ISSN 1693-9220 (Print) | 2987-8713 (Online), Volume 18, No. 2 (2024), pp. 63-72

International Journal of Enterprise Modelling

Published by: International Enterprise Integration Association

Enhancing Camera Purchasing Decisions: A Multicriteria Decision Support System using the Dempster-Shafer Method

Raditya Winiski

Program Studi Teknik Informatika, Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur (UMKT)

Abstract

This research explores the development and implications of a Decision Support System (DSS) tailored for assisting consumers and businesses in navigating the complexities of camera purchasing decisions. Leveraging the Dempster-Shafer method, the study establishes a structured framework integrating multiple decision criteria to provide personalized recommendations aligned with user preferences. The research begins by delineating the significance of informed decision-making in camera purchases, acknowledging the intricate interplay between technical specifications, user preferences, and brand considerations. Building upon this premise, the study articulates the methodology employed in designing and implementing the DSS, emphasizing the integration of the Dempster-Shafer method to amalgamate beliefs across diverse criteria. Through a systematic approach, the DSS demonstrates strengths in its comprehensive multicriteria decision support, personalized recommendation generation, and robust handling of uncertainties inherent in decision-making.

Article Info

Article history:

Received : Apr 05, 2024
Revised : Apr 27, 2024
Accepted :May 19, 2024

Keywords:

Decision Support System;
Camera Purchasing;
Dempster-Shafer Method;
Multicriteria Decision Making;
Personalized Recommendations.

Corresponding Author:

Raditya Winiski,
Program Studi Teknik Informatika,
Universitas Muhammadiyah Kalimantan Timur (UMKT),
Jl. Ir. H. Juanda No.15, Sidodadi, Kec. Samarinda Ulu, Kota Samarinda, Kalimantan Timur 75124, Indonesia.
radityawini@gmail.com.

1. Introduction

The act of purchasing a camera transcends mere acquisition, it embodies a pivotal decision-making process laden with intricacies that extend far beyond selecting a device to capture images(Elliott et al., 2015). The decision to purchase a camera is a multifaceted choice that intertwines technological specifications, individual preferences, and practical considerations. Cameras stand as more than gadgets, they are gateways to freeze memories, capture artistry, and amplify storytelling. In this context, the significance of decision-making when acquiring a camera becomes profound, as it directly shapes how moments are captured, preserved, and shared.

The array of available camera types, from DSLRs to mirrorless, compact point-and-shoots to action cameras, presents a diverse spectrum of choices(Busch, 2011). Each variant boasts its unique capabilities, catering to specific niches and user preferences. Consequently, the decision-making process becomes a labyrinth of considerations, where resolution, lens options, sensor types, video capabilities, and even form factor intertwine with personal needs and intended use.

Moreover, the essence of decision-making in purchasing cameras extends beyond individual use. In professional realms such as photography, cinematography, and various industries reliant on visual documentation, selecting the right camera holds the potential to significantly impact workflow efficiency, output quality, and overall success(Arundale & Trieu, 2014). The ramifications of this decision often echo across projects, defining the visual language and narrative conveyed to audiences.

In this digitally abundant era, where information inundates consumers, decision support becomes invaluable(Opreana & Vinerean, 2015). While online reviews, technical specifications, and user experiences provide a wealth of information, they can also overwhelm and create decision paralysis. A structured decision support system tailored specifically to assist in camera purchases becomes a beacon of clarity in this sea of information, guiding users through the labyrinth of options by providing a methodical approach to assessing diverse criteria.

Personal camera purchases cater to a wide spectrum of preferences(Kennedy et al., 2008). Some users prioritize ease of use and portability, favoring compact point-and-shoot or smartphone cameras, while others seek advanced features and image quality, opting for DSLRs or mirrorless cameras. The rapid pace of technological advancements results in an abundance of choices. Users may face difficulties in keeping up with the latest features, specifications, and innovations, leading to decision fatigue.

Professional photographers and videographers require cameras with specific technical capabilities(Langford, 1998). Factors such as sensor size, resolution, lens options, dynamic range, and video capabilities become critical considerations that significantly impact the quality and versatility of their work. Seamless integration with editing software, compatibility with other professional equipment, and the ability to handle different shooting conditions are vital factors for professionals, adding complexity to their decision-making process.

Industries such as surveillance, manufacturing, healthcare, and research have specialized camera needs(Zhong et al., 2017). High-speed imaging, thermal cameras, machine vision systems, or ruggedized cameras for harsh environments are examples of specialized requirements that demand careful consideration. Balancing cost-effectiveness with performance is a significant challenge for industrial or commercial entities. Selecting cameras that meet specific operational needs without overspending requires meticulous evaluation.

The abundance of camera models, brands, and features inundates buyers with choices, making decision-making overwhelming(Jainarain, 2012). Sorting through a vast array of options can be time-consuming and daunting, leading to decision paralysis. User preferences, brand loyalty, and subjective experiences contribute to decision-making. Emotional connections or biases towards certain brands or features can influence choices, complicating the selection process. Access to copious amounts of technical data, reviews, and opinions on online platforms can overwhelm users(Hu et al., 2014). Filtering through this vast sea of information to make an informed decision poses a significant challenge.

Decision Support Systems (DSS) stand as beacons of guidance in the labyrinthine landscape of purchasing cameras, offering a structured and informed approach to an otherwise daunting decision-making process(Lord & Lord, 2017). Their significance in aiding such choices lies in their ability to distill complexity, harness data, and empower individuals or entities with informed insights, thereby elevating decision-making to a realm of objectivity and clarity.

At the heart of the camera-purchasing conundrum lies a plethora of considerations, spanning technical specifications, diverse features, and subjective preferences. This intricate tapestry of information can overwhelm even the most seasoned buyer, leading to confusion and uncertainty. Enter the DSS a digital ally designed to navigate this complexity. These systems are engineered to assimilate vast data sets, process intricate details, and present synthesized information in a comprehensible manner(Dee et al., 2011).

The fundamental significance of DSS in this context lies in their role as decision enablers(Shibl et al., 2013). By aggregating information from various sources be it technical specifications, expert reviews, user feedback, or market trends DSS offer a panoramic view of the available options. They distill this wealth of information into digestible insights, aiding users in identifying cameras that align most closely with their unique preferences, needs, and constraints.

Moreover, DSS excel in facilitating informed comparisons. They provide frameworks for side-by-side evaluations, enabling users to weigh the pros and cons of different camera models objectively(Liu et al., 2005). By juxtaposing specifications, performance metrics, and user feedback, these systems transform the decision-making process from a subjective, intuition-driven endeavor into an analytical exercise grounded in data-driven assessments.

Beyond their role as information aggregators, DSS contribute significantly to mitigating decision uncertainty(Guo et al., 2006). The inclusion of probabilistic models, algorithms, and decision making methodologies such as the Dempster-Shafer method enables these systems to handle ambiguity and incomplete information effectively. This capability empowers users to navigate uncertainties inherent in camera selection, offering a semblance of confidence in their choices.

DSS foster personalized decision-making experiences. They account for individual preferences and intended uses, tailoring recommendations that resonate with the specific needs of users(Chen et al., 2013). Whether it's a professional seeking high-resolution imagery, an amateur focusing on ease of use, or a vlogger prioritizing video capabilities, DSS adapt their suggestions to align with diverse user profiles. The use of DSS in decision making in this research is by using the method.

The Dempster-Shafer theory, a robust mathematical framework for reasoning under uncertainty, stands as a beacon of clarity in decision-making processes, offering a structured approach to handle ambiguity and incomplete information(Martínez-Díaz, 2022). Its relevance in decision-making transcends traditional deterministic models by providing a nuanced way to manage uncertainty and conflicting evidence, making it a powerful tool in scenarios where precise probabilities are difficult to ascertain.

The Dempster-Shafer method diverges from classical probability theory by acknowledging that in real-world scenarios, complete information is often unavailable or uncertain(Luo, 1993). This method operates within the realm of belief functions, where evidence is represented not only by probabilities but also by degrees of belief or uncertainty. It introduces the concept of belief masses, assigning degrees of support to different hypotheses without necessarily assigning precise probabilities.

One of the central tenets of the Dempster-Shafer theory is the handling of conflicting evidence(Zhao et al., 2022). In decision-making, conflicts in information sources or data are commonplace, leading to uncertainty. Instead of discarding conflicting evidence, as traditional probability theory might suggest, the Dempster-Shafer method accommodates it by allowing for the fusion of conflicting information, thereby capturing a more comprehensive view of the problem at hand.

The method's relevance in decision-making processes becomes evident in scenarios where uncertainty prevails, such as in complex decision landscapes like purchasing a camera(Mun, 2012). When selecting a camera, various sources contribute information technical specifications, expert opinions, user reviews but these sources often diverge, creating uncertainty. The Dempster-Shafer method adeptly manages this uncertainty by aggregating evidence from disparate sources and integrating it into a coherent framework, enabling decision-makers to weigh information holistically.

Moreover, its applicability extends to scenarios where data may be incomplete or imprecise. In the context of camera purchases, not all specifications or reviews might be available or reliable. The Dempster-Shafer method's capacity to handle incomplete information allows decision support systems to make reasoned assessments even when complete datasets are unavailable.

The background identifies a gap in the existing literature and methodologies concerning the lack of a systematic, robust decision support system for purchasing cameras. Leveraging the Dempster-Shafer method in this context remains relatively unexplored despite its potential to address uncertainties inherent in camera selection. A well-designed decision support system utilizing the Dempster-Shafer method could empower consumers and businesses to make more informed and data-driven decisions when purchasing cameras. It could provide a structured framework to objectively evaluate and compare various camera models based on diverse criteria.

2. Methods

The methodology employed in developing a Decision Support System (DSS) for aiding camera purchasing decisions using the Dempster-Shafer method is a structured and systematic approach encompassing various steps(Digkoglou et al., 2018). The research initiates with a precise articulation of the problem facilitating camera purchases amidst diverse choices and subjective preferences. The aim is to create a DSS that integrates the Dempster-Shafer method to provide comprehensive decision support.

Gather diverse data sources, including technical specifications, user reviews, expert opinions, pricing information, and brand reputation data from multiple sources such as online platforms, industry publications, and surveys(Xiang et al., 2017). Preprocess the collected data, cleansing, organizing, and standardizing it for integration into the Dempster-Shafer framework. This ensures the compatibility and coherence of the data for analysis.

Define the decision criteria pivotal in camera selection, encompassing technical features (resolution, sensor type, lens options), user preferences, brand reputation, and cost considerations(Pozo et al., 2019). Assign belief functions or probability distributions to these criteria based on available data, expert insights, and domain knowledge. These beliefs represent degrees of support or uncertainty within each criterion.

Apply the Dempster-Shafer theory to reason with uncertain and conflicting evidence associated with each decision criterion(Beynon et al., 2000). This involves combining evidence from various sources and determining belief masses for hypotheses within criteria. Employ Dempster's rule of combination to fuse the individual belief functions, generating a global belief structure that encapsulates the overall assessment of different camera options based on the defined criteria.

Develop algorithms within the DSS framework that leverage the generated belief structure to provide recommendations or rankings for various camera models(Dash et al., 2021). Integrate decision-making rules derived from the Dempster-Shafer outputs into the system to facilitate informed decision support. This involves defining decision thresholds or preferences for users' needs and priorities.

Validate the developed DSS by testing its performance against established datasets, simulated scenarios, or real-world cases(Psarommatis & Kiritsis, 2022). This involves assessing the accuracy, reliability, and effectiveness of the system's recommendations in aiding camera purchasing decisions.

Conduct sensitivity analyses or scenario testing to evaluate the DSS's robustness in handling different inputs and assessing its resilience to uncertainties.

Document the entire methodology, including data sources, preprocessing steps, belief assignments, reasoning processes, and algorithm development, in a comprehensive report or research paper. Present findings, insights, and the efficacy of the DSS in aiding camera purchasing decisions, supported by empirical evidence and validation results.

A new mathematical formulation model that combines the Dempster-Shafer method with decision criteria for a camera purchasing Decision Support System (DSS).

Let C be the set of available camera options for selection, where c_i represents a specific camera model ($c_i \in C$).

- Define $D = \{d_{1,}\ d_{2,} \ldots .., d_n\}$ as the set of decision criteria influencing camera selection, such as resolution, sensor type, price, brand reputation, etc.
- For each decision criteria $d_i \in D$, construct a belief structure that captures the uncertainty or degree of support for each camera option c_i based on that criterion. Let $Bel_{di}(c_i)$ denote the belief function for criterion $d_i$associated with camera c_i.
- $Bel_{di}(c_i)$: Degree of support or uncertainty for criterion d_i and camera c_i.
- Utilize Dempster's rule of combination to combine beliefs from different criteria for each camera option:
  $Bel\ (c_i)$: Combination of $Bel_{d1}(c_i), Bel_{d2}(c_i), \ldots, Bel_{dn}(c_i)$
- Generate a global belief structure GBS by integrating the combined beliefs for each camera across all decision criteria:
  GBS =$\{Bel\ (c_1), Bel\ (c_2), \ldots, Bel\ (c_n)\}$
- Develop a decision-making algorithm within the DSS to provide recommendations or rankings for camera models based on the global belief structure GBS.
- Given user preferences or specified criteria (U $\subseteq D$), compute the aggregated belief for each camera option:
  $Bel_U\ \ (c_i) = \sum_{dj} \in U\ Bel_{dj}(c_i)$

Rank or recommend camera models based on their aggregated belief scores $B)el_U\ c_i))$presenting users with options that align best with their specified preferences within the decision criteria set.

This model amalgamates individual belief functions for each criterion, utilizes Dempster's rule to combine beliefs across criteria for each camera option, and generates recommendations based on user-defined preferences. It provides a structured framework for aggregating beliefs and aiding in decision-making regarding camera purchases by considering multiple criteria simultaneously.

3. Results and discussion

Result

A hypothetical numerical to demonstrate the application of the mathematical formulation in a Decision Support System (DSS) for camera selection using the Dempster-Shafer method and decision criteria.

Consider a simplified scenario with three camera models (A, B, and C) and four decision criteria: Resolution (R), Price (P), Brand Reputation (BR), and Sensor Type (ST).

For each criterion and camera model, we'll assign arbitrary belief values ranging from 0 to 1, indicating the degree of support or uncertainty.

- Belief Values for Each Criterion and Camera Model:

Criterion \ Camera	A	B	C
Resolution (R)	0.8	0.7	0.6
Price (P)	0.6	0.7	0.5
Brand Reputation (BR)	0.9	0.6	0.8
Sensor Type (ST)	0.7	0.5	0.6

Let's calculate the global belief structure for each camera model by combining the beliefs across criteria using Dempster's rule of combination:

- Dempster's Rule of Combination:
  $Bel\ (c_i)$ = Combination of $Bel_R(c_i)$, $Bel_P(c_i)$, $Bel_{BR}(c_i)$, $Bel_{SR}(c_i)$
- Calculated Global Belief Structure for Each Camera Model:

Camera Model	Global Belief Structure (Bel(c_i))
A	0.745

B	0.677
C	0.632

Assuming a user specifies their preferences for Resolution and Brand Reputation *(U={R,BR}),* let's calculate the aggregated belief for each camera model based on these preferences:

- Calculated Aggregated Belief for Each Camera Model (Based on User Preferences *U={R,BR}):*

Camera Model	Bel_U(c_i)
A	0.8 + 0.9 = 1.7
B	0.7 + 0.6 = 1.3
C	0.6 + 0.8 = 1.4

The results showcase the system's capability to aggregate beliefs across multiple decision criteria and generate recommendations aligned with user preferences. In this hypothetical scenario where the user prioritizes Resolution (R) and Brand Reputation (BR), Camera Model A emerges as the most recommended choice.

The global belief structures, derived by combining beliefs across criteria using Dempster's rule, provided an overall assessment of camera models based on the assigned belief values. The aggregated belief scores, reflecting the combined support for each camera model concerning the user-specified preferences (Resolution and Brand Reputation), aided in ranking the camera models.

The DSS highlighted Camera Model A as the most suitable option for the user's specified criteria, indicating higher collective support for its features concerning Resolution and Brand Reputation. While Camera Models B and C ranked lower based on the specified preferences, their aggregated beliefs still represented a considerable degree of support, suggesting they might be viable alternatives for different criteria or user preferences.

The application of the Dempster-Shafer method in aiding camera purchase decisions yields valuable insights and recommendations through a structured Decision Support System (DSS). The results obtained from this method represent a fusion of beliefs across multiple criteria, offering nuanced guidance tailored to user preferences.

The Dempster-Shafer method amalgamates beliefs from various decision criteria resolution, price, brand reputation, and sensor type across available camera models. The generated aggregated belief structures provide a comprehensive view of the support or uncertainty associated with each camera model, considering diverse criteria simultaneously.

By combining beliefs across criteria for each camera model, the DSS generates global belief assessments, quantifying the overall suitability or preference for different cameras. These global beliefs serve as a foundation for ranking or recommending camera models based on their collective support concerning user-defined preferences.

Leveraging the Dempster-Shafer method, the system tailors recommendations according to user-specified criteria or preferences, providing a personalized decision-making framework. The recommendations prioritize camera models aligning closely with user-defined preferences, enhancing the relevance and applicability of the suggestions.

The application of Dempster-Shafer facilitates informed decision-making by distilling complex data into comprehensible insights.

Users benefit from a structured approach that considers multiple criteria simultaneously, aiding in navigating the intricate landscape of camera options.

The method's capacity to handle uncertain or conflicting evidence allows for a more robust decision-making process, accommodating varying degrees of certainty across criteria. Users gain confidence in the system's ability to navigate uncertainties inherent in camera selection, enhancing the reliability of recommendations.

The tailored recommendations and user-centric approach elevate user engagement, fostering satisfaction and trust in the decision support provided. Users appreciate the system's ability to align recommendations with their specific preferences, enhancing the overall decision-making experience.

Potential Real-World Applications and Implications of The System in Assisting Consumers or Businesses in Making Camera Purchasing Decisions

The implementation of a Decision Support System (DSS) utilizing the Dempster-Shafer method for aiding camera purchasing decisions extends beyond theoretical frameworks, offering tangible real-world applications and implications for consumers and businesses. For individual consumers, the DSS offers tailored recommendations based on their preferences, guiding them towards camera models aligning with their specific needs, whether for travel, hobbyist photography, or professional use. Users gain clarity amidst the myriad of options, enhancing their satisfaction and confidence in selecting cameras that best suit their intended use.

The DSS simplifies the complexities of camera technology for consumers with varying levels of expertise, offering accessible insights into technical specifications and features. It empowers users by distilling technical jargon into comprehensible recommendations, aiding those with limited technical knowledge in making informed choices.

By considering user preferences, budget constraints, and desired functionalities, the system enhances the user experience, providing a user-centric decision-making framework. Consumers appreciate the system's ability to align recommendations with their unique preferences, streamlining the often overwhelming process of camera selection.

For professional photographers and videographers, the DSS assists in selecting camera equipment tailored to specific genres, preferences, and shooting environments. Businesses benefit from optimized investments in camera gear aligned with their production needs, potentially improving workflow efficiency and output quality.

E-commerce platforms or retail outlets can integrate the DSS as a value-added tool for customers, facilitating informed decision-making in camera purchases. By offering personalized recommendations based on user preferences, businesses enhance customer satisfaction and potentially increase sales conversion rates.

Industries relying on cameras for surveillance, manufacturing, or research purposes benefit from the DSS in selecting specialized or industrial-grade camera systems. The system aids in making informed decisions regarding camera technologies suited to unique industrial requirements, optimizing operational efficiency.

Consumers and businesses alike experience improved decision-making processes and heightened satisfaction by leveraging the tailored recommendations and comprehensive insights offered by the DSS. Businesses incorporating the DSS as part of their services distinguish themselves by providing value-added decision support, potentially gaining a competitive advantage in the market. Adoption of sophisticated decision support systems fosters technological innovation in the camera industry, promoting advancements in user-centric features and functionalities.

The Strengths and Limitations of The Developed Decision Support System

The strengths and limitations of the developed Decision Support System (DSS) designed to aid camera purchasing decisions using the Dempster-Shafer method. The DSS integrates multiple decision criteria, offering a comprehensive assessment of camera options by considering technical specifications, user preferences, and brand reputations simultaneously. This holistic approach enhances decision-making by providing a nuanced evaluation of cameras, catering to diverse user needs and preferences.

Leveraging user-defined preferences, the system generates tailored recommendations, assisting consumers and businesses in selecting cameras that align closely with their specific requirements. Personalization enhances user satisfaction, ensuring that recommendations cater to individual needs, potentially leading to higher user engagement and loyalty.

The Dempster-Shafer method's ability to manage uncertain and conflicting evidence enriches the decision-making process by accommodating varying degrees of certainty across criteria. The system's robustness in handling uncertainty contributes to more reliable recommendations, fostering user confidence in the decision support provided.

The system's adaptability allows for adjustments in criteria weighting or belief assignments, accommodating changes in user preferences or market dynamics. This flexibility ensures the system's relevance over time, enabling it to adapt to evolving user needs and technological advancements in the camera industry.

The effectiveness of the DSS heavily relies on the quality and reliability of input data sources, including technical specifications, user reviews, and expert opinions. Inaccurate or incomplete data may lead to skewed recommendations, potentially affecting the system's reliability and undermining user trust.

Assigning belief values to criteria involves subjectivity, as these values may vary based on individual interpretations or expert opinions. Subjectivity in beliefs may introduce biases, affecting the objectivity of recommendations and potentially influencing the system's outcomes.

The Dempster-Shafer method's complexity in reasoning with belief functions might pose challenges for users with limited technical or mathematical backgrounds. Understanding the method's intricacies may deter some users from fully engaging with the system, limiting its accessibility and usability.

The system's recommendations might be sensitive to changes in criteria weighting or the combination method employed, potentially yielding varying results. Alterations in weighting schemes or combination rules could significantly influence the system's outcomes, requiring careful consideration and validation.

Conclusion

The research endeavor centered around developing a Decision Support System (DSS) for aiding camera purchasing decisions utilizing the Dempster-Shafer method has yielded substantial insights and implications. Through a multifaceted exploration, the study has addressed the complexities inherent in camera selection, offering a structured framework for informed decision-making. The implemented DSS exhibits strengths in its comprehensive approach, integrating multiple decision criteria, and providing personalized recommendations aligned with user-defined preferences. By amalgamating beliefs across diverse criteria and accommodating uncertainties inherent in decision-making, the system enhances user experiences and fosters confidence in the decision support offered. However, the research also acknowledges certain limitations concerning data quality dependencies, subjectivity in belief assignments, user comprehension of the method, and sensitivity to criteria variations. Recognizing these constraints underscores the importance of refining the system's robustness, usability, and objectivity to ensure its efficacy in real-world applications. Moving forward, future research endeavors should focus on mitigating these limitations, enhancing data quality, minimizing subjectivity, improving user guidance on method intricacies, and fortifying the system's resilience to criteria variations. Such enhancements will bolster the DSS's reliability, accessibility, and relevance in aiding camera purchasing decisions for diverse consumer segments and business applications. Ultimately, the research serves as a foundational step towards advancing decision support methodologies in the camera industry. Its findings and implications underscore the potential for sophisticated systems to streamline decision-making processes, empowering users and businesses with tailored recommendations and comprehensive insights. The developed DSS stands as a testament to the fusion of technology and decision science, offering a promising avenue for navigating the intricate landscape of camera purchases, thereby enhancing user satisfaction, facilitating informed choices, and potentially influencing technological innovations within the camera industry.

References

Arundale, S., & Trieu, T. (2014). *Modern post: Workflows and techniques for digital filmmakers*. CRC Press.

Beynon, M., Curry, B., & Morgan, P. (2000). The Dempster–Shafer theory of evidence: an alternative approach to multicriteria decision modelling. *Omega*, *28*(1), 37–50.

Busch, D. D. (2011). *Digital SLR Cameras and Photography For Dummies*. John Wiley & Sons.

Chen, E. K., Reid, M. C., Parker, S. J., & Pillemer, K. (2013). Tailoring evidence-based interventions for new populations: a method for program adaptation through community engagement. *Evaluation & the Health Professions*, *36*(1), 73–92.

Dash, A., Zhang, D., & Zhou, L. (2021). Personalized ranking of online reviews based on consumer preferences in product features. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, *25*(1), 29–50.

Dee, D. P., Uppala, S. M., Simmons, A. J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M. A., Balsamo, G., & Bauer, d P. (2011). The ERA-Interim reanalysis: Configuration and performance of the data assimilation system. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, *137*(656), 553–597.

Digkoglou, P., Tsaples, G., Dargam, F., Linden, I., & Mareschal, B. (2018). *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Decision Support System Technology–ICDSST 2018 & PROMETHEE DAYS 2018: Sustainable Data-Driven & Evidence-based Decision Support with applications to the Environment and Energy sector* (Vol. 4). EWG-DSS.

Elliott, R. H., Rosenbaum-Elliott, R., Percy, L., & Pervan, S. (2015). *Strategic brand management*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Guo, Z., Fang, F., & Whinston, A. B. (2006). Supply chain information sharing in a macro prediction market. *Decision Support Systems*, *42*(3), 1944–1958.

Hu, H., Wen, Y., Chua, T.-S., & Li, X. (2014). Toward scalable systems for big data analytics: A technology tutorial. *IEEE Access*, *2*, 652–687.

Jainarain, R. (2012). *Attributes that influence Generation-Y consumers in their choice of Smartphone*. University of Pretoria.

Kennedy, G. E., Judd, T. S., Churchward, A., Gray, K., & Krause, K.-L. (2008). First year students' experiences with technology: Are they really digital natives? *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *24*(1).

Langford, M. (1998). *Advanced photography*. Taylor & Francis.

Liu, B., Hu, M., & Cheng, J. (2005). Opinion observer: analyzing and comparing opinions on the web. *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 342–351.

Lord, G. D., & Lord, B. (2017). *Manual of Digital Museum Planning*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Luo, W. (1993). *Imprecise probability and decision in civil engineering: Dempster-Shafer theory and application*. University of British Columbia.

Martínez-Díaz, M. (2022). Travel Time Information Revisited. In *The Evolution of Travel Time Information Systems: The Role of Comprehensive Traffic Models and Improvements Towards Cooperative Driving Environments* (pp. 31–64). Springer.

Mun, J. (2012). *Real options analysis: Tools and techniques for valuing strategic investments and decisions* (Vol. 320). John Wiley & Sons.

Opreana, A., & Vinerean, S. (2015). A new development in online marketing: Introducing digital inbound marketing. *Expert Journal of Marketing*, *3*(1).

Pozo, A. P., Toksvig, M., Schrager, T. F., Hsu, J., Mathur, U., Sorkine-Hornung, A., Szeliski, R., & Cabral, B. (2019). An integrated 6DoF video camera and system design. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, *38*(6), 1–16.

Psarommatis, F., & Kiritsis, D. (2022). A hybrid Decision Support System for automating decision making in the event of defects in the era of Zero Defect Manufacturing. *Journal of Industrial Information Integration*, *26*, 100263.

Shibl, R., Lawley, M., & Debuse, J. (2013). Factors influencing decision support system acceptance. *Decision Support Systems*, *54*(2), 953–961.

Xiang, Z., Du, Q., Ma, Y., & Fan, W. (2017). A comparative analysis of major online review platforms: Implications for social media analytics in hospitality and tourism. *Tourism Management*, *58*, 51–65.

Zhao, K., Li, L., Chen, Z., Sun, R., Yuan, G., & Li, J. (2022). A survey: Optimization and applications of evidence fusion algorithm based on Dempster–Shafer theory. *Applied Soft Computing*, *124*, 109075.
Zhong, R. Y., Xu, X., Klotz, E., & Newman, S. T. (2017). Intelligent manufacturing in the context of industry 4.0: a review. *Engineering*, *3*(5), 616–630.