Ranking of Electronic Business Processes with TOPSIS Technique

Mojtaba Rezaei¹, Mozhgan Ghanbarzadeh Kalian², Mohammad Hosseini³

¹Faculty of Industrial Engineering, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.

2 Department of management, Islamic Azad university, science and research branch, Tehran, Iran.

3 Faculty of management, Department of business management, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran.

Abstract:

E-business is similar to e-commerce, but goes beyond simply buying and selling products and services online. E-business includes a wider range of business processes, such as supply chain management, electronic order processing and customer relationship management. Therefore, e-business processes can help companies operate more efficiently and effectively. The purpose of this research is to rank the main and key options in electronic business using the TOPSIS algorithm. The results showed that the most important among the indicators is related to the idea and creativity to find a new and effective customer in the market and the large and significant network of suppliers, and the indicators of continuous innovation and productivity and the ability to track orders in comparison with the indicators They are less important.

۱

Keywords: ranking, electronic business, TOPSIS algorithm.

1- Introduction

E-business includes any process that a business organization conducts through a computer-mediated network [1]. Business organizations include any for-profit, governmental or non-profit entity. Their processes include production-based, customer-based, and internal or management-based business processes. E-business includes several main components: business intelligence, customer relationship management, supply chain management, enterprise resource planning, e-commerce, intra-company e-commerce, collaboration and online. Inter-occupational activities [2].

Innovations in communication technology allow businesses to operate globally like before. In the past, communications could take several days. Now all business transactions are performed in just few minutes. E-commerce, also known as e-commerce, refers to doing business over the Internet [3-5].

The benefits of such a business are many and increasing every day. Starting an ebusiness is about pursuing the dream of balancing professional goals and personal freedoms at a pace you can live with [6].

The emergence of communication technology facilitated communication, joining companies, creating value networks, and the increasing fading of industry boundaries, and replaced the concept of business model as the unit of analysis. Related business is one of the important and promising business areas that can create thousands of job and income opportunities, if the necessary technological, social and economic infrastructures of the country are provided [7].

There are as many types of business models [8,9]. For example, direct sales, advertising-based stores are the examples of traditional business models. Hybrid models also exist, such as businesses that combine online retail with brick-and-mortar stores or with sports organizations such as the NBA [10].

Veit's business model includes four parts: product, customer interface, infrastructure management, and financial resources. The product element includes the value provided; Customer interface including target customer, distribution channel and relationships. The sub-structure management includes the configuration of value, ability and cooperation, and financial resources including the cost structure and income model [11].

Veit considers this model to be a combination of three elements: value stream (value provided to business partners and customers), income stream (guaranteed income plan for operators) and support (various business supply chain design issues) for business [12].

After numerous reviews and studies, in order to conduct this research in the field of organizing and ranking internet businesses with the aim of creating culture and helping to improve the quality of e-commerce space, as well as compiling the ranking indicators of businesses with the electronic trust symbol [13]. In the first step, on How to monitor how businesses respond to the complaints received by buyers should be considered as a criteria for rating these businesses, and according to the way of interaction and response of franchise owners of internet businesses, initial scoring is based on definition indicators [14]. However, it is important to mention that interaction and response to customers is only one of several criteria considered for ranking internet businesses. Moreover, the indicators such as website security, product presentation quality, customer experience, integrated sales system, optimal and efficient website, full compliance with privacy issues, etc. are all factors that have been explored in most countries of the world to rank businesses. It is hoped that with the implementation of the ranking of internet businesses, a safer and more advanced environment will be provided for new businesses and their customers so that we can see the growth and progress of these businesses as much as possible.

In this research, we are looking for an answer to the question of what is the ranking of businesses active in the field of electronic services.

٣

2- Literature Review

Lucia et al., in a research titled e-business implementation and performance, analysis of mediating factors with the aim of investigating the impact of ebusiness implementation (in terms of internal and external integration) on organizational performance through the mediating effects of differentiation, company agility, It is the development of customer relations and attracting partners. The results show that the measurement of all structures support this feature, except for internal integration. Foreign diffusion leads to differentiation, firm agility, relationship development and partner attraction for American and Spanish firms. However, internal integration has no effect on any outcome that the United States, for Spanish firms, considers to have a positive and direct effect on economic performance. The mediating role of non-financial performance between outsourcing and organizational performance depends on the country [15].

Maditinos et al., in a research entitled factors affecting the implementation of successful e-business with the aim of investigating the impact of organizational capabilities on the successful implementation of e-business, more specifically, the study of a three-dimensional conceptual framework, including " It suggests organizational capabilities of learning, "knowledge management capability", "organizational readiness". The results of this study show that "availability of training", "level of knowledge" and "sharing knowledge" are the most important factors for the successful implementation of e-business. In addition, "company size" seems to be another important factor. On the other hand, "technical expertise", "accumulation of knowledge" and the application of knowledge have a significant impact on the implementation of electronic business [16].

Caldwell et al., in a research entitled the effect of e-commerce on the understanding of supply chain risks with the aim of understanding the risks of managers and individual supply chains in the understanding of e-business. The results show that e-business has the potential to bring benefits consider significant, but also include new and different risks. This research shows that small companies pay short attention to e-business instead of running it. E-business can support rather than reduce relationships within the organization [17].

Yuen, in an article titled Towards a ranking strategy for e-commerce products in Etihad Electronic Portal using the basic cognitive network process, presented that the basic cognitive network process for the ranking strategy is proposed according to multiple criteria and multiple options [18].

Barnes & Hinton in a research entitled the concept of measuring e-business performance using an innovation acceptance framework, the purpose of this article is to renew the evidence of e-business performance by studying it in the innovation acceptance theory. Studying the importance of individual, cognitive, social and cultural influences in environmental organization is a factor in the desire to adapt measurement criteria for online business activities. The findings point to the benefits available from incorporating new theoretical perspectives into performance measurement research [19].

Bordonaba-Juste et al., in a research entitled the antecedents and consequences of e-business adoption for European retailers with the aim of contributing to the discussion related to the antecedents of business e-mail use and the effect of this level in changing strategy, management and marketing. The results show that the application of electronic business means a change in strategy, company management and marketing in all the countries studied. The differences between the two groups of countries are minimal. The main factors influencing the level of business email usage are expertise and perceived benefits [20].

Wen et al, have evaluated the efficiency of these businesses in a research titled measuring the efficiency of e-businesses with the data envelopment analysis method. The input and output variables were determined with three financial, operational and e-business specific criteria [21].

Serrano et al., studied measuring the efficiency of Internet companies using the data coverage analysis method and rank Internet companies based on their efficiency. In this regard. Three criteria have been considered as input and two criteria as output of the system; And by measuring the efficiency of this system, they have ranked internet companies [22].

There are very few researches about the ranking of active companies in the field of electronic business, so that most of these researches are focused on the longterm or short-term performance of electronic businesses.

3- Research method

1- Descriptive and demographic statistics of the research sample The characteristics of the sample members, including gender, work experience and educational degree are reported below.

Gender

As seen in the graph below, 75% of the respondents were male and 25% were female.



Figure 1- Gender of sample people

B-Work experience

As seen in figure (2), 25 percent of the respondents have a work experience between 5 and 10 years. 33% of the participants have a work experience between 11 and 15 years and 17% of the respondents between 16 and 20 years of experience and finally 25% of the participants have a work experience of more than 20 years.



Figure 2- Professional Work experience of sample people

C- Educational Degree

As seen in Figure 3, 25% of the respondents had a master's degree (M.Sc) and 75% of the respondents had a Ph.D degree.



Figure 3- Educational degree of sample people

3-2- Data analysis

In according to the study of theoretical foundations and experts' opinions, the factors influencing the evaluation of electronic business ranking indicators are divided into six main categories (supply management, marketing and market management, supply and sales, logistics and distribution, warranty and customer relations, and internal business management), and 24 sub-factors were identified in the figure 2. Then, the matrix of AHP pairwise comparisons was made for the main and secondary factors and was provided to them in order to get the opinion of the experts.



Figure 2: Conceptual model of e-business factors





3-2-1- Steps of working with AHP

The working steps of the AHP model begin with defining the elements and deciding and prioritizing them. To use AHP in solving the evaluation problem, there are five basic steps as follows:

The first step: forming a hierarchical tree

The second step: determining the importance of criteria and sub-criteria

The third step: determining the importance coefficient of the options

The fourth step: determining the final score

The fifth step: Examining consistency in judgments.

Objective: The main question of the research or the problem that we intend to solve is called the objective. The goal is the highest level of the hierarchical tree and has only one parameter, the selection of which is the task of the highest level of project decision making.

Criteria: It is called the criteria that include the goal and the creator of that criterion. The standards are actually the touchstone of the goal or the means of measuring it. The more the criteria cover more of the target components and express the target more, the more accurate the result will be. Criteria are the second level of the hierarchical tree after the goal. At this level, we can draw and adjust the required number of criteria on the horizontal level as needed. The criteria can be divided into sub-criteria. This situation can be increased up to n below the standard on the vertical and horizontal level depending on the necessity.

Substitutes: Substitutes are actually the purpose and destination of the target in the hierarchical tree, and the target response is obtained from among the drawn alternatives. Alternatives are the last level of the hierarchical tree and it depends on how to use the AHP method.

| The | The comparison | |
|-----------|-------------------------|--|
| preferred | situation of i compared | Explanation |
| value | to j | |
| 1 | Equal importance | Option or index i has equal importance compared to |
| 1 | Equal importance | j or they do not have priority over each other. |
| 2 | Relatively more | Ontion or index, i is clichtly more important than i |
| 3 | important | Option of index 1 is slightly more important than J. |
| 5 | More important | Option or index i is more important than j. |
| 7 | Much more important | Option or index i has much more priority than j. |
| 0 | Absolutoly important | Option or index is absolutely not more important |
| 2 | | than j and comparable to j. |

Table 4: Valuation of indicators relative to each other

3-2-2- Weighing the options based on Chang's extended analysis method

In 1992, Chang presented a very simple method to extend the hierarchical analysis process to fuzzy space. This method, which was developed based on arithmetic mean of experts' opinions and hourly normalization method and using fuzzy triangular numbers, was investigated by researchers. The steps to perform this method are as follows:

Step 1; Draw a hierarchical tree: In this step, draw the structure of the decision hierarchy using the goal, criterion and option levels.

Step 2; Forming the matrix of paired comparisons:

Using the opinion of the decision maker, form the matrix of comparisons using triangular fuzzy numbers $t_{i,j} = (a_{ij}.b_{ij}.c_{ij})$ based on the opinions of several decision makers.

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{bmatrix} (1.1.1) & \begin{cases} \tilde{a}_{211} & \tilde{a}_{1n1} \\ \tilde{a}_{212} & & \\$$

In this matrix, P_{ij} is the number of people commenting on the priority of department i compared to j.

Step 3; Arithmetic mean of opinions: Arithmetic mean of decision makers' opinions in the form of the matrix below

Calculate:

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{bmatrix} (1.1.1) & \tilde{a}_{12} & \tilde{a}_{1n} \\ \tilde{a}_{21} & (1.1.1) & \tilde{a}_{2n} \\ \tilde{a}_{n1} & \tilde{a}_{n2} & (1.1.1) \end{bmatrix}$$

Mean of decision makers' opinions

$$\tilde{a}_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{p_{ij}} a_{ijk}}{P_{ij}} \qquad i.j = 1.2....n$$

Step 4; Calculation of the sum of the row elements: Calculate the sum of the row elements:

$$\tilde{S}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \qquad i = 1.2 \dots n$$

Step 5; Normalize: Normalize the sum of the rows in the following way.

$$\widetilde{M}_i = \widetilde{S}_i \otimes \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{S}_i\right]^{-1} \qquad i = 1.2....n$$

Step 6; Determining the degree of probability of being larger:

We calculate the degree of probability that each μi is larger than other μi and call it d'(Ai).

The degree of probability that the fuzzy triangular number $_{2\mu_2=(l_2,m_2,u)}$ is larger than the fuzzy triangular number $_{1\mu_1=(l_1,m_1,u)}$ is equal to:

$$V(M_2 > M_1) = sub_{y \ge x} [\min(\mu_{M_1}(x), (\mu_{M_2}(y))]$$

This relationship can be synonymously expressed as follows:

$$V(M_2 \ge M_1) = hgt(M_2 \cap M_1) = \mu_{M_2}(d)$$

=
$$\begin{cases} 1 & m_2 \ge m_1 \\ 0 & l_2 \ge u_1 \\ \frac{l_1 - u_2}{(m_2 - u_2) - (m_1 - l_1)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Normalizing: by normalizing the vector and women, the normalized weights are obtained.

$$w = \left[\frac{\dot{d}(A_1)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{d}(A_i)} \cdot \frac{\dot{d}(A_2)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{d}(A_i)} \cdot \dots \cdot \frac{\dot{d}(A_n)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{d}(A_n)}\right]^l$$

The above weights are deterministic (non-phased) weights. By repeating this process, the weights of all the matrices are obtained.

By performing these calculations, the results are obtained in the following order.

Step 8: Combination of weights: By combining the option weights and criteria, the final weights are obtained.

$$\widetilde{U}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \widetilde{W}_i \, \widetilde{r}_{ij} \qquad \forall i$$

3-2-3- TOPSIS method

The main logic of the TOPSIS method presented by Huang and Yun in 1891 is the definition of an ideal solution and a negative ideal solution. The ideal answer is the answer that maximizes the benefit criteria and minimizes the cost criteria. On the contrary, the ideal answer is negative. The best option is the one that has the least distance from the ideal and the most distance from the negative ideal. In this research, the method proposed by Kaya and Kahraman in 2011 was used to perform TOPSIS calculations. Consider the decision matrix related to each of the experts as follows (P is the number of experts, m is the number of options, and n is the number of criteria):

$$\tilde{Z}^{(k)} = \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{Z_{11}}^{(k)} & \cdots & \widetilde{Z_{12}}^{(k)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \widetilde{Z_{21}}^{(k)} & \cdots & \widetilde{Z_{2n}}^{(k)} \\ \vdots \\ \widetilde{Z_{m1}}^{(k)} & \widetilde{Z_{n2}}^{(k)} & \widetilde{Z_{mn}}^{(k)} \end{bmatrix} . k = 1.2....P$$

In the next step, you get the average of experts' opinions collectively.

$$\widetilde{D}^{(k)} = \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{x_{11}}^{(k)} & \widetilde{x_{12}}^{(k)} & \cdots & \widetilde{x_{1n}}^{(k)} & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \widetilde{x_{21}}^{(k)} & \ddots & \cdots & \widetilde{x_{2n}}^{(k)} \\ \vdots \\ \widetilde{x_{m1}}^{(k)} & \widetilde{x_{n2}}^{(k)} & \cdots & \widetilde{x_{mn}}^{(k)} \end{bmatrix}$$

4- Results

4-1- Determining the priority of criteria and indicators using AHP technique

In this research, Hierarchical analysis technique has been used to determine the weight of the extracted criteria and indicators from the records and library studies. In Table 2, the criteria and sub-criteria extracted from the research and the corresponding symbols are presented in the Expert Choice 11 software.

Table 2: Research criteria and sub-criteria and their corresponding symbols in the AHP software

| Criteria | symbol | Sub-criteria | symbol | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|--|--------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | A large and significant network of suppliers | C11 | | | | | |
| | | Communication with the supplier through | C12 | | | | | |
| Supply management | C1 | electronic communication | | | | | | |
| Suppry management | 01 | Codified mechanism for selection, | C13 | | | | | |
| | | evaluation, ranking | | | | | | |
| | | Strategy and consultation and cooperation | C14 | | | | | |
| | | Ideas and creativity to find new customers | C21 | | | | | |
| Marketing and market management | C2 | Participation and cooperation in virtual space | C22 | | | | | |
| | | Effective in the market | C23 | | | | | |
| | | Being up-to-date and having the quality of | C31 | | | | | |
| | | the products | | | | | | |
| | | Easy to use and stylish appearance of the | C32 | | | | | |
| | | product | | | | | | |
| Supply and sale | C3 | Product customization | C33 | | | | | |
| | | C3 Product customization Technical capabilities, especially speed | | | | | | |
| | | security | C35 | | | | | |
| | | Reasonable price compared to competitors | C36 | | | | | |
| | | Availability of products | C41 | | | | | |
| | | Different products | C42 | | | | | |
| Logistics and distribution | C4 | Fast response | C43 | | | | | |
| | | Ability to track orders | C44 | | | | | |
| | | Ability to withdraw the product | C45 | | | | | |
| | | Warranty | C51 | | | | | |
| Warranty and customer | C5 | after sales service | C52 | | | | | |
| relations | | Communication with customers after purchase | C53 | | | | | |
| | | Training and updating employees | C61 | | | | | |
| Internal business management | C6 | Continuous innovation and productivity | C62 | | | | | |
| C | | Cost management strategy | C63 | | | | | |

4-2- Determining the priority and weight of sub-criteria based on the purpose of the research

At this stage, the research sub-criteria have been compared in pairs based on the goal. The final ranking of the 24 criteria affecting the ranking of electronic businesses is presented in Table 3. As can be seen, according to the reported results, the most important among the indicators is related to the idea and

creativity to find a new and effective customer in the market and a large and significant network of suppliers. Also, the indicators of continuous innovation and productivity and the ability to track orders are less important in comparison with other indicators.

| Factors | Weight factor | Indexes | Index weight in the subgroup | Final weight | Rank |
|---------------|------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------|
| | | A large and significant network of suppliers | 0.468 | 0.117 | 3 |
| Supply | | Electronic communication with suppliers | 0.174 | 0.044 | 6 |
| management | 0.251 | Codified mechanism for selection, evaluation, ranking | 0.199 | 0.05 | 5 |
| | | Strategy and consultation and cooperation | 0.159 | 0.04 | 7 |
| Marketing and | | Ideas and creativity to find new customers | 0.587 | 0.268 | 1 |
| market | 0.457 | Participation and cooperation in virtual space | 0.120 | 0.055 | 4 |
| management | | Effective in the market | 0.293 | 0.134 | 2 |
| | | Being up-to-date and having the quality of the products | 0.184 | 0.021 | 14 |
| Supply and | | Easy to use and stylish appearance of the product | 0.076 | 0.009 | 20 |
| sale | 0.116 | Product customization | 0.062 | 0.007 | 21 |
| | | Technical capabilities, especially speed | 0.077 | 0.009 | 19 |
| | | security | 0.328 | 0.038 | 8 |
| | | Reasonable price compared to competitors | 0.273 | 0.032 | 10 |
| | | Availability of products | 0.305 | 0.023 | 13 |
| Logistics and | | Different products | 0.427 | 0.032 | 9 |
| distribution | 0.075 | Fast response | 0.135 | 0.01 | 18 |
| distribution | | Ability to track orders | 0.065 | 0.005 | 23 |
| | | Ability to withdraw the product | 0.069 | 0.005 | 22 |
| Warranty and | | Warranty | 0.337 | 0.019 | 15 |
| | 0.057 | after sales service | 0.462 | 0.026 | 12 |
| relations | 0.007 | Communication with customers after purchase | 0.201 | 0.011 | 17 |
| Internal | | Training and updating employees | 0.239 | 0.011 | 16 |
| business | 0.045 | Continuous innovation and productivity | 0.100 | 0.004 | 24 |
| management | | Cost management strategy | 0.661 | 0.03 | 11 |

| Table 3: The final weights of 24 indicators affecting the ranking of electronic bus | sinesses |
|---|----------|
| based on the AHP technique | |

4-3- Ranking of electronic business processes with TOPSIS technique

In this study, TOPSIS technique was used to rank the key processes of electronic business. The most suitable option is the option that has the most distance from negative factors and the least distance from positive factors. In this research, 5 of the key processes in the TOPSIS technique have been investigated, which are reported in Table 4.

| | process | Symbol in Topsis software |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | Business Intelligence | A1 |
| 2 | Supply Chain Management | A2 |
| 3 | customer relation management | A3 |
| 4 | Enterprise Resource Planning | A4 |
| 5 | Electronic commerce | A5 |

Table 4: Key processes of electronic businesses

In the first stage of the TOPSIS technique, the final criteria extracted using the AHP technique are used as input and decision table columns in the TOPSIS technique. Due to the fact that several experts were used in this research, the decision matrix was obtained through the mean of all experts. This matrix can be observed in Table 5.

Table 5: The decision matrix of all experts

| | C11 | C12 | C13 | C14 | C21 | C22 | C23 | C31 | C32 | C33 | C34 | C35 | C36 | C41 | C42 | C43 | C44 | C45 | C51 | C52 | C53 | C61 | C62 | C63 |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| A 1 | 6.5 | 7.5 | 6 | 6 | 8.5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5.5 | 8 | 7 | 7.5 | 4.5 | 7.5 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 4.5 | 6 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8 | 8 |
| A 2 | 8.5 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| A 3 | 4.5 | 8.5 | 4.5 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 3.5 | 9 | 6.5 | 8 | 5.5 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 5 |
| A 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4.5 | 3 | 3 | 2.5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2.5 | 4.5 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 4 |
| A 5 | 4.5 | 5 | 5.5 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7.5 | 6 | 8.5 | 5.5 | 5 | 6.5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 7.5 |

The steps of the TOPSIS method

Step 1: Normalize the decision matrix

The following relationship is used for normalization.

$$r_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{x_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{ij}^2}} \quad i = 1, \dots, m \quad ; j = 1, \dots, n \quad 1$$

The results of the normalized matrix is reported in Table 6.

| | C11 | C12 | C13 | C14 | C21 | C22 | C23 | C31 | C32 | C33 | C34 | C35 | C36 | C41 | C42 | C43 | C44 | C45 | C51 | C52 | C53 | C61 | C62 | C63 |
|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| A 1 | 0.50 3 | 0.52 3 | 0.44 3 | 0.47 7 | 0.57 4 | 0.35 9 | 0.46 3 | 0.45 5 | 0.46 3 | 0.63 | 0.54 9 | 0.50 6 | 0.42 4 | 0.52 6 | 0.48 5 | 0.52 2 | 0.28 1 | 0.37 8 | 0.33 4 | 0.39 9 | 0.53 8 | 0.56 | 0.48 1 | 0.58 6 |
| A 2 | 0.65 7 | 0.41 9 | 0.66 4 | 0.55 6 | 0.33 8 | 0.50 2 | 0.38 6 | 0.30 3 | 0.29 5 | 0.31 5 | 0.35 3 | 0.40 5 | 0.37 7 | 0.35 | 0.55 4 | 0.58 7 | 0.56 3 | 0.52 9 | 0.52 | 0.53 2 | 0.25 3 | 0.26 4 | 0.42 1 | 0.36 6 |
| A 3 | 0.34 8 | 0.59 3 | 0.33 2 | 0.47 7 | 0.60 8 | 0.43 | 0.54 | 0.53 1 | 0.50 5 | 0.47 3 | 0.27 4 | 0.60 7 | 0.61 3 | 0.56 1 | 0.38 1 | 0.32 6 | 0.56 3 | 0.52 9 | 0.66 8 | 0.59 8 | 0.57 | 0.33 | 0.48 1 | 0.36 6 |
| A 4 | 0.27 1 | 0.27 9 | 0.29 5 | 0.27 8 | 0.27 | 0.32 3 | 0.23 1 | 0.22 7 | 0.21 1 | 0.23 6 | 0.23 5 | 0.27 | 0.28 3 | 0.28 | 0.27 7 | 0.26 1 | 0.21 1 | 0.30 2 | 0.18 6 | 0.29 9 | 0.25 3 | 0.59 3 | 0.36 1 | 0.29 3 |
| A 5 | 0.34 8 | 0.34 9 | 0.40 6 | 0.39 7 | 0.33 8 | 0.57 4 | 0.54 | 0.60 6 | 0.63 2 | 0.47 3 | 0.66 6 | 0.37 1 | 0.47 1 | 0.45 6 | 0.48 5 | 0.45 7 | 0.49 3 | 0.45 4 | 0.37 1 | 0.33 2 | 0.50 7 | 0.39 5 | 0.48 1 | 0.55 |

Table 6: The normalized matrix

Step 2: Calculate the normalized weight matrix

In according to equation 2, the normalized matrix is multiplied by the weight of the criteria and the weighted normalized matrix is obtained.

$$v_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) = w_j r_{ij}(\mathbf{x})$$
 $i = 1, ..., m$; $j = 1, ..., n$ 2

The obtained normalized weight matrix is shown in table 7.

| | C11 | C12 | C13 | C14 | C21 | C22 | C23 | C31 | C32 | C33 | C34 | C35 | C36 | C41 | C42 | C43 | C44 | C45 | C51 | C52 | C53 | C61 | C62 | C63 |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 1 | 59 | 23 | 22 | 19 | 54 | 2 | 62 | 1 | 04 | 04 | 05 | 19 | 14 | 12 | 16 | 05 | 01 | 02 | 06 | 1 | 06 | 06 | 02 | 18 |

Table 7: The normalized weight matrix

| A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2 | 77 | 18 | 33 | 22 | 9 | 28 | 52 | 06 | 03 | 02 | 03 | 15 | 12 | 08 | 18 | 06 | 03 | 03 | 1 | 14 | 03 | 03 | 02 | 11 |
| A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 3 | 41 | 26 | 17 | 19 | 63 | 24 | 72 | 11 | 05 | 03 | 02 | 23 | 2 | 13 | 12 | 03 | 03 | 03 | 13 | 16 | 06 | 04 | 02 | 11 |
| A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 4 | 32 | 12 | 15 | 11 | 72 | 18 | 31 | 05 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 1 | 09 | 06 | 09 | 03 | 01 | 02 | 04 | 08 | 03 | 07 | 01 | 09 |
| A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 5 | 41 | 15 | 2 | 16 | 9 | 32 | 72 | 13 | 06 | 03 | 06 | 14 | 15 | 1 | 16 | 05 | 02 | 02 | 07 | 09 | 06 | 04 | 02 | 16 |

Step 3: Determine positive and negative ideal points

The basis of the TOPSIS method is to calculate the distance of the options from the positive and negative ideal. Therefore, at this stage, the positive and negative ideal solutions are determined according to the following relationships

$$A^{+} = (v_{1}^{+}, v_{2}^{+}, \dots, v_{n}^{+})$$
3

$$A^{-} = (v_{1}^{-}, v_{2}^{-}, \dots, v_{n}^{-})$$

$$4$$

So that:

$$v_j^+ = \{ (\max v_{ij}(x) | j \epsilon j_1), (\min v_{ij}(x) | j \epsilon j_2) \} \ i = 1, ..., m$$
 5

$$v_{j}^{-} = \{ (\min v_{ij}(x) | j \in j_{1}), (\max v_{ij}(x) | j \in j_{2}) \} \ i = 1, \dots, m$$

 j_1 and j_2 correspond to positive and negative criteria, respectively. The ideal positive and negative values for the criteria of this research is presented in table 8.

Table 8: Positive and negative ideal values

| Criteria | Positive ideal | Negative ideal |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| A large and significant network of suppliers | 0.077 | 0.032 |
| Electronic communication with suppliers | 0.026 | 0.012 |
| Codified mechanism for selection, evaluation, | 0.033 | 0.015 |
| ranking | | |
| Strategy and consultation and cooperation | 0.022 | 0.011 |
| Ideas and creativity to find new customers | 0.163 | 0.072 |
| Participation and cooperation in virtual space | 0.032 | 0.018 |
| Effective in the market | 0.072 | 0.031 |

| Sufficiency, accuracy and up-to-date content of | 0.013 | 0.005 |
|---|-------|-------|
| the online store | | |
| Easy to use and stylish appearance of the | 0.006 | 0.002 |
| product | | |
| Product customization | 0.004 | 0.002 |
| Technical capabilities, especially speed | 0.006 | 0.002 |
| security | 0.023 | 0.01 |
| Reasonable price compared to competitors | 0.02 | 0.009 |
| Availability of products | 0.013 | 0.006 |
| Different products | 0.018 | 0.009 |
| Fast response | 0.006 | 0.003 |
| Ability to track orders | 0.003 | 0.001 |
| Ability to withdraw the product | 0.003 | 0.002 |
| Warranty | 0.013 | 0.004 |
| after sales service | 0.016 | 0.008 |
| Communication with customers after purchase | 0.006 | 0.003 |
| Development, training and improvement of | 0.007 | 0.003 |
| employees | | |
| Continuous innovation and productivity | 0.002 | 0.001 |
| Effective and sustainable cost management and | 0.018 | 0.009 |
| revenue models | | |

Step 4: Calculate the distance from positive and negative ideal points

The TOPSIS method ranks options based on how close they are to the positive ideal and how far they are from the negative ideal. Therefore, at this stage, the distance of each option to the positive and negative ideal is calculated based on the following relationships.

$$d_i^+ = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n [v_{ij}(x) - v_j^+(x)]^2} , \ i = 1, \dots, m$$
 7

$$d_i^- = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n [v_{ij}(x) - v_j^-(x)]^2}$$
, $i = 1, ..., m$ 8

The positive and negative distance to the ideal for key processes is shown in table 9.

| Option | Positive ideal distance | Negative ideal distance |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Business Intelligence | 0.031 | 0.094 |
| Supply Chain Management | 0.078 | 0.06 |

Table 9: The distance to positive and negative ideal

| customer relation management | 0.042 | 0.104 |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|
| Enterprise Resource Planning | 0.116 | 0.004 |
| Electronic commerce | 0.084 | 0.052 |

Step 5: Calculate how close the options are to the ideal

At this stage, the degree of proximity of each option to the ideal solution is obtained through the following formula. The closer this amount is to 1, it means that the option has less distance from the positive ideal and more distance from the negative ideal.

$$C_i = \frac{d_i^-}{(d_i^+ + d_i^-)}$$
, $i = 1, ..., m$ 9

The relative closeness of each process or option to the ideal solution and their ranking is shown in table 10. As it is clear from the results of the table, the closest distance to the ideal solution for electronic businesses belongs to business intelligence factors in the first place with a value of 0.755 and customer relationship management in the second place with a value of 0.712.

| Option | Ci | Rank | |
|------------------------------|-------|------|--|
| Business Intelligence | 0.755 | 1 | |
| Supply Chain Management | 0.437 | 3 | |
| Customer relation management | 0.712 | 2 | |
| Enterprise Resource Planning | 0.03 | 5 | |
| Electronic commerce | 0.381 | 4 | |

Table 10: Ranking and closeness of key processes to ideal



Figure 6: Ranking and closeness of key processes to ideal

Conclusion

In this research, the most important indicators affecting the ranking of electronic business were investigated and ranked.

| Supply management | Marketing and market management | Supply and sale | Logistics and distribution | Warranty and customer relations | Internal business management |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 0.251 | 0.457 | 0.116 | 0.075 | 0.057 | 0.045 |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 |

Table 11: Electronic business weight based on AHP technique

As shown in Table 11, the biggest weight of the main factors in the e-business ranking is related to marketing and market management. Also, determining the priority of the weight of the sub-criteria of supply management, the highest weight and importance among the sub-criteria of supply management is the large and significant network of suppliers with a weight of 0.468, and the least important weight is the sub-criterion of strategy and consultation and cooperation with a weight of 0.159.

It is concluded that among all the criteria and their sub-criteria in electronic business, the most important criteria is related to the idea and creativity to find a new and effective customer in the market and the large and significant network of suppliers. In addition, the Continuous innovation and productivity indicators and ability to track orders are less important in comparison with other indicators.

In this research, AHP and TOPSIS methods have been used to prioritize and measure them. which has been done in different steps of this work, in this research, five of the key processes in the TOPSIS technique have been examined, which include business intelligence, supply chain management, customer relationship management, organizational resource planning and business It is electronics, each of which has a symbol assigned to it in the Topsys software. The results in the step of determining positive and negative ideal points in business intelligence with a positive ideal distance of 0.031 and a negative ideal distance of 0.094. In supply chain management with a positive ideal distance of 0.078 and a negative ideal distance of 0.042 and with a negative ideal distance of 0.104. In Enterprise Resource Planning with a positive ideal distance of 0.116 and with a negative ideal distance of 0.084 and with a negative ideal distance of 0.052 was achieved.

After calculating the degree of closeness of the options to the ideal, the closest distance to the ideal solution for electronic businesses belongs to business intelligence agents in the first place with a value of 0.755 and customer relationship management in the second place with a value of 0.712.

References

[1] Brzozowska, A., & Bubel, D. (2015). E-business as a new trend in the economy. *Procedia Computer Science*, 65, 1095-1104.

[2] Kabrilyants, R., Obeidat, B., Alshurideh, M., & Masadeh, R. (2021). The role of organizational capabilities on e-business successful implementation. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, *5*(3), 417-432.

[3] Fathian, M., Akhavan, P. and Hoorali, M., (2008). E-readiness assessment of nonprofit ICT SMEs in a developing country: The case of Iran. Technovation, 28(9), pp.578-590.

[4] Mahdiabadi, S. E., Eslami, S., Eslami, H., & Hataminasab, S. H. (2021). Ranking Cloud Computing Criteria in Developing Electronic Communications Services Using MCDM. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 9(SPE1), 885.

[5] Abid, A. A., Rahim, M. M., & Scheepers, H. (2011). Experienced benefits and barriers of e-business technology adoption by SME suppliers. *Communications of the IBIMA*.

[6] Al Tamer, M. (2021). THE ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS OF E-COMMERCE TO BOTH CUSTOMERS & BUSINESSES. *BAU Journal-Creative Sustainable Development*, 2(2), 6.

[7] Niromand Pourandekht, Ranjabr Mehbobeh, Arabi Seyed Mohammad, Haj Sadeghi Behnaz, 2013, presenting a framework for business model design, information technology management, winter 2013, volume 5, number 4; Page 267 to page 284.

[8] Hitt, L.M. and Brynjolfsson, E., (1994). Creating value and destroying profits?: three measures of information technology's contributions.

[9] Fotouhinia, M., Poushaneh, K., & Khosravi Babadi, A. A. (2021). ranking the factors that determine the neccesity of electronic citizen in the curriculum of the first high school. *Information and Communication Technology in Educational Sciences*, *11*(43), 131-151.

[10] Colovic, A., & Schruoffeneger, M. (2021). Institutional voids and business model innovation: How grassroots social businesses advance deprived communities in emerging economies. *Management and Organization Review*, *17*(2), 314-343.

[11] Anderson, R.C. and Reeb, D.M., (2004). Board composition: Balancing family influence in S&P 500 firms. Administrative science quarterly, 49(2), pp.209-237

[12] Veit, D., Clemons, E., Benlian, A., Buxmann, P., Hess, T., Kundisch, D., ... & Spann, M. (2014). Business models. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 6(1), 45-53.

[15] Lucia-Palacios, L., Bordonaba-Juste, V., Polo-Redondo, Y. and Grünhagen, M., (2014). E-business implementation and performance: analysis of mediating factors. Internet Research, 24(2), pp.223-245.

[16] Maditinos, D., Chatzoudes, D. and Sarigiannidis, L., (2014). Factors affecting ebusiness successful implementation. International Journal of Commerce and Management, 24(4), pp.300-320.

[17] Caldwell, N., Harland, C., Powell, P. and Zheng, J., 2013. Impact of e-business on perceived supply chain risks. Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 20(4), pp.688-715.

[18] Yuen, K.K.F., (2013). Toward a ranking strategy for e-commerce products in an ealliance portal using Primitive Cognitive Network Process. Procedia Computer Science, 17, pp.1091-1096.

[19] Barnes, D. and Matthew Hinton, C., (2012). Reconceptualising e-business performance measurement using an innovation adoption framework. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 61(5), pp.502-517.

[20] Bordonaba-Juste, V., Lucia-Palacios, L. and Polo-Redondo, Y., (2012). Antecedents and consequences of e-business adoption for European retailers. Internet Research, 22(5), pp.532-550.

[21] Wen, H.J., Lim, B. and Lisa Huang, H., (2003). Measuring e-commerce efficiency: a data envelopment analysis (DEA) approach. Industrial Management & Data Systems, 103(9), pp.703-710.

[22] Serrano-Cinca, C., Fuertes-Callén, Y. and Mar-Molinero, C., (2005). Measuring DEA efficiency in Internet companies. Decision Support Systems, 38(4), pp.557-573.