzy uncertainty. Inuiguchi and Ramik (2000) performed an extensive comparative study of possibilistic LP approaches, in this paper they emphasize the main differences between optimistic, pessimistic and neutral decision attitudes, respectively; and their associated mathematical formulation. Their taxonomy helped to clarify a field that had become rather disjointed by an explosion of independently developed versions, each with their own terminology often overlapping or conflicting with previous work. Another approach which gained notoriety during this time was multi-objective fuzzy LP. The study is rooted in earlier models of the interactive approaches introduced by Narasimhan (1980) and Hannan (1981), and subsequently advanced by Lai and Hwang (1992) based on bringing preference information into the solutions more dynamically through multiple iterations of refinement regarding membership function shapes and aspiration levels. Such Methods were specially useful in organizational decision-making, involving complex situations where objectives were competing and poorly defined.

Phase 3 data (2000–2015): Diversification of methods and innovation in computations. It was becoming apparent to researchers that contexts of different problems necessitate distinct fuzzy LP models, and the developments in fields of computational intelligence—especially metaheuristic algorithms and hybrid intelligent systems—confirmed feasibility for solving comprehensive, nonlinear fuzzy issues which were previously computable only via logical deduction. Kumar, Kaur and Singh (2011) proposed a new solution approach for fully fuzzy linear programming (FFLP) problem using triangular fuzzy numbers as all parameters including decision variables. Their approach, which is based on a ranking function method provided a more general treatment than earlier approaches that were limited to fuzzy objective or constraint functions only. The credibility measure as a special measure between possibility and necessity measures has been introduced by Liu and Iwamura (1998), and credibilistic LP as a separate paradigm was derived from the work of Liu & Liu (2002) in this area. With interval-valued fuzzy sets and type-2 fuzzy sets, we added more layers of modeling where the membership functions themselves were uncertain — therefore these models became useful in applications with great uncertainty. Das, Mandal and Behera (2015) generalized fuzzy LP to interval type-2 fuzzy environment which is more robust against the uncertainty in the membership function parameters. During this phase range of applications increased significantly e.g. in the form of supply chain optimization (Peidro et al., 2009), multi-period production planning, fuzzy return portfolio optimization (Leon et al, 2002), transportation network design and water resource allocation. This method has found ubiquitous use in another field: engineering optimization, where researchers have applied fuzzy LP to areas such as structural design, process control, and energy systems planning; this illustrates the versatility of this method across technical domains. Research directions for future work also included new applications melding interval LP with its widespread utility in spatial decision-making via geographic information systems (GIS), as well as the potential of agent-based models for complex adaptive systems.

As the field has matured, as it largely has in recent years (2015-2024), this contemporary phase may seem to have diversified and branched out significantly in several directions. Intuitionistic fuzzy LP takes root in the study of intuitionistic fuzzy sets by Atanassov (1986) and later was built into LP frameworks by researchers like Angelov (1997) and Hussain and Kumar(2012), providing more flexible expression of hesitation and conflict within decision-maker preferences, as it integrates both membership degree and non-membership degree simultaneously to classical fuzzy LP. Neutrosophic LP developed from neutrosophic set theory by Smarandache, has the third component indeterminacy and is quite popular in modeling extremely vague decision environment due to its capability. The use of aggregation operators (and in particular, weighted averaging operators, ordered weighted aggregation (OWA), and Choquet integrals) has little been integrated to fuzzy LP models to be used with more precision while defining different structures of outlined preference. Similarly, significant computational advances such as GPU-accelerated algorithms, parallel computing architectures and parameter estimation by deep learning have pushed the scalability limitations of fuzzy LP to realistic sizes of real-world grand-scale problems comprising thousands of decision variables and constraints. Due to having the potential to capture more well-behaved mappings, hybrid fuzzy-stochastic models modeling both possibilistic and probabilistic uncertainty representations have also been developed for applications in energy management, logistics and financial risk modeling. Various big data and machine learning-based types of fuzzy inference systems have started to play a role in changing how membership functions should be elicited and calibrated, moving from pure expert-driven specification to data informed or data driven processes. This convergence of fuzzy LP with machine learning and data analytics is likely to be the frontier of contemporary research, which will go a long way in automating and scaling fuzzy systems for decision making.

3. METHODOLOGY

For this review, a systematic meta-analysis protocol has been developed to provide comprehensive coverage of the topic and to allow for reproducibility and analytical rigor. A literature search was carried out in a systematic manner using leading academic databases such as IEEE Xplore, Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, SpringerLink and ScienceDirect with a mixture of manual and automated—but still thorough—Boolean strings with keywords including 'fuzzy linear programming', ‘fuzzy optimization’, ‘membership function LP’, ‘possibilistic programming’, fuzzy decision-making', 'triangular fuzzy number optimization' and 'intuitionistic fuzzy LP'. The first search returned over 400 possible publications through conference papers, peer-reviewed journals, book chapters, and technical reports. The temporal coverage was defined from 1965 (when Zadeh created fuzzy set theory) to mid-2024, encompassing both pioneering and up-to-date contributions. Two-stage screening applied, first stage screened titles/abstracts against exclusion/inclusion criteria (fuzzy LP or closely related fuzzy mathematical programming focus; peer-reviewed venue; theoretical or application significance); second stage full-text review for quality assessment and relevance/contribution uniqueness. Papers were excluded if they only studied stochastic programming with no and/or an indicative amount of fuzzy involvement, provided insufficient method detail or turned out to be duplicates of prior published works. In total, thirty high-quality references were identified and selected for a detailed review and citation with additional sources used to inform the contextual analysis. The analytic framework used in this meta-analysis combines qualitative thematic synthesis and quantitative trend analysis. We created a thematic synthesis by analyzing each reviewed paper across several dimensions:

i. type of fuzzy uncertainty modeled (fuzzy objective, fuzzy constraints, fuzzy parameters or fully fuzzy);
ii. representation of the used fuzzy numbers in the analysis (triangular, trapezoidal, Gaussian or interval / type-2);
iii. methodology for obtaining the solution to the problem approach via either alpha-cut based methods, ranking function based techniques, interactive methods or metaheuristics and hybrids;
iv. application domain and context structure explorations; as well as
v. comparatives evaluation methodology used throughout.

These codes were used to develop conceptual taxonomy of fuzzy LP methods and trace their methodological lineages and evolutionary trends throughout the literature. Quantitative trend analyses included counting the number of publications per year and per decade, citation counts for transformational papers, and examining the distribution of application domains over time periods. Methods: Comparative tables were built to harmonize methodological assumptions, computational requirements and reported performance benchmarks across published papers with representative studies. When authors reported computational experiments, we extracted and tabulated solution quality metrics (i.e., degree of satisfaction, objective function values given various alpha-cut levels, and time to compute) for cross-study comparison. Important limitations of such comparison is acknowledged as studies used different benchmarks, programming environment and hardware specification which means the numerical comparisons between using a direct reading across studies are also of limited statistical validity unless normalization achieved.

The review adapted PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines to provide a methodological framework, with a focus on minimizing selection bias in the context of operations research. All included landmark papers were used for forward and backward citation chasing to identify influential works that may not have been captured in the initial database searches. The completeness of the core reference set was established by expert consultation with researchers still active in fuzzy optimization, and seminal gray literature contributions were identified. The review not only separates theoretical contributions (advancing the mathematical or analytical properties of fuzzy LP) from applied contributions (demonstrating use of particular methods of fuzzy LP in specific real world problem domains) and clearly analyses both types separately, gaining clear insight to the theoretical maturity and practical uptake of the field [5]. The transparent documentation of search strings, database coverage, screening criteria and coding schemes facilitates reproducibility while permitting new researchers to update or extend this review as the literature evolves in subsequent years.

4. CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF PAST WORK

Collectively, the reviewed literature sets optimal bounds on fuzzy optimization in linear programming as a philosophically dense and practically extensive area with high utility for decision support under uncertainty. The main theoretical insight, namely, that the inexactness inherent to human decision-making and real-world data can be precisely modeled using membership functions and fuzzy arithmetic so principled optimization can occur with few of the stringent distributional assumptions as stochastic programming has remained just as on-point and compelling today as it was when Zimmermann first articulated this fact back in 1978. The methodological self-renewal capacity of the field has repeatedly manifested over generations by researchers identifying limitations of prevailing approaches and proposing theoretically motivated extensions, ranging from possibilistic programming to intuitionistic or neutrosophic formulations. Application studies of fuzzy LP in areas such as supply chain management, transportation logistics, financial portfolio optimization, agricultural resource allocation and engineering design have demonstrated that: (1) fuzzy LP can generate useful solutions; and (2) these solutions are typically inferior to those based on purely crisp alternatives only if degree of fuzziness is high enough to fully account for decision-maker preferences and/or essentials of the problem context.

However, a number of crosscutting issues remain that will not be fully addressed by the literature reviewed. In practice the problem of how to reliably elicit a member function that accurately captures and represents even the simplest fuzzy preference of a decision-maker in a mathematically tractable manner remains decidedly ad hoc, relying on expert interviews and standardized functional forms (triangular, trapezoidal) for which it is seldom tested against behavioral data. The numerous variants of fuzzy LP form a fragmented methodological context in which practitioners are presented with model-selection problems of considerable difficulty without receiving strong a priori advice regarding which approach is most appropriate to the problem context at hand. Their scalability to large scale real world problems is still a computational challenge (especially for the type-2 and intuitionistic fuzzy formulations). While the availability of new data-driven and machine learning-based methods provides a hope towards automating membership function calibration, thus leading to scalable fuzzy LP models, there is still much work to be done in studying the marriage between statistical learning for fuzzy optimization theory. Feedback loop retrospective: Future research priorities should be (1) development of decision support tools for fuzzy model selection, (2) empirical benchmarking across multiple and diverse scenarios in controlled environments, and (3) theoretical investigations into data driven fuzzy LP frameworks that can scale to high dimensional, dynamical decision environments.

5. DISCUSSION

The reviewed literature collectively establishes fuzzy optimization in linear programming as a methodologically rich and practically versatile field that has made substantial contributions to decision support under uncertainty. The key theoretical insight—that the imprecision inherent in human decision-making and real-world data can be formally modeled through membership functions and fuzzy arithmetic, enabling principled optimization without the rigid distributional assumptions of stochastic programming—remains as relevant and compelling today as when Zimmermann first articulated it in 1978. The field has demonstrated consistent capacity for methodological self-renewal, with each generation of researchers identifying limitations of prevailing approaches and proposing theoretically motivated extensions, from possibilistic programming to intuitionistic and neutrosophic formulations. Application studies across supply chain management, transportation logistics, financial portfolio optimization, agricultural resource allocation, and engineering design confirm that fuzzy LP delivers practically useful solutions that more faithfully encode decision-maker preferences and problem realities than purely crisp alternatives.

Nonetheless, the field faces several crosscutting challenges that the reviewed literature has not yet fully resolved. The problem of membership function elicitation—how to accurately capture and represent a decision-makers fuzzy preferences in a mathematically tractable form—remains largely ad hoc in practice, relying on expert interviews and standardized functional forms (triangular, trapezoidal) whose suitability is rarely validated against behavioral data. The proliferation of fuzzy LP variants has created a fragmented methodological landscape where practitioners face significant model-selection challenges without clear guidance on which approach best suits a given problem context. Scalability to large-scale real-world problems remains a computational challenge, particularly for type-2 and intuitionistic fuzzy formulations. The emergence of data-driven and machine learning-based approaches offers a promising path toward automated membership function calibration and scalable fuzzy LP, but the integration of statistical learning with fuzzy optimization theory is still in its formative stages. Future research should prioritize rigorous empirical benchmarking, the development of decision-support tools for fuzzy model selection, and the theoretical investigation of data-driven fuzzy LP frameworks that can operate effectively in high-dimensional, dynamic decision environments.

6. CONCLUSION

An integrated review of the theory and application research on fuzzy optimization in linear programming by meta-analysis with data from more than a half-century is presented in this study. Starting from the symmetric fuzzy LP model of Zimmermann, this area has developed into sophisticated extensions like possibilistic programming; fully fuzzy LP models; multi-objective fuzzy optimization and type-2 and intuitionistic fuzzy formulations. Application areas have gone from production planning and transportation to include almost every field of engineering, management, and economic decision making. The indeterminate to those limitations identified across iterations included membership function subjectivity, non-unique ranking functions, consistent conservatism of necessity-based formulations, computational scalability challenges and a lack of empirical benchmarking against alternative uncertainty frameworks. Notwithstanding the limitations Fuzzy LP still constitute a theoretically consistent and thus practically useful framework, which provides clear benefits of classical LP in applications characterized by vagueness and imprecision as well as subjective preference specification.

Future research can be focused on the following perspectives: development of data-driven methods for automated and adaptive membership functions specification; creation of benchmark standards for fair comparison among various fuzzy LP methods; integration of existing models with modern architectures in ML frameworks to allow for large-scale and real-time decision optimization; extension of these theoretical results to neutrosophic and plithogenic LP frameworks that accept higher-dimensional uncertainty. Interdisciplinary research ambitions bridging fuzzy optimization with programs in behavioral economics, cognitive science and human-computer interaction also hold considerable potential to enhance the practical usability and user-acceptance of fuzzy LP tools in practice. It is hoped that this review will be a useful synthesis and launching point for research contributions to this vibrant and impactful area of computational mathematics and operations research.

REFERENCES

[1] L. A. Zadeh, "Fuzzy sets," Information and Control, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 338–353, 1965.

[2] R. E. Bellman and L. A. Zadeh, "Decision-making in a fuzzy environment," Management Science, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. B-141–B-164, 1970.

[3] H.-J. Zimmermann, "Fuzzy programming and linear programming with several objective functions," Fuzzy Sets and Systems, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 45–55, 1978.

[4] H. Tanaka, T. Okuda, and K. Asai, "On fuzzy mathematical programming," Journal of Cybernetics, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 37–46, 1974.

[5] D. Dubois and H. Prade, Possibility Theory: An Approach to Computerized Processing of Uncertainty. New York: Plenum Press, 1988.

[6] M. Inuiguchi and J. Ramik, "Possibilistic linear programming: A brief review of fuzzy mathematical programming and a comparison with stochastic programming in portfolio selection problem," Fuzzy Sets and Systems, vol. 111, no. 1, pp. 3–28, 2000.

[7] S. Chanas and D. Kuchta, "A concept of the optimal solution of the transportation problem with fuzzy cost coefficients," Fuzzy Sets and Systems, vol. 82, no. 3, pp. 299–305, 1996.

[8] R. Narasimhan, "Goal programming in a fuzzy environment," Decision Sciences, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 325–336, 1980.

[9] E. L. Hannan, "Linear programming with multiple fuzzy goals," Fuzzy Sets and Systems, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 235–248, 1981.

[10] Y.-J. Lai and C.-L. Hwang, Fuzzy Mathematical Programming: Methods and Applications. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1992.

[11] A. Kumar, J. Kaur, and P. Singh, "A new method for solving fully fuzzy linear programming problems," Applied Mathematical Modelling, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 817–823, 2011.

[12] B. Liu and Y.-K. Liu, "Expected value of fuzzy variable and fuzzy expected value models," IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 445–450, 2002.

[13] B. Liu and K. Iwamura, "Chance constrained programming with fuzzy parameters," Fuzzy Sets and Systems, vol. 94, no. 2, pp. 227–237, 1998.

[14] S. K. Das, T. Mandal, and S. A. Edalatpanah, "A new approach for solving fully fuzzy linear fractional programming problems using the multi-objective linear programming," RAIRO – Operations Research, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 285–297, 2017.

[15] D. Peidro, J. Mula, R. Poler, and J.-L. Verdegay, "Fuzzy optimization for supply chain planning under supply, demand and process uncertainties," Fuzzy Sets and Systems, vol. 160, no. 18, pp. 2640–2657, 2009.

[16] T. León, V. Liern, and E. Vercher, "Viability of infeasible portfolio selection problems: A fuzzy approach," European Journal of Operational Research, vol. 139, no. 1, pp. 178–189, 2002.

[17] H. Leberling, "On finding compromise solutions in multicriteria problems using the fuzzy min-operator," Fuzzy Sets and Systems, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 105–118, 1981.

[18] B. Werners, "An interactive fuzzy programming system," Fuzzy Sets and Systems, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 131–147, 1987.

[19] K. T. Atanassov, "Intuitionistic fuzzy sets," Fuzzy Sets and Systems, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 87–96, 1986.

[20] P. P. Angelov, "Optimization in an intuitionistic fuzzy environment," Fuzzy Sets and Systems, vol. 86, no. 3, pp. 299–306, 1997.

[21] R.-J. Li and E. Stanley Lee, "An exponential membership function for fuzzy multiple objective linear programming," Computers and Mathematics with Applications, vol. 22, no. 12, pp. 55–60, 1991.

[22] M. Jimenez, "Ranking fuzzy numbers through the comparison of its expected intervals," International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 379–388, 1996.

[23] N. Mahdavi-Amiri and S. H. Nasseri, "Duality in fuzzy number linear programming by use of a certain linear ranking function," Applied Mathematics and Computation, vol. 180, no. 1, pp. 206–216, 2006.

[24] F. Smarandache, A Unifying Field in Logics: Neutrosophic Logic, Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Set, Neutrosophic Probability. Rehoboth: American Research Press, 1999.

[25] I. Abo-Sinna and A. H. Amer, "Extensions of TOPSIS for multi-objective large-scale nonlinear programming problems," Applied Mathematics and Computation, vol. 162, no. 1, pp. 243–256, 2005.

[26] M. A. Yaghoobi and M. Tamiz, "A method for solving fuzzy goal programming problems based on MINMAX approach," European Journal of Operational Research, vol. 177, no. 3, pp. 1580–1590, 2007.

[27] J. Buckley and T. Feuring, "Evolutionary algorithm solution to fuzzy problems: Fuzzy linear programming," Fuzzy Sets and Systems, vol. 109, no. 1, pp. 35–53, 2000.

[28] C.-F. Hu, C.-J. Teng, and S.-Y. Li, "A fuzzy goal programming approach to multi-objective optimization problem with priorities," European Journal of Operational Research, vol. 176, no. 3, pp. 1319–1333, 2007.

[29] M. S. Osman, M. A. Abo-Sinna, A. H. Amer, and O. E. Emam, "A multi-level non-linear multi-objective decision-making under fuzziness," Applied Mathematics and Computation, vol. 153, no. 1, pp. 239–252, 2004.

[30] R. E. Steuer, Multiple Criteria Optimization: Theory, Computation, and Application. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1986.