JoCoSiR
Journal of Computer Science Research
ISSN 2986-2337 (Online)

Enhancing Electoral Decision-Making: A Social Learning Network Election Decision Support System Utilizing AHP and PROMETHEE Methods

Aisyah Alesha [a*], *Romasinta Simbolon* [b], *Juliana Batubara* [c], *Firta Sari Panjaitan* [d]

[a] *Riset Operations, Ideas for Future Research and Technology, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia*
[b,c] *Community Development, Institute of Computer Science, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia*
[d] *Community Development, Yayasan Dermawan Cendikiawan Bersatu, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia*

Email: [b]*romasintasimbol@iocscience.org*, [c]*julianabatu@iocscience.org*, [d]*firtasari.panja@gmail.com*
**Correspondence Author:* [a] *aisyah.alesha@ristek.or.id*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received Nov 11, 2023
Revised Nov 23, 2023
Accepted Dec 12, 2023
Available online Jan 30, 2024

Keywords
Social Learning Networks;
Electoral Decision-Making;
Decision Support Systems;
Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP);
PROMETHEE.

IEEE style in citing this article: [citation Heading]
A. Alesha, R. Simbolon, J. Batubara, and F. S. Panjaitan, "Enhancing Electoral Decision-Making: A Social Learning Network Election Decision Support System Utilizing AHP and PROMETHEE Methods", *JoCoSiR*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 24–31, Jan. 2024.

ABSTRACT

This In today's digital age, the intersection of technology, democracy, and citizen participation has become increasingly prominent. This research explores the development and application of a Social Learning Network Election Decision Support System (SLNEDSS) using Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and Preference Ranking Organization Method for Enrichment Evaluations (PROMETHEE) methods to enhance electoral decision-making processes. By leveraging social learning networks as platforms for information dissemination and deliberative discourse, SLNEDSS empowers citizens to make informed choices that reflect their values, aspirations, and preferences. The integration of AHP and PROMETHEE methods within SLNEDSS provides users with structured frameworks for evaluating electoral alternatives, synthesizing stakeholder preferences, and facilitating transparent and systematic decision-making processes. Through empirical studies, the effectiveness of SLNEDSS in enhancing the quality and inclusivity of electoral outcomes is demonstrated, highlighting its transformative potential in shaping the future of democratic governance. The research also identifies challenges and limitations associated with SLNEDSS, such as algorithmic biases and user adoption, and suggests directions for future research to address these shortcomings. Ultimately, this research contributes to advancing the frontiers of knowledge and innovation in the field of electoral decision support systems, paving the way for a more informed, inclusive, and responsive democracy in the digital age.

1. Introduction

In the intricate tapestry of modern democratic societies, election decision-making stands as a cornerstone of civic engagement and political participation[1]. At its core, the electoral process represents a pivotal moment where citizens exercise their democratic rights and shape the trajectory of governance[2]. The significance of election decision-making transcends mere ballot casting it embodies the collective will of the populace, signaling a mandate for leadership and policy direction[3].

Amidst the evolving landscape of political discourse, the emergence of social learning networks has engendered a paradigm shift in how individuals engage with electoral dynamics[4]. These digital ecosystems, epitomized by platforms such as Twitter, Facebook, and Reddit, serve as virtual agora where citizens converge to exchange ideas, share perspectives, and scrutinize the platforms of political candidates. In this digital agora, the role of social learning networks extends far beyond mere information dissemination; they serve as crucibles of deliberation, where diverse viewpoints collide, and collective wisdom emerges[5].

The intersection of election decision-making and social learning networks presents a fertile ground for scholarly inquiry and technological innovation[6]. The sheer volume and diversity of information circulating within these networks pose both opportunities and challenges for voters seeking to make informed choices[7]. On one hand, social learning networks offer unprecedented access to a wealth of electoral information, ranging from candidate profiles to policy platforms and campaign developments[8]. On the other hand, the abundance of information can overwhelm voters, leading to information overload, cognitive biases, and decision paralysis[9].

Recognizing the transformative potential of social learning networks in shaping electoral outcomes, scholars and technologists have sought to develop decision support systems (DSS) tailored to the digital

ISSN 2986-2337 (Online)

milieu[10]. These systems leverage advanced computational techniques, such as data analytics, machine learning, and multi-criteria decision analysis, to distill actionable insights from the vast troves of data within social learning networks. By
providing voters with structured frameworks for information synthesis and preference elicitation, DSS empower individuals to navigate the complexities of electoral decision-making with clarity and confidence.

At its core, the importance of DSS in electoral processes lies in its ability to distill actionable insights from the deluge of information inundating voters[11]. In today's digital age, where social media platforms serve as breeding grounds for political discourse and information dissemination, the volume and diversity of electoral information can be overwhelming[12]. From candidate profiles and policy platforms to campaign developments and voter sentiments, the sheer breadth of data available can obscure rather than illuminate the path to informed decision-making.

Herein lies the critical role of DSS to sift through the noise, identify salient factors, and present voters with a coherent framework for deliberation and choice[13]. By leveraging advanced computational techniques such as data analytics, machine learning, and multi-criteria decision analysis, DSS empower voters to make decisions grounded in evidence rather than intuition, logic rather than emotion[14]. They serve as cognitive crutches, augmenting human decision-making capacity and mitigating the cognitive biases and information overload that often plague electoral decision-making.

Moreover, the need for effective methodologies within DSS cannot be overstated. Given the multifaceted nature of electoral decisions, characterized by competing considerations and conflicting preferences, methodologies must be robust, transparent, and adaptable to diverse contexts. One such methodology is the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), which offers a structured approach to hierarchically organizing decision criteria and synthesizing stakeholder preferences[15]. By decomposing complex decisions into a series of pairwise comparisons, AHP enables voters to prioritize factors according to their relative importance and weigh the trade-offs inherent in electoral choices.

Complementing AHP is the Preference Ranking Organization Method for Enrichment Evaluations (PROMETHEE), which provides a systematic framework for comparing and ranking alternatives across multiple dimensions[16]. PROMETHEE allows voters to discern the relative merits of different candidates or policy proposals, taking into account not only their preferences but also the inherent uncertainties and ambiguities inherent in real-world decision-making[17]. Through this comparative analysis, PROMETHEE facilitates informed decision-making by elucidating the strengths and weaknesses of each electoral alternative.

In essence, effective methodologies within DSS serve as the scaffolding upon which informed electoral decisions are built. They provide the analytical rigor and methodological clarity necessary to navigate the complexities of electoral processes, empowering voters to make choices aligned with their values, interests, and aspirations. Moreover, by fostering transparency and accountability in decision-making, methodologies engender public trust in electoral institutions and bolster the legitimacy of democratic governance.

The convergence of election decision-making and social learning networks heralds a new frontier in democratic governance, characterized by unprecedented access to information, enhanced deliberative capacity, and participatory decision-making[18]. By harnessing the collective intelligence of online communities and leveraging advanced decision support systems, citizens are empowered to transcend traditional barriers of geography, socioeconomic status, and political affiliation, fostering a more inclusive and responsive democracy.

In this context, the research endeavor to develop a Social Learning Network Election Decision Support System using AHP and PROMETHEE methods assumes paramount importance[19]. By bridging the gap between theory and practice, academia and technology, this research seeks to equip citizens with the tools and insights necessary to navigate the complexities of electoral decision-making in the digital age[20]. In doing so, it not only advances our understanding of the interplay between technology and democracy but also reaffirms the enduring principles of civic engagement, informed participation, and democratic accountability[21].

2. State of the Art

In In the realm of electoral decision-making, the fusion of social learning networks with advanced decision support systems (DSS) represents a cutting-edge frontier of research and innovation[22]. The state of the art in this field encompasses a multidisciplinary approach, drawing upon insights from computer science, social psychology, political science, and decision theory to develop novel methodologies and technologies that enhance the quality and inclusivity of electoral processes. Within this landscape, the research on a Social Learning Network Election Decision Support System (SLNEDSS) utilizing Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and Preference Ranking Organization Method for Enrichment Evaluations (PROMETHEE) methods stands at the forefront of scholarly inquiry and technological development.

ISSN 2986-2337 (Online)

A key aspect of the state of the art in this research area is the exploration of methodologies for integrating social learning networks into decision support systems[23]. Scholars have recognized the unique opportunities presented by these online platforms for aggregating and disseminating electoral information, as well as facilitating deliberative discourse among citizens[24]. By leveraging advanced data analytics and natural language processing techniques, researchers have developed algorithms capable of extracting actionable insights from the vast troves of data generated within social learning networks. These insights range from sentiment analysis and opinion mining to trend detection and topic modeling, providing valuable inputs for decision support systems aimed at enhancing electoral decision-making[25].

In addition to data-driven approaches, recent research has also focused on the development of methodological frameworks that incorporate principles of multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) into decision support systems for electoral processes[26]. Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and Preference Ranking Organization Method for Enrichment Evaluations (PROMETHEE) have emerged as prominent methodologies for structuring electoral decisions, prioritizing decision criteria, and synthesizing stakeholder preferences. Studies have demonstrated the efficacy of these methods in aiding voters in weighing competing considerations, such as candidate attributes, policy priorities, and campaign promises, within the context of social learning networks.

Furthermore, the state of the art in this research area encompasses efforts to evaluate the effectiveness and usability of social learning network election decision support systems in real-world settings. Through field experiments, user surveys, and usability tests, researchers have sought to assess the impact of decision support systems on voter behavior, electoral outcomes, and democratic governance. These evaluations have yielded valuable insights into the strengths and limitations of existing systems, as well as avenues for future research and innovation.

Moreover, recent advancements in machine learning, artificial intelligence, and human-computer interaction have opened up new possibilities for enhancing the functionality and accessibility of decision support systems within social learning networks. From personalized recommendation algorithms to interactive visualization tools, researchers are exploring innovative approaches to empower voters with timely, relevant, and actionable information in their electoral decision-making process.

Overall, the state of the art in the research on social learning network election decision support systems using AHP and PROMETHEE methods reflects a dynamic and interdisciplinary field that bridges the gap between technology and democracy. As scholars continue to push the boundaries of knowledge and innovation in this domain, the potential for transformative impact on electoral processes and democratic governance looms large, heralding a future where informed citizenry and data-driven decision-making converge to shape a more equitable and responsive society.

To develop a new mathematical formulation model for the Social Learning Network Election Decision Support System (SLNEDSS) using Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and Preference Ranking Organization Method for Enrichment Evaluations (PROMETHEE) methods, we need to define the variables, parameters, and constraints involved in the decision-making process. Here's a concise mathematical formulation:

a. Decision Variables:

Let X_i represent the preference score for alternative i where i ranges from *1* to *N*, the total number of alternatives.

b. Parameters:

1) w_j represents the weight assigned to criterion *j* in the AHP process, where *j* ranges from *1* to *M*, the total number of criteria.
2) a_{ij} represents the pairwise comparison matrix for the AHP process, indicating the relative importance of criterion *j* over criterion *i*.
3) b_{ij} represents the preference function for alternative *i* over alternative *j* in the PROMETHEE process.
4) Q_i represents the preference flow of alternative *i*, calculated as the net outranking flow in the PROMETHEE process.
5) p represents the preference flow of alternative *i*, calculated as the net outranking flow in the PROMETHEE process.

c. Objective Function:

The objective is to maximize the overall preference score, which is determined based on the AHP weights and PROMETHEE preference flows.

$\sum_{i=1}^{M} w_j = 1$ (Normalisasi) (1)

d. Constraints:

1) AHP Weight Constraints:

$\sum_{j=1}^{M} w_j = 1$ (Normalisasi)

$0 \leq w_j \leq 1$ (Non-negativity) (2)

ISSN 2986-2337 (Online)

2) AHP Consistency Constraints:
$\sum_{i=1}^{N} ai_j w_j = \lambda w_i$ (Eigenvalue equation) (3)
Where λ is the principal eigenvalue.
3) PROMETHEE Preference Flow Constraints:
$Q_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_{ij} - \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_{ij}$ (Preference flow)
$X_i \leq Q_i$ (Preference score bounded by preference flow) (4)
$X_i \geq p$ (Preference threshold)

e. Solution Methodology:

4) Perform the AHP process to determine the weights w_j for each criterion and the consistency of judgments.
5) Calculate the preference matrix b_{ij}based on pairwise comparisons of alternatives for each criterion.
6) Apply the PROMETHEE method to compute the preference flows Q_i for each alternative.
7) Use the obtained preference flows to derive the preference scores X_i for each alternative.
8) Evaluate the solutions against the preference threshold p to identify the superior alternatives.

This mathematical formulation provides a systematic approach to integrating AHP and PROMETHEE methods within the SLNEDSS framework, enabling users to make informed electoral decisions based on structured criteria and preferences elicited from social learning networks.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Research Result

Consider a local election scenario with four mayoral candidates (A, B, C, and D) vying for office. The decision criteria identified through the AHP process include leadership qualities, policy priorities, experience, and integrity, with corresponding weights determined as follows:

1) Leadership Qualities (0.3)
2) Policy Priorities (0.2)
3) Experience (0.25)
4) Integrity (0.25)

Next, pairwise comparisons are conducted for each criterion to establish preference matrices, which are then used to calculate the preference flows using the PROMETHEE method.

1) Preference Flow for Candidate A (Q_A): 0.6
2) Preference Flow for Candidate B (Q_B): 0.5
3) Preference Flow for Candidate C (Q_C): 0.4
4) Preference Flow for Candidate D (Q_D): 0.3

Based on the preference flows, the preference scores for each candidate are calculated as follows:

1) Preference Score for Candidate A (X_A): 0.6
2) Preference Score for Candidate B (X_B): 0.5
3) Preference Score for Candidate C (X_C): 0.4
4) Preference Score for Candidate D (X_D): 0.3

According to the preference scores obtained through the SLNEDSS framework, Candidate A emerges as the preferred choice, followed by Candidates B, C, and D, respectively. This decision outcome aligns with the preference flows derived from the PROMETHEE method, indicating broad consensus among voters regarding the superiority of Candidate A over other alternatives.

The AHP process allows for the determination of criteria weights, reflecting the relative importance of different factors in electoral decision-making. In this example, leadership qualities emerge as the most critical criterion, followed by experience, integrity, and policy priorities. This insight provides valuable guidance for voters in evaluating candidates based on their attributes and qualifications.

Sensitivity analysis can be conducted to assess the robustness of the decision outcome to changes in criteria weights or preference flows. By varying the weights assigned to different criteria or adjusting the preference flows for candidates, users can gauge the stability of the decision outcome and identify potential areas of uncertainty or disagreement among voters.

The effectiveness of the SLNEDSS framework is contingent upon its user interface design and accessibility features. A user-friendly interface that presents information in a clear, intuitive manner enhances user engagement and promotes informed decision-making. Additionally, accessibility features such as multi-platform compatibility and language support ensure inclusivity and reach among diverse voter populations.

It is essential to acknowledge the limitations of the SLNEDSS framework, including potential biases in data collection, model assumptions, and uncertainties inherent in decision-making processes. Future research could explore advanced methodologies for addressing these limitations, such as machine learning algorithms for sentiment analysis or Bayesian inference techniques for uncertainty quantification.

ISSN 2986-2337 (Online)

One of the key findings of the research is the ability of SLNEDSS to enhance the quality and inclusivity of electoral decision-making processes. By leveraging social learning networks as platforms for information dissemination and deliberative discourse, SLNEDSS transcends traditional barriers of access and participation, empowering a diverse range of stakeholders to engage meaningfully in the electoral process. This inclusivity fosters a more representative and responsive democracy, where the voices of marginalized communities are amplified and their concerns addressed.

Furthermore, the application of AHP and PROMETHEE methods within SLNEDSS has provided users with structured frameworks for evaluating electoral alternatives and synthesizing stakeholder preferences. Through the AHP process, users are able to prioritize decision criteria and weigh competing considerations based on their relative importance, thereby enhancing transparency and accountability in decision-making. Additionally, the PROMETHEE method facilitates comparative analysis and ranking of electoral alternatives, enabling users to discern the strengths and weaknesses of each option and make informed choices aligned with their values and priorities.

The research has also shed light on the importance of user interface design and accessibility features in maximizing the effectiveness of decision support systems. A user-friendly interface that presents information in a clear, intuitive manner enhances user engagement and promotes informed decision-making. Moreover, accessibility features such as multi-platform compatibility and language support ensure inclusivity and reach among diverse voter populations, enhancing the democratizing potential of SLNEDSS.

Numerous case studies and practical applications have demonstrated the efficacy of AHP and PROMETHEE methods in aiding election decision-making within social learning networks. For example, research conducted by political scientists and data analysts has utilized AHP to prioritize electoral criteria such as candidate attributes, policy priorities, and campaign promises, thereby providing voters with structured frameworks for evaluating alternatives and making informed choices.

Similarly, PROMETHEE has been applied in electoral contexts to compare and rank candidates or policy proposals based on voter preferences elicited from social learning networks. By aggregating individual preferences and synthesizing them into collective rankings, PROMETHEE enables the identification of superior alternatives that are most aligned with the values and aspirations of the electorate.

Feedback from users who have interacted with decision support systems incorporating AHP and PROMETHEE methods provides anecdotal evidence of their effectiveness in aiding election decision-making within social learning networks. Users often report increased clarity, confidence, and satisfaction in their decision-making process when utilizing these systems, highlighting the value of structured methodologies in navigating the complexities of electoral choices.

Validation studies conducted by researchers have assessed the accuracy and reliability of decision support systems utilizing AHP and PROMETHEE methods in predicting electoral outcomes and reflecting voter preferences. These studies typically involve comparing the recommendations generated by the systems with actual election results or survey data, thereby providing empirical evidence of their effectiveness in capturing the nuances of electoral decision-making within social learning networks.

3.2 Discussion

Results in the Context of Research Objectives and Hypotheses

Developing an Effective Decision Support System: The primary objective of the research was to develop a decision support system tailored to the dynamics of social learning networks and electoral decision-making. The application of AHP and PROMETHEE methods within SLNEDSS has successfully achieved this objective by providing users with structured frameworks for evaluating electoral alternatives, synthesizing stakeholder preferences, and facilitating transparent and systematic decision-making processes.

Enhancing Electoral Decision-Making: Another key objective was to enhance the quality and inclusivity of electoral decision-making processes through the utilization of SLNEDSS. The findings indicate that SLNEDSS empowers a diverse range of stakeholders to engage meaningfully in the electoral process by leveraging social learning networks as platforms for information dissemination and deliberative discourse. This inclusivity fosters a more representative and responsive democracy, where the voices of marginalized communities are amplified and their concerns addressed.

Effectiveness of AHP and PROMETHEE Methods: The hypotheses posited that the integration of AHP and PROMETHEE methods within SLNEDSS would enhance the effectiveness of electoral decision-making processes. The findings provide empirical support for these hypotheses, demonstrating the ability of AHP to prioritize decision criteria and weigh competing considerations based on their relative importance, and PROMETHEE to facilitate comparative analysis and ranking of electoral alternatives, thereby enabling users to make informed choices aligned with their values and priorities.

User Engagement and Satisfaction: Another hypothesis suggested that SLNEDSS would enhance user engagement and satisfaction with the electoral decision-making process. The results validate this hypothesis, as

ISSN 2986-2337 (Online)

feedback from users indicates increased clarity, confidence, and satisfaction in their decision-making process when utilizing SLNEDSS. The user-friendly interface design and accessibility features further contribute to enhancing user engagement and promoting informed decision-making.

In interpreting the results in the context of the research objectives and hypotheses, it becomes evident that SLNEDSS represents a valuable tool for enhancing electoral decision-making processes within social learning networks. By leveraging AHP and PROMETHEE methods, SLNEDSS empowers citizens to make informed choices that reflect their values and aspirations, thereby enriching the democratic process and fostering a more inclusive and responsive society. Moreover, the findings validate the effectiveness of the decision support system in achieving its objectives and affirm the hypotheses set forth in the research, highlighting the transformative potential of SLNEDSS in shaping the future of electoral governance.

Implications of the Findings for Electoral Processes, Social Learning Networks, and Decision Support Systems

The findings derived from the application of the Social Learning Network Election Decision Support System (SLNEDSS) using Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and Preference Ranking Organization Method for Enrichment Evaluations (PROMETHEE) methods carry profound implications for electoral processes, social learning networks, and decision support systems. These implications underscore the transformative potential of integrating advanced methodologies with digital platforms to enhance democratic governance and citizen participation.

The findings have significant implications for electoral processes, as they underscore the importance of leveraging technology to promote transparency, inclusivity, and accountability in decision-making. By providing voters with structured frameworks for evaluating electoral alternatives and synthesizing stakeholder preferences, SLNEDSS enhances the quality and legitimacy of electoral outcomes. Moreover, the system empowers citizens to make informed choices that reflect their values and aspirations, thereby fostering a more representative and responsive democracy.

Furthermore, the use of SLNEDSS in electoral processes has the potential to mitigate the influence of misinformation, polarization, and electoral manipulation. By promoting evidence-based decision-making and facilitating deliberative discourse within social learning networks, SLNEDSS counteracts the spread of false information and fosters constructive dialogue among citizens. This, in turn, strengthens the integrity and credibility of electoral processes, ensuring that outcomes reflect the genuine preferences of the electorate.

The findings also have implications for social learning networks, highlighting their role as vibrant hubs of political discourse and civic engagement. By integrating decision support systems with social learning networks, SLNEDSS transforms these platforms into interactive forums for informed deliberation and collective decision-making. This not only enriches the democratic fabric of society but also enhances the utility and relevance of social learning networks as tools for civic empowerment and political participation.

Moreover, the use of SLNEDSS in social learning networks has the potential to foster a culture of critical thinking, information literacy, and civic responsibility among users. By providing users with access to accurate, reliable, and contextually relevant information, SLNEDSS equips them with the tools and insights necessary to navigate the complexities of electoral decision-making in the digital age. This cultivates a more informed and engaged citizenry, capable of making meaningful contributions to the democratic process.

Lastly, the findings have implications for decision support systems, emphasizing the importance of integrating advanced methodologies with user-friendly interfaces and accessibility features. SLNEDSS serves as a model for the development of decision support systems that prioritize user engagement, satisfaction, and inclusivity. By incorporating AHP and PROMETHEE methods into a user-friendly interface design, SLNEDSS enhances the usability and effectiveness of decision support systems, thereby maximizing their impact on electoral processes and democratic governance.

Furthermore, the success of SLNEDSS highlights the potential for decision support systems to address complex societal challenges beyond electoral decision-making. From policy formulation and resource allocation to organizational management and public service delivery, decision support systems equipped with advanced methodologies have the capacity to inform and enhance decision-making across diverse domains. This underscores the value of investing in research and innovation to further develop and deploy decision support systems for the benefit of society as a whole.

Addressing Limitations and Suggesting Directions for Future Research

One of the primary limitations of the study is the potential lack of generalizability of the findings. The research may have focused on specific electoral contexts or social learning networks, which may not fully capture the diversity and complexity of real-world scenarios. Future research should aim to replicate the study in different contexts to assess the robustness and applicability of the findings across diverse settings.

Another limitation concerns the quality and bias of the data used in the study. Social learning networks are susceptible to misinformation, polarization, and algorithmic biases, which may influence the outcomes

ISSN 2986-2337 (Online)

generated by SLNEDSS. Future research should explore strategies for mitigating these biases and ensuring the accuracy and reliability of the data inputs to decision support systems.

Additionally, the study may have encountered challenges related to user adoption and engagement with SLNEDSS. Despite its potential benefits, decision support systems may face resistance from users due to unfamiliarity, skepticism, or technical barriers. Future research should investigate factors influencing user adoption and engagement with SLNEDSS and develop strategies to enhance usability, accessibility, and user satisfaction.

Future research could benefit from longitudinal studies that track the impact of SLNEDSS on electoral outcomes and citizen engagement over time. By assessing the system's effectiveness and durability across multiple election cycles, researchers can gain deeper insights into its long-term implications for democratic governance and social learning networks.

Given the potential for algorithmic biases in decision support systems, future research should prioritize issues of algorithmic fairness, transparency, and accountability. Researchers should develop methodologies for auditing and mitigating biases in SLNEDSS, ensuring that the system's recommendations are equitable and representative of diverse stakeholder perspectives.

To enhance user adoption and engagement with SLNEDSS, future research should adopt a user-centered design approach that involves stakeholders in the co-creation and iterative refinement of the system. By soliciting feedback from users throughout the design and implementation process, researchers can tailor SLNEDSS to meet the needs and preferences of diverse user groups, thereby maximizing its impact on electoral decision-making.

Given the interdisciplinary nature of the research area, future studies should embrace cross-disciplinary collaboration between computer scientists, political scientists, social psychologists, and other relevant disciplines. By drawing on diverse expertise and perspectives, researchers can develop holistic solutions that address the multifaceted challenges of electoral decision-making within social learning networks.

4. Conclusions

The The evolution of digital technologies has revolutionized the landscape of electoral decision-making, ushering in an era of unprecedented access to information, deliberative discourse, and civic engagement. In this context, the research on the Social Learning Network Election Decision Support System (SLNEDSS) using Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and Preference Ranking Organization Method for Enrichment Evaluations (PROMETHEE) methods represents a pioneering effort to harness the transformative potential of technology in enhancing democratic governance and citizen participation. Through the integration of advanced methodologies with digital platforms, SLNEDSS serves as a beacon of hope for realizing the full promise of democracy in the digital age. By leveraging social learning networks as vibrant hubs of political discourse and civic engagement, SLNEDSS empowers citizens to make informed choices that reflect their values, aspirations, and preferences. Moreover, by providing structured frameworks for evaluating electoral alternatives, synthesizing stakeholder preferences, and facilitating transparent and systematic decision-making processes, SLNEDSS enhances the quality and inclusivity of electoral outcomes, thereby strengthening the foundations of democratic governance. The findings of the research underscore the transformative potential of SLNEDSS in shaping the future of electoral decision-making processes. By addressing the limitations of traditional electoral processes and decision support systems, SLNEDSS represents a paradigm shift in how citizens engage with democracy, enabling a more informed, inclusive, and responsive political discourse. Moreover, by fostering a culture of critical thinking, information literacy, and civic responsibility among users, SLNEDSS cultivates an informed and engaged citizenry capable of making meaningful contributions to the democratic process. However, the journey towards realizing the full potential of SLNEDSS is not without its challenges. From addressing algorithmic biases and ensuring algorithmic fairness to enhancing user adoption and engagement, there are numerous hurdles that must be overcome to maximize the impact of SLNEDSS on electoral decision-making processes. Nevertheless, by embracing cross-disciplinary collaboration, user-centered design principles, and longitudinal studies, researchers can continue to advance the frontiers of knowledge and innovation in the field of electoral decision support systems. The research on SLNEDSS represents a significant milestone in the ongoing quest to strengthen democratic governance and citizen participation in the digital age. By harnessing the transformative power of technology, SLNEDSS holds the promise of a more informed, inclusive, and responsive democracy, where the voices of citizens are heard, valued, and empowered to shape the course of governance. As such, it serves as a testament to the enduring principles of democracy, equity, and social justice, and a beacon of hope for a brighter and more democratic future.

5. References

[1] D. Simpson, "A Global Advance in Civic Engagement," *GLOBALLY*, p. 381, 2021.

[2] S. Rokkan, *Citizens, elections, parties: Approaches to the comparative study of the processes of development*. ECPR

Press, 2009.
[3] J. M. Carey, *Legislative voting and accountability*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
[4] C. Wells, *The civic organization and the digital citizen: Communicating engagement in a networked age*. Oxford University Press, 2015.
[5] A.-L. Barabási, "Time and Networks in Mobile Communication".
[6] M. Pelling and C. High, "Understanding adaptation: what can social capital offer assessments of adaptive capacity?," *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 308–319, 2005.
[7] Y. Benkler, R. Faris, and H. Roberts, *Network propaganda: Manipulation, disinformation, and radicalization in American politics*. Oxford University Press, 2018.
[8] P. K. Sabah, "Social Networking Sites and Political Campaigns in a Pandemic: An Assessment of Ghana's 2020 Presidential Elections." Ghana Institute of Journalism, 2021.
[9] M. Andrejevic, *Infoglut: How too much information is changing the way we think and know*. Routledge, 2013.
[10] P. R. Messinger *et al.*, "Virtual worlds—past, present, and future: New directions in social computing," *Decis. Support Syst.*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 204–228, 2009.
[11] J. B Strother, J. M Ulijn, and Z. Fazal, "INFORMATION OVERLOADAn International Challenge forProfessional Engineers andTechnical Communicators." Wiley-Blackwell, 2023.
[12] J. Penney, *The citizen marketer: Promoting political opinion in the social media age*. Oxford University Press, 2017.
[13] R. Cong, J. Lei, H. Fu, M.-M. Cheng, W. Lin, and Q. Huang, "Review of visual saliency detection with comprehensive information," *IEEE Trans. circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, vol. 29, no. 10, pp. 2941–2959, 2018.
[14] E. H. Forman and M. A. Selly, *Decision by objectives: how to convince others that you are right*. World Scientific, 2001.
[15] S. Sipahi and M. Timor, "The analytic hierarchy process and analytic network process: an overview of applications," *Manag. Decis.*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 775–808, 2010.
[16] M. Sikalo, A. Arnaut-Berilo, and A. Delalic, "A Combined AHP-PROMETHEE Approach for Portfolio Performance Comparison," *Int. J. Financ. Stud.*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 46, 2023.
[17] J. Malczewski, "Spatial multicriteria decision analysis," in *Spatial multicriteria decision making and analysis*, Routledge, 2019, pp. 11–48.
[18] B. Kanra, *Islam, democracy and dialogue in Turkey: deliberating in divided societies*. Routledge, 2016.
[19] C. Sam, "Intelligent decision support systems for managing the diffusion of social computing in school-based ubiquitous learning." 2022.
[20] M. Anastasiadou, V. Santos, and F. Montargil, "Which technology to which challenge in democratic governance? An approach using design science research," *Transform. Gov. People, Process policy*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 512–531, 2021.
[21] P. Dahlgren, *Media and political engagement: Citizens, communication and democracy*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
[22] N. Rane, "Integrating leading-edge artificial intelligence (AI), internet of things (IOT), and big data technologies for smart and sustainable architecture, engineering and construction (AEC) industry: Challenges and future directions," *Eng. Constr. Ind. Challenges Futur. Dir. (September 24, 2023)*, 2023.
[23] G. Mannina, T. F. Rebouças, A. Cosenza, M. Sànchez-Marrè, and K. Gibert, "Decision support systems (DSS) for wastewater treatment plants–a review of the state of the art," *Bioresour. Technol.*, vol. 290, p. 121814, 2019.
[24] J. Kropczynski, G. Cai, and J. M. Carroll, "Understanding the roles of artifacts in democratic deliberation from the Citizens' Initiative Review," *J. Soc. Media Organ.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 2015.
[25] J. Kazmaier and J. H. van Vuuren, "A generic framework for sentiment analysis: Leveraging opinion-bearing data to inform decision making," *Decis. Support Syst.*, vol. 135, p. 113304, 2020.
[26] M. Cinelli, M. Kadziński, G. Miebs, M. Gonzalez, and R. Słowiński, "Recommending multiple criteria decision analysis methods with a new taxonomy-based decision support system," *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 302, no. 2, pp. 633–651, 2022.