Spectrum of decision making and applications
Volume 00, Issue 00 (2025) 1-18

SCIENTIFIC OASIS

Spectrum of Decision Making
and Applications

Journal homepage: www.dmap-journal.org
ISSN: 3042-1470



SDMA

Spectrum of Decision Making Applications

Scientific Oasis

SCIO

HyperFuzzy and SuperHyperFuzzy Group Decision-Making

Takaaki Fujita[1,*]

[1] Independent Researcher, Tokyo, Japan.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 13 June 2025
Received in revised form28 July 2025
Accepted 27 August 2025
Available online 1 Sepetember 2025

Keywords:
Fuzzy Set, Group Decision-Making, Fuzzy Group Decision-Making, HyperFuzzy Group Decision-Making, SuperHyperFuzzy Group Decision-Making

ABSTRACT

Fuzzy sets model vagueness by assigning each element a membership value in the interval $[0, 1]$. Hyperfuzzy sets extend this concept by mapping each element to a nonempty subset of $[0, 1]$, thereby capturing both uncertainty and variability in membership degrees. An (m, n)-superhyperfuzzy set further generalizes these ideas by associating each nonempty element of the mth and nth iterated powersets with a nonempty family of subsets of $[0, 1]$, enabling the representation of hierarchical and nested forms of imprecision. Decision-making refers to the process of identifying, evaluating, and selecting the most suitable option from multiple alternatives to achieve specified objectives. Fuzzy group decision-making aggregates experts' fuzzy preference relations to produce collective rankings or to select optimal alternatives. While extensive research has been conducted on hyperfuzzy and superhyperfuzzy sets as well as on fuzzy group decision-making, their integrated framework remains largely unexplored. Motivated by this gap, the present study investigates the formulation, properties, and potential applications of hyperfuzzy and superhyperfuzzy group decision-making.

1. Preliminaries

We now introduce the basic concepts and notation used throughout. All sets in this paper are assumed finite.

1.1 *HyperFuzzy Sets and SuperHyperFuzzy Sets*

Fuzzy sets model vagueness by assigning each element a membership degree in $[0, 1]$ [1, 2]. Related extensions include Bipolar Fuzzy Sets[3, 4], Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets[5], Neutrosophic Sets [6], Hesitant Fuzzy Sets[7], and Plithogenic Sets[8, 9]. In this work, we focus on two key generalizations: the *HyperFuzzy Set* [10–12] and its hierarchical counterpart, the *SuperHyperFuzzy Set* [13]. Both frameworks

---

[*] *Takaaki Fujita.*
E-mail address: Takaaki.fujita060@gmail.com

https://doi.org/10.31181/sdmap4158

employ iterated powerset constructions to represent multiple layers of uncertainty.

Definition 1.1 (Base Set)**.** *[14] A* base set *S is the universe from which all further constructions derive:*

$$S = \{\, x \mid x \text{ belongs to the specified domain}\}.$$

Every element of $\mathcal{P}(S)$, $\mathcal{P}_n(S)$, and related constructs is drawn from S.

Definition 1.2 (Powerset)**.** *[15] The* powerset *of S, denoted $\mathcal{P}(S)$, is the family of all subsets of S, including $\emptyset$ and S itself:*

$$\mathcal{P}(S) = \{\, A \mid A \subseteq S\}.$$

Definition 1.3 (n-th Powerset)**.** *[16] Starting with $\mathcal{P}_1(H) = \mathcal{P}(H)$, the n-*th powerset *of H is defined inductively by*

$$\mathcal{P}_{n+1}(H) \;=\; \mathcal{P}\bigl(\mathcal{P}_n(H)\bigr) \quad (n \geq 1).$$

*Likewise, the n-*th nonempty powerset *$\mathcal{P}_n^*(H)$ omits the empty set at each stage:*

$$\mathcal{P}_1^*(H) = \mathcal{P}(H) \setminus \{\emptyset\},$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{n+1}^*(H) = \mathcal{P}\bigl(\mathcal{P}_n^*(H)\bigr) \setminus \{\emptyset\}.$$

Example 1.4 (Real-world 3rd Powerset: Produce Packaging)**.** *Consider the universe of fruits*

$$H = \{\text{apple}, \text{banana}, \text{cherry}\}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{P}_1(H) = \mathcal{P}(H) = \bigl\{\emptyset, \{\text{apple}\}, \{\text{banana}\}, \{\text{cherry}\}, \{\text{apple,banana}\}, \{\text{apple,cherry}\}, \{\text{banana,cherry}\}, \{\text{apple,banana,cherry}\}\bigr\}.$$

Interpret each nonempty subset as a basket *of fruit:*

$$B_1 = \{\text{apple,banana}\}, \quad B_2 = \{\text{banana,cherry}\}, \quad B_3 = \{\text{apple,cherry}\}, \ \ldots$$

Next,

$$\mathcal{P}_2(H) = \mathcal{P}\bigl(\mathcal{P}_1(H)\bigr)$$

is the family of all pallets*, each pallet being a collection of baskets. For example:*

$$P_A = \bigl\{\, B_1,\, B_2\bigr\} = \bigl\{\{\text{apple,banana}\},\, \{\text{banana,cherry}\}\bigr\} \;\in\; \mathcal{P}_2(H),$$

$$P_B = \bigl\{\, B_3,\, \{\text{apple}\}\bigr\} = \bigl\{\{\text{apple,cherry}\},\, \{\text{apple}\}\bigr\} \;\in\; \mathcal{P}_2(H).$$

Finally,

$$\mathcal{P}_3(H) = \mathcal{P}\bigl(\mathcal{P}_2(H)\bigr)$$

is the family of all containers*, each container grouping several pallets. For instance:*

$$C = \bigl\{\, P_A,\, P_B\bigr\} = \bigl\{\{\{\text{apple,banana}\}, \{\text{banana,cherry}\}\},\; \{\{\text{apple,cherry}\}, \{\text{apple}\}\}\bigr\} \;\in\; \mathcal{P}_3(H).$$

In this way, $\mathcal{P}_1(H)$ models individual baskets, $\mathcal{P}_2(H)$ models pallets of baskets, and $\mathcal{P}_3(H)$ models shipping containers of pallets—concretely illustrating the 3rd iterated powerset in a produce-packaging context.

Definition 1.5 (Fuzzy Set)**.** *[1, 17]* A fuzzy set τ *on a nonempty universe* Y *is a function*

$$\tau : Y \;\longrightarrow\; [0,1].$$

A fuzzy relation δ *on* Y *is a fuzzy subset of* $Y \times Y$ *satisfying*

$$\delta(y,z) \;\le\; \min\{\tau(y),\tau(z)\} \quad \text{for all } y,z \in Y.$$

Definition 1.6 (HyperFuzzy Set)**.** *[10, 12] Let* X *be a nonempty universe. A* HyperFuzzy Set $\tilde{A}$ *on* X *is given by*

$$\tilde{\mu} : X \;\longrightarrow\; \tilde{\mathcal{P}}([0,1]),$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}([0,1])$ *denotes all nonempty subsets of* $[0,1]$*. For each* $x \in X$*, the set* $\tilde{\mu}(x) \subseteq [0,1]$ *represents the range of plausible membership degrees for* x*, thus modeling both fuzziness and variability simultaneously.*

Example 1.7 (Real-world Example of a HyperFuzzy Set: Product Quality Assessment)**.** *Let*

$$X = \{\textit{Laptop},\ \textit{Tablet},\ \textit{Smartphone}\}$$

be the set of products in a store. A panel of experts evaluates the overall quality *of each product, but instead of giving a single membership degree in* $[0,1]$*, each product is assigned a* set of plausible values *representing the variability in expert opinions.*

Define the HyperFuzzy membership function

$$\tilde{\mu} : X \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}}([0,1])$$

by:

$$\tilde{\mu}(\textit{Laptop}) = \{0.80, 0.85, 0.90\}, \quad \tilde{\mu}(\textit{Tablet}) = \{0.65, 0.70\}, \quad \tilde{\mu}(\textit{Smartphone}) = \{0.75, 0.78, 0.82\}.$$

Here:

- *The laptop's quality assessment varies between* 0.80 *and* 0.90*, depending on design and performance reviews.*
- *The tablet's scores are slightly lower and more consistent, reflecting moderate consensus among experts.*
- *The smartphone's quality range is intermediate, capturing differences in opinion about durability and features.*

This representation models both the fuzziness of product quality *and the* variability in expert assessments*.*

Definition 1.8 (m,n-SuperHyperFuzzy Set)**.** *[13, 18] Let* X *be a nonempty set and let* $m,n \in \mathbb{N}_0$*. Define the nonempty* k*-th powerset of a set* Y *by*

$$\mathcal{P}^*_0(Y) = Y, \quad \mathcal{P}^*_k(Y) = \mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}^*_{k-1}(Y)\big) \setminus \{\emptyset\}, \quad k \ge 1.$$

In particular, $\mathcal{P}^*_m(X)$ *is the family of all nonempty elements of the* m*-th iterated powerset of* X*, and* $\mathcal{P}^*_n([0,1])$ *is defined analogously. Then an* (m,n)*-SuperHyperFuzzy Set on* X *is a function*

$$\tilde{\mu}_{m,n} : \mathcal{P}^*_m(X) \;\longrightarrow\; \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^*_n\big([0,1]\big), \quad A \;\mapsto\; \tilde{\mu}_{m,n}(A),$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^*_n([0,1])$ *denotes the collection of all nonempty subsets of* $\mathcal{P}_n([0,1])$*. Thus each* $A \in \mathcal{P}^*_m(X)$ *is assigned a nonempty family of membership-degree sets* $\tilde{\mu}_{m,n}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_n([0,1])$*, capturing hierarchical uncertainty across both the* m*- and* n*-levels.*

Example 1.9 (Real-world $(2, 2)$-SuperHyperFuzzy Set: Climate Impact Assessment). *Let*

$$X = \{\textit{Temp},\ \textit{Sea},\ \textit{Precip}\}$$

be the three key climate indicators: temperature increase (Temp), sea-level rise (Sea), and precipitation variability (Precip). We take $m = 2$, $n = 2$.

Step 1: Compute the iterated powersets.

$$\mathcal{P}_1^*(X) = \big\{\{\textit{Temp}\},\ \{\textit{Sea}\},\ \{\textit{Precip}\},\ \{\textit{Temp,Sea}\},\ \{\textit{Temp,Precip}\},\ \{\textit{Sea,Precip}\},\ \{\textit{Temp,Sea,Precip}\}\big\},$$

$$\mathcal{P}_2^*(X) = \mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}_1^*(X)\big) \setminus \{\emptyset\},$$

so each element of $\mathcal{P}_2^*(X)$ is a nonempty collection of subsets of X. For instance, consider

$$A = \big\{\{\textit{Temp,Sea}\},\ \{\textit{Sea,Precip}\}\big\}\ \in\ \mathcal{P}_2^*(X).$$

Step 2: Define the membership mapping. *We set*

$$\tilde{\mu}_{2,2}(A)\ =\ \Big\{\underbrace{\{0.65, 0.75\}}_{\substack{\text{Scenario-1}\\ \text{expert-bounds}}},\ \underbrace{\{0.80\}}_{\substack{\text{Scenario-2}\\ \text{single estimate}}}\ \Big\}\ \subseteq\ \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2^*([0, 1]),$$

meaning:

- *For the grouping $\{\textit{Temp,Sea}\}$, experts' assessments under Scenario 1 span the interval $[0.65, 0.75]$.*
- *For the grouping $\{\textit{Sea,Precip}\}$, Scenario 2 yields a single consensus value 0.80.*

Thus

$$\tilde{\mu}_{2,2} : \mathcal{P}_2^*(X)\ \longrightarrow\ \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2^*([0, 1])$$

assigns to each "pair-of-pairs" of indicators a nonempty family of fuzzy-degree sets, capturing both the hierarchy of indicator combinations (level 2) and nested uncertainty (level 2) arising from multiple scenarios and expert bounds.

Example 1.10 (Real-world $(1, 2)$-SuperHyperFuzzy Set: Customer Product Feedback). *Let*

$$X = \{\textit{EaseOfUse},\ \textit{Reliability},\ \textit{Design}\},\quad m = 1,\ n = 2.$$

Then the nonempty first-level powerset is

$$\mathcal{P}_1^*(X) = \big\{\{\textit{EaseOfUse}\},\ \{\textit{Reliability}\},\ \{\textit{Design}\},$$
$$\{\textit{EaseOfUse}, \textit{Reliability}\},\ \{\textit{EaseOfUse}, \textit{Design}\},$$
$$\{\textit{Reliability}, \textit{Design}\},\ \{\textit{EaseOfUse}, \textit{Reliability}, \textit{Design}\}\big\}.$$

We define the superhyperfuzzy membership function

$$\tilde{\mu}_{1,2} : \mathcal{P}_1^*(X)\ \longrightarrow\ \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2^*([0, 1])$$

by assigning to each attribute-group a family of fuzzy-degree sets reflecting different customer segments.

For the pair

$$A = \{\textit{EaseOfUse}, \textit{Reliability}\},$$

set

$$\tilde{\mu}_{1,2}(A) = \Big\{ \underbrace{\{0.70,\ 0.75\}}_{\substack{\textit{Casual users}\\ \textit{feedback range}}},\ \underbrace{\{0.85\}}_{\substack{\textit{Expert testers}\\ \textit{consensus}}} \Big\} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2^*([0,1]).$$

For the singleton

$$B = \{\text{Design}\},$$

set

$$\tilde{\mu}_{1,2}(B) = \Big\{ \{0.65,\ 0.70,\ 0.72\},\ \{0.80,\ 0.83\} \Big\},$$

where the first inner set is ratings from focus-group survey and the second from expert review.

Thus $\tilde{\mu}_{1,2}$ assigns to each nonempty attribute grouping in $\mathcal{P}_1^*(X)$ a nonempty collection of fuzzy-degree sets, capturing both the hierarchical grouping of product features (level 1) and the nested uncertainty across distinct customer segments (level 2).

1.2 Fuzzy Group Decision Making

Decision making involves evaluating a set of alternatives and selecting the most appropriate option based on defined criteria, stakeholder preferences, and available information [19, 20]. Fuzzy Group Decision Making extends this process by aggregating multiple experts' fuzzy preference relations—mappings $R_h : X \times X \to [0,1]$—to generate collective rankings or identify robust, optimal solutions (cf.[21, 22]). Related approaches include Intuitionistic Fuzzy Group Decision Making[23, 24], Hesitant Fuzzy Group Decision Making [25, 26], and Neutrosophic Group Decision Making[27, 28].

Definition 1.11 (Fuzzy Group Decision Making). *(cf.[29, 30]) Let $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be a finite set of* alternatives *and $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ a finite set of* experts. *For each expert e_h, let*

$$R_h : X \times X \longrightarrow [0,1]$$

be a fuzzy preference relation *satisfying*

1. *reflexivity: $R_h(x_i, x_i) = \frac{1}{2}$ for all i,*
2. *reciprocity: $R_h(x_i, x_k) + R_h(x_k, x_i) = 1$ for all i, k.*

A fuzzy group decision making problem *is the tuple*

$$\big(X,\ E,\ \{R_h\}_{h=1}^m,\ \Phi,\ D\big),$$

where

1. *Φ is an* aggregation operator

$$\Phi : \prod_{h=1}^{m} [0,1]^{X \times X} \longrightarrow [0,1]^{X \times X},$$

defined pointwise by

$$R^*(x_i, x_k) \ = \ \Phi\big(R_1(x_i, x_k), \dots, R_m(x_i, x_k)\big), \quad \forall\, x_i, x_k \in X.$$

2. *D is a* decision rule *assigning to the collective relation R^* either*
   - *a* ranking *via the fuzzy outranking* $x_i \succ^* x_k \iff R^*(x_i, x_k) \geq R^*(x_k, x_i),$

- *or a* selection *of one or more optimal alternatives, for example by computing*

$$s_i \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^{n} R^*(x_i, x_k) \quad \text{and choosing all } x_i \text{ with maximal } s_i.$$

The solution of the problem is

$$D\big(\Phi(R_1, \dots, R_m)\big).$$

Example 1.12 (Fuzzy Group Decision Making: Car Selection)**.** *(cf.[31, 32]) Consider a committee of three experts $E = \{E_1, E_2, E_3\}$ choosing among three car models $X = \{$Car A, Car B, Car C$\}$. We illustrate the steps in detail.*

Step 1: Expert preference relations. *Each expert E_h supplies a fuzzy preference matrix*

$$R_h\big(x_i, x_j\big) \in [0,1] \quad (i,j = 1,2,3)$$

with $R_h(x_i, x_i) = 0.5$ and $R_h(x_i, x_j) + R_h(x_j, x_i) = 1$. Concretely:

R_1 :

	A	B	C
A	0.5	0.6	0.7
B	0.4	0.5	0.4
C	0.3	0.6	0.5

R_2 :

	A	B	C
A	0.5	0.8	0.6
B	0.2	0.5	0.55
C	0.4	0.45	0.5

R_3 :

	A	B	C
A	0.5	0.7	0.55
B	0.3	0.5	0.5
C	0.45	0.5	0.5

Step 2: Aggregation. *We choose the arithmetic-mean operator*

$$\Phi\big(R_1, R_2, R_3\big)(x_i, x_j) = \frac{R_1(x_i, x_j) + R_2(x_i, x_j) + R_3(x_i, x_j)}{3}.$$

Thus the collective relation $R^* = \Phi(R_1, R_2, R_3)$ is

R^* :

	A	B	C
A	0.50	0.70	0.617
B	0.30	0.50	0.483
C	0.383	0.517	0.50

$\big(R^*(B, A) = 1 - 0.70,\ \dots\big)$

Step 3: Decision rule. *We compute the "score" of each alternative:*

$$s(\text{A}) = 0.50 + 0.70 + 0.617 = 1.817,$$

$$s(\text{B}) = 0.30 + 0.50 + 0.483 = 1.283,$$

$$s(\text{C}) = 0.383 + 0.517 + 0.50 = 1.400.$$

Selecting the car(s) with maximal score yields the ranking

$$\textit{Car A} \ \succ^* \ \textit{Car C} \ \succ^* \ \textit{Car B}.$$

*Hence the group's preferred choice is **Car A**.*

2. Main Results

In this section, we present the main contributions of this paper, namely the formal definitions and fundamental properties of HyperFuzzy Group Decision Making, SuperHyperFuzzy Group Decision Making, and their associated aggregation and decision rules.

2.1 HyperFuzzy Group Decision Making

HyperFuzzy Group Decision Making aggregates experts' hyperfuzzy preference sets to produce collective rankings or selections accounting for set-valued uncertainty.

Definition 2.1 (HyperFuzzy Group Decision Making)**.** *Let* $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ *be a finite set of* alternatives *and* $E = \{e_1, \ldots, e_m\}$ *a finite set of* experts. *Denote by*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}([0,1]) \;=\; \{\, S \subseteq [0,1] \mid S \neq \varnothing \}$$

the family of all nonempty subsets of $[0,1]$*. For each expert* e_h*, let*

$$\tilde{R}_h : X \times X \;\longrightarrow\; \tilde{\mathcal{P}}([0,1])$$

be a hyperfuzzy preference relation *satisfying for all* $x_i, x_k \in X$*:*

1. *reflexivity:* $\tilde{R}_h(x_i, x_i) \subseteq [0,1]$ *contains* 0.5*,*
2. *reciprocity:* $\tilde{R}_h(x_k, x_i) = \{\, 1 - \alpha \mid \alpha \in \tilde{R}_h(x_i, x_k) \,\}$*.*

Define the aggregation operator

$$\tilde{\Phi} : \prod_{h=1}^{m} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}([0,1])^{X \times X} \;\longrightarrow\; \tilde{\mathcal{P}}([0,1])^{X \times X}$$

by

$$\tilde{R}^*(x_i, x_k) = \tilde{\Phi}\big(\tilde{R}_1(x_i, x_k), \ldots, \tilde{R}_m(x_i, x_k)\big) \;=\; \bigcup_{h=1}^{m} \tilde{R}_h(x_i, x_k),$$

for all $x_i, x_k \in X$*. Finally, let* D *be a decision rule which, given the collective relation* $\tilde{R}^*$*, yields either*

- *a* ranking *via the hyperfuzzy outranking*

$$x_i \succ^* x_k \quad\Longleftrightarrow\quad \max \tilde{R}^*(x_i, x_k) \;\geq\; \max \tilde{R}^*(x_k, x_i),$$

- *or a* selection *of optimal alternatives, for example by computing*

$$s_i \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^{n} \max \tilde{R}^*(x_i, x_k), \quad \text{and choosing all } x_i \text{ with maximal } s_i.$$

The tuple

$$\big(X,\; E,\; \{\tilde{R}_h\}_{h=1}^{m},\; \tilde{\Phi},\; D\big)$$

is called a HyperFuzzy Group Decision Making *problem.*

Example 2.2 (HyperFuzzy Group Decision Making: Smartphone Selection)**.** *(cf.[33, 34]) Let*

$$X = \{\textit{Phone A},\ \textit{Phone B},\ \textit{Phone C}\}, \quad E = \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}.$$

Each expert e_h provides a hyperfuzzy preference relation $\tilde{R}_h : X \times X \to \tilde{\mathcal{P}}([0,1])$ with reflexivity $\tilde{R}_h(x,x) \supseteq \{0.5\}$ and reciprocity $\tilde{R}_h(y,x) = \{1-\alpha : \alpha \in \tilde{R}_h(x,y)\}$.

Step 1: Expert hyperfuzzy preferences.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{R}_1(\mathrm{A},\mathrm{B}) = \{0.60, 0.70\}, && \tilde{R}_1(\mathrm{A},\mathrm{C}) = \{0.80\}, && \tilde{R}_1(\mathrm{B},\mathrm{C}) = \{0.50, 0.55\},\\
&\tilde{R}_2(\mathrm{A},\mathrm{B}) = \{0.65\}, && \tilde{R}_2(\mathrm{A},\mathrm{C}) = \{0.75, 0.85\}, && \tilde{R}_2(\mathrm{B},\mathrm{C}) = \{0.40, 0.60\},\\
&\tilde{R}_3(\mathrm{A},\mathrm{B}) = \{0.60, 0.65, 0.70\}, && \tilde{R}_3(\mathrm{A},\mathrm{C}) = \{0.80\}, && \tilde{R}_3(\mathrm{B},\mathrm{C}) = \{0.50, 0.60, 0.70\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Their reciprocals follow by $\tilde{R}_h(y,x) = \{1-\alpha \mid \alpha \in \tilde{R}_h(x,y)\}$.

Step 2: Aggregation. *Define $\tilde{R}^*(x,y) = \bigcup_{h=1}^{3} \tilde{R}_h(x,y)$. Then*

$$\tilde{R}^*(\mathrm{A},\mathrm{B}) = \{0.60, 0.65, 0.70\},$$

$$\tilde{R}^*(\mathrm{A},\mathrm{C}) = \{0.75, 0.80, 0.85\},$$
$$\tilde{R}^*(\mathrm{B},\mathrm{C}) = \{0.40, 0.50, 0.55, 0.60, 0.70\}.$$

Reciprocals:

$$\tilde{R}^*(\mathrm{B},\mathrm{A}) = \{0.30, 0.35, 0.40\},$$
$$\tilde{R}^*(\mathrm{C},\mathrm{A}) = \{0.15, 0.20, 0.25\},$$
$$\tilde{R}^*(\mathrm{C},\mathrm{B}) = \{0.30, 0.40, 0.45, 0.50, 0.60\}.$$

Step 3: Decision rule (hyperfuzzy outranking). *Compute maxima:*

$$\max \tilde{R}^*(\mathrm{A},\mathrm{B}) = 0.70,\ \max \tilde{R}^*(\mathrm{B},\mathrm{A}) = 0.40$$

$$\Longrightarrow \quad \mathrm{A} \succ^* \mathrm{B},$$
$$\max \tilde{R}^*(\mathrm{A},\mathrm{C}) = 0.85,\ \max \tilde{R}^*(\mathrm{C},\mathrm{A}) = 0.25$$
$$\Longrightarrow \quad \mathrm{A} \succ^* \mathrm{C},$$
$$\max \tilde{R}^*(\mathrm{B},\mathrm{C}) = 0.70,\ \max \tilde{R}^*(\mathrm{C},\mathrm{B}) = 0.60$$
$$\Longrightarrow \quad \mathrm{B} \succ^* \mathrm{C}.$$

Thus the collective ranking is

$$\textit{Phone A} \ \succ^* \ \textit{Phone B} \ \succ^* \ \textit{Phone C},$$

so the group's preferred choice is ***Phone A****.*

Theorem 2.3. *In a HyperFuzzy Group Decision Making problem as above:*

1. *The collective relation $\tilde{R}^* : X \times X \to \tilde{\mathcal{P}}([0,1])$ is a* HyperFuzzy Set *on $X \times X$.*
2. *If each $\tilde{R}_h(x_i, x_k)$ is a singleton for all h, i, k, then the model reduces exactly to the classical Fuzzy Group Decision Making.*

Proof.
(1) By definition, $\tilde{R}^*(x_i, x_k)$ is the union of nonempty subsets of $[0,1]$, hence itself a nonempty subset of $[0,1]$. Thus $\tilde{R}^* \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}([0,1])^{X\times X}$, which is precisely the data of a HyperFuzzy Set on $X \times X$.
(2) If each expert's preference $\tilde{R}_h(x_i, x_k) = \{\mu_h(x_i, x_k)\}$ for some $\mu_h(x_i, x_k) \in [0,1]$, then

$$\tilde{R}^*(x_i, x_k) = \bigcup_{h=1}^{m} \{\mu_h(x_i, x_k)\} = \{\max_{1\le h\le m} \mu_h(x_i, x_k)\},$$

so the collective preference is the singleton-valued relation $\mu^*(x_i, x_k) = \max_h \mu_h(x_i, x_k)$. Hence $\mu^* \colon X \times X \to [0,1]$ is an ordinary fuzzy preference relation, and one recovers exactly the classical Fuzzy Group Decision Making formulation. □

2.2 SuperHyperFuzzy Group Decision Making

SuperHyperFuzzy Group Decision Making extends aggregation by employing iterated powerset structures of alternatives and membership degrees to model hierarchical uncertainty.

Definition 2.4 ((m,n)-SuperHyperFuzzy Group Decision Making)**.** *Let $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_p\}$ be a finite set of* alternatives *and $E = \{e_1, \ldots, e_m\}$ a finite set of* experts. *Fix nonnegative integers m, n. Define the nonempty k-th powerset and its "tilde" extension by*

$$\mathcal{P}_0^*(Y) = Y, \quad \mathcal{P}_k^*(Y) = \mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}_{k-1}^*(Y)\big) \setminus \{\emptyset\},$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_k^*(Y) = \big\{\, S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_k(Y) \mid S \neq \varnothing \big\}.$$

In particular $\mathcal{P}_m^*(X)$ is the domain of "super-alternatives" and $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_n^*([0,1])$ the family of allowed membership-degree sets at level n. A (m,n)-SuperHyperFuzzy Group Decision Making problem consists of:

- *For each expert e_h, a* superhyperfuzzy preference relation

  $$\tilde{R}_h : \mathcal{P}_m^*(X) \times \mathcal{P}_m^*(X) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_n^*([0,1]),$$

  subject to

  1. *(Reflexivity) $\kappa_n(\tfrac{1}{2}) \in \tilde{R}_h(A, A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{P}_m^*(X)$,*
  2. *(Reciprocity) for each inner-level set $U \in \tilde{R}_h(A, B)$, $\mathrm{Comp}_n(U) \in \tilde{R}_h(B, A)$, where $\mathrm{Comp}_0(x) = 1 - x$ and $\mathrm{Comp}_{k+1}(S) = \{\mathrm{Comp}_k(s) \mid s \in S\}$.*

- *An* aggregation operator

  $$\tilde{\Phi} : \prod_{h=1}^{m} \Big(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_n^*([0,1])\Big)^{\mathcal{P}_m^*(X)\times\mathcal{P}_m^*(X)} \longrightarrow \Big(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_n^*([0,1])\Big)^{\mathcal{P}_m^*(X)\times\mathcal{P}_m^*(X)},$$

  defined pointwise by set–union:

  $$\tilde{R}^*(A, B) = \tilde{\Phi}\big(\tilde{R}_1(A, B), \ldots, \tilde{R}_m(A, B)\big) = \bigcup_{h=1}^{m} \tilde{R}_h(A, B).$$

- *A* decision rule D *which, given $\tilde{R}^*$, either*

- *ranks "super-alternatives" by*

$$A \succ^* B \iff \max^{(n)}\big(\tilde{R}^*(A,B)\big)$$

$$\geq \max^{(n)}\big(\tilde{R}^*(B,A)\big),$$

  where

$$\overset{(0)}{\max}(x) = x$$

  ,

$$\overset{(k+1)}{\max}(S) = \max\{\overset{(k)}{\max}(s) \mid s \in S\}$$

  ,

- *or selects all A maximizing*

$$s(A) = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}^*_m(X)} \max^{(n)}(\tilde{R}^*(A,B)).$$

The tuple

$$\big(X,\ E,\ \{\tilde{R}_h\}_{h=1}^m,\ \tilde{\Phi},\ D\big)$$

is called a (m,n)-SuperHyperFuzzy Group Decision Making problem.

Example 2.5 (Real-world $(1,2)$-SuperHyperFuzzy Group Decision Making: Supplier Evaluation)**.** *Let*

$$X = \{\textit{Cost},\ \textit{Quality},\ \textit{Delivery}\}, \quad m = 1,\ n = 2, \quad E = \{e_1, e_2\}.$$

Then the "super-alternatives" domain is $\mathcal{P}^*_1(X)$, i.e. all nonempty subsets of X. In practice, the committee considers two major bundles:

$$A = \{\textit{Cost}, \textit{Quality}\},$$

$$B = \{\textit{Quality}, \textit{Delivery}\}.$$

Each expert e_h gives a superhyperfuzzy preference $\tilde{R}_h \colon \mathcal{P}^*_1(X) \times \mathcal{P}^*_1(X) \to \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^*_2([0,1])$.

Expert e_1:

$$\tilde{R}_1(A,B) = \Big\{\{\,0.70, 0.75\},\ \{\,0.85\}\Big\},$$

$$\tilde{R}_1(B,A) = \Big\{\{\,0.15, 0.25\},\ \{\,0.30\}\Big\},$$

with $\kappa_2(0.5) = \{\{0.5\}\} \in \tilde{R}_1(A,A)$.

Expert e_2:

$$\tilde{R}_2(A,B) = \Big\{\{\,0.65\},\ \{\,0.80, 0.90\}\Big\},$$

$$\tilde{R}_2(B,A) = \Big\{\{\,0.10\},\ \{\,0.20, 0.35\}\Big\},$$

with $\kappa_2(0.5) \in \tilde{R}_2(B,B)$.

Aggregating by union,

$$\tilde{R}^*(A,B) = \tilde{R}_1(A,B) \cup \tilde{R}_2(A,B) = \{\ \{0.65\}, \{0.70, 0.75\}, \{0.80, 0.90\}, \{0.85\}\},$$

$$\tilde{R}^*(B,A) = \{\ \{0.10\}, \{0.15, 0.25\}, \{0.20, 0.35\}, \{0.30\}\}.$$

Applying the hyperfuzzy outranking rule,

$$\overset{(2)}{\max}\big(\tilde{R}^*(A,B)\big) = \max\{\max\{0.65\}, \max\{0.70, 0.75\}, \max\{0.80, 0.90\}, \max\{0.85\}\} = 0.90,$$

$$\overset{(2)}{\max}\big(\tilde{R}^*(B,A)\big) = 0.35,$$

hence $A \succ^* B$*. The group thus selects the "Cost + Quality" bundle A as the optimal supplier profile.*

Example 2.6 (Real-world $(2,1)$-SuperHyperFuzzy Group Decision Making: Urban Infrastructure Prioritization). *Let*

$$X = \{\textit{Transportation},\ \textit{Housing},\ \textit{GreenSpace},\ \textit{Industry}\}, \quad m = 2,\ n = 1, \quad E = \{e_1, e_2\}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{P}_1^*(X) = \big\{\{\textit{Transportation}\},\ \{\textit{Housing}\},\ \{\textit{GreenSpace}\},\ \{\textit{Industry}\},$$
$$\{\textit{Transportation,Housing}\},\ \ldots,\ \{\textit{Transportation,Housing,GreenSpace,Industry}\}\big\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}_2^*(X) = \mathcal{P}\big(\mathcal{P}_1^*(X)\big) \setminus \{\emptyset\},$$

whose elements are super-alternatives, *i.e. collections of nonempty subsets of X. In practice we focus on:*

$$A = \big\{\{\textit{Transportation,Housing}\},\ \{\textit{Housing,GreenSpace}\}\big\},$$
$$B = \big\{\{\textit{Transportation,Industry}\},\ \{\textit{GreenSpace,Industry}\}\big\},$$

both in $\mathcal{P}_2^*(X)$.

Expert e_1:

$$\tilde{R}_1(A,B) = \big\{\{0.60, 0.75\},\ \{0.85\}\big\},$$
$$\tilde{R}_1(B,A) = \big\{\{0.15, 0.25\},\ \{0.30\}\big\},$$

with reflexivity $\{0.5\} \in \tilde{R}_1(A,A)$.

Expert e_2:

$$\tilde{R}_2(A,B) = \big\{\{0.65\},\ \{0.80, 0.90\}\big\},$$
$$\tilde{R}_2(B,A) = \big\{\{0.10\},\ \{0.20, 0.35\}\big\},$$

with $\{0.5\} \in \tilde{R}_2(B,B)$.

Aggregation: *By union,*

$$\tilde{R}^*(A,B) = \tilde{R}_1(A,B) \cup \tilde{R}_2(A,B) = \{\{0.60, 0.75\}, \{0.65\}, \{0.80, 0.90\}, \{0.85\}\},$$

$$\tilde{R}^*(B,A) = \{\{0.15, 0.25\}, \{0.30\}, \{0.10\}, \{0.20, 0.35\}\}.$$

Decision rule (hyperfuzzy outranking): *Compute pointwise maxima:*

$$\max \tilde{R}^*(A,B) = \max\{0.60, 0.75, 0.65, 0.80, 0.90, 0.85\} = 0.90, \quad \max \tilde{R}^*(B,A) = 0.35.$$

Since $0.90 > 0.35$, we have $A \succ^* B$. Thus the group's optimal choice is the super-alternative A, prioritizing the "Transportation & Housing" and "Housing & GreenSpace" bundles.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $\big(X, E, \{\tilde{R}_h\}, \tilde{\Phi}, D\big)$ be a (m,n)-SuperHyperFuzzy Group Decision Making problem as above. Then:*

1. *The aggregated relation $\tilde{R}^* : \mathcal{P}_m^*(X) \times \mathcal{P}_m^*(X) \to \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_n^*([0,1])$ is precisely an (m,n)-SuperHyperFuzzy Set on $\mathcal{P}_m^*(X)$.*
2. *If $m = n = 0$, then $\mathcal{P}_0^*(X) = X$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_0^*([0,1]) = [0,1]$, so the model reduces to classical Fuzzy Group Decision Making.*
3. *If $m = 0$ and $n > 0$, then it reduces to HyperFuzzy Group Decision Making.*

Proof. (1) By construction, for each (A, B), $\tilde{R}^*(A, B)$ is a nonempty union of elements in $\mathcal{P}_n([0, 1])$, so $\tilde{R}^*(A, B) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^*_n([0, 1])$. Hence $\tilde{R}^*$ is exactly an (m, n)-SuperHyperFuzzy Set on $\mathcal{P}^*_m(X)$.

(2) If $m = n = 0$, then by definition $\mathcal{P}^*_0(X) = X$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^*_0([0, 1]) = [0, 1]$. Each expert relation $\tilde{R}_h$ becomes a function $X \times X \to [0, 1]$, and aggregation by union becomes pointwise maximum. This coincides with the classical fuzzy-preference aggregation.

(3) If $m = 0$ but $n > 0$, then $\mathcal{P}^*_0(X) = X$ while $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^*_n([0, 1])$ remains nonempty subsets of $\mathcal{P}_n([0, 1])$. Thus one recovers exactly the HyperFuzzy Group Decision Making formulation. ☐

Theorem 2.8 (Aggregation Closure). *Let $\big(X, E, \{\tilde{R}_h\}_{h=1}^m, \tilde{\Phi}, D\big)$ be a (m, n)-SuperHyperFuzzy Group Decision Making problem, and define the collective relation*

$$\tilde{R}^*(A, B) = \tilde{\Phi}\big(\tilde{R}_1(A, B), \ldots, \tilde{R}_m(A, B)\big) = \bigcup_{h=1}^{m} \tilde{R}_h(A, B),$$

for all $A, B \in \mathcal{P}^*_m(X)$. Then $\tilde{R}^*$ is again a valid superhyperfuzzy preference relation, i.e.

$$\tilde{R}^* : \mathcal{P}^*_m(X) \times \mathcal{P}^*_m(X) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^*_n([0, 1]),$$

satisfying reflexivity and reciprocity.

Proof. By definition each $\tilde{R}_h(A, B)$ is a nonempty subset of $\mathcal{P}_n([0, 1])$. A union of nonempty subsets is nonempty, so $\tilde{R}^*(A, B) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^*_n([0, 1])$. For reflexivity, since $\kappa_n(\frac{1}{2}) \in \tilde{R}_h(A, A)$ for each h, it follows $\kappa_n(\frac{1}{2}) \in \bigcup_{h=1}^m \tilde{R}_h(A, A) = \tilde{R}^*(A, A)$. For reciprocity, if $U \in \tilde{R}^*(A, B)$ then $U \in \tilde{R}_{h_0}(A, B)$ for some h_0, hence by assumption $\mathrm{Comp}_n(U) \in \tilde{R}_{h_0}(B, A) \subseteq \tilde{R}^*(B, A)$. This shows $\tilde{R}^*$ satisfies both axioms, proving the claim. ☐

Theorem 2.9 (Consensus Idempotence). *If all experts agree pointwise, i.e. $\tilde{R}_1 = \tilde{R}_2 = \cdots = \tilde{R}_m =: R$, then the aggregated relation coincides with R:*

$$\tilde{R}^*(A, B) = \bigcup_{h=1}^{m} R(A, B) = R(A, B) \quad \forall\, A, B \in \mathcal{P}^*_m(X).$$

Proof. Since each $\tilde{R}_h(A, B) = R(A, B)$, the union $\bigcup_{h=1}^m R(A, B)$ simply returns the same set $R(A, B)$, establishing idempotence under unanimous expert opinion. ☐

Theorem 2.10 (Score Monotonicity). *Let $\big(X, E, \{\tilde{R}_h\}, \tilde{\Phi}, D\big)$ be a (m, n)-SuperHyperFuzzy GDM problem with aggregated relation $\tilde{R}^*(A, B) = \bigcup_{h=1}^m \tilde{R}_h(A, B)$. Define the "score" of a super-alternative A by*

$$s(A) = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}^*_m(X)} \max^{(n)}\big(\tilde{R}^*(A, B)\big).$$

If for some expert index t and some pair (A_0, B_0) we replace $\tilde{R}_t(A_0, B_0)$ by a strictly larger nonempty set $\tilde{R}'_t(A_0, B_0) \supsetneq \tilde{R}_t(A_0, B_0)$, then the new aggregated relation $\tilde{R}^{*'}$ satisfies

$$s'(A_0) \;\geq\; s(A_0),$$

and $s'(A) = s(A)$ for all $A \neq A_0$.

Proof. Only the union at (A_0, B_0) changes:

$$\tilde{R}^{*\prime}(A_0, B_0) = \Big(\bigcup_{h\neq t} \tilde{R}_h(A_0, B_0)\Big) \;\cup\; \tilde{R}_t'(A_0, B_0) \;\supseteq\; \tilde{R}^*(A_0, B_0).$$

Hence $\max^{(n)}\big(\tilde{R}^{*\prime}(A_0, B_0)\big) \geq \max^{(n)}\big(\tilde{R}^*(A_0, B_0)\big)$, while for any other pair $(A, B) \neq (A_0, B_0)$ the aggregated set is unchanged, so its maximum is unchanged. Summing over B yields $s'(A_0) \geq s(A_0)$ and $s'(A) = s(A)$ for $A \neq A_0$. ☐

Theorem 2.11 (Redundancy of Dominated Expert)**.** *In the same setting, suppose there is an expert index t such that for every pair (A, B)*

$$\tilde{R}_t(A, B) \;\subseteq\; \bigcup_{h\neq t} \tilde{R}_h(A, B).$$

Then removing expert t does not change the aggregated relation:

$$\bigcup_{h=1}^{m} \tilde{R}_h(A, B) = \bigcup_{h\neq t} \tilde{R}_h(A, B),$$

$$\forall\, A, B \in \mathcal{P}_m^*(X).$$

Proof. For each (A, B),

$$\bigcup_{h=1}^{m} \tilde{R}_h(A, B) = \Big(\bigcup_{h\neq t} \tilde{R}_h(A, B)\Big) \;\cup\; \tilde{R}_t(A, B)$$

$$= \bigcup_{h\neq t} \tilde{R}_h(A, B),$$

since by hypothesis $\tilde{R}_t(A, B)$ is already contained in the union over $h \neq t$. Thus the aggregate is unchanged when t is omitted. ☐

Theorem 2.12 (Commutativity and Associativity of Aggregation)**.** *The union-based aggregation operator $\tilde{\Phi}\big(\tilde{R}_1, \ldots, \tilde{R}_m\big) = \bigcup_{h=1}^{m} \tilde{R}_h$ is both commutative and associative in the expert index: for any reordering or grouping of the $\tilde{R}_h$, the result of $\tilde{R}^*$ is identical.*

Proof. Union of sets is well-known to satisfy $A \cup B = B \cup A$ (commutativity) and $(A \cup B) \cup C = A \cup (B \cup C)$ (associativity). Applying these identities repeatedly across the family $\{\tilde{R}_h(A, B)\}_{h=1}^{m}$ yields the desired result. ☐

3. Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced the Hyperfuzzy and (m, n)-SuperHyperfuzzy Group Decision Making frameworks. Future work will explore group decision making approaches based on Graphs [35, 36], Hypergraphs [37, 38], Shadowed set [39–41], Neutrosophic Set[42, 43], Picture Fuzzy Set[44, 45], Plithogenic Set[46, 47], and SuperHyperGraphs [48–50], and will include experimental evaluations using various algorithms and datasets.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my colleagues, advisors, and the anonymous peer reviewers for their valuable feedback and encouragement, which greatly enriched this work. I am also grateful to the scholars whose prior research laid the foundation for this study, the institutions and individuals who provided essential infrastructure and support, and to all readers for their interest.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there are no conflicts of interest related to this manuscript.

Funding

No external funding or financial support was received for this study.

Author Contributions

This manuscript was prepared solely by the author.

Data Availability

This paper presents theoretical developments only; no datasets were generated or analyzed. Future empirical work is encouraged to validate and extend the framework introduced here.

Ethical Approval

This research did not involve human participants, animal subjects, or sensitive personal data, and therefore did not require ethical approval.

Research Integrity

The author confirms that this manuscript is original, has not been published elsewhere, and is not under consideration by any other journal.

Use of Computational Tools

All proofs and derivations were performed manually; no computational software (e.g., Mathematica, SageMath, Coq) was used.

Code Availability

No code or software was developed for this study.

Scope and Limitations

The concepts presented here remain to be empirically validated. While every effort has been made to ensure accuracy and proper attribution, errors may persist. Readers are encouraged to consult the cited literature and report any corrections. These results hold under the specified assumptions; extending them beyond this scope is a subject for future research.

Supplementary Information

No supplementary materials accompany this paper.

Clinical Trial

This study did not involve any clinical trials.

Consent to Participate

Not applicable.

Consent to Publish

The author consents to the publication of this manuscript.

References

[1] Zadeh, L. A. (1965). Fuzzy sets. *Information and control*, *8*(3), 338–353. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(65)90241-X

[2] Zimmermann, H.-J. (2011). *Fuzzy set theory—and its applications*. Springer Science & Business Media.

[3] Zhang, W.-R. (1994). Bipolar fuzzy sets and relations: A computational framework for cognitive modeling and multiagent decision analysis. *NAFIPS/IFIS/NASA '94. Proceedings of the First International Joint Conference of The North American Fuzzy Information Processing Society Biannual Conference. The Industrial Fuzzy Control and Intellige*, 305–309. 10.1109/IJCF.1994.375115

[4] Akram, M. (2011). Bipolar fuzzy graphs. *Information sciences*, *181*(24), 5548–5564. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2011.07.037

[5] Atanassov, K. (2016). Intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *International journal bioautomation*, *20*, 1.

[6] Wang, H., Smarandache, F., Zhang, Y., & Sunderraman, R. (2010). *Single valued neutrosophic sets*. Infinite study. https://fs.unm.edu/SingleValuedNeutrosophicSets.pdf

[7] Torra, V., & Narukawa, Y. (2009). On hesitant fuzzy sets and decision. *2009 IEEE international conference on fuzzy systems*, 1378–1382. https://doi.org/10.1109/FUZZY.2009.5276884

[8] Smarandache, F. (2018). *Plithogenic set, an extension of crisp, fuzzy, intuitionistic fuzzy, and neutrosophic sets-revisited*. Infinite study. https://fs.unm.edu/NSS/PlithogenicSetAnExtensionOfCrisp.pdf

[9] Kandasamy, W. V., Ilanthenral, K., & Smarandache, F. (2020). *Plithogenic graphs*. Infinite Study.

[10] Jun, Y. B., Hur, K., & Lee, K. J. (2017). Hyperfuzzy subalgebras of bck/bci-algebras. *Annals of Fuzzy Mathematics and Informatics*. http://www.afmi.or.kr/articles_in_%5C%20press/2017-11/AFMI-H-170927R2/AFMI-H-1709272R2.pdf

[11] Song, S.-Z., Kim, S. J., & Jun, Y. B. (2017). Hyperfuzzy ideals in bck/bci-algebras. *Mathematics*, *5*(4), 81.

[12] Ghosh, J., & Samanta, T. K. (2012). Hyperfuzzy sets and hyperfuzzy group. *Int. J. Adv. Sci. Technol*, *41*, 27–37. http://article.nadiapub.com/IJAST/vol41/3.pdf

[13] Fujita, T. (2025a). *Advancing uncertain combinatorics through graphization, hyperization, and uncertainization: Fuzzy, neutrosophic, soft, rough, and beyond*. Biblio Publishing.

[14] Fujita, T. (2025b). An introduction and reexamination of hyperprobability and superhyperprobability: Comprehensive overview. *Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics*, *27*(5), 82–109. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajpas/2025/v27i5757

[15] Lunar, M. M. C., & Robles, R. A. (2019). Characterization and structure of a power set graph. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications*, *3*(6), 1–4. https://www.ijarp.org/published-research-papers/june2019/Characterization-And-Structure-Of-A-Power-Set-Graph.pdf

[16] Smarandache, F. (2024). Foundation of superhyperstructure & neutrosophic superhyperstructure. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, *63*(1), 21. https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nss_journal/vol63/iss1/21/

[17] Zadeh, L. A. (1996). Fuzzy logic, neural networks, and soft computing. In *Fuzzy sets, fuzzy logic, and fuzzy systems: Selected papers by lotfi a zadeh* (pp. 775–782). World Scientific.

[18] Smarandache, F. (2017). *Hyperuncertain, superuncertain, and superhyperuncertain sets/logics/probabilities/statistics*. Infinite Study.

[19] Beroggi, G. E., & Wallace, W. A. (1994). Operational risk management: A new paradigm for decision making. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, *24*(10), 1450–1457. https://doi.org/10.1109/21.310528

[20] Abdel-Basset, M., Zhou, Y., Mohamed, M., & Chang, V. (2018). A group decision making framework based on neutrosophic vikor approach for e-government website evaluation. *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems*, *34*(6), 4213–4224. https://doi.org/10.3233/JIFS-171952

[21] Urena, R., Cabrerizo, F. J., Morente-Molinera, J. A., & Herrera-Viedma, E. (2016). Gdm-r: A new framework in r to support fuzzy group decision making processes. *Information Sciences*, *357*, 161–181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2016.03.008

[22] Büyüközkan, G., Feyzioğlu, O., & Ruan, D. (2007). Fuzzy group decision-making to multiple preference formats in quality function deployment. *Computers in Industry*, *58*(5), 392–402. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2006.07.002

[23] Yue, Z. (2011). Deriving decision maker's weights based on distance measure for interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy group decision making. *Expert Systems with Applications*, *38*(9), 11665–11670. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2011.03.046

[24] Xu, Z. (2010). A method based on distance measure for interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy group decision making. *Information sciences*, *180*(1), 181–190. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2009.09.005

[25] Yu, D., Li, D.-F., & Merigó, J. M. (2016). Dual hesitant fuzzy group decision making method and its application to supplier selection. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics*, *7*(5), 819–831. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13042-015-0400-3

[26] Shouzhen, Z., Baležentis, A., & Weihua, S. (2013). The multi-criteria hesitant fuzzy group decision making with multimoora method. *Economic Computation & Economic Cybernetics Studies & Research*, *47*(3). https://scispace.com/pdf/the-multi-criteria-hesitant-fuzzy-group-decision-making-with-8r42crkizr.pdf

[27] Şahin, R. (2014). Multi-criteria neutrosophic decision making method based on score and accuracy functions under neutrosophic environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.5202*.

[28] Kanchana, A., Nagarajan, D., & Jacob, K. (2024). Single and interval valued neutrosophic group decision making problem based on dynamic programming cluster model. *Computational and Applied Mathematics*, *43*(5), 287. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40314-024-02798-0

[29] Rafi-Ul-Shan, P. M., Bashiri, M., Kamal, M. M., Mangla, S. K., & Tjahjono, B. (2024). An analysis of fuzzy group decision making to adopt emerging technologies for fashion supply chain risk management. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, *71*, 8469–8487. https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2024.3354845

[30] Islam, M. S., Salem, M., Tantawy, M., & Salah, M. (2024). Cost overrun risk assessment for healthcare projects: A modified fuzzy group decision-making approach. *Journal of Construction*

Engineering and Management, *150*(12), 04024168. https://doi.org/10.1061/JCEMD4.COENG-15134

[31] Ali, Y., Mehmood, B., Huzaifa, M., Yasir, U., & Khan, A. U. (2020). Development of a new hybrid multi criteria decision-making method for a car selection scenario. *Facta Universitatis, Series: Mechanical Engineering*, *18*(3), 357–373. https://doi.org/10.22190/FUME200305031A

[32] Amiri, M., Ayazi, S. A., Olfat, L., & Moradi, J. S. (2011). Group decision making process for supplier selection with vikor under fuzzy circumstance case study: An iranian car parts supplier. *International bulletin of business administration*, *10*(6), 66–75.

[33] Büyüközkan, G., & Güleryüz, S. (2016). Multi criteria group decision making approach for smart phone selection using intuitionistic fuzzy topsis. *International Journal of Computational Intelligence Systems*, *9*(4), 709–725. https://doi.org/10.1080/18756891.2016.1204119

[34] Yildiz, A., & Ergul, E. U. (2015). A two-phased multi-criteria decision-making approach for selecting the best smartphone. *South African Journal of Industrial Engineering*, *26*(3), 194–215. https://doi.org/10.7166/26-3-1208

[35] Gross, J. L., Yellen, J., & Anderson, M. (2018). *Graph theory and its applications*. Chapman; Hall/CRC.

[36] Diestel, R. (n.d.). Graduate texts in mathematics: Graph theory.

[37] Bretto, A. (2013). Hypergraph theory. *An introduction. Mathematical Engineering. Cham: Springer*, *1*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-00080-0

[38] Feng, Y., You, H., Zhang, Z., Ji, R., & Gao, Y. (2019). Hypergraph neural networks. *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, *33*(01), 3558–3565. https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.09401

[39] Pedrycz, W. (1998). Shadowed sets: Representing and processing fuzzy sets. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)*, *28*(1), 103–109. https://doi.org/10.1109/3477.658584

[40] Yang, J., & Yao, Y. (2021). A three-way decision based construction of shadowed sets from atanassov intuitionistic fuzzy sets. *Information Sciences*, *577*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2021.06.065

[41] Patel, H. R., & Shah, V. A. (2021). General type-2 fuzzy logic systems using shadowed sets: A new paradigm towards fault-tolerant control. *2021 Australian & New Zealand Control Conference (ANZCC)*, 116–121. https://doi.org/10.1109/ANZCC53563.2021.9628361

[42] Broumi, S., Talea, M., Bakali, A., & Smarandache, F. (2016). Single valued neutrosophic graphs. *Journal of New theory*, (10), 86–101. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.50940

[43] Broumi, S., Bakali, A., Talea, M., & Smarandache, F. (2018). An isolated bipolar single-valued neutrosophic graphs. *Information Systems Design and Intelligent Applications: Proceedings of Fourth International Conference INDIA 2017*, 816–822. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-7512-4_80

[44] Cuong, B. C., & Kreinovich, V. (2013). Picture fuzzy sets-a new concept for computational intelligence problems. *2013 third world congress on information and communication technologies (WICT 2013)*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/WICT.2013.7113099

[45] Khan, W. A., Arif, W., NGUYEN, Q. H., Le, T. T., & Van Pham, H. (2024). Picture fuzzy directed hypergraphs with applications towards decision-making and managing hazardous chemicals. *IEEE Access*.

[46] Sultana, F., Gulistan, M., Ali, M., Yaqoob, N., Khan, M., Rashid, T., & Ahmed, T. (2023). A study of plithogenic graphs: Applications in spreading coronavirus disease (covid-19) globally. *Journal of ambient intelligence and humanized computing*, *14*(10), 13139–13159. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12652-022-03772-6

[47] Smarandache, F. (2020). *Extension of hypergraph to n-superhypergraph and to plithogenic n-superhypergraph, and extension of hyperalgebra to n-ary (classical-/neutro-/anti-) hyperalgebra*. Infinite Study. https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nss_journal/vol33/iss1/18/

[48] Smarandache, F. (2022). *Introduction to the n-superhypergraph-the most general form of graph today*. Infinite Study. https://fs.unm.edu/NSS/n-SuperHyperGraph.pdf

[49] Hamidi, M., Smarandache, F., & Davneshvar, E. (2022). Spectrum of superhypergraphs via flows. *Journal of Mathematics*, *2022*(1), 9158912. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/9158912

[50] Hamidi, M., & Taghinezhad, M. (2023). *Application of superhypergraphs-based domination number in real world*. Infinite Study. https://fs.unm.edu/SHS/ApplicationsSuperHyperGraph.pdf