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In this paper, we develop a multiattribute group decision-making (MAGDM) method to solve problems with interactive attributes under interval-valued $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy set (IVq-ROFS) environment. Firstly, the interval-valued $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy Choquet integral average (IVq-ROFCA) operator is proposed to aggregate interval-valued $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy information. Then, we investigate the interval-valued $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy Choquet integral geometric (IVq-ROFCG) operator and offer several related properties. More importantly, for handling problems with interdependence between attributes for IVq-ROFS, a MAGDM method is developed based on the IVq-ROFCA operator. Finally, an example of the warning management system for hypertension is given to illustrate the proposed method, and parameter analysis and comparison analysis further verify the feasibility and validity of the proposed method.

1. Introduction

As a powerful and practical approach, fuzzy set (FS) [1] has been deeply used in various areas, such as medical treatment, manufacturing, and education. With the increase in people’s awareness of complex and uncertain issues, fuzzy theories and methods have received great attention [2–5]. Since decision-makers need to deal with the possibilities of support, opposition, and neutrality in real life, Atanassov [6] proposed the intuitionistic fuzzy set (IFS), that is, the sum of the membership degree ($u$) and the nonmembership degree ($v$) satisfies $u + v \leq 1$. In response to the condition $u + v > 1$, Yager [7] investigated the Pythagorean fuzzy set (PFS) ($u^2 + v^2 \leq 1$). As a wider range compared with intuitionistic fuzzy, Verma and Merigo [8] defined a generalized hybrid trigonometric Pythagorean fuzzy similarity measure and developed the approach for Pythagorean fuzzy decision-making; Bakioglu and Atahan [9] addressed the prioritization of risks involved with self-driving vehicles by the proposed new hybrid MCDM method based on AHP and TOPSIS VIKOR under Pythagorean fuzzy environment; Peng and Yang [10] defined interval-valued Pythagorean fuzzy sets (IVPFSs) and developed two interval-valued Pythagorean fuzzy aggregation operators to solve MAGDM problems. Gradually, for dealing with much more complicated problems, Yager [11] proposed the $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy set ($q$-ROFS) ($u^q + v^q \leq 1, q \geq 1$) in 2016 and extended the fuzzy set to a wider range of applications based on the different values of $q$. Researchers have put forward numerous excellent results in recent years. Yager et al. [12, 13] further deduced the related properties and mathematical principles of $q$-ROFS. Liu and Wang proposed several weighted average operators of $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy numbers ($q$-ROFNs) [14]. Liu and Liu developed the $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy Bonferroni mean operator to deal with problems [15]. Xing et al. [16] developed the $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy point weighted aggregation operator and applied it to $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy decision-making. Garg investigated the trigonometric operation-based $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy aggregation operator for processing fuzzy information [17] and introduced a novel concept of the connection number-based $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy set (CN-$q$-ROFS) [18]. Hussain et al. [19] proposed $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy soft weighted averaging, $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy soft ordered weighted averaging, and $q$-rung orthopair fuzzy soft hybrid averaging operators. Verma [20] defined two order-$\alpha$
divergence measures for q-ROFS to quantify the information of discrimination that determine completely unknown or partially known attribute weights. Aydemir and Gunduz [21] presented neutrality average and neutrality geometric aggregation operators and further designed a general score function for q-ROFS based on power aggregation operators. Liu et al. [22] constructed the normalized bidirectional projection model and generalized knowledge-based entropy measure under q-rung orthopair fuzzy environment. In particular, it is better to address strongly uncertain decision-making problems via IVq-ROFS, such that Garg [23] defined q-connection numbers (q-CNs) and gave some new q-exponential operation laws (q-EOLs) and operators over q-CNs for IVq-ROFS and presented the possibility of comparison between IVq-ROFSs [24]. Garg [25] introduced a novel concept of interval-valued q-rung orthopair fuzzy preference relations (IVq-ROFPRs) and then proposed additive consistent of IVq-ROFPR and programming model to derive the weights of alternatives.

However, attributes are not independent in decision-making, and there are more mutual influences and correlations that can be appropriately solved by the Choquet integral [26]. The Choquet integral comes with decision-making problems with independent attributes in hand [27–29], which had been conducted in an in-depth research study Tan and Chen defined the intuitionistic of the fuzzy measure based on the Choquet integral [30] and investigated the induced Choquet ordered averaging operator for aggregating expert evaluation [31].

Tan and Chen defined the intuitionistic of the fuzzy measure based on the Choquet integral [30] and investigated the induced Choquet ordered averaging operator for aggregating expert evaluation [31].

Although the aforementioned studies brilliantly handle complex decision-making problems, they cannot be applied to the decision-making problem where attributes are dependent under the interval-valued q-rung orthopair fuzzy environment. Accordingly, this paper develops two interval-valued q-rung orthopair fuzzy Choquet integral operators for aggregating fuzzy information. Subsequently, a MAGDM method is constructed by employing the proposed IVq-ROFCA operator, where interaction attributes of alternatives among the MAGDM problem are taken into account. Finally, compared with existing methods, the practicability and superiority of the proposed method are demonstrated.

The remainder of this paper is constructed as follows: Section 2 reviews the concept of the IVq-ROFS and Choquet integral operator, Section 3 proposes the IVq-ROFCA operator and the IVq-ROFCG operator and extends several weighted and ordered operators, Section 4 introduces a MAGDM method based on the IVq-ROFCA operator, Section 5 gives an illustrated case and then provides parameter analysis and comparison analysis, and Section 6 concludes this paper.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we make a brief review of the IVq-ROFS and Choquet integral.

Definition 1 (see [11]). Let \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \) be a fixed set, \( a = \{x_1, t_\alpha(x_1), f_\alpha(x_1) | x_1 \in X\} \) is a q-ROFS, where \( t_\alpha: X \rightarrow [0, 1], f_\alpha: X \rightarrow [0, 1] \) and the following equation holds:

\[
0 \leq (t_\alpha(x_i))^q + (f_\alpha(x_i))^q \leq 1, \tag{1}
\]

where \( q \geq 1 \). For all \( x_i \in X, t_\alpha(x_i) \) is the degree of membership, \( f_\alpha(x_i) \) is the degree of nonmembership, and the degree of indeterminacy \( \pi_\alpha(x_i) \) is shown in as follows:

\[
\pi_\alpha(x_i) = \sqrt{1 - (t_\alpha(x_i))^q} - (f_\alpha(x_i))^q (q \geq 1). \tag{2}
\]

Definition 2 (see [39]). Given a fixed set \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}, \) IVq-ROFS \( a \) on \( X \) is defined as

\[
a = \{x_i, t_\alpha(x_i), f_\alpha(x_i) | x_i \in X\}. \tag{3}
\]

The membership is represented by interval values \( t_\alpha(x_i) = [t^*_\alpha(x_i), t^*_\alpha(x_i)] \in [0, 1] \) and the nonmembership \( f_\alpha(x_i) = [f^*_\alpha(x_i), f^*_\alpha(x_i)] \in [0, 1], 0 \leq (t^*_\alpha(x_i))^q + (f^*_\alpha(x_i))^q \leq 1, (q \geq 1) \). The indeterminacy degree of \( a \) is shown as follows:

\[
\pi_\alpha(x_i) = [\pi^*_\alpha(x_i), \pi^*_\alpha(x_i)] = \left[ \sqrt{1 - (t^*_\alpha(x_i))^q} - (f^*_\alpha(x_i))^q, \sqrt{1 - (t^*_\alpha(x_i))^q} - (f^*_\alpha(x_i))^q \right]. \tag{4}
\]

In particular, IVq-ROFS extends the application of interval-valued fuzzy sets in decision-making problems. When \( q = 1 \), IVq-ROFS would reduce to the interval-valued...
intuitionistic fuzzy set (IVIFS); when $q = 2$, IVq-ROFS would transform to IVPFS.

\[ a_1 \oplus a_2 = \left< \frac{\sqrt{\left( t_{a_1}^+ \right)^q + \left( t_{a_2}^+ \right)^q - \left( t_{a_1}^- \right)^q - \left( t_{a_2}^- \right)^q}}{\sqrt{\left( t_{a_1}^+ \right)^q + \left( t_{a_2}^+ \right)^q - \left( t_{a_1}^- \right)^q - \left( t_{a_2}^- \right)^q}}, \left[ f_{a_1}^-, f_{a_2}^+, f_{a_2}^-, f_{a_2}^- \right] \right> \tag{5} \]

\[ a_1 \otimes a_2 = \left< \left[ t_{a_1}^+, t_{a_1}^-, t_{a_2}^+, t_{a_2}^- \right], \frac{\sqrt{\left( f_{a_1}^+ \right)^q + \left( f_{a_2}^+ \right)^q - \left( f_{a_1}^- \right)^q - \left( f_{a_2}^- \right)^q}}{\sqrt{\left( f_{a_1}^+ \right)^q + \left( f_{a_2}^+ \right)^q - \left( f_{a_1}^- \right)^q - \left( f_{a_2}^- \right)^q}}, \left( f_{a_1}^+ \right)^q, \left( f_{a_2}^+ \right)^q, \left( f_{a_1}^- \right)^q, \left( f_{a_2}^- \right)^q \right> \tag{6} \]

\[ \lambda a_1 = \left< \frac{\sqrt{1 - \left( 1 - \left( t_{a_1}^+ \right)^q \right)^\lambda}}{\sqrt{1 - \left( 1 - \left( t_{a_1}^- \right)^q \right)^\lambda}}, \frac{\sqrt{1 - \left( 1 - \left( f_{a_1}^+ \right)^q \right)^\lambda}}{\sqrt{1 - \left( 1 - \left( f_{a_1}^- \right)^q \right)^\lambda}}, 1 \right> \tag{7} \]

\[ a_1^+ = \left< \left( t_{a_1}^+ \right)^q, \left( t_{a_1}^- \right)^q \right>, \frac{\sqrt{1 - \left( 1 - \left( f_{a_1}^+ \right)^q \right)^\lambda}}{\sqrt{1 - \left( 1 - \left( f_{a_1}^- \right)^q \right)^\lambda}} \right> \tag{8} \]

\[ S(a) = \frac{1}{2} \left< \left( t_{a_1}^+ \right)^q + \left( t_{a_2}^+ \right)^q - \left( f_{a_1}^+ \right)^q - \left( f_{a_2}^+ \right)^q \right> \tag{9} \]

\[ H(a) = \frac{1}{2} \left< \left( t_{a_1}^- \right)^q + \left( t_{a_2}^- \right)^q + \left( f_{a_1}^+ \right)^q + \left( f_{a_2}^+ \right)^q \right> \tag{10} \]

\[ \int f \, d\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(x_{\sigma(i)}) \left[ \mu(B_{\sigma(i)}) - \mu(B_{\sigma(i-1)}) \right] \tag{11} \]

\[ (C_1) \int a \, d\mu = IVq-ROFCA \left( a(x_1), a(x_2), \ldots, a(x_n) \right) \]

\[ = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ \mu(B_{\sigma(i)}) - \mu(B_{\sigma(i-1)}) \right] a(x_{\sigma(i)}) \tag{12} \]

\[ (\sigma(1), \sigma(2), \ldots, \sigma(n)) \text{ denotes a permutation of } (1, 2, \ldots, n) \]

3. Several Interval-Valued $q$-Rung Orthopair Fuzzy Choquet Integral Operators

In this section, we investigate IVq-ROFCA and IVq-ROFCG operators, discuss their properties, and extend their weighted operators.

3.1. IVq-ROFCA

\[ a_1 = \left< [t_{a_1}^-, t_{a_1}^+], [f_{a_1}^-, f_{a_1}^+] \right> \]

Definition 8. Let $\mu$ be the fuzzy measure on the nonempty finite set $X = \{ x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \}$ ($\mu(\emptyset) = 0$) and $a(x_i) = \left< [t_{a_1}^-(x_i), t_{a_1}^+(x_i)], [f_{a_1}^-(x_i), f_{a_1}^+(x_i)] \right>$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$) be IVq-ROFS. The IVq-ROFCA operator is defined as

\[ \left( C_1 \right) \int a \, d\mu = IVq-ROFCA \left( a(x_1), a(x_2), \ldots, a(x_n) \right) \]

\[ = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ \mu(B_{\sigma(i)}) - \mu(B_{\sigma(i-1)}) \right] a(x_{\sigma(i)}) \]
ROFCA operator aggregates information according to the fuzzy measures between attributes, and it is easy to find that the aggregation results obtained are still IVq-ROFNs.

\[ IVq - ROFCA(a(x_1), a(x_2), \ldots, a(x_n)) \]

\[ = \left\langle \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( 1 - t_a^\mu(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{q \mu(B_{\sigma(i-1)}) - \mu(B_{\sigma(i-1)})}, \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( f_a^\mu(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{q \mu(B_{\sigma(i)} - \mu(B_{\sigma(i-1)}}) \right\rangle. \]  

**Proof.** Based on Definition 3, we prove equation (13) by mathematical induction.

If \( n = 2 \),

\[ IVq - ROFCA(a(x_1), a(x_2)) = \left\langle \prod_{i=1}^{2} \left( \mu(B_{\sigma(i)}) - \mu(B_{\sigma(i-1)}) \right) a(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right\rangle. \]  

If \( n = k \),

\[ IVq - ROFCA(a(x_1), a(x_2), \ldots, a(x_k)) \]

\[ = \left\langle \prod_{i=1}^{k} \left( 1 - t_a^\mu(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{q \mu(B_{\sigma(i-1)}) - \mu(B_{\sigma(i-1)})}, \prod_{i=1}^{k} \left( f_a^\mu(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{q \mu(B_{\sigma(i)} - \mu(B_{\sigma(i-1)}}) \right\rangle. \]  

If \( n = k + 1 \), the results of IVq-ROFCA are as follows:

**Theorem 1.** For IVq-ROFNs \( a(x_i) = [t_a^{-1}(x_i), t_a^+(x_i)] \), \( f_a^{-1}(x_i), f_a^+(x_i)] \), \( (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n) \), \( \mu(\emptyset) = 0 \) is the fuzzy measure on the nonempty finite set \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \), and the IVq-ROFCA operator can be expressed as
\[ IV_q - ROFCA (a(x_1), a(x_2), \ldots, a(x_{k+1})) = \prod_{i=1}^{k+1} [\mu (B_{\sigma (i)}) - \mu (B_{\sigma (i-1)})] a(x_{\sigma (i)}) \]

\[ = \prod_{i=1}^{k} [\mu (B_{\sigma (i)}) - \mu (B_{\sigma (i-1)})] a(x_{\sigma (i)}) \Phi [\mu (B_{\sigma (k+1)}) - \mu (B_{\sigma (k)})] a(x_{\sigma (k+1)}) \]

Equation (13) holds, and Theorem 1 holds.

Example 1. Suppose there are three suppliers \( \{ x_1, x_2, x_3 \} \) to be chosen. The core competitiveness of suppliers can be evaluated by three criteria \( \{ C_1, C_2, C_3 \} \): \( C_1 \) denotes the level of technological innovation, \( C_2 \) denotes the ability of circulation control, and \( C_3 \) denotes the capability of management. The decision matrix \( A = (a_{ij})_{3 \times 3} \) is generated by evaluation of experts, in which the IVq-ROFN evaluation values \( a_{ij} = < [t^-_{aij}, f^-_{aij}], [f^+_{aij}, t^+_{aij}] > (i, j = 1, 2, 3) \) are represented in Table 1. Now, it needs to evaluate the core competitiveness of \( \{ x_1, x_2, x_3 \} \) according to the decision matrix \( A \), which provides the reference for the manufacturing enterprise to select the best solution. The fuzzy measure \( \mu \) between attributes is set as follows:

\[ \mu (\emptyset) = 0, \]
\[ \mu (\{ C_1, C_2, C_3 \}) = 1, \]
\[ \mu (\{ C_1 \}) = \mu (\{ C_2 \}) = 0.4, \]
\[ \mu (\{ C_3 \}) = 0.3, \]
\[ \mu (\{ C_1, C_2 \}) = 0.5, \]
\[ \mu (\{ C_1, C_3 \}) = \mu (\{ C_2, C_3 \}) = 0.8. \]

Let \( q = 3 \), all the IVq-ROFNs in \( A \) satisfy \( t^-_{aij} + f^-_{aij} \leq 1 \), and the results are obtained as follows:

\[ r_1 = IV_q - ROFCA (x_1 (C_1), x_1 (C_2), x_1 (C_3)) \]
\[ = < [0.57, 0.77], [0.39, 0.54] >, \]
\[ r_2 = IV_q - ROFCA (x_2 (C_1), x_2 (C_2), x_2 (C_3)) \]
\[ = < [0.49, 0.70], [0.41, 0.57] >, \]
\[ r_3 = IV_q - ROFCA (x_3 (C_1), x_3 (C_2), x_3 (C_3)) \]
\[ = < [0.52, 0.72], [0.34, 0.46] >. \]

It is easy to find \( r_1, r_2, \) and \( r_3 \) are IVq-ROFNs. According to equation (9), \( S(r_1) > S(r_2) > S(r_3) \) can be derived, which indicates that the supplier \( x_1 \) is better than \( x_2 \) and \( x_3 \).

Theorem 2. Suppose \( a_i = < [t^-_{a_i}, t^+_{a_i}], [f^-_{a_i}, f^+_{a_i}] > (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n) \) are IVq-ROFNs, \( \mu \) is the fuzzy measure on a nonempty finite set \( X = \{ x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \} \), and then, the following four properties of the IVq-ROFCA operator hold:

1. Idempotency: for an IVq-ROFN \( a = < [t^-_{a}, t^+_{a}], [f^-_{a}, f^+_{a}] > \), if \( a_i = a (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n) \), then \( IV_q - ROFCA (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) = a \)
2. Boundedness: if \( a_{\min} = < [\min (t^-_{a}), \min (t^+_{a})], [\max (f^-_{a}), \max (f^+_{a})] > \) and \( a_{\max} = < [\max (t^-_{a}), \max (t^+_{a})], [\min (f^-_{a}), \min (f^+_{a})] > \), then \( a_{\min} \leq IV_q - ROFCA (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \leq a_{\max} \)
3. Commutativity: suppose \( (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \) is a permutation of \( (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \), then \( IV_q - ROFCA (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) = IV_q - ROFCA (a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_n) \)
4. Monotonicity: if \( \beta_i = < [t^-_{\beta_i}, t^+_{\beta_i}], [f^-_{\beta_i}, f^+_{\beta_i}] > (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n) \) are IVq-ROFNs and \( t^-_{\beta_i} + f^-_{\beta_i} \leq t^-_{\beta_i} + f^-_{\beta_i} \leq t^+_{\beta_i} + f^+_{\beta_i} \leq t^+_{\beta_i} + f^+_{\beta_i} \), then \( IV_q - ROFCA (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) = IV_q - ROFCA (a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_n) \)
The proof of Theorem 2 is given as follows.

Proof. (1) Because all elements in the $a_i$ are equal and $a_i = a$,

The proof of Theorem 2 is given as follows.

\[
\mu(x_i) = \frac{1}{n} \text{ and } \mu(B_{a(i)}) = \mu(B_{a(i-1)})
\]

IVq - ROFCA($a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n$)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\sqrt{\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(1 - t_{a(i)}^{-q}\right)^{1/n}} \mu(B_{a(i)}) - \mu(B_{a(i-1)}) \\
\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( \mu(B_{a(i)}) \right) - \mu(B_{a(i-1)})
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
\sqrt{\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(1 - t_{a(i)}^{-q}\right)^{1/n}} \left( f_{a(i)}^{-q} \right)^{1/n} \\
\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( f_{a(i)}^{-q} \right)^{1/n}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
\sqrt{\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(1 - t_{a(i)}^{-q}\right)^{1/n}} \left( f_{a(i)}^{-q} \right)^{1/n} \\
\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( f_{a(i)}^{-q} \right)^{1/n}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
\sqrt{\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(1 - t_{a(i)}^{-q}\right)^{1/n}} \left( f_{a(i)}^{-q} \right)^{1/n} \\
\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( f_{a(i)}^{-q} \right)^{1/n}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
\sqrt{\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(1 - t_{a(i)}^{-q}\right)^{1/n}} \left( f_{a(i)}^{-q} \right)^{1/n} \\
\prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( f_{a(i)}^{-q} \right)^{1/n}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(2) According to equation (9), it can be seen that

\[
S(a_{\min}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\min(t_{a(i)})^q + (\min(t_{a(i)})^q) - (\max(t_{a(i)})^q - (\max(t_{a(i)})^q) \right]
\]

\[
S(a_{\max}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\max(t_{a(i)})^q + (\max(t_{a(i)})^q) - (\min(t_{a(i)})^q - (\min(t_{a(i)})^q) \right]
\]

For any $t_{a(i)}$, it satisfies

---

**Table 1**: Decision matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{3x3}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$C_1$</th>
<th>$C_2$</th>
<th>$C_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_1$</td>
<td>$[0.6, 0.8]$, $[0.3, 0.5]$</td>
<td>$[0.3, 0.4]$, $[0.5, 0.6]$</td>
<td>$[0.5, 0.6]$, $[0.4, 0.5]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_2$</td>
<td>$[0.6, 0.8]$, $[0.3, 0.5]$</td>
<td>$[0.3, 0.4]$, $[0.5, 0.7]$</td>
<td>$[0.4, 0.7]$, $[0.3, 0.5]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_3$</td>
<td>$[0.3, 0.4]$, $[0.5, 0.6]$</td>
<td>$[0.4, 0.6]$, $[0.4, 0.5]$</td>
<td>$[0.5, 0.7]$, $[0.3, 0.5]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarly,\[
\begin{align*}
(\min(t_{a_i}))^q &\leq (t_{a_i})^q, \\
\geq (\max(t_{a_i}))^q, \\
\geq 1 - (t_{a_i})^q;
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - (\min(t_{a_i}))^q)^{\mu(B_{a_{i0}}) - \mu(B_{a_{i-1}})}
\geq \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - (t_{a_i})^q)^{\mu(B_{a_{i0}}) - \mu(B_{a_{i-1}})}
\geq \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - (\max(t_{a_i}))^q)^{\mu(B_{a_{i0}}) - \mu(B_{a_{i-1}})} \tag{21}
\]
\[
1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - (\min(t_{a_i}))^q)^{\mu(B_{a_{i0}}) - \mu(B_{a_{i-1}})}
\leq 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - (t_{a_i})^q)^{\mu(B_{a_{i0}}) - \mu(B_{a_{i-1}})}
\leq 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - (\max(t_{a_i}))^q)^{\mu(B_{a_{i0}}) - \mu(B_{a_{i-1}})}.
\]

Namely,

\[
IVq - ROFCA(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) = \begin{bmatrix}
\sqrt{1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - t_{a_{i0}}^{-q})^{\mu(B_{a_{i0}}) - \mu(B_{a_{i-1}})}} \\
\sqrt{1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - t_{a_{i0}}^{-q})^{\mu(B_{a_{i0}}) - \mu(B_{a_{i-1}})}}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\prod_{i=1}^{n}(f_{a_{i0}}-)^{\mu(B_{a_{i0}}) - \mu(B_{a_{i-1}})} \\
\prod_{i=1}^{n}(f_{a_{i0}}-)^{\mu(B_{a_{i0}}) - \mu(B_{a_{i-1}})}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
= IVq - ROFCA(a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_n). \tag{25}
\]

(4) Based on \(t_{a_i} \leq t_{b_i}^q\) and Definition 8, it can be found that

\[
t_{a_{i0}}^{-q} \leq t_{b_{i0}}^{-q},
\]
\[
1 - t_{a_{i0}}^{-q} \geq 1 - t_{b_{i0}}^{-q}. \tag{26}
\]

Thus,

\[
\prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - t_{a_{i0}}^{-q})^{\mu(B_{a_{i0}}) - \mu(B_{a_{i-1}})} \geq \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - t_{b_{i0}}^{-q})^{\mu(B_{a_{i0}}) - \mu(B_{a_{i-1}})} \tag{27}
\]

Similarly,
According to Definition 6, it is obviously discovered that \( IVq - ROFCA(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \leq IVq - ROFCA(\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_n) \). □

For some special relationships that exist between evaluation values in decision-making, we then develop the following operators to facilitate calculation.

\[
\begin{align*}
\sqrt[n]{1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - t_{a(x_i)}^{q})} & \cdot \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n}(f_{a(x_i)})^{q} \right] \\
\prod_{i=1}^{n}(f_{a(x_i)})^{q} & \geq \prod_{i=1}^{n}(f_{a(x_i)})^{q} \\
\prod_{i=1}^{n}(f_{a(x_i)})^{q} & \geq \prod_{i=1}^{n}(f_{a(x_i)})^{q} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(28)

(3) If \( (B_t) = Q(\sum_{i \in B} \mu\{x_i\}) \) for all \( B \subseteq X \), where \( Qs \) is a basic unit-interval monotonic function, satisfies monotonicity in \([0, 1]\) and follows properties: (i) \( Q(0) = 0 \); (ii) \( Q(1) = 1 \); (iii) for \( x < y \), \( Q(x) \geq Q(y) \). For \( w_i = \mu(B_{\sigma(i)}) - \mu(B_{\sigma(i-1)}) = Q(\sum_{i \in B} \mu\{x_i\}) \)\( (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n) \), where \( w = (w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n) \) and \( \sum w_i = 1 \), then the IVq-ROFCG operator changes to the interval-valued q-rung orthopair fuzzy order weighted Choquet average (IVq-ROFOWCA) operator that is proposed as

\[
\begin{align*}
IVq - ROFOWCA(a(x_1), a(x_2), \ldots, a(x_n)) &= \\
&= \left[ \sqrt[n]{1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - t_{a(x_i)}^{q})} \right]^{w_i} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n}(f_{a(x_i)})^{q} \right]^{w_i} \\
&\geq \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n}(f_{a(x_i)})^{q} \right]^{w_i} \geq \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n}(f_{a(x_i)})^{q} \right]^{w_i} > .
\end{align*}
\]

(29)

3.2. IVq-ROFCG

Definition 10. Let \( \mu \) be the fuzzy measure on the nonempty finite set \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \) \( (\mu(\emptyset) = 0) \) and \( a(x_i) = \{t_{a(x_i)}^{q}, f_{a(x_i)}^{q}\} \) \( (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n) \) be IVq-ROFNS.

\[
\begin{align*}
IVq - ROFCG(a(x_1), a(x_2), \ldots, a(x_n)) &= \\
&= \left[ \sqrt[n]{1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - t_{a(x_i)}^{q})} \right]^{w_i} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n}(f_{a(x_i)})^{q} \right]^{w_i} \\
&\geq \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n}(f_{a(x_i)})^{q} \right]^{w_i} \geq \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n}(f_{a(x_i)})^{q} \right]^{w_i} > .
\end{align*}
\]

(30)

Especially, if \( \mu\{x_i\} = (1/n) \) \( (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n) \), then the IVq-ROFCG operator reduces to the IVq-ROFOCA operator. In addition, we develop the IVq-ROFCG operator in Section 3.2.
**Theorem 3.** If $\mu$ is the fuzzy measure on the nonempty finite set $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$ and $a(x_i) = \langle t_{a_i}(x_i), t^*_{a_i}(x_i) \rangle$, $[f_a^- (x_i), f_a^+ (x_i)] > (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$ are IVq-ROFNs, $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$. Then, the IVq-ROFCG operator is represented by

$$
IVq - ROFCG(a(x_1), a(x_2), \ldots, a(x_n)) = \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( t_{a_i}(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{\mu(B_{a_i}) - \mu(B_{a_i-1})} \right] \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( t^*_{a_i}(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{\mu(B_{a_i}) - \mu(B_{a_i-1})} \right] > .
$$

(33)

The proof of Theorem 3 is similar to Theorem 1, and the proof is omitted.

**Theorem 4.** If $a_i = \langle t_{a_i}, t^*_{a_i} \rangle$, $[f_a^- , f_a^+] > (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$ is a set of IVq-ROFNs, $\mu$ is the fuzzy measure on the nonempty finite set $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$, then the following properties of the IVq-ROFCG operator hold:

1. **Idempotency:** for an IVq-ROFN $a = \langle t_a, t^*_{a} \rangle$, $[f_a^- , f_a^+]$, if $a_i = a$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$, then $IVq - ROFCG(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) = a$.

2. **Boundedness:** if $a_{min} = \langle \min(t^-_a), \min(t^*_a) \rangle$, $\max(f^-_a), \max(f^+_a)$ and $a_{max} = \langle \max(t^-_a), \max(t^*_a) \rangle$, $\min(f^-_a), \min(f^+_a)$, then $a_{min} \leq IVq - ROFCG(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \leq a_{max}$.

3. **Commutativity:** suppose that $(a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_n)$ is a permutation of $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$, then $IVq - ROFCG(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) = IVq - ROFCG(a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_n)$.

(4) **Monotonicity:** if $\beta_i = \langle t^-_{\beta_i}, t^*_\beta_i \rangle$, $[f^-_{\beta_i}, f^+_{\beta_i}] > (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$ is a set of IVq-ROFNs and $t^-_{a_i} \leq t^-_{\beta_i}, t^*_a \leq t^*_{\beta_i}$, $f^-_a \geq f^-_{\beta_i}, f^+_a \geq f^+_{\beta_i}$, then $IVq - ROFCG(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \leq IVq - ROFCG(\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_n)$.

The proof of Theorem 4 is similar to Theorem 2, and the proof is omitted.

**Definition 11.** Let $\mu$ be the fuzzy measure on the nonempty finite set $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$ ($\mu(\emptyset) = 0$) and $a(x_i) = \langle t_{a_i}(x_i), t^*_{a_i}(x_i) \rangle$, $[f_a^- (x_i), f_a^+ (x_i)] > (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$ be n IVq-ROFNs. Then,

(1) If $\mu (B \cup C) = \mu (B) + \mu (C)$ for all $B, C \subseteq X$, $B \cap C = \emptyset$, and it is independent for any elements in $X$ that means $\mu (B) = \sum_{x \in B} \mu(\{x\})$. Then, the IVq-ROFCG operator transforms to the interval-valued q-run orthopair fuzzy weighted Choquet geometric (IVq-ROFWCG) operator that is represented by

$$
IVq - ROFWCG(a(x_1), a(x_2), \ldots, a(x_n)) = \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( t_{a_i}(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{\mu(\{x_i\})} \right] \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( t^*_{a_i}(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{\mu(\{x_i\})} \right] > .
$$

(34)

(2) If $\mu (B) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i$ for all $B \subseteq X$, we have $\lambda_i = \mu(B_{a_i}) - \mu(B_{a_i-1})$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$), where $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_n)^T$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i = 1 (\lambda_i \geq 0)$, the IVq-ROFCG operator reduces to the interval-valued q-run orthopair fuzzy order Choquet geometric (IVq-ROFOCG) operator expressed by

$$
IVq - ROFOCG(a(x_1), a(x_2), \ldots, a(x_n)) = \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( t_{a_i}(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{\lambda_i} \right] \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( t^*_{a_i}(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{\lambda_i} \right] > .
$$

(35)
(3) If \( \mu(B) = Q(\sum_{x \in B} \mu([x_i]), \forall B \subseteq X \) when \( Q \) is a basic unit-interval monotonic function, satisfies monotonicity in [0,1], and follows properties: (i) \( Q(0) = 0 \); (ii) \( Q(1) = 1 \); (iii) \( Q(x) \geq Q(y) \) for \( x > y \). Then, we let \( w_i = \mu(B_{q(i)}) - \mu(B_{q(i-1)}) = Q(\sum_{x \in [x_i])} \mu([x_i])) - Q(\sum_{x \in [x_i])} \mu([x_i])) (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n) \), where \( w = (w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n)^T \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = 1 (w_i \geq 0) \). Then, the IVq-ROFCA operator changes to the interval-valued q-rung orthopair fuzzy order weighted Choquet geometric (IVq-ROFOWCG) operator that is shown as

\[
IVq - ROFOWCG((a(\{x_1\}), a(\{x_2\}), \ldots, a(\{x_n\})) = \\
\left[ \frac{n}{i=1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \left( 1 - f_{a}([x_i]))^{q} \right)^{w_{i}} \right) \right]^{q} - \left[ \frac{n}{i=1} \left( 1 - f_{a}([x_i]))^{q} \right)^{w_{i}} \right]^{q}.
\]

Equation (36)

Especially, if \( \mu([x_i]) = (1/n) (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n) \), it is obvious to find that the IVq-ROFOWCG operator reduces to the IVq-ROFOCG operator.

4. A MAGDM Method Based on the IVq-ROFCA Operator

In this section, we develop a MAGDM method based on the IVq-ROFCA operator. For a MAGDM problem, \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m\} \) is the set of alternatives, \( C = \{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n\} \) is the set of interaction between attributes, and \( \mu(C_i) (j = 1, 2, \ldots, n) \) is the fuzzy measure of attributes, \( e = \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_l\} \) indicates the set of experts, and \( \mu(e_k) (k = 1, 2, \ldots, l) \) is the fuzzy measure of experts. For each expert, a decision matrix of different alternatives is \( A = (a_{ij})_{m \times n} = \{x_{a_{i}}, f_{a_{i}}\}, [f_{a_{i}}, f_{a_{j}}] > \) where \( a_{ij} \) are IVq-ROFNs that satisfy \( (x_{a_{i}})^{q} + (f_{a_{i}})^{q} \leq 1 (q \geq 1) \). For the \( k \)th expert \( e_k \), the decision matrix is expressed as \( A^{(k)} = (a_{ij}^{(k)})_{m \times n}, a_{ij}^{(k)} \) denotes the \( k \)th expert’s evaluation of alternative \( x_i \) with the attribute \( C_j \). Because of the differences between physical dimensions of attributes, the decision matrix needs to be standardized. Correspondingly, \( \Omega_i \) indicates the benefit type and \( \Omega_k \) indicates the cost type, and the standardization processing is shown in equation (37) and the complement operation of fuzzy numbers is shown in equation (38):

\[
\begin{align*}
\left( a_{ij}^{(k)} \right)_{c} & = \left( a_{ij}^{(k)} \right)_{e}, a_{ij}^{(k)} \in \Omega_i, \quad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, m, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n), \quad \text{equation (37)} \\
\left( a_{ij}^{(k)} \right)_{e} & = -\left( a_{ij}^{(k)} \right)_{c}, a_{ij}^{(k)} \in \Omega_k, \quad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, m, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n). \quad \text{equation (38)}
\end{align*}
\]

The steps of the MAGDM method based on the IVq-ROFCA operator are as follows:

(1) According to the evaluation matrix given by experts, the appropriate value of \( q \) is chosen. When the amount of data is small, the value of \( q \) can be determined by observation. If the amount of data is large, \( q \) can be determined by the traversal method utilizing \( (x_{a_{i}})^{q} + (f_{a_{i}})^{q} \leq 1 (q \geq 1) \).

(2) Using equations (37) and (38), the decision matrix \( A^{(k)} \) is converted into the standardize matrix \( A^{(k)}_{e} \).

(3) \( A^{(k)}_{e} = (a_{ij}^{(k)})_{m \times n} \) is aggregated into \( R = (r_{ij})_{m \times n} \) employing the IVq-ROFCA operator, and the collective matrix is derived by

\[
R_{ij} = IVq - ROFCA\left( a_{ij}^{(1)}, a_{ij}^{(2)}, \ldots, a_{ij}^{(l)} \right) (i = 1, 2, \ldots, m, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n), \quad \text{equation (39)}
\]

(5) The score value and the accuracy value of \( r_{ij} \) are obtained according to equations (9) and (10), which determine the ranking of alternatives.

5. Case of the Warning Management System for Hypertension

5.1. Decision Result by the Proposed MAGDM Method.

In order to manage the efficiency of doctors, we...
plan to develop a daily follow-up warning management system for hypertension. The warning degrees are divided into five levels that are represented in five colors denoted by $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5\}$. $x_1$ indicates that the resident shall seek treatment immediately, showing red; $x_2$ indicates the resident needs treatment in time, showing orange; $x_3$ indicates the resident should be treated for the timely follow-up to promote management, showing yellow; $x_4$ indicates that blood pressure management may be required in the future, showing blue; and $x_5$ indicates that the blood pressure of the resident is normal, and the color is green. The warning levels are related to numerous factors of hypertension patients, among which the blood pressure measurements, related diseases, related risk factors, and follow-up time intervals are represented as the attributes denoted by $C = [C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4]$. From a managerial perspective, $C_1$, $C_2$, and $C_3$ are benefit types, and $C_4$ is the cost type. With different importance, the fuzzy measures of attributes are listed in Table 2.

Table 2: The fuzzy measures of attributes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuzzy measures of $[C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4]$</th>
<th>$\mu(\emptyset) = 0$</th>
<th>$\mu([C_1]) = 0.2$</th>
<th>$\mu([C_2]) = 0.2$</th>
<th>$\mu([C_3]) = 0.5$</th>
<th>$\mu([C_4]) = 0.42$</th>
<th>$\mu([C_1, C_2]) = 0.5$</th>
<th>$\mu([C_1, C_3]) = 0.45$</th>
<th>$\mu([C_1, C_4]) = 0.35$</th>
<th>$\mu([C_2, C_3]) = 0.65$</th>
<th>$\mu([C_2, C_4]) = 0.57$</th>
<th>$\mu([C_3, C_4]) = 0.77$</th>
<th>$\mu([C_1, C_2, C_3]) = 0.8$</th>
<th>$\mu([C_1, C_2, C_4]) = 0.8$</th>
<th>$\mu([C_1, C_3, C_4]) = 1.0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The score of each alternative is determined by equation (9):

\[ S(r_1) = 0.53, \]
\[ S(r_2) = 0.65, \]
\[ S(r_3) = 0.73, \]
\[ S(r_4) = 0.25, \]
\[ S(r_5) = -0.19. \]

The ranking result of alternatives’ scores is derived as follows:

\[ S(r_1) > S(r_2) > S(r_3) > S(r_4) > S(r_5). \]

Therefore, the ranking of alternatives is $x_1 > x_2 > x_3 > x_4 > x_5$, and $x_1$ is the optimal selection, which means the doctor is required for timely follow-up to promote management of blood pressure of this patient who receives yellow warning.

5.2 Parameter Analysis. For further studying the influence of $q$, we analyze different values of $q$ in this subsection, which are 2, 3, 4, and 5 in this case, and the results are listed in Table 7 and Figure 1.
with the results obtained in Table 7. Hence, the decision result does not change due to the variation in the value of \( q \). However, with the increase in the \( q \) value, it can be discovered that scores of the alternatives are declining completely but show different trends of downward. Considering the practical application, there is not much practical significance for IVq-ROFNs with the large value of \( q \), which often does not exceed 5. Therefore, the value of \( q \) will not have an impact on the final decision result.

5.3. Comparison Analysis. In this subsection, the proposed method is used to solve the case in [32], which is compared with the method given in [32, 40]. There are 5 alternatives with 4 attributes \( C_1, C_2, C_3, \) and \( C_4 \) for 3 experts \( e_1, e_2, \) and \( e_3 \) to make a decision, and the evaluation matrices \( A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}, \) and \( A^{(3)} \) of interval-valued intuitionistic fuzzy numbers (IVIFNs) given are listed in Tables 8–10. Besides, the fuzzy measures of experts are \( \mu(e_1) = \mu(e_2) = \mu(e_3) = 0.4, \mu(e_1, e_2) = \mu(e_1, e_3) = \mu(e_2, e_3) = 0.73, \) and \( \mu(e_1, e_2, e_3) = 1, \) and the fuzzy measures of attributes are shown in Table 11.

If \( \mu \) is the fuzzy measure on the nonempty finite set \( X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \) (\( \mu(\emptyset) = 0 \)), for an IVIFS \( \tilde{a}(x_i) = [<f^+(x_i), f^-(x_i)>], \) \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \), the \( \mu \)-IFPGA\(^2 \) operator and the interval-valued
### Table 7: Decision result with $q=2,3,4,$ and5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$q$</th>
<th>Results of IVq ROCA</th>
<th>Score of alternatives</th>
<th>Ranking of alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$r_1 = &lt; [0.60, 0.71], [0.32, 0.46] &gt; r_2 = &lt; [0.64, 0.79], [0.27, 0.38] &gt; r_3 = &lt; [0.69, 0.76], [0.32, 0.42] &gt; r_4 = &lt; [0.53, 0.62], [0.40, 0.50] &gt; r_5 = &lt; [0.42, 0.54], [0.37, 0.68] &gt;$</td>
<td>$S(r_2) = 0.555(r_2), 0.735(r_2), 0.775(r_2), 0.265(r_5), 0.032$</td>
<td>$x_3 &gt; x_2 &gt; x_1 &gt; x_4 &gt; x_5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$r_1 = &lt; [0.63, 0.74], [0.32, 0.46] &gt; r_2 = &lt; [0.67, 0.75], [0.27, 0.38] &gt; r_3 = &lt; [0.71, 0.78], [0.32, 0.42] &gt; r_4 = &lt; [0.56, 0.64], [0.40, 0.50] &gt; r_5 = &lt; [0.47, 0.59], [0.37, 0.68] &gt;$</td>
<td>$S(r_2) = 0.535(r_2), 0.655(r_2), 0.735(r_2), 0.255(r_3), 0.019$</td>
<td>$x_3 &gt; x_2 &gt; x_1 &gt; x_4 &gt; x_5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$r_1 = &lt; [0.65, 0.75], [0.32, 0.46] &gt; r_2 = &lt; [0.69, 0.77], [0.27, 0.38] &gt; r_3 = &lt; [0.73, 0.80], [0.32, 0.42] &gt; r_4 = &lt; [0.58, 0.66], [0.40, 0.50] &gt; r_5 = &lt; [0.51, 0.62], [0.37, 0.68] &gt;$</td>
<td>$S(r_2) = 0.445(r_2), 0.555(r_2), 0.655(r_2), 0.215(r_3), 0.010$</td>
<td>$x_3 &gt; x_2 &gt; x_1 &gt; x_4 &gt; x_5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$r_1 = &lt; [0.67, 0.77], [0.32, 0.46] &gt; r_2 = &lt; [0.71, 0.78], [0.27, 0.38] &gt; r_3 = &lt; [0.75, 0.81], [0.32, 0.42] &gt; r_4 = &lt; [0.60, 0.68], [0.40, 0.50] &gt; r_5 = &lt; [0.54, 0.65], [0.37, 0.68] &gt;$</td>
<td>$S(r_2) = 0.375(r_2), 0.465(r_2), 0.575(r_2), 0.185(r_3), 0.014$</td>
<td>$x_3 &gt; x_2 &gt; x_1 &gt; x_4 &gt; x_5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Decision matrix $A^{(1)}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$C_1$</th>
<th>$C_2$</th>
<th>$C_3$</th>
<th>$C_4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_1$</td>
<td>$[0.4,0.5],[0.3,0.4]$</td>
<td>$[0.4,0.6],[0.2,0.4]$</td>
<td>$[0.1,0.3],[0.5,0.6]$</td>
<td>$[0.3,0.4],[0.3,0.5]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_2$</td>
<td>$[0.6,0.7],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.6,0.7],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.4,0.7],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.6],[0.1,0.3]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_3$</td>
<td>$[0.6,0.7],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.6],[0.3,0.4]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.6],[0.1,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.4,0.5],[0.2,0.4]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_4$</td>
<td>$[0.3,0.4],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.6,0.7],[0.1,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.3,0.4],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
<td>$[0.3,0.7],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_5$</td>
<td>$[0.7,0.8],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
<td>$[0.3,0.5],[0.1,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.6],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.3,0.4],[0.5,0.6]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Decision result with $q=2, 3, 4$, and 5.

Table 9: Decision matrix $A^{(2)}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$C_1$</th>
<th>$C_2$</th>
<th>$C_3$</th>
<th>$C_4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_1$</td>
<td>$[0.3,0.4],[0.4,0.5]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.6],[0.1,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.4,0.5],[0.3,0.4]$</td>
<td>$[0.4,0.6],[0.2,0.4]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_2$</td>
<td>$[0.3,0.6],[0.3,0.4]$</td>
<td>$[0.4,0.7],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.6],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.6,0.7],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_3$</td>
<td>$[0.6,0.8],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.6],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.7],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.1,0.3],[0.5,0.6]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_4$</td>
<td>$[0.4,0.5],[0.3,0.5]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.8],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
<td>$[0.2,0.5],[0.3,0.4]$</td>
<td>$[0.4,0.7],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_5$</td>
<td>$[0.6,0.7],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.6,0.7],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.7],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.6,0.7],[0.1,0.3]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Decision matrix $A^{(3)}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$C_1$</th>
<th>$C_2$</th>
<th>$C_3$</th>
<th>$C_4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_1$</td>
<td>$[0.2,0.5],[0.3,0.4]$</td>
<td>$[0.4,0.5],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
<td>$[0.3,0.6],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.3,0.7],[0.1,0.3]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_2$</td>
<td>$[0.2,0.7],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.3,0.6],[0.2,0.4]$</td>
<td>$[0.4,0.7],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.8],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_3$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.6],[0.3,0.4]$</td>
<td>$[0.7,0.8],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.6],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.4,0.5],[0.3,0.4]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_4$</td>
<td>$[0.3,0.6],[0.2,0.4]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.6],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.1,0.4],[0.3,0.6]$</td>
<td>$[0.3,0.7],[0.1,0.2]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_5$</td>
<td>$[0.6,0.7],[0.1,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.6],[0.3,0.4]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.6],[0.2,0.3]$</td>
<td>$[0.5,0.6],[0.2,0.4]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Fuzzy measures of attributes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuzzy measures of attributes</th>
<th>$\mu[C_1]$</th>
<th>$\mu[C_2]$</th>
<th>$\mu[C_3]$</th>
<th>$\mu[C_4]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_1]$</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_2]$</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_3]$</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_4]$</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_1, C_2]$</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_1, C_3]$</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_1, C_4]$</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_2, C_3]$</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_2, C_4]$</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_3, C_4]$</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_1, C_2, C_3]$</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_1, C_2, C_4]$</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_1, C_3, C_4]$</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_2, C_3, C_4]$</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu[C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4]$</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
intuitionistic fuzzy Einstein geometric Choquet integral (IVIFEGC) operator are defined as follows:

\[
\text{GIIIFGA}(\tilde{a}(x_1), \tilde{a}(x_2), \ldots, \tilde{a}(x_n)) = \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( t_{\alpha}^{-}(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{\mu(B_{\sigma(i)}) - \mu(B_{\sigma(i+1)})} \right] \left[ 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( 1 - f_{\alpha}^{-}(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{\mu(B_{\sigma(i)}) - \mu(B_{\sigma(i+1)})} \right],
\]

\[
\text{IVIFEGC}(\tilde{a}(x_1), \tilde{a}(x_2), \ldots, \tilde{a}(x_n)) = \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( 2 - t_{\alpha}^{-}(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{\mu(B_{\sigma(i)}) - \mu(B_{\sigma(i+1)})} + \prod_{i=1}^{n} t_{\alpha}^{-}(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right] \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( 1 + f_{\alpha}^{-}(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right)^{\mu(B_{\sigma(i)}) - \mu(B_{\sigma(i+1)})} + \prod_{i=1}^{n} f_{\alpha}^{-}(x_{\sigma(i)}) \right],
\]

where \((\sigma(1), \sigma(2), \ldots, \sigma(n))\) is a permutation of \((1, 2, \ldots, n)\) such that \(\tilde{a}(x_{\sigma(1)}) \leq \tilde{a}(x_{\sigma(2)}) \leq \cdots \leq \tilde{a}(x_{\sigma(n)})\), \(B_{\sigma(i)} = \{x_{\sigma(i)}, x_{\sigma(i+1)}, \ldots, x_{\sigma(n)}\} (i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, B_{\sigma(n+1)} = \emptyset)\).

In this case, we set \(q = 1\), IVq-ROFCA are equal to IVIFNs, which are applied to the comparison with existing methods. The obtained results of different methods are shown in Figure 2 and Table 12.

In this case, compared with the method proposed in [40], the same best and worst solutions are obtained by the method proposed in this paper, and obvious differences in the scores of alternatives are discovered. However, there are differences between \(x_3\) and \(x_4\), and the small deviation is derived between them. From the method proposed in [32], the decision result is completely different from the other two methods, and the closeness of each alternative has a few differences. We analyze the reason as follows.

In this case, the membership degrees of IVIFNs are generally greater than nonmembership degrees. From the method proposed in [32], multiple decision matrices are aggregated by CITOPSIS, which reduces the difference in the influence of the membership and nonmembership of each alternative on the results. Thus, the deviations of alternatives are not obvious. Contrarily, the method proposed in this paper employs IVq-ROFCA to process fuzzy information, which further highlights the degree of expert support for the alternatives. The collective matrices of GIIIFGA and IVq-ROFCA of Tables 8–10 are listed in Tables 13 and 14, respectively. According to equation (9), the scores of these two matrices are presented in Figure 3.

From Figure 3, the abscissa in the figure represents the alternatives with different attributes and the ordinate indicates their scores. It is easy to find that there are only few differences between membership and nonmembership, except for the evaluation of \(x_2\) with \(C_1\). Correspondingly, the span of the interval in membership with a wide range can be found in the experts’ evaluation of \(x_2\) with \(C_1\) from Tables 8–10, such as [0.2, 0.7]. Considering the above, there are differences in the selection of \(x_2\) between the method proposed in this paper and the proposed method in [32]. On the other hand, it reflects that more advantages of the method proposed in this paper will be discovered, while the
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Figure 2: Ranking of different methods.

Table 12: Results by different methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operators</th>
<th>Score or closeness</th>
<th>Alternative ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed method</td>
<td>$S(x_1) = 0.165$, $S(x_2) = 0.715$, $S(x_3) = 0.745$, $S(x_4) = 0.385$, $S(x_5) = 0.77$</td>
<td>$x_5 &gt; x_3 &gt; x_2 &gt; x_4 &gt; x_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVIFEGC [40]</td>
<td>$S(x_1) = 0.055$, $S(x_2) = 0.665$, $S(x_3) = 0.655$, $S(x_4) = 0.265$, $S(x_5) = 0.70$</td>
<td>$x_5 &gt; x_2 &gt; x_3 &gt; x_4 &gt; x_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choquet integral-based TOPSIS (CITOPSIS) [32]</td>
<td>$r(x_1) = 0.4817$, $r(x_2) = 0.5465$, $r(x_3) = 0.65$, $r(x_4) = 0.26$, $r(x_5) = 0.70$</td>
<td>$x_2 &gt; x_3 &gt; x_4 &gt; x_5 &gt; x_1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Collective matrix by GIIFGA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C_1</th>
<th>C_2</th>
<th>C_3</th>
<th>C_4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_1$</td>
<td>$[0.3017,0.4645]$, $[0.2685,0.3687]$</td>
<td>$[0.4373,0.5650]$, $[0.2682,0.3687]$</td>
<td>$[0.2575,0.4686]$, $[0.3219,0.4278]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_2$</td>
<td>$[0.3463,0.5386]$, $[0.2917,0.3925]$</td>
<td>$[0.4353,0.6715]$, $[0.1682,0.2283]$</td>
<td>$[0.2572,0.6732]$, $[0.1682,0.3283]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_3$</td>
<td>$[0.5712,0.7083]$, $[0.1850,0.2598]$</td>
<td>$[0.5720,0.6732]$, $[0.1682,0.3283]$</td>
<td>$[0.5000,0.6382]$, $[0.1682,0.3283]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_4$</td>
<td>$[0.3242,0.4996]$, $[0.2283,0.3990]$</td>
<td>$[0.4288,0.6758]$, $[0.1659,0.2283]$</td>
<td>$[0.1951,0.4306]$, $[0.2260,0.3966]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_5$</td>
<td>$[0.6382,0.7384]$, $[0.1282,0.2616]$</td>
<td>$[0.4685,0.6075]$, $[0.1716,0.2982]$</td>
<td>$[0.5000,0.6382]$, $[0.2000,0.3000]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Collective matrix by IVq-ROFCA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C_1</th>
<th>C_2</th>
<th>C_3</th>
<th>C_4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_1$</td>
<td>$[0.3122,0.4748]$, $[0.3242,0.4248]$</td>
<td>$[0.4288,0.5694]$, $[0.1320,0.2944]$</td>
<td>$[0.2575,0.4686]$, $[0.3219,0.4278]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_2$</td>
<td>$[0.4152,0.6758]$, $[0.2231,0.3242]$</td>
<td>$[0.4632,0.6701]$, $[0.1659,0.2957]$</td>
<td>$[0.4288,0.6758]$, $[0.1206,0.2231]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_3$</td>
<td>$[0.5694,0.7043]$, $[0.1437,0.2514]$</td>
<td>$[0.5776,0.6818]$, $[0.1552,0.2639]$</td>
<td>$[0.5000,0.6299]$, $[0.1516,0.3000]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_4$</td>
<td>$[0.3285,0.5004]$, $[0.2231,0.3787]$</td>
<td>$[0.5143,0.7043]$, $[0.1257,0.2689]$</td>
<td>$[0.2116,0.4288]$, $[0.1933,0.3456]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_5$</td>
<td>$[0.6435,0.7449]$, $[0.1206,0.2551]$</td>
<td>$[0.4614,0.5953]$, $[0.1437,0.2957]$</td>
<td>$[0.5000,0.6299]$, $[0.2000,0.3000]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: The scores of different matrices obtained by GIIFGA and IVq-ROFCA.
degree of support of experts for the alternatives is significantly higher than that of the opposition.

Above all, the proposed method employs the Choquet integral to aggregate interval-valued q-rung orthopair fuzzy information in this paper, which is a powerful tool to deal with MAGDM problems with dependent attributes. Moreover, the proposed method will highlight the support of experts for the alternatives and better reflect the superiority of the optimal alternative. Nevertheless, the proposed operators and the MAGDM method are used to handle decision problems for IVq-ROFNs, which are not able to be applied to different fuzzy environments. Besides, as a great impact on decision results remains to be studied, the degree of consensus among experts needs to be further studied in the proposed method.

6. Conclusion

The Choquet integral is an efficient tool to solve decision problems with interaction between attributes. For addressing complex MAGDM problems under interval-valued q-rung orthopair fuzzy information, we develop the IVq-ROFCA operator and the IVq-ROFCG operator and discuss some properties of them, including idempotency, commutativity, monotonicity, and boundedness. Particularly, we further design Choquet integral weighted and ordered operators for IVq-ROFS. Subsequently, a novel method is devised to process fuzzy information employing the IVq-ROFCA operator. Finally, a case of early-warning in the daily management of hypertension is given to illustrate the proposed method, and the results obtained are consistent with the actual situation provided by medical experts. The feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed method are proved by sensitivity analysis and comparative analysis additionally. Ulteriorly, our future research will focus on consensus models of IVq-ROFS, for instance, the MAGDM method with the Choquet integral based on consistency and consensus of experts. Moreover, considering the broad development prospect of fuzzy theory in the era of big data [41], the integration of the decision-making method, machine learning and big data are also one of our research directions in the future.
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