Judul Artikel: **SPATIAL DATA MODELING USING MADM FOR CLASSIFICATION OF FOOD SELF-SUFFICIENCY REGIONS**

1) Submission Confirmation (IJICIC-2107-006) (10 Juli 2021)
2) Review Result: IJICIC-2107-006 (22 Agustus 2021)
3) Acceptance Letter: IJICIC-2107-006 (8 Januari 2022)
4) Final Submission (IJICIC-2107-006) (15-28 Januari 2022)
5) Paper Proof (IJICIC-2107-006) (14 Februari 2022)
6) Publish (April 2022)

1) Submission Confirmation (IJICIC-2107-006) (10 Juli 2021)

Unitomo Mail

ANIK VEGA V, S.Kom.,MT unitomo <vega@unitomo.ac.id>

Submission Confirmation (IJICIC-2107-006)

2 pesan

office@ijicic.net <office@ijicic.net> 10 Juli 2021 pukul 07.26
Kepada: vega@unitomo.ac.id
Cc: www.erri@stmik-yadika.ac.id, seftin.fitri.si@upnjatim.ac.id, robertmarco@amikom.ac.id, almaukar@president.ac.id

Dear Ms. Anik vega Vitianingsih,

We are pleased to receive your manuscript for possible publication in International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control (IJICIC).

Reference No.: IJICIC-2107-006

Title: Spatial Data Modeling Using MADM Model Approach For Classification Of Food Self-Sufficiency Regions

Author(s): Anik vega Vitianingsih, Robert Marco, Anastasia Lidya Maukar , Erri Wahyu Puspitarini, Seftin Fitri Ana W

It has been assigned the above number "IJICIC-2107-006". We hope to process the submission within next two to three months.

The following points were confirmed during submission.

1) The manuscript that has been submitted has not been published, is not scheduled to be published, and indeed is not currently under review for publication elsewhere.

2) The author (or the author's institution or company) will be approached with a kind request to pay a reasonable charge as described in the journal website to cover part of the cost of publication, if the manuscript is accepted.

3) All authors have contributed to the completion of this manuscript and agree with submission of the contents of this manuscript. It is authors' responsibility to provide their correct contact information (affiliations and emails), and the journal office takes no responsibility to verify the information. If authors provide false contact information, then their submissions will be rejected, and their published papers will be retracted as soon as it becomes clear.

Please remember in any future correspondence regarding this article to always include its manuscript number IJICIC-2107-006, and feel free to contact us at office@ijicic.net if you have any further question.

Thanks for submitting your manuscript to IJICIC.

Kind regards,

Dr. Yan SHI

Executive Editor, IJICIC

Professor, School of Industrial and Welfare Engineering, Tokai University

9-1-1, Toroku, Kumamoto 862-8652, Japan

Tel.: 81-96-386-2666, Fax: 81-96-386-2666

E-mail: office@ijicic.net

ANIK VEGA V, S.Kom.,MT unitomo <vega@unitomo.ac.id> 10 Juli 2021 pukul 22.53
Kepada: office@ijicic.net

Dear Editor IJICIC,

I will confirm the delivery of paper ID "IJICIC-2107-006" as follows:

1. The manuscript that I have been submitted has not been published, is not scheduled to be published, and indeed is not currently under review for publication elsewhere. **(authors agree)**
2. The author (or the author's institution or company) will be approached with a kind request to pay a reasonable charge as described in the journal website to cover part of the cost of publication if the manuscript is accepted. **(authors agree)**
3. All authors have contributed to the completion of this manuscript and agree with the submission of the contents of this manuscript. It is the authors' responsibility to provide their correct contact information (affiliations and emails), and the journal office takes no responsibility to verify the information. If authors provide false contact information, then their submissions will be rejected, and their published papers will be retracted as soon as it becomes clear. **(authors agree)**

Many thanks

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

2) Review Result: IJICIC-2107-006 (22 Agustus 2021)

ANIK VEGA V, S.Kom.,MT unitomo <vega@unitomo.ac.id>

Review Result: IJICIC-2107-006 (1)

1 pesan

office@ijicic.net <office@ijicic.net> 22 Agustus 2021 pukul 17.10
Kepada: vega@unitomo.ac.id
Cc: www.erri@stmik-yadika.ac.id, seftin.fitri.si@upnjatim.ac.id, robertmarco@amikom.ac.id, almaukar@president.ac.id

Dear Ms. Anik vega Vitianingsih,

Reference No.: IJICIC-2107-006

Title: Spatial Data Modeling Using MADM Model Approach For Classification Of Food Self-Sufficiency Regions

Author(s): Anik vega Vitianingsih, Robert Marco, Anastasia Lidya Maukar , Erri Wahyu Puspitarini, Seftin Fitri Ana W

The paper above you submitted for possible publication in International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control (IJICIC), has been reviewed by an Associate Editor and/or reviewers. Based on the Associate Editor’s recommendation with which I concur (see the bottom of this email), I am sorry to inform you that your paper is not publishable in its current form. However, it may be publishable after extensive revision and rewriting. If you decide to do this, I would suggest that you carefully consider the comments of the Associate Editor/reviewers, and submit the revised version and response letter to IJICIC Office within three months from the date of this letter.

Thank you for your submission to IJICIC, and we are looking forward to receiving the revision, soon.

Best Regards,

Dr. Yan SHI

Executive Editor, IJICIC

Professor, School of Industrial and Welfare Engineering, Tokai University

9-1-1, Toroku, Kumamoto 862-8652, Japan

Tel.: 81-96-386-2666, Fax: 81-96-386-2666

E-mail: office@ijicic.net

Comments:
(1) It is of good significance to present spatial data modeling to classify and predict food self-sufficiency areas using an approach for multi-attribute decision making based on Geographical Information System technology.
(2) The full name of acronyms in the Abstract such as GIS, MADM and WPM are suggested to be given, in order to clearly state the key information of the work.
(3) The motivation of making the contribution is stated as the proposed multi-parameter criteria for modeling spatial data with WPM and Naïve Bayes methods have not been

used in previous studies [2, 6, 8, 13, 16, 18, 19, 24]. It is not convincing enough. Please specify the motivation.
(4) At the end of the Introduction, a summary on the structure of the work is suggested to be added.
(5) The structure of the work is not good. After the Introduction, it is not proper to list two sections without any incremental contribution. Thus, consider to adjust the structure to highlight the incremental point.
(6) The flowchart in Figure 1 shows the main contribution, so more corresponding explanations are suggested to be added. In addition, the resolution of the work is suggested to be improved.
(7) Section 4 should be enriched, where the technical details in the integration are suggested to be made clear.
(8) In Section 5, some concern exist. First, all figures are not clear enough. Second, the practical insights are not enough. Third, the advantage of the work is not highlighted. Please consider to fix these concerns.
(9) More up-to-date studies are suggested to be added, such as “Chen Zhang, Senchun Chai, Lingguo Cui and Baihai Zhang, Road Condition Recognition in Self-Driving Cars Based on Classification and Regression Tree, ICIC Express Letters, Part B: Applications, vol.10, no.12, pp.1115-1122, 2019”.
(10) Some syntax errors exist, such as the “Otgonbayar et al. (2017), This research use...” and “Onojeghuo et al (2018), using machine learning vector machine...” on Page 3. Please double check the English.

Dear Editor of the International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control (IJICIC),

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to revise the manuscript:

- Manuscript number: **IJICIC-2107-006**
- Title: Spatial Data Modeling Using MADM for Classification of Food Self-Sufficiency Regions

In detail, we include point-by-point changes that are done to revise this paper.

Thank for your attention.

Best regards,
Anik Vega Vitianingsih

Comments:

(1) It is of good significance to present spatial data modeling to classify and predict food self-sufficiency areas using an approach for multi-attribute decision making based on Geographical Information System technology.

Answer:
Thank you for your support.

(2) The full name of acronyms in the Abstract such as GIS, MADM and WPM are suggested to be given, in order to clearly state the key information of the work.

Answer:
The full name of acronyms in the Abstract in order to clearly state the key information, we have listed. Thanks for the suggestion.

(3) The motivation of making the contribution is stated as the proposed multi-parameter criteria for modeling spatial data with WPM and Naïve Bayes methods have not been used in previous studies [2, 6, 8, 13, 16, 18, 19, 24]. It is not convincing enough. Please specify the motivation.

Answer:
The suggestion to improve we provide in paragraphs 6 and 7 based on literature study in paragraph 5 in section I. Introduction.

(4) At the end of the Introduction, a summary on the structure of the work is suggested to be added.

Answer:
The suggestion to improve we provide in paragraph 5 in section I. Introduction.

(5) The structure of the work is not good. After the Introduction, it is not proper to list two sections without any incremental contribution. Thus, consider to adjust the structure to highlight the incremental point.

Answer:
We have adjusted suggestions for improvements to the paper

(6) The flowchart in Figure 1 shows the main contribution, so more corresponding explanations are suggested to be added. In addition, the resolution of the work is suggested to be improved.

Answer:
We have adjusted suggestions for improvements to the paper in section 3.

(7) Section 4 should be enriched, where the technical details in the integration are suggested to be made clear.

Answer:
Section 4 in the previous paper, Methodology Chapter, I have adjusted the suggestions for improvement in section 3.

(8) In Section 5, some concern exist. First, all figures are not clear enough. Second, the practical insights are not enough. Third, the advantage of the work is not highlighted. Please consider to fix these concerns.

Answer:
Suggestions for improvement we have given in Section 5

(9) More up-to-date studies are suggested to be added, such as "Chen Zhang, Senchun Chai, Lingguo Cui and Baihai Zhang, Road Condition Recognition in Self-Driving Cars Based on Classification and Regression Tree, ICIC Express Letters, Part B: Applications, vol.10, no.12, pp.1115-1122, 2019".

Answer:
We are sorry to say, the title of the paper "Road Condition Recognition in Self-Driving Cars Based on Classification and Regression Tree", I can't find on a search engine.

(10) Some syntax errors exist, such as the "Otgonbayar et al. (2017), This research use..." and "Onojeghuo et al (2018), using machine learning vector machine..." on Page 3. Please double check the English.

Answer:
Thank you for your suggestion, we have rechecked the manuscript with tools (Grammarly) to find the syntax errors, and proofread by colleagues. and we found more syntax errors. Syntax errors have been removed and edited (my changes a yellow block mark)

Spatial Data Modeling Using MADM for Classification of Food Self-Sufficiency Regions

Anik Vega Vitianingsih[1*], Robert Marco[2], Anastasia Lidya Maukar[3], Seftin Fitri Ana Wati[4], and Annur Tsalis[5]

[1,5]Department of Informatics
Universitas Dr. Soetomo, Surabaya, Indonesia
*Corresponding author: vega@unitomo.ac.id
tsalisannur@gmail.com

[2]Department of Informatics
Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
robertmarco@amikom.ac.id

[3]Department of Industrial Engineering
President University, Bekasi, Indonesia
almaukar@president.ac.id

[5]Department of Information System
UPN Veteran Jawa Timur, Surabaya, Indonesia
seftin.fitri.si@upnjatim.ac.id

ABSTRACT. A population increase without equivalent rice production can lead to a decrease in food security. Efforts are required to identify agricultural land for its self-sufficient rice field areas. This paper presents spatial data modeling to classify and predict food self-sufficiency areas using multi-attribute decision making (MADM) by applying Geographical Information System (GIS) technology. The classification of food self-sufficient areas uses the Weighted Product (WP) method applying multi-attribute parameters of agricultural production, total food demand, and the area of the agricultural sub-districts. The Naive Bayes method predicts food self-sufficiency based on several parameters: seed type, fertilizer, season, and terrain type. The results of the method test show superiority in classifying food self-sufficient areas by having an average coefficient value in the kappa index test of 0.78. The trial results conclude that this method has good agreement strength for use in spatial data analysis of the food self-sufficient areas classification using the MADM approach.

Keywords: GIS, Spatial Data Modeling, Food Self-Sufficiency, MADM, WP, Naïve Bayes

1. Introduction. Rice is one of the staple foods consumed by several countries worldwide. Thus, it is important to map rice fields in a timely and efficient manner to maintain agricultural sustainability and food security. The agricultural land mapping remains challenging in fragmented landscapes, such as rice-growing areas because the information on rice farming areas is still dominated by small-scale agriculture compared to large-scale agriculture. Thus, land use is one of the functions in accelerating the production of agricultural products aimed at meeting food needs and improving people's welfare [1]. Based on the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) survey results, it is estimated that the growth rate of agricultural production is estimated to decline to 1.5% between 2015 and 2030, further to 0.9% between 2030 and 2050. Thus, it is necessary to apply a spatial pattern to produce information on the distribution/mapping of rice fields, which is very much needed as a strategic form of food security [2].

Spatial data analysis is essential for monitoring and controlling agricultural land mapping. In the last few decades, there has been growing research interest in proposing MADM-based models in analyzing spatial data for areas such as healthcare [3] [4]; agriculture [5] [6]; population [7], and so on. It was developed based on climatic, soil, and topographical conditions to determine the rank of various suitability factors and weights as a map of the suitability of production and rice fields [8]. The rice farming land suitability analysis based on spatial climate maps was carried out using Extracting Criteria Maps for the Agro-climatic zoning and weighted overlay as a spatial analysis used in zoning the suitability of other crops in the State [9].

Spatial data modeling is a process of spatial data analysis in geocoding and mapping to produce a decision-making system used for stakeholder policy [10] [11]. At present, the rapid development of the GIS through the integration process and precise analysis can be performed using different methods. The model approach uses MADM to determine the factors and their weights for mapping the suitability of rice farming land [12], such as Analytical hierarchical process [13]–[15]; Simple additive weighting [16]. Meanwhile, modeling and analyzing spatial patterns through a machine learning-based Artificial Intelligence (AI) algorithm that is used for mapping the suitability of rice farming land, includes: Naïve bayes and Radial basis function networks [12]; Decision tree [17]; Bayesian [18]; Support vector machine and Random Forest [19].

The suitability analysis of land mapping and the preparation of land use maps using GIS is the most practical application in land resource planning and management [20]. GIS technology has been widely used in evaluating the suitability of agricultural land mapping because it leads to the rapid creation of static maps and map estimates by combining several information data to produce a layer suitability map [20]–[23]. Based on previous research, GIS technology uses spatial analysis to identify agricultural land suitability with spatial, temporal, and spatial-temporal methods. The development of sustainable rice was analyzed by integrating the logistic regression and multi-criteria land evaluation, such as characteristics of local land-use conversions [24]. A Bayesian autoregressive framework that utilizes available agricultural spatial data was used for developing a predictive smoothing model for the self-sufficiency index (SSI) as a subset of clusters [18][24]. However, previous studies did not use the approach and parameters presented in this paper's discussion, namely the multi-criteria parameter approach, to explore the need for supporting factors in the analysis process, AI method using mathematical modeling is suitable to produce a mapping distribution of agricultural land areas with multi-class classification and experts to determine criteria, weighting, and ranking attributes.

The most relevant literature and the theory of used methods in this study [25] related to the classification of agricultural land mapping areas based on food self-sufficiency status. Several literature studies have attempted to improve results in scientifically mapping an area. Also, previous researchers have suggested developing mathematical models, GIS MADM methods, and AI. Thus, in the theoretical background section, we focus on the studies of MADM, AI, GIS, or a combination of these methods. The studied an ecological model framework by using multi-criteria decision-making methods such as the Analytic Network Process (ANP), Simple Additive Weighting (SAW), and Vlse Kriterijumska Optimizacija I Kompromisno Resenje-Analytical Hierarchy Process (VIKOR-AHP) in a GIS environment with the aim of selecting a suitable location for agricultural land use [16]. Another study, merging geographic information system (GIS) technology and multi-criteria decision making (MCDM) using the Analytic hierarchy process (AHP) for the suitability of agricultural land for crop cultivation [15]. This research [17] use the MCDM (multi-criteria decision-making) spatial method and the AHP-based GIS, it is developed for each criterion layer value by multiplying the parameters for each factor obtained from the pair comparison matrix by adding weights and by the appropriate evaluation of several criterion factors affecting agricultural land. In comparison application of the AHP method is used to rank various suitability factors. The resulting weights are used to build a suitability map layer using the weighted sum overlay tool on the ArcGIS 10.1 platform. Furthermore, a map of the suitability of rice production in the study area was made [8]. The research of [18] pproposed machine learning vector machine (SVM) and random forest (RF) classification algorithms to map the spatial distribution of rice fields. The presented a Bayesian autoregressive framework that leverages available agricultural data to develop predictive smoothing models for the self-sufficiency index (SSI) [19]. The developed a fuzzy multi-criteria decision-making technique integrated with GIS to assess suitable areas for rice cultivation in Amol District, Iran. The suitability factors, including soil properties, climatic conditions, topography, and accessibility, were selected based on the FAO framework and expert opinion [20]. Based on the literature review results, there are still limited studies that combine several methods for mapping agricultural land.

There are several main challenges in the suitability of mapping rice farming land-based on food self-sufficiency status. The first issue concerns spatial information about the surrounding population, which is reflected in the demand for rice as a food security strategy to agricultural productivity. To overcome it, geographic information about the surrounding environment and the network structure is required. Second, the attributes of the surrounding environment to climatic conditions and pest attacks. Several previous studies have stated that population density is the most significant criterion for food security [2][26]. Another study stated that essential factors in agricultural yield models are climate, soil properties, and water availability [27]. In this case, there is an analysis related to land suitability that must be applied in the final decision to meet the needs and reflect local conditions well [2][6], which is used to produce information on spatial mapping and the areas of rice fields as a strategic form of food security [2]. The proposed multi-parameter criteria for modeling spatial data with WP and Naïve Bayes methods have not been used in previous studies. The authors proposed an approach through spatial data modeling using MADM to determine the mapping of agricultural areas based on the scope of food self-sufficiency status to address the challenges of mapping rice farming areas to determine food self-sufficiency status. Based on the authors' knowledge, the approach proposed in this paper is still very limited so far.

MADM (Multi-Attribute Decision-Making) approaches are commonly used to find the best solution, choose a single option, or rate options from most to least appropriate [28]. The Weighted Product (WP) method is one of the Multiple-Attribute Decision Making (MADM) methods. It aims to evaluate and compare to the rest through the multiplication of ratios related to every criterion and select the most applicable alternatives [29]. This method is more straightforward and more efficient [28]. The WP method is considered suitable for both single and multi-dimensional problems/have high subjectivity [30], and produces a short calculation time [31]. In addition, the WP method has a moderate agreement strength category, which can be applied for modeling spatial data in GIS for regional classification [4]. While the use of Naïve Bayes classification in determining the class based on the hypothesis, there is no dependence between attributes in maximizing the posterior probability [32][33]. This method can quickly build simple structures without learning procedures and has a shorter computation time, resulting in higher efficiency [34]. Naïve Bayes is one of the algorithms that have advantages and outperforms many sophisticated classifications, especially when the attributes are not strongly correlated [33][35][36]. Meanwhile, limited studies combine Naive Bayes classification with weighting features [37]–[39].

The results of this study could be part of an effort to observe, monitor, and control food self-sufficiency as a strategic aspect of food security in developing countries with tropical climates. The mapping results can help stakeholders or the food security agency to classify and predict self-sufficient food areas. AI is used as a framework in spatial data modeling, using GIS technology to visualize the classification of food self-sufficient areas. Implementation and testing of the system, it can be concluded that the application of web-GIS applications to determine food self-sufficiency mapping in Mojokerto district can provide information on the productivity of agricultural rice products, be able to determine the regional potential for self-sufficiency, and be able to predict areas of potential self-sufficiency in very good, good, adequate, less, very less for any calculation method analysis. The results of the analysis using the Weighted Product and Naive Bayes methods based on the parameters of land area, productivity, population, irrigation system, rainfall, and agricultural equipment in Mojokerto district show that the prediction of self-sufficiency in Mojokerto district shows good results by having an average coefficient value on the test. Kohen Kappa index is 0.78, and the analysis results determine the number of areas with abundant agricultural products and can be made self-sufficient.

2. Method. Integrating GIS with MADM techniques for decision-making creates a powerful tool to solve various problems, including selecting a feasible location [40]. A practical framework for comparison is finding the most desirable from a limited set of alternatives on a predefined attribute [41]. Decision-making systems involving spatial data can be equipped with MADM, integrating and managing spatial data and attribute data to perform spatial data analysis [42] [43]. The spatial data modeling in the discussion of this paper as basic data to produce a classification of agricultural land mapping based on the scope of food self-sufficiency status. The stages of the spatial data modeling process for classification are shown in the flowchart in Figure 1.



Figure 1. Flowchart of spatial data modeling for food self-sufficiency classification

Step 1. The initial stage will be inputting or recording all data needed. The goal is to define the spatial data requirements and layer attribute data in the spatial shapefile dataset (*.shp). The spatial datasets include district maps in each sub-district. This paper uses two types of datasets, namely spatial datasets and quantitative attribute datasets. The spatial datasets consist of a base map of the Mojokerto Regency, consisting of 18 sub-districts with information coverage in the village level. The quantitative attribute dataset for food self-sufficiency spatial data modeling (Table 1) contains attributes, such as population (households/sub-district), land in hectare (Ha), productivity in quintal (=100 kg) per hectare (Qt/Ha), Plant Pest Organisms (Pest), and Rainfall (Month). The quantitative attribute dataset for spatial data modeling predicting food self-sufficiency (Table 2) contains attributes, such as types of seeds, type of fertilizer, irrigation system, agricultural land area, and agricultural tools

Step 2. The spatial data modeling to determine food self-sufficiency areas using the WP method on the MADM model is explained in section 2.1. the WP method through the MADM method will process the results of the regulation layer to get the V_i Preference value. The spatial data modeling for predicting food self-sufficiency using the Naïve Bayes method on machine learning is explained in section 2.2.

Step 3. Determine the ranking value to determine the classification of food self-sufficiency areas using the Guttman Scale. Based on the explanation of the steps in section 2.3 and the results of calculations using Eq. (9). The Guttman method for value classification includes the category of food self-sufficiency status with very good, good, average, fair, and poor conditions in each region.

Step 4. Calculate the degree of agreement for both assessment methods using Cohen's kappa method based on the process of section 2.5. Calculate the measuring Classification Model performance using APR based on section 2.6.

2.1 Multiple Attribute Decision Making (MADM). MADM is part of the multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) and multi-objective decision-making (MODM) systems [44]. MADM is used for discrete retrieval, where alternative decision support systems are predetermined [45]. The Weighted Product (WP) method is a popular weighting method that is part of a decision-making system using MADM multi-parameter criteria [30]. In addition, WP method has a limited set of decision alternatives that provide explanations for several decision criteria. The main process of using WP method is multiplication, which serves to connect attribute ratings, where each attribute must be ranked with attribute weights. This process has similarities to the normalization process [46][47]. The weighting of this method is calculated based on the level of importance, the more important, the higher the weight value. The importance of the Weighted Product method, with a value of 1 is "very unimportant" to 5 is "very important".

The WP method approach is to assign a score to each resulting alternative multiplied by the weighted value for each parameter attribute, with the following steps:

Step 1. Determine the criteria (C_j). Determine the recommendation of rice farming land that has the suitability status of a food self-sufficient area to be accepted. Then some criteria are taken for decision making. These criteria have been determined based on expert judgment. In MADM, using expert weight rationality directly influences the accuracy of the decision results [48].

Step 2. Determine the weight value of each of the existing criteria (w). The weight is the value or relative importance of each criterion (C_j) given by experts. Meanwhile, the process in Eq. (1) of normalizing the criterion weight (W), $\sum w_j = 1$.

$$W = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\} \tag{1}$$

Where $W(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)$ is the weighted value of each criterion of importance, while $\sum w_j$ is the sum of all the weights added up to reach a value of 1.

Step 3. Simplify the weight criteria (normalization). Simplification of each weight of each criterion according to Eq. (2). Normalize or increase the weights to produce a value of $w_j = 1$ where $j = 1,2, \dots, n$ many alternatives and $\sum w_j$ is the sum of weights.

$$W_j = \frac{w_j}{\sum w_j} \tag{2}$$

Step 4. Calculate of value the vector S_i as a preference for an alternative, is given based on Eq. (3).

$$S_i = \prod_{j=1}^{n} X_{ij} W_j, with\ i = 1,2, \dots m \tag{3}$$

Where, S_i is the result of normalization of decisions on ith alternative (preference criteria), X_{ij} is an alternative rating per attribute (value of the criteria), and W_j variable is the attribute Weight, and n is the number of criteria. On this alternative, where $\sum w_j = 1$. W_j is the rank of positive value for the profit attribute and negative value for the cost attribute.

Step 5. Calculate of value the vector V_i to calculate the relative Preference of each alternative on vector V, with the following Eq. (4). Determine the value of the vector V where is vector V is an alternative preference that will be used to rank each number of vector values S with the total value of vector S.

$$V_i = \frac{S_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} S_i}, with\ i = 1,2, \dots, m \tag{4}$$

2.2 Naïve Bayes. Naïve Bayes is a simple probability classification method that estimates the probability of a new observation included in a predefined category [34][47]. It is assumed that the classification can be estimated by calculating the conditional probability density function and the posterior probability [49]. Posterior probability can be calculated based on Eq. (5) and Eq. (6) [50].

$$P(c|x) = \frac{P(x|c)P(c)}{P(x)} \tag{5}$$

$$P(c|x) = P(x_1|c) \times P(x_2|c) \times \dots \times P(x_n|c) \times P(c) \tag{6}$$

Where, $P(c|x)$ as the posterior probability of class (c, target) given predictor (x, attribute), while $P(c)$ is the probability of the previous class, and $P(x)$ is the previous probability of the predictor. $P(x|c)$ is the possibility, which is the class probability given the predictor.

2.3 Spatial Dataset. In this section, we will explain the results of the weighting process using the Weighted Product method. The weight values of each attribute of self-sufficiency are shown in Table 1. Each spatial dataset will be assigned a weighted value to determine the level of importance/influence on the classification. The level of importance used for weighting in each attribute [51] is as follows:

- if X_i is very good, then the value of X_i is 95.
- if X_i is good, then the value of X_i is 85.
- if X_i is an average, then the value of X_i is 75.
- if, X_i is fair, then the value of X_i is 65.
- if, X_i is poor, then the value of X_i is 55.

Table 1. Weighting Parameters of Self-Sufficiency Attributes Using WP Method

Attribute	**Parameter**	**Category**	**Weight value**
Population (X_1)	< 500	Very good	95
	500 – 1000	Good	85
	> 1000	Average	75
Agricultural land area (X_2)	> 250	Very good	95
	250 – 200	Good	85
	200 – 150	Average	75
	150 – 100	Fair	65
	100 – 0	Poor	55
Productivity (Qt/Ha) (X_3)	> 90	Very good	95
	≤ 90 – >70	Good	85
	≤ 70 – >50	Average	75
	≤ 50 – >30	Fair	65
	< 30	Poor	55
OPT (Pest) ($X4$)	0 – 8 %	Very good	95
	8 – 15 %	Good	85
	15 – 25 %	Average	75
	25 – 45 %	Fair	65
	> 45 %	Poor	55
Rainfall (Month) (X_3)	≥150mm	Very good	95
	<150mm – ≥100mm	Good	85
	<100mm – ≥50mm	Average	75
	<50mm	Fair	65

After determining the parameter weight values, the next step is the WP method calculation, which will be reviewed in the next sub-chapter. This method is used to determine which districts are food self-sufficient. Next, the Naive Bayes method is used for determining the weights of each attribute of self-sufficiency prediction by using data in Table 2.

Table 2. Weighting Parameters of Self-Sufficiency Prediction Attributes Using Naïve Bayes

Attribute	**Parameter**	**Category**
Types of seeds	Hybrid	Very good
	Superior	Good
	Local	Average
Type of fertilizer	Organic and Inorganic (Mix)	Very good
	Inorganic	Good
	Organic	Average
Irrigation system	Technical Irrigation Rice Fields	Very good
	Semi-Technical Irrigation Rice Fields	Good
	Rainfed Rice Fields	Average
Agricultural land area	> 250	Very good
	250 – 200	Good

Attribute	Parameter	Category
	200 – 150	Average
	150 – 100	Fair
	100 – 0	Poor
Agricultural tools TR2: Tractor RT/TRAY: Rice Transplanter with tray	TR2 +RT/TRAY (Mix)	Very good
	TR2	Good
	RT/TRAY	Average

2.4 The Guttman Scale. The Guttman scale is a method of measuring the value of the classification [52]. This scale is a basis for measurement to draw conclusions on qualitative data [53] and to remove ambiguity from an intervention result value in the estimated classification value [54]. The type of dataset that uses scores/weights in the analysis process will provide a value based on the uncertainty factor of the class of variables described, which can be measured using the Guttman scale [55] based on Eq. (7).

$$I = \frac{R}{K} \tag{7}$$

Where I is the result of the interval value obtained from the variable R, which is the range of data values and the K variable with the number of alternative classifications that will be generated. In the discussion of this paper, the value of the variable R is obtained from the range of values between the maximum value of V_i and the minimum value of V_i. Variable K is the number of alternative classifications, namely very good, good, average, fair, dan poor.

2.5 Method Consistency Test. The Cohen Kappa method was used to test the consistency of the two methods used in this study. This measurement is used for qualitative data based on Eq. (8) [56].

$$K = \frac{\Pr(a) - \Pr(e)}{1 - \Pr(e)} \tag{8}$$

K is the measurement coefficient between the WP and Naive Bayes methods. While $Pr(a)$ as a percentage of the number of consistent measurements for comparisons between methods, and $Pr(e)$ is the percentage change. Based on the Cohen Kappa method, explaining the range of coefficient values, as follows: if the value of the variable $K < 0.21$, the strength of agreement is called "poor", if the value is between 0.21 and 0.40 is called "fair", if the value is between 0.41 and 0 .60 is called "moderate", a value of 0.61 to 0.80 is called "good" agree strength, and if it is between 0.81 and 1.00 is called "very good" the strength agrees.

2.6 Confusion Matrix Measuring Model. This method uses the accuracy, precision, and recall approach to validation and evaluation methods. Confusion matrix [57] [58] that used in this approach, consisting of two positive and two negative classes which compare the actual data and the data obtained as output of classification as in Table 3. The precision, recall, and accuracy value is calculated with the average value in each class.

Table 3. Confusion Matrix

Actual data	**Predicted classification**	
	Positive (+)	**Negative (-)**
Positive (+)	True positives (TP)	False negatives (FN)
Negative (-)	False positives (FP)	True negatives (TN)

Precision and recall are generally defined as the ratio between correctly identified events (usually known as true positives in classification), and significant events (precision), or actual events (recall) [60].

3. Results and Discussion. The trial data from private datasets from the Department of Agriculture of the Mojokerto districts, Indonesia, is a reference source and guidance on multi-criteria parameters.

This paper will analyze self-sufficiency results in one of the 19 sub-districts, namely *Jolotundo* village. The result of the classification scale value for mapping the area of agricultural rice land is based on the status of food self-sufficiency using the WP method refers to Eq. (9). Table 4 represents the findings of the Guttman Scale examination based on Eq. (7).

Table 4. The Findings of the Guttman Scale Examination

WP Method
$R = V_{i_{Max}} - V_{i_{Min}} = 0.21160 - 0.1929 = 0.0187$ $K = 5$ and, $I = \frac{0.0187}{5} = 0.00374$
Assessment very good criteria: $Highest\ score - I = 0.21160 - 0.00374 = 0.20786$ *Assessment good criteria:* $Very\ good\ criteria - I = 0.20786 - 0.00374 = 0.20412$ *Assessment average criteria:* $Good\ criteria - I = 0.20412 - 0.00374 = 0.20038$ *Assessment fair criteria:* $average\ criteria - I = 0.20038 - 0.00374 = 0.19664$

$$\begin{cases} very\ good, if\ V_i \geq 0.20786 \\ good, if\ V_i \geq 0.20412\ and\ V_i < 0.20786 \\ average, if\ V_i \geq 0.20038\ and\ V_i < 0.20412 \\ fair, if\ V_i \geq 0.19664\ and\ V_i < 0.20038 \\ very\ good, if\ V_i < 0.19664 \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

Table 5 shows implementation datasets of self-sufficiency attributes assessment from five different Jolotundo villages.

Table 5. Weighted Product Implementation Datasets

Village	**Attributes (X)**				
	Population (X_1)	Land area (X_2)	Productivity (X_3)	O.P.T. (X_4)	Rainfall (X_5)
Jolotundo	75	95	75	96	75

Step 1. The WP method requires weights and attributes to determine food self-sufficiency in the Food Security Agency.
Step 2. The decision-maker assigned the Preference Weights for each attribute (X_i). The results are shown in Table 6 (source by research appendix at the Department of Agriculture, Mojokerto Regency, Department of Agriculture, Mojokerto Regency, Indonesia).

Table 6. Weights of each self-sufficiency attribute preferences

Weight	**Attribute (X_i)**				
	Population (X_1)	Land area (X_2)	Productivity (X_3)	O.P.T (X_4)	Rainfall (X_5)
w	95	75	65	80	95
$\sum w_i = 395$					

Step 3. based on Table 7, the normalization is performed using Eq. (2), and the result can be seen in Table 5.

Table 7. Result of normalization of self-sufficiency attributes

Weight	X_1 $\left(\frac{X_1}{\sum W}\right)$	X_2 $\left(\frac{X_2}{\sum W}\right)$	X_3 $\left(\frac{X_3}{\sum W}\right)$	X_4 $\left(\frac{X_4}{\sum W}\right)$	X_5 $\left(\frac{X_5}{\sum W}\right)$
w	0.24	0.19	0.24	0.16	0.16
$\sum w_i = 1.00$					

Step 4. Calculate $\boldsymbol{S}$ vector using Eq (3), with the elaboration of the formula as Eq. (9). The result of vector calculations of each village for self-sufficiency attributes calculation are shown in Table 8.

$$S_i = (X_1 \wedge^{attribute\ weight\_x_1})*(X_2 \wedge^{attribute\ weight\_x_2})*(X_3 \wedge^{attribute\ weight\_x_3})* (X_4 \wedge^{attribute\ weight\_x_4})*(X_5 \wedge^{attribute\ weight\_x_5}) \tag{9}$$

Step 5. Determine the Preference ($\boldsymbol{V_i}$) based on Eq. (4). The results of the preference calculation are shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8. Preference calculation results

Vector S_i	**Vector V_i**
81.03	0,21160

Based on the results of the final calculation, Preference ($\boldsymbol{V_i}$) described in Table 6 to find out the distribution results of the mapping classification of food self-sufficient areas in East Java Province in Mojokerto districts, Indonesia. WP method is used to determine the classification of areas. Figure 2(a) shows the analysis map of the irrigation system of each village, with green color for technical irrigation conditions, yellow for semi-technical conditions, and blue for rain-fed conditions. Figure 2(b) shows population data for each village. The yellow color indicates population less than 1000 households, the green for more than 1000 but less than 2000 households, the red for more than 2000 but less than 3000 households, the gray for more than 3000 households, and the turquoise green for not populated.

Data on the rice planting area for each village is shown in Figure 2(c). The yellow color represents the planting area less than 200 Hectares (Ha), the green for more than 200 Ha, and the gray for no rice planting area. Figure 2(d) shows each village's rice harvest productivity data. The yellow color represents the yield of less than 50 Qt/Ha, the green for more than 100 Qt/Ha, and the gray for no rice planting land area. Figure 2(e) displays the deployment of agricultural tools in every village with red color for the area with RT/TRAY tools, the yellow for TR2 only, the green for a combination of RT/TRAY and TR2, and the gray for the area with no subsidy due to no agricultural land for rice. Figure 2(f) shows the results of the self-sufficiency classification analysis using the WP method with the blue for very good self-sufficiency analysis results, the green for good, the yellow for quite good, the orange for poor, the red for very poor.



(a.) Classification of irrigation



(b.) Classification of population



(c.) Classification of rice plant area



(d.) Classification of productivity



(e.) Classification of Agricultural tool



(f.) Self-sufficiency analysis results

Figure 2. Mapping Classification Results using the WP Method

To determine the potential self-sufficiency area using the Naive Bayes method uses five parameters: type of seed, type of fertilizer, irrigation systems, agricultural land area, and agricultural tool. An example of applying the manual calculation is in Table 7. Using Eq (5) and (6), the status of each village can be determined. For a numerical example, the calculation is performed for Village 11. The steps are as follows:

Step 1. Compute the probability of the appearance of "Yes" status and the appearance of "No" status.
Step 2. Compute is the probability of the appearance of "Yes" status when *X* variable is established *(P(Yes/X))* and the probability of the appearance of "No" status when *X* is established *(P(No/X))*. Where, $\mathbf{x_1}$ =superior; $\mathbf{x_2}$ =mix; $\mathbf{x_3}$ =technical irrigation; $\mathbf{x_4}$ =300-400; $\mathbf{x_5}$ =TR2; $\mathbf{x_6}$='?'
Step 3: Compute the P(Yes/x) and P(No/X) using Eq. 10 and Eq. 11.

$$\mathrm{P(Yes/x)} = 0.081;\ \mathrm{P(No/x)} = 0 \quad (10)$$
$$P(Yes|x) = P(x_1|Yes) \times P(x_2|Yes) \times P(x_3|Yes) \times P(x_4|Yes) \times P(x_5|Yes) \times P(Yes)$$

$$\boldsymbol{P(No|x) = P(x_1|No) \times P(x_2|No) \times P(x_3|No) \times P(x_4|No) \times P(x_5|No) \times P(No)} \quad (11)$$

Step 4. Compare the P(Yes/x) and P(No/X). Since the P(Yes/x) is greater than the P(No/x), the status of Village 11 is "Yes."

TABLE 9. Food Self-Sufficient Prediction Datasets from 11 Villages

Village No	Food Self-Sufficient Prediction Attributes					Status
	Type of Seeds (x_1)	Type of fertilize (x_2)	Irrigation system (x_3)	Agricultural land area (x_4)	Agricultural tool (x_5)	
1	Local	Organic	Technical Irrigation	100-200	TR2	Yes
2	Superior	Inorganic	Semi Technical	0-100	RT/TRAY	Yes
3	Local	Organic	Rainfed	300-400	MIX	No
4	Local	Mix	Semi Technical	>400	TR2	Yes
5	Superior	Mix	Rainfed	300-400	RT/TRAY	No
6	Hybrid	Organic	Semi Technical	200-300	TR2	Yes
7	Local	Inorganic	Rainfed	>400	RT/TRAY	No
8	Hybrid	Organic	Technical Irrigation	300-400	MIX	Yes
9	Local	Organic	Semi Technical	200-300	TR2	Yes
10	Hybrid	Mix	Technical Irrigation	>400	MIX	Yes
11	Superior	Mix	Technical Irrigation	300-400	TR2	?

Analyzing the results of self-sufficiency predictions in the Jatirejo sub-district area, the result of the vector calculation was "Yes" with details of 300 land data, the irrigation system is the same as technical, type of seed is the same as superior, agricultural equipment is the same as TR2 and fertilizer is the same as organic and inorganic with information on land data very good, the irrigation system is good, good type of seeds, good agricultural tools, and fertilizer very good. Figure 3 displays a self-sufficiency prediction map, with blue color for areas predicted to be self-sufficient food and yellow for being able to be self-sufficient.



Figure 3. Distribution of Mapping Classification Results with the Naïve Bayes

Using the WP method based on Eq. (4) resulting Table 6 and Naive Bayes method based on Eq. (5) resulting Table 7, evaluate the classification performance on the analysis result. Measuring algorithm performance in classification metrics usually revolves around using precision and recall evaluation frameworks [59]. The evaluated categorical classifiers for areas of food self-sufficiency using precision, recall, and performance metric accuracy. Precision aims to measure the accuracy of the classification results, and recall is to measure the completeness of the classification results. In contrast, accuracy is the most common measure of the classification process [61].

It is testing the spatial analysis for food self-sufficiency mapping application in Mojokerto district, Indonesia, by calculating the success rate of predictive analysis using the weighted product method. The prediction analysis calculation went well 12 times. The calculation experiment was carried out 20 times. For comparison, the test for the prediction method uses the Naive Bayes method. The prediction analysis calculation went well eight times. The calculation experiment was carried out 15 times. So that the results of the calculations on the weighted product method are carried out to find out that the analysis value of the GIS food self-sufficiency mapping application that is implemented based on the Web in Mojokerto districts is in the good category, this is because the level of predictive analysis of the resulting system is 69% precision, 85% recall, and 75% accuracy. While the Naive Bayes method is included in the good category, this is because the predictive analysis level of the resulting system is 62% precision, 80% recall, and 70% accuracy.

4. Conclusion. This paper examines the combination of WP and Naïve Bayes methods in classifying multi-attribute for spatial data modeling. The WP method on MADM allows comparative mapping results according to the level of importance, weight, and rank of priority given to each multi-parameter attribute in providing spatial sensitivity analysis. This paper produces a V_i Preference value from the WP method by considering quantitative data and calculating the Guttman scale classification parameter. This becomes very important in the decision-making system for identifying food self-sufficient areas.

While the Naïve Bayes method predicts the mapping of self-sufficient food areas, by maximizing the posterior probability, the method can quickly produce a structured result with a shorter processing time. The result of WP and Naïve Bayes methods combination unlocks new potential for further research in combining several different methods in spatial data modeling. Based on the test results, they have a good category agreement strength for use in spatial data modeling in GIS to classify self-sufficient food areas. Kohen Kappa index is 0.78, and the analysis results determine the number of regions with abundant agricultural products and can be made self-sufficient. Moreover, the MADM method, classification method with optimization parameters, and datasets can be considered further research. It is expected to provide better accuracy.

Acknowledgments. This paper is the result of collaborative research in GIS for spatial analysis and model estimation. The author gives the highest appreciation to the Department of Agriculture and Food

Security, Mojokerto Regency, East Java Province, Indonesia, which has provided access to private data and multi-criteria parameters used for model testing.

References

[1] F. A. A. O. O. T. U. Nations, "Farming must change to feed the world," 2009. [Online]. Available: http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/9962/icode/.

[2] X. Xiao *et al.*, "Mapping paddy rice agriculture in southern China using multi-temporal MODIS images," *Remote Sens. Environ.*, vol. 95, no. 4, pp. 480–492, 2005.

[3] B. Zhu, Y. Fu, J. Liu, and Y. Mao, "Spatial distribution of 12 class B notifiable infectious diseases in China: A retrospective study," *PLoS One*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1–17, 2018.

[4] A. Vitianingsih, A. Choiron, D. Cahyono, A. Umam, and S. Suyanto, "Spatial Data Modeling on GIS for Classification of Measles-prone Region Using Multiple Attribute Decision Making," *Int. J. Intell. Eng. Syst.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 97–107, 2019.

[5] A. A. Mustafa, M. Singh, R. N. Sahoo, N. Ahmed, M. Khanna, and A. Sarangi, "Land Suitability Analysis for Different Crops: A Multi Criteria Decision Making Approach using Remote Sensing and GIS," *Water Technol.*, vol. 3, no. 12, pp. 61–84, 2011.

[6] T. Prakash, "Land suitability analysis for agricultural crops: A fuzzy Multicriteria Decision Making Approach," 2003.

[7] M. Javari, M. Saghaei, and F. Fadaei Jazi, "Analyzing the resilience of urban settlements using multiple-criteria decision-making (MCDM) models (case study: Malayer city)," *Sustain. Environ.*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 1889083, 2021.

[8] S. A. Getachew Tesfaye Ayehu, "Land Suitability Analysis for Rice Production: A GIS Based Multi-Criteria Decision Approach," *Am. J. Geogr. Inf. Syst.* , vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 95–104, 2015.

[9] A. Ezra, A. A. Adebayo, and A. S. Umar, "Application of Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) Model in Agro-climatic Zoning of Taraba State for Ofada Rice Production," *FUTY J. Environ.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 108–120, 2020.

[10] R. N. Parker and E. K. Asencio, *GIS and Spatial Analysis for the Social Sciences: Coding, Mapping and Modeling*. Taylor & Francis Group, 2009.

[11] G. P. M. Spagnuolo, *Heterogenous Spatial Data: Fusion, Modeling, and Analysis for GIS Applications.* Morgan & Claypool, 2016.

[12] X. Lei, W. Chen, and B. T. Pham, "Performance evaluation of GIS-based artificial intelligence approaches for landslide susceptibility modeling and spatial patterns analysis," *ISPRS Int. J. Geo-Information*, vol. 9, no. 7, pp. 1–20, 2020.

[13] M. Otgonbayar, C. Atzberger, J. Chambers, D. Amarsaikhan, S. Böck, and J. Tsogtbayar, "Land Suitability Evaluation for Agricultural Cropland in Mongolia Using the Spatial MCDM Method and AHP Based GIS," *J. Geosci. Environ. Prot.*, vol. 05, no. 09, pp. 238–263, 2017.

[14] B. Feizizadeh and T. Blaschke, "Journal of Environmental Planning and Land suitability analysis for Tabriz County , Iran : a multi-criteria evaluation approach using GIS," *J. Environ. Plan. Manag*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 1–23, 2013.

[15] P. Zolfaghary, M. Zakerinia, and H. Kazemi, "A model for the use of urban treated wastewater in agriculture using multiple criteria decision making (MCDM) and geographic information system (GIS)," *Agric. Water Manag.*, vol. 243, no. August, p. 106490, 2021.

[16] H. R. Pourkhabbaz, S. Javanmardi, and H. A. Faraji Sabokbar, "Suitability analysis for determining potential agricultural land use by the multi-criteria decision making models SAW and VIKOR-AHP (case study: Takestan-Qazvin plain)," *J. Agric. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 1005–1016, 2014.

[17] A. Nurkholis and I. S. Sitanggang, "A spatial analysis of soybean land suitability using spatial decision tree algorithm," in *Proceedings Of SPIE*, 2019, no. December, p. 65.

[18] K. T. Morrison, T. A. Nelson, F. S. Nathoo, and A. S. Ostry, "Application of Bayesian spatial smoothing models to assess agricultural self-sufficiency," *Int. J. Geogr. Inf. Sci.*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 1213–1229, 2012.

[19] A. O. Onojeghuo, G. A. Blackburn, Q. Wang, P. M. Atkinson, D. Kindred, and Y. Miao, "Mapping paddy rice fields by applying machine learning algorithms to multi-temporal sentinel-1A and landsat data," *Int. J. Remote Sens.*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1042–1067, 2018.

[20] Z. Maddahi, A. Jalalian, M. M. K. Zarkesh, and N. Honarjo, "Land suitability analysis for rice cultivation using a GIS-based fuzzy multi-criteria decision making approach: Central part of amol district, Iran," *Soil Water Res.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 29–38, 2017.

[21] A. Barakat, W. Ennaji, A. El Jazouli, R. Amediaz, and F. Touhami, "Multivariate analysis and GIS-based soil suitability diagnosis for sustainable intensive agriculture in Beni-Moussa irrigated subperimeter (Tadla plain, Morocco)," *Model. Earth Syst. Environ.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 1–8, 2017.

[22] J. Kihoro, N. J. Bosco, and H. Murage, "Suitability analysis for rice growing sites using a multicriteria

evaluation and GIS approach in great Mwea region, Kenya," *Springerplus*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2013.
[23] D. N. Kuria and E. Waithaka, "Using geographic information systems (GIS) to determine land suitability for rice crop growing in the Tana delta," *J. Geogr. Reg. Plan.*, vol. 4, no. 9, pp. 525–532, 2011.
[24] I. Nahib *et al.*, "Integration of logistic regression and multicriteria land evaluation to simulation establishment of sustainable paddy field zone in Indramayu Regency, West Java Province, Indonesia," in *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 2018, vol. 149, no. 012005, pp. 1–12.
[25] M. K. S. David W Miller, *Executive Decisions and Operations Research*. Prentice-Hall; 1St Edition, 1960.
[26] Y. Li, Z. Sun, and F. Accatino, "Spatial distribution and driving factors determining local food and feed self-sufficiency in the eastern regions of China," *Food Energy Secur.*, no. May, pp. 1–17, 2021.
[27] V. Talasila, C. Prasad, G. T. S. Reddy, and A. Aparna, "Analysis and prediction of crop production in Andhra region using deep convolutional regression network," *Int. J. Intell. Eng. Syst.*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 1–9, 2020.
[28] E. Boltürk, A. Karaşan, and C. Kahraman, "Simple additive weighting and weighted product methods using neutrosophic sets," in *Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing*, vol. 369, 2019, pp. 647–676.
[29] A. Kolios, V. Mytilinou, E. Lozano-Minguez, and K. Salonitis, "A comparative study of multiple-criteria decision-making methods under stochastic inputs," *Energies*, vol. 9, no. 7. 2016.
[30] D. M. Martin and M. Mazzotta, "Non-monetary valuation using Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis: Sensitivity of additive aggregation methods to scaling and compensation assumptions," *Ecosyst. Serv.*, vol. 29, no. February, pp. 13–22, 2018.
[31] C. H. Yeh, "A Problem-based Selection of Multi-attribute Decision-making Methods," *Int. Trans. Oper. Res.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 169–181, 2002.
[32] R. Blanquero, E. Carrizosa, and P. Ramírez-cobo, "Variable selection for Naïve Bayes classification," *Comput. Oper. Res.*, vol. 135, no. November, p. 105456, 2021.
[33] H. Zhang, L. Jiang, and L. Yu, "Attribute and instance weighted naive Bayes," *Pattern Recognit.*, vol. 111, no. March, p. 107674, 2021.
[34] R. Liu *et al.*, "Assessing spatial likelihood of flooding hazard using naïve Bayes and GIS: a case study in Bowen Basin, Australia," *Stoch. Environ. Res. Risk Assess.*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 1575–1590, 2016.
[35] D. G. & M. G. Nir Friedman, "Bayesian Network Classifier," *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. (including Subser. Lect. Notes Artif. Intell. Lect. Notes Bioinformatics)*, vol. 29, no. PART 3, pp. 131–163, 1997.
[36] M. Benjumeda, C. Bielza, and P. Larrañaga, "Tractability of most probable explanations in multidimensional Bayesian network classifiers," *Int. J. Approx. Reason.*, vol. 93, no. October, pp. 74–87, 2018.
[37] T. Gärtner and P. Flach, "WBCSVM: Weighted Bayesian Classification based on Support Vector Machines," in *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2001, pp. 154–161.
[38] M. Miao, H. Zeng, A. Wang, C. Zhao, and F. Liu, "Discriminative spatial-frequency-temporal feature extraction and classification of motor imagery EEG: An sparse regression and Weighted Naïve Bayesian Classifier-based approach," *J. Neurosci. Methods*, vol. 278, no. February, pp. 13–24, 2017.
[39] C. Mao, L. Lu, and B. Hu, "Local probabilistic model for Bayesian classification: A generalized local classification model," *Appl. Soft Comput. J.*, vol. 93, no. August, p. 106379, 2020.
[40] M. Kabak, M. Erbaş, C. Çetinkaya, and E. Özceylan, "A GIS-based MCDM approach for the evaluation of bike-share stations," *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 201, no. November, pp. 49–60, 2018.
[41] Y. Qin, Y. Liu, Z. Hong, and H. Jia, "Hesitant fuzzy Muirhead mean operators and its application to multiple attribute decision making," *Int. J. Innov. Comput. Inf. Control*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 1223–1238, 2018.
[42] S. Drobne and A. Lisec, "Multi-attribute decision analysis in GIS: Weighted linear combination and ordered weighted averaging," *Informatica*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 459–474, 2009.
[43] A. V. Vitianingsih, I. Wisnubhadra, S. S. K. Baharin, R. Marco, and A. L. Maukar, "Classification of pertussis vulnerable area with location analytics using multiple attribute decision making," *Int. J. Innov. Comput. Inf. Control*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1943–1957, 2020.
[44] M. J. Zhang and J. X. Nan, "A compromise ratio ranking method of triangular intuitionistic fuzzy numbers and its application to MADM problems," *Iran. J. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 21–37, 2013.
[45] E. Triantaphyllou, *Multi-Criteria Decision Making Methods: A Comparative Study*. Springer, Boston, MA, 2000.
[46] H. Jafaryeganeh, M. Ventura, and C. Guedes Soares, "Effect of normalization techniques in multi-criteria decision making methods for the design of ship internal layout from a Pareto optimal set," *Struct. Multidiscip. Optim.*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 1849–1863, 2020.
[47] K. Yoon, "The propagation of errors in multiple-attribute decision analysis: A practical approach," *J. Oper. Res. Soc.*, vol. 40, no. 7, pp. 681–686, 1989.
[48] Y. Yang and J. He, "A novel method based on fixed point iteration and improved topsis method for multi-

attribute group decision making," *Int. J. Innov. Comput. Inf. Control*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 15–29, 2021.
[49] D. Soria, J. M. Garibaldi, F. Ambrogi, E. M. Biganzoli, and I. O. Ellis, "A 'non-parametric' version of the naive Bayes classifier," *Knowledge-Based Syst.*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 775–784, 2011.
[50] P. Tsangaratos and I. Ilia, "Comparison of a logistic regression and Naïve Bayes classifier in landslide susceptibility assessments: The influence of models complexity and training dataset size," *Catena*, vol. 145, no. October, pp. 164–179, 2016.
[51] and R. W. S.Kusumadewi, S.Hartati, , A.Harjoko, *Fuzzy multi-attribute decision making (fuzzy madm)*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Graha Ilmu.
[52] L. Guttman, "The Determinacy Of Factor Score Matrices With Implications For Five Other Basic Problems Of Common-Factor Theory," *Br. J. Stat. Psychol.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 65–81, 1955.
[53] L. Guttman, "A Basis for Scaling Qualitative Data," *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, vol. 9, no. 2, p. 139, 1944.
[54] R. E. Tractenberg, F. Yumoto, P. S. Aisen, J. A. Kaye, and R. J. Mislevy, "Using the Guttman scale to define and estimate measurement error in items over time: The case of cognitive decline and the meaning of 'points lost,'" *PLoS One*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 1–8, 2012.
[55] A. Stegeman, "A new method for simultaneous estimation of the factor model parameters, factor scores, and unique parts," *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.*, vol. 99, no. July, pp. 189–203, 2016.
[56] R. A. and C. M. Walker, *Categorical Data Analysis for the Behavioral and Social Sciences*. Taylor & Francis Group, 2021.
[57] M. Sokolova and G. Lapalme, "A systematic analysis of performance measures for classification tasks," *Inf. Process. Manag.*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 427–437, 2009.
[58] Max Bramer, *Principles Data Mining*. London-Spinger: http://www.springer.com/series/7592, 2007.
[59] M. G. Jesse Davis, "The relationship between Precision-Recall and ROC curves," in *ICML '06: Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, 2006.
[60] L. Torgo and R. Ribeiro, "Utility-Based Regression Luis," in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science book series*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007, pp. 597–604.
[61] A. Tripathy, A. Agrawal, and S. K. Rath, "Classification of sentiment reviews using n-gram machine learning approach," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 57, no. September, pp. 117–126, 2016.

3) Acceptance Letter: IJICIC-2107-006 (8 Januari 2022)

ANIK VEGA V, S.Kom.,MT unitomo <vega@unitomo.ac.id>

Acceptance Letter: IJICIC-2107-006

1 pesan

office@ijicic.net <office@ijicic.net> 8 Januari 2022 pukul 17.40
Kepada: vega@unitomo.ac.id
Cc: www.erri@stmik-yadika.ac.id, seftin.fitri.si@upnjatim.ac.id, robertmarco@amikom.ac.id, almaukar@president.ac.id

Dear Ms. Anik vega Vitianingsih,

I am pleased to let you know that your paper submitted to IJICIC below

Reference No.: IJICIC-2107-006

Title: Spatial Data Modeling Using MADM Model Approach For Classification Of Food Self-Sufficiency Regions

Author(s): Anik vega Vitianingsih, Robert Marco, Anastasia Lidya Maukar , Erri Wahyu Puspitarini, Seftin Fitri Ana W

has been accepted for publication in International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control (IJICIC). Please use the IJICIC style files (http://www.ijicic.net) to prepare the final version of your paper. Please note that author biography is also required.

Please send the final version, the Copyright Form (http://www.ijicic.net) and the completed Invoice Letter on IJICIC online submission system (http://www.ijicic.net) within three weeks' time. All authors' handwritten signatures are required in Copyright Form.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Yan SHI

Executive Editor, IJICIC

Professor, School of Industrial and Welfare Engineering, Tokai University

9-1-1, Toroku, Kumamoto 862-8652, Japan

Tel.: 81-96-386-2666

E-mail: office@ijicic.net

International Journal of Innovative
Computing, Information and Control ICIC International ©2021 ISSN 1349-4198
Volume **xx** Number **xx**, February **xx** pp. **1–3**

Spatial Data Modeling using MADM for Classification of Food Self-Sufficiency Regions

Anik Vega Vitianingsih[1*], Robert Marco[2], Anastasia Lidya Maukar [3], Erri Wahyu Puspitarini[4], And Seftin Fitri Ana Wati[5]

[1]Department of Informatics
Universitas Dr. Soetomo, Surabaya, Indonesia
*Corresponding author: vega@unitomo.ac.id
tsalisannur@gmail.com

[2]Department of Informatics
Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
robertmarco@amikom.ac.id

[3]Department of Industrial Engineering
President University, Bekasi, Indonesia
almaukar@president.ac.id

[4]Department of Informatics Engineering
STMIK Yadika Bangil
Pasuruan, Indonesia
www.erri@stmik-yadika.ac.id

[5]Department of Information System
UPN Veteran Jawa Timur, Surabaya, Indonesia
seftin.fitri.si@upnjatim.ac.id

Received xxxxxxx, revised xxxxxxx

ABSTRACT. *A population increase without equivalent rice production can lead to a decrease in food security. Efforts are required to identify agricultural land for its self-sufficient rice field areas. This paper presents spatial data modeling to classify and predict food self-sufficiency areas using multi-attribute decision making (MADM) by applying Geographical Information System (GIS) technology. The classification of food self-sufficient areas uses the Weighted Product (WP) method applying multi-attribute parameters of agricultural production, total food demand, and the area of the agricultural sub-districts. The Naive Bayes method predicts food self-sufficiency based on several parameters: seed type, fertilizer, season, and terrain type. The results of the method test show superiority in classifying food self-sufficient areas by having an average coefficient value in the kappa index test of 0.78. The trial results conclude that this method has good agreement strength for use in spatial data analysis of the food self-sufficient areas classification using the MADM approach.*
Keywords: GIS, Spatial Data Modeling, Food Self-Sufficiency, MADM, WP, Naïve Bayes

1. **Introduction.** Rice is one of the staple foods consumed in several countries worldwide. Thus, it is important to map rice fields in a timely and efficient manner to maintain agricultural sustainability and food security. The agricultural land mapping remains challenging in fragmented landscapes, such as rice-growing areas, because the information on rice farming areas is still dominated by small-scale agriculture compared to large-scale agriculture. Thus, land use is one of the functions in accelerating the production of agricultural products aimed at meeting food needs and improving people's welfare [1]. Based on the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) survey, it is estimated that the growth rate of agricultural production declines to 1.5% between 2015 and 2030, further to 0.9% between 2030 and

DOI: 10.24507/ijicic.17.01.xxx

2050. Thus, it is necessary to apply a spatial pattern to produce information on the distribution/mapping of rice fields, which is very much needed as a strategic policy of food security [2].

Spatial data analysis is essential for monitoring and controlling agricultural land mapping. In the last few decades, there has been growing research interest in proposing MADM-based models in analyzing spatial data for areas such as healthcare [3] [4]; agriculture [5] [6]; population [7], and so on. It was developed based on climatic, soil, and topographical conditions to determine the rank of various suitability factors and weights as a map of the suitability of production and rice fields [8]. The rice farming land suitability analysis based on spatial climate maps was carried out using Extracting Criteria Maps for the Agro-climatic zoning and weighted overlay as a spatial analysis used in zoning the suitability of other crops[9].

Spatial data modeling is a process of spatial data analysis in geocoding and mapping to construct a decision-making system used for stakeholder policy [10] [11]. At present, the rapid development of the GIS through the integration process and precise analysis can be performed using different methods. The model approach uses MADM to determine the factors and their weights for mapping the suitability of rice farming land [12], such as analytical hierarchical process [13]–[15], simple additive weighting [16]. Meanwhile, modeling and analyzing spatial patterns through a machine learning-based Artificial Intelligence (AI) algorithm used for mapping the suitability of rice farming land, includes Naïve bayes and Radial basis function networks [12]; Decision tree [17]; Bayesian [18]; Support vector machine and Random Forest [19].

The suitability analysis of land mapping and the preparation of land use maps using GIS is the most practical application in land resource planning and management [20]. GIS technology has been widely used in evaluating the suitability of agricultural land mapping because it leads to the rapid creation of static maps and map estimates by combining several information data to produce a layer suitability map [20]–[23]. Based on previous research, GIS technology uses spatial analysis to identify agricultural land suitability with spatial, temporal, and spatial-temporal methods. The development of sustainable rice was analyzed by integrating the logistic regression and multi-criteria land evaluation, such as characteristics of local land-use conversions [24]. A Bayesian autoregressive framework that utilizes available agricultural spatial data was used for developing a predictive smoothing model for the self-sufficiency index (SSI) as a subset of clusters [18][24]. However, previous studies did not use the approach and parameters presented in this study, namely the multi-criteria parameter approach, to explore the need for supporting factors in the analysis process. AI using mathematical modeling is suitable to produce a mapping distribution of agricultural land areas with multi-class classification and experts to determine criteria, weighting, and ranking attributes.

The most relevant literature and the theory of used methods in this study [25] related to the classification of agricultural land mapping areas based on food self-sufficiency status. Several literature studies have attempted to improve results in scientifically mapping an area. Also, previous researchers have suggested developing mathematical models, GIS MADM methods, and AI. Thus, in the theoretical background section, we focus on the studies of MADM, AI, GIS, or a combination of these methods. Previous researches studied an ecological model framework by using multi-criteria decision-making methods such as the Analytic Network Process (ANP), Simple Additive Weighting (SAW), and Vlse Kriterijumska Optimizacija I Kompromisno Resenje-Analytical Hierarchy Process (VIKOR-AHP) in a GIS environment with the aim of selecting a suitable location for agricultural land use [16]. Another study merged geographic information system (GIS) technology and multi-criteria decision making (MCDM) using the Analytic hierarchy process (AHP) for the suitability of agricultural land for crop cultivation [15]. This research [17] uses the MCDM spatial method and the AHP-based GIS, it is developed for each criterion layer value by multiplying the parameters for each factor obtained from the pair comparison matrix by adding weights and by the appropriate evaluation of several criterion factors affecting agricultural land.

In comparison application of the AHP method is used to rank various suitability factors. The resulting weights are used to build a suitability map layer using the weighted sum overlay tool on the ArcGIS 10.1 platform. Furthermore, a map of the suitability of rice production in the study area was made [8]. [18] proposed machine learning vector machine (SVM) and random forest (RF) classification algorithms to map the spatial distribution of rice fields. [19] presented a Bayesian autoregressive framework that leverages available agricultural data to develop predictive smoothing models for the self-sufficiency index (SSI). The developed a fuzzy multi-criteria decision-making technique integrated with GIS to assess suitable areas for rice cultivation in Amol District, Iran. The suitability factors, including soil properties, climatic conditions, topography, and accessibility, were selected based on the FAO framework and expert opinion [20]. Based on the literature review results, there are still limited studies that combine several methods for mapping agricultural land.

There are several challenges for mapping of suitability for rice farming land-based on food self-sufficiency status. The first issue concerns spatial information about the surrounding population, which is reflected in demand for rice as a food security strategy to agricultural productivity. Then, geographic information about the surrounding environment, as well as the network structure, are required, secondly, the surrounding environment's qualities to climatic conditions and pest attacks. Several studies have stated that population density is the most significant criterion for food security [2][26]. Another study stated that essential factors in agricultural yield models are climate, soil properties, and water availability [27]. There is an analysis related to land suitability that must be applied in the final decision to meet the needs and reflect local conditions well [2][6], which is used to produce information on spatial mapping and the areas of rice fields as a strategic form of food security [2]. Previous studies have not used the proposed multi-parameter criteria for modeling spatial data with WP and Naïve Bayes methods. The authors proposed an spatial data modelling using MADM to define the mapping of agricultural areas based on the scope of food self-sufficiency category to address the challenges of mapping rice farming areas to determine food self-sufficiency status. This proposed approach is still very limited so far.

Multi-Attribute Decision-Making (MADM) approaches are commonly used to find the best solution, choose a single option, or rate options from most to least appropriate [28]. As one of the MADM methods, the Weighted Product (WP) method aims to evaluate and compare to the rest through the multiplication of ratios related to every criterion and select the most applicable alternatives [29]. This method is more straightforward and more efficient [28]. The WP method is considered suitable for both single and multi-dimensional problems/have high subjectivity [30], and produces a short calculation time [31]. In addition, the WP method has a moderate agreement strength category, which can be applied for modelling spatial data using GIS for regional classification [4]. While the use of Naïve Bayes classification in determining the class based on the hypothesis, there is no dependence between attributes in maximizing the posterior probability [32][33]. This method can quickly build simple structures without learning procedures and has a shorter computation time, resulting in higher efficiency [34]. Naïve Bayes is one of the algorithms that have advantages and outperforms many sophisticated classifications, especially when the attributes are not strongly correlated [33][35][36]. Meanwhile, limited studies combine Naive Bayes classification with weighting features [37]–[39].

The results of this study could be part of an effort to observe, monitor, and control food self-sufficiency as a strategic policy of food security in developing torpical countries. The mapping results can help stakeholders, or the food security agency classify and predict self-sufficient food areas. AI is used as a framework in spatial data modeling, using GIS technology to visualize the classification of food self-sufficient areas. From implementation and testing results, it can be concluded that web-GIS applications of mapping food self-sufficiency in Mojokerto district can provide information on the productivity of rice products, determine the regional potential for self-sufficiency, and predict areas of potential self-sufficiency The analysis results using the WP and Naive Bayes methods based on the parameters of land area, productivity, population, irrigation system, rainfall, and agricultural equipment in the Mojokerto district show that the prediction of self-sufficiency is good. Kohen Kappa index is 0.78, and the analysis results determine the number of areas with abundant agricultural products and high self-sufficiency.

2. **Method.** Integrating GIS with MADM techniques for decision-making creates a powerful tool to solve various problems, including selecting a feasible location [40]. A practical framework for comparison is finding the most desirable from a limited set of alternatives on a predefined attribute [41]. Decision-making systems involving spatial data can be equipped with MADM, integrating and managing spatial data and attribute data to perform spatial data analysis [42] [43]. The spatial data modeling in the discussion is primary data to produce a classification of agricultural land mapping based on food self-sufficiency status. The stages of the spatial data modeling process for classification are shown in Figure 1.

Step 1. The goal is to define the spatial data requirements and layer attribute data in the spatial shapefile dataset (*.shp). This paper uses two types of datasets, namely spatial datasets including district maps in each sub-district and quantitative attribute datasets. The base map spatial datasets of the Mojokerto Regency consists of 18 sub-districts with information coverage at the village level. The quantitative attribute dataset for food self-sufficiency spatial data modeling (Table 1) contains attributes, such as population (households/sub-district), land in hectare (Ha), productivity in quintal (=100 kg) per hectare (Qt/Ha), Plant Pest Organisms (Pest), and Rainfall (Month). The quantitative attribute dataset for spatial data modeling predicting food self-sufficiency (see Table 2) contains attributes, such as types of seeds, type of fertilizer, irrigation system, agricultural land area, and agricultural tools



FIGURE 1. Flowchart of spatial data modeling for food self-sufficiency classification

Step 2. The spatial data modeling to determine food self-sufficiency areas using the WP method on the MADM model is explained in section 2.1. the WP method through the MADM method will process the results of the regulation layer to get the V_i Preference value. The spatial data modeling for predicting food self-sufficiency using the Naïve Bayes method on machine learning is explained in section 2.2.

Step 3. Compute the ranking value to determine the classification of food self-sufficiency areas using the Guttman Scale as described in Section 2.3. The classification value includes food self-sufficiency status with very good, good, average, fair, and poor conditions in each region.

Step 4. Calculate the degree of agreement for both assessment methods using Cohen's kappa method based on the process of section 2.5. Then, calculate the measuring of Classification Model performance using APR based on section 2.6.

2.1 **Multiple Attribute Decision Making (MADM).** MADM is part of the multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) and multi-objective decision-making (MODM) systems [44]. MADM is used for discrete retrieval, where alternative decision support systems are predetermined [45]. The Weighted Product (WP) method is a popular weighting method that is part of a decision-making system using MADM multi-parameter criteria [30]. In addition, WP method has a limited set of decision alternatives that provide explanations for several decision criteria. The main process of using WP method is multiplication, which serves to connect attribute ratings, where each attribute must be ranked with attribute weights. This process has similarities to the normalization process [46][47]. The weight is computed based on the level of importance. The more important, the higher the weight value, value of 1 is "very unimportant" and 5 is "very important".

The WP method approach is to assign a score to each alternative multiplied by the weighted value for each parameter attribute, with the following steps:

Step 1. Determine the criteria (C_j) of rice farming land that has the suitability status of a food self-sufficient area based on expert judgment. In MADM, using expert weight rationality directly influences the accuracy of the decision results [48].
Step 2. Determine the weight value of each existing criteria (w) or relative importance of each criterion (C_j) given by experts. The process in Eq. (1) normalizes the criterion weight (W), $\sum w_j = 1$, with $W(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)$ is the weighted importance value of each criterion.

$$W = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\} \quad (1)$$

Step 3. Simplify the weight criteria according to Eq. (2). Normalize or increase the weights to produce a value of $w_j = 1$ where $j = 1,2, \dots, n$ criteria and $\sum w_j$ is the sum of weights.

$$W_j = \frac{w_j}{\sum w_j} \quad (2)$$

Step 4. Calculate the value of vector S_i as an alternative preference based on Eq. (3).

$$S_i = \prod_{j=1}^{n} X_{ij} W_j, with\ i = 1,2, \dots m \quad (3)$$

Where, S_i is the result of decisions normalization on i[th] alternative (preference criteria), X_{ij} is an alternative rating per attribute (value of the criteria), W_j is the weight attribute, and n is the number of criteria. W_j is the rank of positive value for the profit attribute and negative value for the cost attribute.

Step 5. Calculate the vector V_i value, using Eq. (4), as the relative preference of each alternative on vector V by dividing each number of vector values S with the total value of vector S.

$$V_i = \frac{S_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} S_i}\ , with\ i = 1,2, \dots, m \quad (4)$$

2.2 **Naïve Bayes.** Naïve Bayes is a simple probability classification method that estimates the probability of a new observation included in a predefined category [34][47]. It is assumed that the classification can be estimated by calculating the conditional probability density function and the posterior probability [49]. Posterior probability can be calculated based on Eq. (5) and Eq. (6) [50].

$$P(c|x) = \frac{P(x|c)P(c)}{P(x)} \quad (5)$$

$$P(c|x) = P(x_1|c) \times P(x_2|c) \times \dots \times P(x_n|c) \times P(c) \quad (6)$$

Where, $P(c|x)$ as the posterior probability of class (c, target) given predictor (x, attribute), while $P(c)$ is the probability of the previous class, and $P(x)$ is the prior probability of the predictor. $P(x|c)$ Is the possibility, which is the class probability given the predictor.

Spatial Dataset. This section explains the weighting process for various attributes using the WP method as shown in Table 1. Each spatial dataset will be assigned a weighted value to determine the level of importance/influence on the classification. The level of importance used for weighting in each attribute [51] is as follows: the value of X_i is 95 for category "Very good"; value 85 for category "Good"; value 75 for category "Average"; value 65 for category "Fair"; value 55 for category "Poor".

Table 1. Weighting Parameters of Self-Sufficiency Attributes Using WP Method

Attribute	**Parameter**	**Category**	**Weight value**
Population (X_1)	< 500	Very good	95
	500 – 1000	Good	85
	> 1000	Average	75
Agricultural land area (X_2)	> 250	Very good	95
	250 – 200	Good	85
	200 – 150	Average	75
	150 – 100	Fair	65
	100 – 0	Poor	55
Productivity (Qt/Ha) (X_3)	> 90	Very good	95
	≤ 90 – >70	Good	85
	≤ 70 – >50	Average	75

Attribute	Parameter	Category	Weight value
	≤ 50 – >30	Fair	65
	< 30	Poor	55
OPT (Pest) (*X4*)	0 – 8 %	Very good	95
	8 – 15 %	Good	85
	15 – 25 %	Average	75
	25 – 45 %	Fair	65
	> 45 %	Poor	55
Rainfall (Month) (X_3)	≥150mm	Very good	95
	<150mm – ≥100mm	Good	85
	<100mm – ≥50mm	Average	75
	<50mm	Fair	65

Using data in Table 2, the Naive Bayes method is applied to determine the weights of each attribute of self-sufficiency prediction

Table 2. Weighting Parameters of Self-Sufficiency Prediction Attributes Using Naïve Bayes

Attribute	Parameter	Category
Types of seeds	Hybrid	Very good
	Superior	Good
	Local	Average
Type of fertilizer	Organic and Inorganic (Mix)	Very good
	Inorganic	Good
	Organic	Average
Irrigation system	Technical Irrigation Rice Fields	Very good
	Semi-Technical Irrigation Rice Fields	Good
	Rainfed Rice Fields	Average
Agricultural land area	> 250	Very good
	250 – 200	Good
	200 – 150	Average
	150 – 100	Fair
	100 – 0	Poor
Agricultural tools TR2: Tractor RT/TRAY: Rice Transplanter with tray	TR2 +RT/TRAY (Mix)	Very good
	TR2	Good
	RT/TRAY	Average

2.3 **The Guttman Scale.** The Guttman scale is a method of measuring the value of the classification [52]. This scale is a basis for measurement to draw conclusions on qualitative data [53] and remove ambiguity from an intervention result value in the estimated classification value [54]. The type of dataset that uses scores/weights in the analysis process will provide a value based on the uncertainty factor of the class of variables described, which can be measured using the Guttman scale [55] based on Eq. (7).

$$I = \frac{R}{K} \quad (7)$$

I is the result of the interval value obtained from the variable R, the range of data value. K is the number of alternative classifications that will be generated, namely very good, good, average, fair, dan poor. In this paper, the value of the variable R is obtained from the range of values between the maximum value of V_i and the minimum value of V_i.

2.4 **Method Consistency Test.** The Cohen Kappa method was used to test the consistency of the two methods used in this study. This measurement is used for qualitative data based on Eq. (8) [56].

$$K = \frac{\Pr(a) - \Pr(e)}{1 - \Pr(e)} \quad (8)$$

K is the measurement coefficient between the WP and Naive Bayes methods. $Pr(a)$ is a percentage of the number of consistent measurements for comparisons between methods. $Pr(e)$ is the percentage change. The method, based on the range of coefficient values, gives results "poor" agreement strength if the value of the variable $K < 0.21$, "fair" for value between 0.21 and 0.40, "moderate" for value between 0.41 and 0.60, "good" for value between 0.61 and 0.80, "very good" for value between 0.81 and 1.00.

Confusion Matrix Measuring Model. The confusion matrix consists of two positive and two negative classes comparing the actual and classification data [57] [58] as seen in Table 3. The precision, recall, and accuracy value are calculated with the average value in each class. Precision and recall are generally defined as the ratio between correctly identified events (usually known as true positives in classification), and significant events (precision), or actual events (recall) [60].

Table 3. Confusion Matrix

Actual data	**Predicted classification**	
	Positive (+)	**Negative (-)**
Positive (+)	True positives (TP)	False negatives (FN)
Negative (-)	False positives (FP)	True negatives (TN)

3. **Results and Discussion.** Table 4 represents the findings of the Guttman Scale examination using Eq. (9) as the result of the classification scale value using the WP method.

Table 4. The Findings of the Guttman Scale Examination

WP Method
$R = V_{i_{Max}} - V_{i_{Min}} = 0.21160 - 0.1929 = 0.0187$ $K = 5$ and, $I = \frac{0.0187}{5} = 0.00374$
$Assessment\ very\ good\ criteria{:}\ Highest\ score - I = 0.21160 - 0.00374 = 0.20786$ $Assessment\ good\ criteria{:}\ Very\ good\ criteria - I = 0.20786 - 0.00374 = 0.20412$ $Assessment\ average\ criteria{:}Good\ criteria - I = 0.20412 - 0.00374 = 0.20038$ $Assessment\ fair\ criteria{:}\ average\ criteria - I = 0.20038 - 0.00374 = 0.19664$

$$\begin{cases} very\ good, if\ V_i \geq 0.20786 \\ good, if\ V_i \geq 0.20412\ and\ V_i < 0.20786 \\ average, if\ V_i \geq 0.20038\ and\ V_i < 0.20412 \\ fair, if\ V_i \geq 0.19664\ and\ V_i < 0.20038 \\ very\ good, if\ V_i < 0.19664 \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

Table 5 shows implementation datasets of self-sufficiency attributes assessment from Jolotundo villages.

Table 5. Weighted Product Implementation Datasets

Village	**Attributes (X)**				
	Population (X_1)	Land area (X_2)	Productivity (X_3)	O.P.T. (X_4)	Rainfall (X_5)
Jolotundo	75	95	75	96	75

Step 1. The WP method requires weights and attributes to determine food self-sufficiency.
Step 2. The decision-maker assigned the Preference Weights for each attribute (X_i) as in Table 6.

Table 6. Weights of each self-sufficiency attribute preferences

Weight	**Attribute (X_i)**					
	Population (X_1)	Land area (X_2)	Productivity (X_3)	O.P.T (X_4)	Rainfall (X_5)	$\sum w_i$
w	95	75	65	80	95	395

Step 3. The normalization is performed using Eq. (2), and the result can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7. Result of normalization of self-sufficiency attributes

Weight	$\left(\frac{X_1}{\sum W}\right)$	$\left(\frac{X_2}{\sum W}\right)$	$\left(\frac{X_3}{\sum W}\right)$	$\left(\frac{X_4}{\sum W}\right)$	$\left(\frac{X_5}{\sum W}\right)$	$\sum w_i$
w	0.24	0.19	0.24	0.16	0.16	1.00

Step 4. Calculate $\boldsymbol{S}$ vector using Eq (3), with the elaboration of Eq. (9). The result of vector calculations of each village for self-sufficiency attributes are shown in Table 8.

$$S_i = (X_1{}^{\wedge attribute\ weight\_x_1}) * (X_2{}^{\wedge attribute\ weight\_x_2}) * (X_3{}^{\wedge attribute\ weight\_x_3}) * (X_4{}^{\wedge attribute\ weight\_x_4}) * (X_5{}^{\wedge attribute\ weight\_x_5}) \tag{9}$$

Step 5. Determine the Preference ($\boldsymbol{V_i}$) using Eq. (4) and the results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Preference calculation results

Vector $\boldsymbol{S_i}$	Vector $\boldsymbol{V_i}$
81.03	0,21160

Preference ($\boldsymbol{V_i}$) is used to determine the distribution of the mapping classification of food self-sufficient areas. Figure 2(a) shows the analysis map of the irrigation system of each village, with green color for technical irrigation conditions, yellow for semi-technical conditions, and blue for rain-fed conditions. Figure 2(b) shows population data for each village. The yellow color indicates population less than 1,000 households, the green for more than 1000 but less than 2000 households, the red for more than 2,000 but less than 3,000 households, the gray for more than 3000 households, and the turquoise green for not populated.

Data of the rice planting area is shown in Figure 2(c). The yellow color represents the planting area less than 200 Hectares (Ha), the green for more than 200 Ha, and the gray for no rice planting area. Figure 2(d) shows each village's rice harvest productivity data. The yellow color represents the yield of less than 50 Qt/Ha, the green for more than 100 Qt/Ha, and the gray for no rice planting land area. Figure 2(e) displays the deployment of agricultural tools in every village with red color for the area with RT/TRAY tools, the yellow for TR2 only, the green for a combination of RT/TRAY and TR2, and the gray for the area with no subsidy due to no agricultural land for rice. Figure 2(f) shows the results of the self-sufficiency classification analysis using the WP method with the blue for very good self-sufficiency, the green for good, the yellow for quite good, the orange for poor, the red for very poor.

Using the Naive Bayes method, the potential self-sufficiency area uses five parameters: type of seed, type of fertilizer, irrigation systems, agricultural land area, and agricultural tool. Using Eq (5) and (6), the status of each village can be determined as in Table 7. For a numerical example, the calculation is performed for Village 11 with following steps:

Step 1. Compute the probability of the appearance of "Yes" status and the appearance of "No" status.

Step 2. Compute is the probability of the appearance of "Yes" status when X variable is established *(P(Yes/X))* and the probability of the appearance of "No" status when X is established *(P(No/X))*. Where, $\mathbf{x_1}$=superior; $\mathbf{x_2}$=mix; $\mathbf{x_3}$=technical irrigation; $\mathbf{x_4}$=300-400; $\mathbf{x_5}$=TR2; $\mathbf{x_6}$='?'

Step 3: Compute the P(Yes/x) and P(No/X) using Eq. 10 and Eq. 11.

$$\mathrm{P(Yes/x)} = 0.081;\ \mathrm{P(No/x)} = 0$$

$$P(Yes|x) = P(x_1|Yes) \times P(x_2|Yes) \times P(x_3|Yes) \times P(x_4|Yes) \times P(x_5|Yes) \times P(Yes) \tag{10}$$

$$P(No|x) = P(x_1|No) \times P(x_2|No) \times P(x_3|No) \times P(x_4|No) \times P(x_5|No) \times P(No) \tag{11}$$

Step 4. Compare the P(Yes/x) and P(No/X). Since the P(Yes/x) is greater than the P(No/x), the status of Village 11 is "Yes."



(a.) Classification of irrigation



(b.) Classification of population



(c.) Classification of rice plant area



(d.) Classification of productivity



(e.) Classification of Agricultural tool



(f.) Self-sufficiency analysis results

FIGURE 2. Mapping Classification Results using the WP Method

Table 9. Food Self-Sufficient Prediction Datasets from 11 Villages

Village No	Food Self-Sufficient Prediction Attributes					Status
	Type of Seeds (x_1)	Type of fertilize (x_2)	Irrigation system (x_3)	Agricultural land area (x_4)	Agricultural tool (x_5)	
1	Local	Organic	Technical Irrigation	100-200	TR2	Yes
2	Superior	Inorganic	Semi Technical	0-100	RT/TRAY	Yes
3	Local	Organic	Rainfed	300-400	MIX	No
4	Local	Mix	Semi Technical	>400	TR2	Yes
5	Superior	Mix	Rainfed	300-400	RT/TRAY	No
6	Hybrid	Organic	Semi Technical	200-300	TR2	Yes
7	Local	Inorganic	Rainfed	>400	RT/TRAY	No
8	Hybrid	Organic	Technical Irrigation	300-400	MIX	Yes
9	Local	Organic	Semi Technical	200-300	TR2	Yes
10	Hybrid	Mix	Technical Irrigation	>400	MIX	Yes
11	Superior	Mix	Technical Irrigation	300-400	TR2	?

Figure 3 shows blue color for areas predicted to be self-sufficient food, yellow for being able to be self-sufficient.



FIGURE 3. The Result of Mapping Classification with the Naïve Bayes

Using the WP method on Eq. (4) resulting Table 6 and Naive Bayes method on Eq. (5) resulting Table 7, evaluate the classification performance on the analysis result. Measuring algorithm performance in classification metrics usually revolves around using precision and recall evaluation frameworks [59]. To evaluate categorical classifiers for areas of food self-sufficiency uses precision, recall, and performance metric accuracy. Precision aims to measure the accuracy, and recall is to measure the completeness of the classification results. In contrast, accuracy is the most common measure of the classification process [61].

The testing of the spatial analysis for food self-sufficiency mapping application is performed by calculating the success rate of predictive analysis using the WP method. The correct predictions are 12 times out of 20 experiments. The Naive Bayes method results in eight accurate predictions out of 15 experiments. The WP method are carried out to mapping food self-sufficiency using GIS. The validation of the predictive result shows 69% of precision, 85% of recall, and 75% of accuracy. Moreover, the Naive Bayes method's precision, recall, and accuracy are 62%, 80%, and 70%, respectively.

4. **Conclusion.** This research examines the combination of WP and Naïve Bayes methods in classifying multi-attribute for spatial data modelling. The WP method on MADM allows comparative mapping results according to the importance level, weight, and rank of priority given to each multi-parameter attribute in providing spatial sensitivity analysis. This paper produces a V_i Preference value from the WP method by considering quantitative data and calculating the Guttman scale classification parameter. This is critical in the decision-making process for identifying food self-sufficient areas.

While the Naïve Bayes method predicts the mapping of self-sufficient food areas, by maximizing the posterior probability, the method can quickly produce a structured result with a shorter processing time. The result of WP and Naïve Bayes methods combination unlocks new potential for further research in combining several different methods in spatial data modeling. Based on the test results, they have a good category agreement strength for GIS spatial data modeling to classify self-sufficient food areas. Kohen Kappa index is 0.78, and the analysis results determine the number of regions with abundant agricultural products and high self-sufficiency. The MADM method, classification method with optimization parameters, and datasets can be considered for further research for better accuracy.

Acknowledgments. This paper is collaborative research in GIS for spatial analysis and model estimation. The authors give the highest appreciation to the Department of Agriculture and Food Security, Mojokerto Regency, East Java Province, Indonesia, which has provided access to private data and multi-criteria parameters used for model testing.

REFERENCES

[1] F. A. A. O. O. T. U. Nations, "Farming must change to feed the world," 2009. [Online]. Available: http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/9962/icode/.
[2] X. Xiao *et al.*, "Mapping paddy rice agriculture in southern China using multi-temporal MODIS images," *Remote Sens. Environ.*, vol. 95, no. 4, pp. 480–492, 2005.
[3] B. Zhu, Y. Fu, J. Liu, and Y. Mao, "Spatial distribution of 12 class B notifiable infectious diseases in China: A retrospective study," *PLoS One*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1–17, 2018.
[4] A. Vitianingsih, A. Choiron, D. Cahyono, A. Umam, and S. Suyanto, "Spatial Data Modeling on GIS for Classification of Measles-prone Region Using Multiple Attribute Decision Making," *Int. J. Intell. Eng. Syst.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 97–107, 2019.
[5] A. A. Mustafa, M. Singh, R. N. Sahoo, N. Ahmed, M. Khanna, and A. Sarangi, "Land Suitability Analysis for Different Crops: A Multi Criteria Decision Making Approach using Remote Sensing and GIS," *Water Technol.*, vol. 3, no. 12, pp. 61–84, 2011.
[6] T. Prakash, "Land suitability analysis for agricultural crops: A fuzzy Multicriteria Decision Making Approach," 2003.
[7] M. Javari, M. Saghaei, and F. Fadaei Jazi, "Analyzing the resilience of urban settlements using multiple-criteria decision-making (MCDM) models (case study: Malayer city)," *Sustain. Environ.*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 1889083, 2021.
[8] S. A. Getachew Tesfaye Ayehu, "Land Suitability Analysis for Rice Production: A GIS Based Multi-Criteria Decision Approach," *Am. J. Geogr. Inf. Syst.* , vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 95–104, 2015.
[9] A. Ezra, A. A. Adebayo, and A. S. Umar, "Application of Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) Model

in Agro-climatic Zoning of Taraba State for Ofada Rice Production," *FUTY J. Environ.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 108–120, 2020.
[10] R. N. Parker and E. K. Asencio, *GIS and Spatial Analysis for the Social Sciences: Coding, Mapping and Modeling*. Taylor & Francis Group, 2009.
[11] G. P. M. Spagnuolo, *Heterogenous Spatial Data: Fusion, Modeling, and Analysis for GIS Applications.* Morgan & Claypool, 2016.
[12] X. Lei, W. Chen, and B. T. Pham, "Performance evaluation of GIS-based artificial intelligence approaches for landslide susceptibility modeling and spatial patterns analysis," *ISPRS Int. J. Geo-Information*, vol. 9, no. 7, pp. 1–20, 2020.
[13] M. Otgonbayar, C. Atzberger, J. Chambers, D. Amarsaikhan, S. Böck, and J. Tsogtbayar, "Land Suitability Evaluation for Agricultural Cropland in Mongolia Using the Spatial MCDM Method and AHP Based GIS," *J. Geosci. Environ. Prot.*, vol. 05, no. 09, pp. 238–263, 2017.
[14] B. Feizizadeh and T. Blaschke, "Journal of Environmental Planning and Land suitability analysis for Tabriz County , Iran : a multi-criteria evaluation approach using GIS," *J. Environ. Plan. Manag*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 1–23, 2013.
[15] P. Zolfaghary, M. Zakerinia, and H. Kazemi, "A model for the use of urban treated wastewater in agriculture using multiple criteria decision making (MCDM) and geographic information system (GIS)," *Agric. Water Manag.*, vol. 243, no. August, p. 106490, 2021.
[16] H. R. Pourkhabbaz, S. Javanmardi, and H. A. Faraji Sabokbar, "Suitability analysis for determining potential agricultural land use by the multi-criteria decision making models SAW and VIKOR-AHP (case study: Takestan-Qazvin plain)," *J. Agric. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 1005–1016, 2014.
[17] A. Nurkholis and I. S. Sitanggang, "A spatial analysis of soybean land suitability using spatial decision tree algorithm," in *Proceedings Of SPIE*, 2019, no. December, p. 65.
[18] K. T. Morrison, T. A. Nelson, F. S. Nathoo, and A. S. Ostry, "Application of Bayesian spatial smoothing models to assess agricultural self-sufficiency," *Int. J. Geogr. Inf. Sci.*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 1213–1229, 2012.
[19] A. O. Onojeghuo, G. A. Blackburn, Q. Wang, P. M. Atkinson, D. Kindred, and Y. Miao, "Mapping paddy rice fields by applying machine learning algorithms to multi-temporal sentinel-1A and landsat data," *Int. J. Remote Sens.*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1042–1067, 2018.
[20] Z. Maddahi, A. Jalalian, M. M. K. Zarkesh, and N. Honarjo, "Land suitability analysis for rice cultivation using a GIS-based fuzzy multi-criteria decision making approach: Central part of amol district, Iran," *Soil Water Res.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 29–38, 2017.
[21] A. Barakat, W. Ennaji, A. El Jazouli, R. Amediaz, and F. Touhami, "Multivariate analysis and GIS-based soil suitability diagnosis for sustainable intensive agriculture in Beni-Moussa irrigated subperimeter (Tadla plain, Morocco)," *Model. Earth Syst. Environ.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 1–8, 2017.
[22] J. Kihoro, N. J. Bosco, and H. Murage, "Suitability analysis for rice growing sites using a multicriteria evaluation and GIS approach in great Mwea region, Kenya," *Springerplus*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2013.
[23] D. N. Kuria and E. Waithaka, "Using geographic information systems (GIS) to determine land suitability for rice crop growing in the Tana delta," *J. Geogr. Reg. Plan.*, vol. 4, no. 9, pp. 525–532, 2011.
[24] I. Nahib *et al.*, "Integration of logistic regression and multicriteria land evaluation to simulation establishment of sustainable paddy field zone in Indramayu Regency, West Java Province, Indonesia," in *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 2018, vol. 149, no. 012005, pp. 1–12.
[25] M. K. S. David W Miller, *Executive Decisions and Operations Research*. Prentice-Hall; 1St Edition, 1960.
[26] Y. Li, Z. Sun, and F. Accatino, "Spatial distribution and driving factors determining local food and feed self-sufficiency in the eastern regions of China," *Food Energy Secur.*, no. May, pp. 1–17, 2021.
[27] V. Talasila, C. Prasad, G. T. S. Reddy, and A. Aparna, "Analysis and prediction of crop production in Andhra region using deep convolutional regression network," *Int. J. Intell. Eng. Syst.*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 1–9, 2020.
[28] E. Boltürk, A. Karaşan, and C. Kahraman, "Simple additive weighting and weighted product methods using neutrosophic sets," in *Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing*, vol. 369, 2019, pp. 647–676.
[29] A. Kolios, V. Mytilinou, E. Lozano-Minguez, and K. Salonitis, "A comparative study of multiple-criteria decision-making methods under stochastic inputs," *Energies*, vol. 9, no. 7. 2016.
[30] D. M. Martin and M. Mazzotta, "Non-monetary valuation using Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis: Sensitivity of additive aggregation methods to scaling and compensation assumptions," *Ecosyst. Serv.*, vol. 29, no. February, pp. 13–22, 2018.
[31] C. H. Yeh, "A Problem-based Selection of Multi-attribute Decision-making Methods," *Int. Trans. Oper. Res.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 169–181, 2002.
[32] R. Blanquero, E. Carrizosa, and P. Ramírez-cobo, "Variable selection for Naïve Bayes classification," *Comput. Oper. Res.*, vol. 135, no. November, p. 105456, 2021.
[33] H. Zhang, L. Jiang, and L. Yu, "Attribute and instance weighted naive Bayes," *Pattern Recognit.*, vol. 111, no. March, p. 107674, 2021.

[34] R. Liu *et al.*, “Assessing spatial likelihood of flooding hazard using naïve Bayes and GIS: a case study in Bowen Basin, Australia,” *Stoch. Environ. Res. Risk Assess.*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 1575–1590, 2016.
[35] D. G. & M. G. Nir Friedman, “Bayesian Network Classifier,” *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. (including Subser. Lect. Notes Artif. Intell. Lect. Notes Bioinformatics)*, vol. 29, no. PART 3, pp. 131–163, 1997.
[36] M. Benjumeda, C. Bielza, and P. Larrañaga, “Tractability of most probable explanations in multidimensional Bayesian network classifiers,” *Int. J. Approx. Reason.*, vol. 93, no. October, pp. 74–87, 2018.
[37] T. Gärtner and P. Flach, “WBCSVM: Weighted Bayesian Classification based on Support Vector Machines,” in *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2001, pp. 154–161.
[38] M. Miao, H. Zeng, A. Wang, C. Zhao, and F. Liu, “Discriminative spatial-frequency-temporal feature extraction and classification of motor imagery EEG: An sparse regression and Weighted Naïve Bayesian Classifier-based approach,” *J. Neurosci. Methods*, vol. 278, no. February, pp. 13–24, 2017.
[39] C. Mao, L. Lu, and B. Hu, “Local probabilistic model for Bayesian classification: A generalized local classification model,” *Appl. Soft Comput. J.*, vol. 93, no. August, p. 106379, 2020.
[40] M. Kabak, M. Erbaş, C. Çetinkaya, and E. Özceylan, “A GIS-based MCDM approach for the evaluation of bike-share stations,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 201, no. November, pp. 49–60, 2018.
[41] Y. Qin, Y. Liu, Z. Hong, and H. Jia, “Hesitant fuzzy Muirhead mean operators and its application to multiple attribute decision making,” *Int. J. Innov. Comput. Inf. Control*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 1223–1238, 2018.
[42] S. Drobne and A. Lisec, “Multi-attribute decision analysis in GIS: Weighted linear combination and ordered weighted averaging,” *Informatica*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 459–474, 2009.
[43] A. V. Vitianingsih, I. Wisnubhadra, S. S. K. Baharin, R. Marco, and A. L. Maukar, “Classification of pertussis vulnerable area with location analytics using multiple attribute decision making,” *Int. J. Innov. Comput. Inf. Control*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1943–1957, 2020.
[44] M. J. Zhang and J. X. Nan, “A compromise ratio ranking method of triangular intuitionistic fuzzy numbers and its application to MADM problems,” *Iran. J. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 21–37, 2013.
[45] E. Triantaphyllou, *Multi-Criteria Decision Making Methods: A Comparative Study*. Springer, Boston, MA, 2000.
[46] H. Jafaryeganeh, M. Ventura, and C. Guedes Soares, “Effect of normalization techniques in multi-criteria decision making methods for the design of ship internal layout from a Pareto optimal set,” *Struct. Multidiscip. Optim.*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 1849–1863, 2020.
[47] K. Yoon, “The propagation of errors in multiple-attribute decision analysis: A practical approach,” *J. Oper. Res. Soc.*, vol. 40, no. 7, pp. 681–686, 1989.
[48] Y. Yang and J. He, “A novel method based on fixed point iteration and improved topsis method for multi-attribute group decision making,” *Int. J. Innov. Comput. Inf. Control*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 15–29, 2021.
[49] D. Soria, J. M. Garibaldi, F. Ambrogi, E. M. Biganzoli, and I. O. Ellis, “A ‘non-parametric’ version of the naive Bayes classifier,” *Knowledge-Based Syst.*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 775–784, 2011.
[50] P. Tsangaratos and I. Ilia, “Comparison of a logistic regression and Naïve Bayes classifier in landslide susceptibility assessments: The influence of models complexity and training dataset size,” *Catena*, vol. 145, no. October, pp. 164–179, 2016.
[51] and R. W. S.Kusumadewi, S.Hartati, , A.Harjoko, *Fuzzy multi-attribute decision making (fuzzy madm)*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Graha Ilmu.
[52] L. Guttman, “The Determinacy Of Factor Score Matrices With Implications For Five Other Basic Problems Of Common-Factor Theory,” *Br. J. Stat. Psychol.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 65–81, 1955.
[53] L. Guttman, “A Basis for Scaling Qualitative Data,” *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, vol. 9, no. 2, p. 139, 1944.
[54] R. E. Tractenberg, F. Yumoto, P. S. Aisen, J. A. Kaye, and R. J. Mislevy, “Using the Guttman scale to define and estimate measurement error in items over time: The case of cognitive decline and the meaning of ‘points lost,’” *PLoS One*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 1–8, 2012.
[55] A. Stegeman, “A new method for simultaneous estimation of the factor model parameters, factor scores, and unique parts,” *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.*, vol. 99, no. July, pp. 189–203, 2016.
[56] R. A. and C. M. Walker, *Categorical Data Analysis for the Behavioral and Social Sciences*. Taylor & Francis Group, 2021.
[57] M. Sokolova and G. Lapalme, “A systematic analysis of performance measures for classification tasks,” *Inf. Process. Manag.*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 427–437, 2009.
[58] Max Bramer, *Principles Data Mining*. London-Spinger: http://www.springer.com/series/7592, 2007.
[59] M. G. Jesse Davis, “The relationship between Precision-Recall and ROC curves,” in *ICML ’06: Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, 2006.
[60] L. Torgo and R. Ribeiro, “Utility-Based Regression Luis,” in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science book series*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007, pp. 597–604.
[61] A. Tripathy, A. Agrawal, and S. K. Rath, “Classification of sentiment reviews using n-gram machine learning approach,” *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 57, no. September, pp. 117–126, 2016.

Author Biography

Anik Vega Vitianingsih is Ph.D. candidate at the Faculty of Information and Communication Technology (FTMK), Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka, Malaysia. Bachelor's degree in Informatics Engineering, Master's degree in Game Tech, her research interests are in Spatial Analysis, Spatial Data Modeling, and Artificial Intelligence in Geographical Information Systems. Being lecturer in the Informatics Department, she is also editor in chief of the International Journal of Artificial Intelligence & Robotics from Universitas Dr. Soetomo. With several papers in various Scopus Journal, she has been reviewer for various international journal, e.g: Taylor and Francis Ltd publishers, Journal of Transportation Safety and Security, IETE Technical Review (Institution of Electronics and Telecommunication Engineers, India), International Journal of Injury Control and Safety Promotion, International Social Science Journal Publisher Wiley-Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Robert Marco is Ph.D candidate at the Faculty of Information and Communication Technology (FTMK), Universiti Teknik Malaysia Melaka, Malaysia with earned Bachelor’s degree in Electrical Engineering and Masters in Engineering. Experienced papers writer in various Scopus Journal, the author is a lecturer in the Department of Informatics, Amikom University, Yogyakarta with research interests in software engineering, machine learning and deep learning, systems analysis.

Anastasia Lidya Maukar is a lecturer in the Industrial Engineering program at President University, Cikarang, West Java. The author received the Bachelor’s degree in Industrial Engineering from the University of Surabaya, Master of Science in Information System Development from the University of Hertfordshire, UK and Master of Technology Management in Industrial Engineering from the Sepuluh Nopember Institute of Technology, Surabaya. Her research and teaching interests are facility layout, databases and information systems, industrial statistics, and production systems. The author is also active in managing national journals and a reviewer in several national journals

Erri Wahyu Puspitarini is currently attending Ph.D program in Information and Communication Technology at Universiti Teknologi Malaysia Melaka (UTeM), with Bachelor’s degree in Information System and Master’s in Information and Technology Management. Her research interest includes behaviour analysis, technology acceptance, system analysis, data science and eLearning Technology.

Seftin Fitri Ana Wati graduated with a bachelor's degree in informatics at UPN "Veteran" East Java and Master of Information Systems from the Sepuluh Nopember Institute of Technology, Surabaya. Interested in conducting research in the field of System Dynamic Modeling, Forecasting, GIS, Analysis systems, Enterprise Systems, she is currently a lecturer in Information Systems at UPN "Veteran" East Java.

4) Final Submission (IJICIC-2107-006) (15-28 Januari 2022)

ANIK VEGA V, S.Kom.,MT unitomo <vega@unitomo.ac.id>

Invoice Letter: IJICIC-2107-006

4 pesan

office@ijicic.net <office@ijicic.net> 8 Januari 2022 pukul 17.40
Kepada: vega@unitomo.ac.id
Cc: www.erri@stmik-yadika.ac.id, seftin.fitri.si@upnjatim.ac.id, robertmarco@amikom.ac.id, almaukar@president.ac.id

International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control (IJICIC)

2022-01-08

INVOICE (No. IJICIC-2107-006)

Ms. Anik vega Vitianingsih

Universitas Dr. Soetomo

Indonesia

vega@unitomo.ac.id

Publication Page Charges for:

Reference No.: IJICIC-2107-006

Title: Spatial Data Modeling Using MADM Model Approach For Classification Of Food Self-Sufficiency Regions

Author(s): Anik vega Vitianingsih, Robert Marco, Anastasia Lidya Maukar , Erri Wahyu Puspitarini, Seftin Fitri Ana W

in (International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control, ISSN 1349-4198)

as a Publication

Amount due: JPY84,000 (within 12 pages)

Please note that any paper over 12 printed pages will be charged an excess page fee of JPY7,000 per page and we don't accept the final version that is different from the accepted version.

[ ] Visa [ ] MasterCard

Credit Card No.:_________/_________/_________/_________

Expiration Date:_________month___/_________year_________

Card Holder's Name:_____________

Authorized Signature:_____________

Notes:

1) The item is Journal Fee by the IJICIC. If you would like to get the Receipt for the payment, please notify us via office@ijicic.net and indicate the detailed Receipt Information as the following sample at the same time.

Name: ****
Organization: ****
Paper Title: ****
----

2) Please return the completed invoice letter together with your final version on the online submission system.

Executive Editor

Yan Shi

IJICIC Editorial Office

Tokai University, Kumamoto Campus

9-1-1, Toroku, Kumamoto 862-8652, Japan

Tel: +81-96-386-2666

E-mail: office@ijicic.net

ANIK VEGA V, S.Kom.,MT unitomo <vega@unitomo.ac.id> 25 Januari 2022 pukul 21.38
Kepada: office@ijicic.net

Dear Editor,

Attachment file I sent:
1. Final paper based on http://www.ijicic.net/
2. Copyright Form (IJICIC)
3. Plagiarism Checker using Turnitin tools

Please give me a paper payment bill to PayPal (vega@unitomo.ac.id) or a paper bill payment link

Thanks
[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

3 lampiran

IJICIC-2107-006.docx
3327K

IJICIC-2107-006_Copyright Form (IJICIC).pdf
168K

IJICIC-2107-006_Turnitin.pdf
4593K

IJICIC-M <lili_ma@ijicic.net> 26 Januari 2022 pukul 08.26
Kepada: "ANIK VEGA V S.Kom.MT unitomo" <vega@unitomo.ac.id>
Cc: office <office@ijicic.net>

Dear Dr. Anik Vega Vitianingsih,

Thanks for your contributions to IJICIC.

Only two payment options are available, either by credit card or by bank transfer.

If you would like to pay by bank transfer, please let us know and then we will send the new Invoice Letter to you.

All submissions to IJICIC are processed through online submission system only, please submit all the documents for final submission on IJICIC submission system.

Please note that we don't accept the final version that is different from the accepted version.

Please feel free to contact us if you still have any further question concerning this.

Best Regards,
Lili Ma

On Behalf of Dr. Yan SHI
Executive Editor, IJICIC
Professor, School of Industrial and Welfare Engineering, Tokai University
9-1-1, Toroku, Kumamoto 862-8652, Japan
Tel.: 81-96-386-2666
E-mail: office@ijicic.net

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

ANIK VEGA V, S.Kom.,MT unitomo <vega@unitomo.ac.id> 26 Januari 2022 pukul 13.47
Kepada: IJICIC-M <lili_ma@ijicic.net>, office@ijicic.net

Dear Editor,

I would like to pay by bank transfer, please send provide us the Invoice Letter.

Many Thanks
[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control (IJICIC) ISSN 1349-4198

Author's Warranty and Assignment of Copyright

Dear Contributor(s),

We are pleased that you are contributing a paper to the ***International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control (IJICIC)***. State Paper ID, the complete title and all authors of the contribution, read the agreement, sign and return it to the IJICIC Office on the online submission system.

Paper ID : **IJICIC-2107-006**
Full title of paper : **Spatial Data Modeling using MADM for Classification of Food Self-Sufficiency Regions**

Author(s) (Full names): Anik Vega Vitianingsih, Robert Marco, Anastasia Lidya Maukar, Erri Wahyu Puspitarini, And Seftin Fitri Ana Wati

Your submission of this work and our acceptance for publication are contingent upon your warranty of the following conditions which constitute the Agreement between the author(s) and the ICIC International.

You warrant that the above titled contribution is original, has not been published elsewhere or has not been submitted for publication elsewhere. You warrant that it does not contain libelous material. You agree to transfer copyright to the ICIC International upon acceptance for publication. If the article contains material copyrighted by others, the author warrants that written permission has been obtained from copyright holders who agree to transfer copyright to the extent allowable.

Please indicate your agreement with these terms by signing and dating below.

Author(s) Signature: **Date: January 25, 2022**

Anik Vega Vitianingsih

Erri Wahyu Puspitarini

Robert Marco

Seftin Fitri Ana Wati

Anastasia Lidya Maukar

International Journal of Innovative
Computing, Information and Control ICIC International ©2021 ISSN 1349-4198
Volume **xx** Number **xx**, February **xx** pp. 1–3

Spatial Data Modeling using MADM for Classification of Food Self-Sufficiency Regions

Anik Vega Vitianingsih[1*], Robert Marco[2], Anastasia Lidya Maukar [3], Erri Wahyu Puspitarini[4], And Seftin Fitri Ana Wati[5]

[1]Department of Informatics
Universitas Dr. Soetomo, Surabaya, Indonesia
*Corresponding author: vega@unitomo.ac.id
tsalisannur@gmail.com

[2]Department of Informatics
Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
robertmarco@amikom.ac.id

[3]Department of Industrial Engineering
President University, Bekasi, Indonesia
almaukar@president.ac.id

[4]Department of Informatics Engineering
STMIK Yadika Bangil
Pasuruan, Indonesia
www.erri@stmik-yadika.ac.id

[5]Department of Information System
UPN Veteran Jawa Timur, Surabaya, Indonesia
seftin.fitri.si@upnjatim.ac.id

Received xxxxxxx, revised xxxxxxx

ABSTRACT. *A population increase without equivalent rice production can lead to a decrease in food security. Efforts are required to identify agricultural land for its self-sufficient rice field areas. It is presented in this research how spatial data modeling can be used to categorize and predict food self-sufficiency zones utilizing multi-attribute decision making (MADM) technology on Geographical Information System (GIS) technology. The classification of food self-sufficient areas uses the Weighted Product (WP) method applying multi-attribute parameters of agricultural production, total food demand, and the area of the agricultural sub-districts. The Naive Bayes method predicts food self-sufficiency based on several parameters: seed type, fertilizer, season, and terrain type. The results of the method test show superiority in classifying food self-sufficient areas by having an average coefficient value in the kappa index test of 0.78. The trial results conclude that it was determined that this method has a high degree of agreement strength when used for spatial data analysis of the food self-sufficient areas classification utilizing the MADM methodology.*

Keywords: GIS, Spatial Data Modeling, Food Self-Sufficiency, MADM, WP, Naïve Bayes

1. **Introduction.** Rice is a staple food in many countries throughout the world, and it is one of the most widely consumed grains in the world. Because of this, mapping rice fields in a timely and efficient manner is critical to ensuring agricultural sustainability and food security in the future. The agricultural land mapping remains challenging in fragmented landscapes, such as rice-growing areas, because the information on rice farming areas is still dominated by small-scale agriculture compared to large-scale agriculture. Thus, land use is one of the functions in accelerating the production of agricultural products aimed at meeting food needs and improving people's welfare [1]. Based on the Food and Agriculture

DOI: 10.24507/ijicic.17.01.xxx

Organization (FAO) survey, it is estimated that the growth rate of agricultural production declines to 1.5% between 2015 and 2030, further to 0.9% between 2030 and 2050. Thus, it is necessary to apply a spatial pattern to produce information on the distribution/mapping of rice fields, which is very much needed as a strategic policy of food security [2].

Spatial data analysis is essential for monitoring and controlling agricultural land mapping. In recent decades, there has been an increase in research interest in presenting MADM-based models for assessing spatial data in domains such as healthcare [3] [4]; agriculture [5] [6]; population [7], and so on. It was developed based on climatic, soil, and topographical conditions to determine the rank of various suitability factors and weights as a map of the suitability of production and rice fields [8]. In order to determine the appropriateness of rice farming land-based on spatial climate maps, researchers employed Extracting Criteria Maps for Agro-climatic Zoning and weighted overlay as a spatial analysis technique, which was also applied in determining the suitability of other crops [9].

In geocoding and mapping GIS, spatial data modeling is the act of analyzing spatial data in order to design a decision-making system that is utilized for stakeholder policy development and implementation [10] [11]. At present, the rapid development of the GIS through the integration process and precise analysis can be performed using different methods. The model approach uses MADM to determine the factors and their weights for mapping the suitability of rice farming land [12], such as analytical hierarchical process [13]–[15], simple additive weighting [16]. Meanwhile, modeling and analyzing spatial patterns through a machine learning-based Artificial Intelligence (AI) algorithm used for mapping the suitability of rice farming land, includes Naïve bayes and Radial basis function networks [12]; Decision tree [17]; Bayesian [18]; Support vector machine and Random Forest [19].

The suitability analysis of land mapping and the preparation of land use maps using GIS is the most practical application in land resource planning and management [20]. GIS technology has been widely used in evaluating the suitability of agricultural land mapping because it leads to the rapid creation of static maps and map estimates by combining several information data to produce a layer suitability map [20]–[23]. Based on previous research, GIS technology uses spatial analysis to identify agricultural land suitability with spatial, temporal, and spatial-temporal methods. The development of sustainable rice was analyzed by integrating the logistic regression and multi-criteria land evaluation, such as characteristics of local land-use conversions [24]. An agricultural spatial data-driven Bayesian autoregressive framework was utilized to create a predictive smoothing model for the self-sufficiency index (SSI) as a subset of clusters, which was then used to test the model's predictions [18][24]. But the approach and parameters offered in this study, namely, the multi-criteria parameter approach, were not used in earlier studies to explore the need for supporting factors in the analysis process. AI using mathematical modeling is suitable to produce a mapping distribution of agricultural land areas with multi-class classification and experts to determine criteria, weighting, and ranking attributes.

According to the most relevant literature and theory of the methodologies utilized in this study [25], the categorization of agricultural land mapping areas based on food self-sufficiency status is the most appropriate classification. Several literature studies have attempted to improve results in scientifically mapping an area. Also, previous researchers have suggested developing mathematical models, GIS MADM methods, and AI. Thus, in the theoretical background section, we will discuss research on MADM, artificial intelligence, geographic information systems (GIS), and combinations of these technologies. A variety of multi-criteria decision-making methods, including the Analytic Network Process (ANP), Simple Additive Weighting (SAW), and Vlse Kriterijumska Optimizacija I Kompromisno Resenje-Analytical Hierarchical Process (VIKOR-AHP), were used in a GIS environment to investigate an ecological model framework with the goal of selecting a suitable location for agricultural land use [16]. Another study combined geographic information system (GIS) technology with multi-criteria decision making (MCDM) and the Analytic hierarchy process (AHP) to determine the suitability of agricultural land for crop development in a different part of the world [15]. According to this study [17], which makes use of the MCDM spatial method and the AHP-based GIS, the value of each criterion layer is calculated by multiplying the parameters for each factor obtained from the pair comparison matrix by adding weights, and the appropriate evaluation of several criterion factors affecting agricultural land is performed.

Application of the AHP approach is used to rank various appropriateness factors in order to make comparisons. The weights obtained as a result of the analysis are utilized to create a suitability map layer on the ArcGIS 10.1 platform, using the weighted sum overlay tool. Furthermore, a map is made that describes the suitability of rice production based on specific regions [8]. [18] proposed machine learning vector machine (SVM) and random forest (RF) classification techniques to map the spatial distribution of rice fields in order to map the spatial distribution of rice. [19] presented a predictive smoothing model to determine the self-sufficiency index (SSI) based on the Bayesian autoregressive framework by utilizing available agricultural data in each region. The researchers devised a fuzzy multi-criteria decision-making technique that was combined with geographic information systems (GIS) to assess optimal rice-growing regions in the Amol District of Iran. In accordance with the FAO framework and expert opinion [20], included soil qualities, meteorological conditions, terrain, and accessibility. In accordance with the findings of the literature study, there are still a limited number of studies that combine different methodologies for mapping agricultural land.

There are various difficulties in mapping land suitable for rice growing based on food self-sufficiency status, which is a difficult task. One issue is spatial information about the surrounding population, which is reflected in the demand for rice as a food security strategy to agricultural productivity as a result of increased agricultural productivity. Then, geographic information about the surrounding environment, the network structure, the qualities of the surrounding environment in relation to climatic conditions, and pest attacks are required, and the network structure is required. Several studies have stated that population density is the most significant criterion for food security [2][26]. Another study stated that essential factors in agricultural yield models are climate, soil properties, and water availability [27]. There is an analysis related to land suitability that must be applied in the final decision to meet the needs and reflect local conditions well [2][6], which is used to produce information on spatial mapping and the areas of rice fields as a strategic form of food security [2]. Previous studies have not used the proposed multi-parameter criteria for modeling spatial data with WP and Naïve Bayes methods. The authors proposed a spatial data modelling using MADM to define the mapping of agricultural areas based on the scope of food self-sufficiency category to address the challenges of mapping rice farming areas to determine food self-sufficiency status. This proposed approach is still very limited so far.

Multi-Attribute Decision-Making (MADM) approaches are commonly used to find the best solution, choose a single option, or rate options from most to least appropriate [28]. As one of the MADM methods, the Weighted Product (WP) method aims to evaluate and compare to the rest through the multiplication of ratios related to every criterion and select the most applicable alternatives [29]. This method is more straightforward and more efficient [28]. The WP method is considered suitable for both single and multi-dimensional problems/have high subjectivity [30], and produces a short calculation time [31]. In addition, the WP method has a moderate agreement strength category, which can be applied for modelling spatial data using GIS for regional classification [4]. While the use of Naïve Bayes classification in determining the class based on the hypothesis, there is no dependence between attributes in maximizing the posterior probability [32][33]. This method can quickly build simple structures without learning procedures and has a shorter computation time, resulting in higher efficiency [34]. Naïve Bayes is one of the algorithms that have advantages and outperforms many sophisticated classifications, especially when the attributes are not strongly correlated [33][35][36]. Meanwhile, limited studies combine Naive Bayes classification with weighting features [37]–[39].

The results of this study could be part of an effort to observe, monitor, and control food self-sufficiency as a strategic policy of food security in developing torpical countries. The mapping results can help stakeholders, or the food security agency classify and predict self-sufficient food areas. AI is used as a framework in spatial data modeling, using GIS technology to visualize the classification of food self-sufficient areas. From iimplementation and testing results, it can be concluded that web-GIS applications of mapping food self-sufficiency in Mojokerto district can provide information on the productivity of rice products, determine the regional potential for self-sufficiency, and predict areas of potential self-sufficiency The analysis results using the WP and Naive Bayes methods based on the parameters of land area, productivity, population, irrigation system, rainfall, and agricultural equipment in the Mojokerto district show that the prediction of self-sufficiency is good. Kohen Kappa index is 0.78, and the analysis results determine the number of areas with abundant agricultural products and high self-sufficiency.

2. **Method.** When GIS and MADM approaches are used for decision-making, a powerful tool is created that may be used to handle a variety of challenges, including the selection of a feasible location [40]. Identifying the most desirable from a small number of choices based on a predefined quality [41] is a useful approach for comparative analysis. Using MADM, decision-making systems using spatial data can be equipped to do spatial data analysis [42][43]. MADM is capable of integrating and managing geographic data as well as attribute data. Agricultural land mapping classification based on food self-sufficiency status is the major data used in the spatial data modelling discussed in this section. Figure 1 is a flowchart depicting the stages of the spatial data modelling process for classification.



FIGURE 1. Flowchart of spatial data modeling for food self-sufficiency classification

Step 1: This process is necessary to determine the necessity for spatial datasets and attribute data in the spatial shapefile dataset (**.shp*). This paper uses two types of datasets, namely spatial datasets including district maps in each sub-district and quantitative attribute datasets. The base map spatial datasets of the Mojokerto Regency consist of 18 sub-districts with information coverage at the village level. The quantitative attribute dataset for food self-sufficiency spatial data modeling (Table 1) contains attributes, such as population (households/sub-district), land in hectare (Ha), productivity in quintal (=100 kg) per hectare (Qt/Ha), Plant Pest Organisms (Pest), and Rainfall (Month). The quantitative attribute dataset for spatial data modelling predicting food self-sufficiency (see Table 2) contains attributes, such as types of seeds, type of fertilizer, irrigation system, agricultural land area, and agricultural tools

Step 2: The spatial data modelling to determine food self-sufficiency areas using the WP method on the MADM model is explained in section 2.1. The WP method is part of the WADM model in decision making which will process the criterion value of each parameter to get the V_i preference value. The spatial data modelling for predicting food self-sufficiency using the Naïve Bayes method on machine learning is explained in section 2.2.

Step 3: Compute the ranking value to determine the classification of food self-sufficiency areas using the Guttman Scale as described in Section 2.3. The classification value comprises the level of food self-sufficiency in each region, with circumstances ranging from very good, good, average, fair, and poor.

Step 4. Calculate the degree of agreement for both assessment methods using Cohen's kappa method based on the process of section 2.5. Then, calculate the measuring of Classification Model performance using APR based on section 2.6.

2.1 **Multiple Attribute Decision Making (MADM).** MADM in the field of spatial analysis is part of a multi-criteria decision-making system (MCDM) and multi-objective decision-making (MODM) [44]. MADM is used for discrete retrieval, where alternative decision support systems are predetermined [45]. The Weighted Product (WP) approach is a prominent weighting method that is used as part of a decision-making system that employs MADM multi-parameter criteria to make decisions. [30]. In addition, WP method has a limited set of decision alternatives that provide explanations for several decision criteria. WP method's primary process is multiplication, which is used to connect attribute ratings in situations where each attribute must be ranked with attribute weights in order to be considered. This process has similarities to the normalization process [46][47]. The weight is computed based on the level of importance. The more important, the higher the weight value, value of 1 is "very unimportant" and 5 is "very important".

The WP method approach is to assign a score to each alternative multiplied by the weighted value for each parameter attribute, with the following steps:

Step 1*:* Determine the criteria (C_j) of rice farming land that has the suitability status of a food self-sufficient area based on expert judgment. In MADM, using expert weight rationality directly influences the accuracy of the decision results [48].

Step 2*:* Determine the weight value of each existing criteria (w) or relative importance of each criterion (C_j) given by experts. The process in Eq. (1) normalizes the criterion weight (W), $\sum w_j = 1$, with $W(w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n)$ is the weighted importance value of each criterion.

$$W = \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n\} \tag{1}$$

Step 3: Simplify the weight criteria according to Eq. (2). Normalize or increase the weights to produce a value of $w_j = 1$ where $j = 1,2, \ldots, n$ criteria and $\sum w_j$ is the sum of weights.

$$W_j = \frac{w_j}{\sum w_j} \tag{2}$$

Step 4: Calculate the value of vector S_i as an alternative preference based on Eq. (3).

$$S_i = \prod\nolimits_{j=1}^{n} X_{ij}\, W_j, with\ i = 1,2, \ldots m \tag{3}$$

Where, S_i is the result of decisions normalization on i^{th} alternative (preference criteria), X_{ij} is an alternative rating per attribute (value of the criteria). The weight attribute is represented by W_j, and the number of criteria is represented by n. the W_j variable is the rank of positive value for the profit attribute and negative value for the cost attribute in the profit and cost attributes, respectively.

Step 5*:* Calculate the vector V_i value, using Eq. (4), as the relative preference of each alternative on vector V by dividing each number of vector values S with the total value of vector S.

$$V_i = \frac{S_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} S_i}\ , with\ i = 1,2, \ldots, \mathrm{m} \tag{4}$$

2.2 **Naïve Bayes.** The Naïve Bayes technique is a straightforward probability classification approach that calculates the likelihood of a new observation being classified into a predetermined category based on previous observations [34][47]. On the basis of this assumption, the classification can be estimated by computing the conditional probability density function and the posterior probability density function [49], to determine the posterior probability using Eq. (5) and Eq. (6) [50].

$$P(c|x) = \frac{P(x|c)P(c)}{P(x)} \tag{5}$$

$$P(c|x) = P(x_1|c) \times P(x_2|c) \times \ldots \times P(x_n|c) \times P(c) \tag{6}$$

Where, $P(c|x)$ is defined as the posterior probability of class (c, target) given predictor (x, attribute), $P(c)$ is defined as the probability of the preceding class, and $P(x)$ is defined as the prior probability of the predictor. The $P(x|c)$ variable denotes the possibility, which is the class probability given the predictor in the case of the possibility.

2.3 **Spatial Dataset.** This section explains the weighting process for various attributes using the WP method as shown in Table 1. In order to establish the level of importance/influence on the classification of each spatial dataset, a weighted value will be assigned to each one. The level of importance used for weighting in each attribute [51] is as follows: the value of X_i is 95 for category "Very good"; value 85 for category "Good"; value 75 for category "Average"; value 65 for category "Fair"; value 55 for category "Poor".

Table 1. Weighting Parameters of Self-Sufficiency Attributes Using WP Method

Attribute	Parameter	Category	Weight value
Population (X_1)	< 500	Very good	95
	500 – 1000	Good	85
	> 1000	Average	75
Agricultural land area (X_2)	> 250	Very good	95
	250 – 200	Good	85
	200 – 150	Average	75
	150 – 100	Fair	65
	100 – 0	Poor	55
Productivity (Qt/Ha) (X_3)	> 90	Very good	95
	≤ 90 – >70	Good	85
	≤ 70 – >50	Average	75
	≤ 50 – >30	Fair	65
	< 30	Poor	55
OPT (Pest) ($X4$)	0 – 8 %	Very good	95
	8 – 15 %	Good	85
	15 – 25 %	Average	75
	25 – 45 %	Fair	65
	> 45 %	Poor	55
Rainfall (Month) (X_3)	≥150mm	Very good	95
	<150mm – ≥100mm	Good	85
	<100mm – ≥50mm	Average	75
	<50mm	Fair	65

By analyzing the data presented in Table 2, the Naive Bayes approach is used to calculate the weights assigned to each feature of self-sufficiency prediction.

Table 2. Weighting Parameters of Self-Sufficiency Prediction Attributes Using Naïve Bayes

Attribute	Parameter	Category
Types of seeds	Hybrid	Very good
	Superior	Good
	Local	Average
Type of fertilizer	Organic and Inorganic (Mix)	Very good
	Inorganic	Good
	Organic	Average
Irrigation system	Technical Irrigation Rice Fields	Very good
	Semi-Technical Irrigation Rice Fields	Good
	Rainfed Rice Fields	Average

Attribute	Parameter	Category
Agricultural land area	> 250	Very good
	250 – 200	Good
	200 – 150	Average
	150 – 100	Fair
	100 – 0	Poor
Agricultural tools TR2: Tractor RT/TRAY: Rice Transplanter with tray	TR2 +RT/TRAY (Mix)	Very good
	TR2	Good
	RT/TRAY	Average

2.4 **The Guttman Scale.** When evaluating a classification, the Guttman scale can be used [52] to determine its importance. In order to draw conclusions from qualitative data [53], this scale is used as a basis for measurement [52]. It also helps to reduce uncertainty from an intervention outcome value in the projected categorization value [54]. The sort of dataset that employs scores/weights in the analysis process will produce a value based on the uncertainty factor of the class of variables described, which may be assessed using the Guttman scale [55] based on Eq. (4). (7).

$$I = \frac{R}{K} \tag{7}$$

The *I* variable is the result of the interval value derived from the *R* variable, which denotes the range of values in the data set. Very good, good, average, fair, and poor are among the potential classifications that will be generated; the *K* variable is the number of such classifications. As shown in this paper, the value of the *R* variable can be calculated by looking at the range of values between the maximum value of V_i and the V_i lowest value.

2.5 **Method Consistency Examination.** For determining the consistency of the two methods used in this experiment, the Cohen Kappa approach was employed. Specifies that this measurement should be utilized for qualitative data based on Eq. (8) [56].

$$K = \frac{\Pr(a) - \Pr(e)}{1 - \Pr(e)} \tag{8}$$

The measuring coefficient between the WP and Naive Bayes methods is denoted by the *K* variable. The percentage of the number of consistent measurements used for comparisons between methods is denoted by the $Pr(a)$ variable. The percentage change is denoted by the $Pr(e)$ variable. The method, based on the range of coefficient values, gives results “poor” agreement strength if the value of the variable $K <$ 0.21, "fair" for value between 0.21 and 0.40, "moderate" for value between 0.41 and 0.60, "good" for value between 0.61 and 0.80, "very good" for value between 0.81 and 1.00.

2.6 **Confusion Matrix Measuring Model.** The confusion matrix consists of two positive and two negative classes comparing the actual and classification data [57] [58] as seen in Table 3. Measuring Model melalui assessment dengan mengetahui nilai akurasi, presisi, and recall. Precision and recall are commonly defined as the ratio of correctly classified events (usually referred to as true positives in classification) to important occurrences (precision), or actual events (recall)[60].

Table 3. Confusion Matrix

Actual data	Predicted classification	
	Positive (+)	Negative (-)
Positive (+)	True positives (TP)	False negatives (FN)
Negative (-)	False positives (FP)	True negatives (TN)

3. **Results and Discussion.** Table 4 represents the findings of the Guttman Scale examination using Eq. (9) as the result of the classification scale value using the WP method

Table 4. The Findings of the Guttman Scale Examination

WP Method
$R = V_{i_{Max}} - V_{i_{Min}} = 0.21160 - 0.1929 = 0.0187$ $K = 5$ and, $I = \frac{0.0187}{5} = 0.00374$
Assessment very good criteria: $Highest\ score - I = 0.21160 - 0.00374 = 0.20786$ *Assessment good criteria:* $Very\ good\ criteria - I = 0.20786 - 0.00374 = 0.20412$ *Assessment average criteria:* $Good\ criteria - I = 0.20412 - 0.00374 = 0.20038$ *Assessment fair criteria:* $average\ criteria - I = 0.20038 - 0.00374 = 0.19664$

$$\begin{cases} very\ good, if\ V_i \geq 0.20786 \\ good, if\ V_i \geq 0.20412\ and\ V_i < 0.20786 \\ average, if\ V_i \geq 0.20038\ and\ V_i < 0.20412 \\ fair, if\ V_i \geq 0.19664\ and\ V_i < 0.20038 \\ very\ good, if\ V_i < 0.19664 \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Table 5 shows implementation datasets of self-sufficiency attributes assessment from Jolotundo villages.

Table 5. Weighted Product Implementation Datasets

Village	Attributes (X)				
	Population (X_1)	Land area (X_2)	Productivity (X_3)	O.P.T. (X_4)	Rainfall (X_5)
Jolotundo	75	95	75	96	75

Step 1. The WP method requires weights and attributes to determine food self-sufficiency.
Step 2. The decision-maker assigned the Preference Weights for each attribute (X_i) as in Table 6.

Table 6. Weights of each self-sufficiency attribute preferences

Weight	Attribute (X_i)					
	Population (X_1)	Land area (X_2)	Productivity (X_3)	O.P.T (X_4)	Rainfall (X_5)	$\sum w_i$
w	95	75	65	80	95	395

Step 3. The normalization is performed using Eq. (2), and the result can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7. Result of normalization of self-sufficiency attributes

Weight	$\left(\frac{X_1}{\sum W}\right)$	$\left(\frac{X_2}{\sum W}\right)$	$\left(\frac{X_3}{\sum W}\right)$	$\left(\frac{X_4}{\sum W}\right)$	$\left(\frac{X_5}{\sum W}\right)$	$\sum w_i$
w	0.24	0.19	0.24	0.16	0.16	1.00

Step 4. Calculate ***S*** vector using Eq (3), with the elaboration of Eq. (9). The result of vector calculations of each village for self-sufficiency attributes are shown in Table 8.

$$S_i = (X_1 \wedge^{attribute\ weight\_x_1}) * (X_2 \wedge^{attribute\ weight\_x_2}) * (X_3 \wedge^{attribute\ weight\_x_3}) * (X_4 \wedge^{attribute\ weight\_x_4}) * (X_5 \wedge^{attribute\ weight\_x_5}) \quad (9)$$

Step 5. Determine the preference (V_i) using Eq. (4) and the results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Preference calculation results

Vector S_i	Vector V_i
81.03	0,21160

Preference ($\boldsymbol{V_i}$) is used to determine the distribution of the mapping classification of food self-sufficient areas. Figure 2(a) shows the analysis map of the irrigation system of each village, with green color for technical irrigation conditions, yellow for semi-technical conditions, and blue for rain-fed conditions. Figure 2(b) shows population data for each village. The yellow color indicates population less than 1,000 households, the green for more than 1000 but less than 2000 households, the red for more than 2,000 but less than 3,000 households, the gray for more than 3000 households, and the turquoise green for not populated.

Data of the rice planting area is shown in Figure 2(c). The yellow color represents the planting area less than 200 Hectares (Ha), the green for more than 200 Ha, and the gray for no rice planting area. Figure 2(d) shows each village's rice harvest productivity data. The yellow color represents the yield of less than 50 Qt/Ha, the green for more than 100 Qt/Ha, and the gray for no rice planting land area. Figure 2(e) displays the deployment of agricultural tools in every village with red color for the area with RT/TRAY tools, the yellow for TR2 only, the green for a combination of RT/TRAY and TR2, and the gray for the area with no subsidy due to no agricultural land for rice. Figure 2(f) shows the results of the self-sufficiency classification analysis using the WP method with the blue for very good self-sufficiency, the green for good, the yellow for quite good, the orange for poor, the red for very poor.

Using the Naive Bayes method, the potential self-sufficiency area uses five parameters: type of seed, type of fertilizer, irrigation systems, agricultural land area, and agricultural tool. Using Eq (5) and (6), the status of each village can be determined as in Table 7. For a numerical example, the calculation is performed for Village 11 with following steps:

Step 1: Compute the probability of the appearance of "Yes" status and the appearance of "No" status.

Step 2: Compute is the probability of the appearance of "Yes" status when X variable is established (P(Yes/X)) and the probability of the appearance of "No" status when X is established (P(No/X)). Where, x_1 =superior; x_2 =mix; x_3 =technical irrigation; x_4 =300-400; x_5 =TR2; x_6='?'

Step 3: Compute the P(Yes/x) and P(No/X) using Eq. 10 and Eq. 11.

$$\mathrm{P(Yes/x)} = 0.081;\ \mathrm{P(No/x)} = 0$$

$$\mathrm{P(Yes|x)} = \mathrm{P(x_1|Yes)} \times \mathrm{P(x_2|Yes)} \times \mathrm{P(x_3|Yes)} \times \mathrm{P(x_4|Yes)} \times \mathrm{P(x_5|Yes)} \times \mathrm{P(Yes)} \tag{10}$$

$$\mathrm{P(No|x)} = \mathrm{P(x_1|No)} \times \mathrm{P(x_2|No)} \times \mathrm{P(x_3|No)} \times \mathrm{P(x_4|No)} \times \mathrm{P(x_5|No)} \times \mathrm{P(No)} \tag{11}$$

Step 4: Compare the P(Yes/x) and P(No/X). Since the P(Yes/x) is greater than the P(No/x), the status of Village 11 is "Yes."



(a.) Classification of irrigation



(b.) Classification of population



(c.) Classification of rice plant area

(d.) Classification of productivity

(e.) Classification of Agricultural tool

(f.) Self-sufficiency analysis results

FIGURE 2. Mapping Classification Results using the WP Method

Figure 3 shows blue color for areas predicted to be self-sufficient food, yellow for being able to be self-sufficient.



FIGURE 3. The Result of Mapping Classification with the Naïve Bayes

Table 9. Food Self-Sufficient Prediction Datasets from 11 Villages

Village No	Food Self-Sufficient Prediction Attributes					Status
	Type of Seeds (x_1)	Type of fertilize (x_2)	Irrigation system (x_3)	Agricultural land area (x_4)	Agricultural Tool (x_5)	
1	Local	Organic	Technical Irrigation	100-200	TR2	Yes
2	Superior	Inorganic	Semi Technical	0-100	RT/TRAY	Yes
3	Local	Organic	Rainfed	300-400	MIX	No
4	Local	Mix	Semi Technical	>400	TR2	Yes
5	Superior	Mix	Rainfed	300-400	RT/TRAY	No

Village No	Food Self-Sufficient Prediction Attributes					Status
	Type of Seeds (x_1)	Type of fertilize (x_2)	Irrigation system (x_3)	Agricultural land area (x_4)	Agricultural Tool (x_5)	
6	Hybrid	Organic	Semi Technical	200-300	TR2	Yes
7	Local	Inorganic	Rainfed	>400	RT/TRAY	No
8	Hybrid	Organic	Technical Irrigation	300-400	MIX	Yes
9	Local	Organic	Semi Technical	200-300	TR2	Yes
10	Hybrid	Mix	Technical Irrigation	>400	MIX	Yes
11	Superior	Mix	Technical Irrigation	300-400	TR2	?

Using the WP method on Eq. (4) resulting Table 6 and Naive Bayes method on Eq. (5) resulting Table 7, evaluate the classification performance on the analysis result. Measuring algorithm performance in classification metrics usually revolves around using precision and recall evaluation frameworks [59]. To evaluate categorical classifiers for areas of food self-sufficiency uses precision, recall, and performance metric accuracy. Precision is intended to assess the accuracy of the classification findings, whereas recall is intended to measure the completeness of the classification results. The accuracy of the categorization process, on the other hand, is the most commonly used confusion metric [61].

The testing of the spatial analysis for food self-sufficiency mapping application is performed by calculating the success rate of predictive analysis using the WP method. The correct predictions are 12 times out of 20 experiments. The Naive Bayes method results in eight accurate predictions out of 15 experiments. The WP method are carried out to mapping food self-sufficiency using GIS. The validation of the predictive result shows 69% of precision, 85% of recall, and 75% of accuracy. Moreover, the Naive Bayes method's precision, recall, and accuracy are 62%, 80%, and 70%, respectively.

4. **Conclusion.** This research examines the combination of WP and Naïve Bayes methods in classifying multi-attribute for spatial data modelling. The WP method on MADM allows comparative mapping results according to the priority level of importance of the parameters, weights, and priority rankings given to each multiparameter attribute in providing spatial sensitivity analysis. This paper considers quantitative data and computing the Guttman scale classification parameter, this research derives the V_i preference value from the WP approach and presents it. This is crucial in the decision-making process for selecting regions that are self-sufficient in terms of food production. While the Naïve Bayes method predicts the mapping of self-sufficient food areas, by maximizing the posterior probability, the method can quickly produce a structured result with a shorter processing time. The result of WP and Naïve Bayes methods combination unlocks new potential for further research in combining several different methods in spatial data modeling. Based on the test results, they have a good category agreement strength for GIS spatial data modeling to classify self-sufficient food areas. Kohen Kappa index is 0.78, and the analysis results determine the number of regions with abundant agricultural products and high self-sufficiency. The MADM method, classification method with optimization parameters, and datasets can be considered for further research for better accuracy.

Acknowledgments. This paper is collaborative research in GIS for spatial analysis and model estimation. The authors give the highest appreciation to the Department of Agriculture and Food Security, Mojokerto Regency, East Java Province, Indonesia, which has provided access to private data and multi-criteria parameters used for model testing.

REFERENCES

[1] F. A. A. O. O. T. U. Nations, “Farming must change to feed the world,” 2009. [Online]. Available: http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/9962/icode/.

[2] X. Xiao *et al.*, “Mapping paddy rice agriculture in southern China using multi-temporal MODIS images,” *Remote Sens. Environ.*, vol. 95, no. 4, pp. 480–492, 2005.

[3] B. Zhu, Y. Fu, J. Liu, and Y. Mao, “Spatial distribution of 12 class B notifiable infectious diseases in China: A retrospective study,” *PLoS One*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1–17, 2018.

[4] A. Vitianingsih, A. Choiron, D. Cahyono, A. Umam, and S. Suyanto, “Spatial Data Modeling on GIS for Classification of Measles-prone Region Using Multiple Attribute Decision Making,” *Int. J. Intell. Eng. Syst.*,

vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 97–107, 2019.
[5] A. A. Mustafa, M. Singh, R. N. Sahoo, N. Ahmed, M. Khanna, and A. Sarangi, “Land Suitability Analysis for Different Crops: A Multi Criteria Decision Making Approach using Remote Sensing and GIS,” *Water Technol.*, vol. 3, no. 12, pp. 61–84, 2011.
[6] T. Prakash, “Land suitability analysis for agricultural crops: A fuzzy Multicriteria Decision Making Approach,” 2003.
[7] M. Javari, M. Saghaei, and F. Fadaei Jazi, “Analyzing the resilience of urban settlements using multiple-criteria decision-making (MCDM) models (case study: Malayer city),” *Sustain. Environ.*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 1889083, 2021.
[8] S. A. Getachew Tesfaye Ayehu, “Land Suitability Analysis for Rice Production: A GIS Based Multi-Criteria Decision Approach,” *Am. J. Geogr. Inf. Syst.* , vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 95–104, 2015.
[9] A. Ezra, A. A. Adebayo, and A. S. Umar, “Application of Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) Model in Agro-climatic Zoning of Taraba State for Ofada Rice Production,” *FUTY J. Environ.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 108–120, 2020.
[10] R. N. Parker and E. K. Asencio, *GIS and Spatial Analysis for the Social Sciences: Coding, Mapping and Modeling*. Taylor & Francis Group, 2009.
[11] G. P. M. Spagnuolo, *Heterogenous Spatial Data: Fusion, Modeling, and Analysis for GIS Applications.* Morgan & Claypool, 2016.
[12] X. Lei, W. Chen, and B. T. Pham, “Performance evaluation of GIS-based artificial intelligence approaches for landslide susceptibility modeling and spatial patterns analysis,” *ISPRS Int. J. Geo-Information*, vol. 9, no. 7, pp. 1–20, 2020.
[13] M. Otgonbayar, C. Atzberger, J. Chambers, D. Amarsaikhan, S. Böck, and J. Tsogtbayar, “Land Suitability Evaluation for Agricultural Cropland in Mongolia Using the Spatial MCDM Method and AHP Based GIS,” *J. Geosci. Environ. Prot.*, vol. 05, no. 09, pp. 238–263, 2017.
[14] B. Feizizadeh and T. Blaschke, “Journal of Environmental Planning and Land suitability analysis for Tabriz County , Iran : a multi-criteria evaluation approach using GIS,” *J. Environ. Plan. Manag*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 1–23, 2013.
[15] P. Zolfaghary, M. Zakerinia, and H. Kazemi, “A model for the use of urban treated wastewater in agriculture using multiple criteria decision making (MCDM) and geographic information system (GIS),” *Agric. Water Manag.*, vol. 243, no. August, p. 106490, 2021.
[16] H. R. Pourkhabbaz, S. Javanmardi, and H. A. Faraji Sabokbar, “Suitability analysis for determining potential agricultural land use by the multi-criteria decision making models SAW and VIKOR-AHP (case study: Takestan-Qazvin plain),” *J. Agric. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 1005–1016, 2014.
[17] A. Nurkholis and I. S. Sitanggang, “A spatial analysis of soybean land suitability using spatial decision tree algorithm,” in *Proceedings Of SPIE*, 2019, no. December, p. 65.
[18] K. T. Morrison, T. A. Nelson, F. S. Nathoo, and A. S. Ostry, “Application of Bayesian spatial smoothing models to assess agricultural self-sufficiency,” *Int. J. Geogr. Inf. Sci.*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 1213–1229, 2012.
[19] A. O. Onojeghuo, G. A. Blackburn, Q. Wang, P. M. Atkinson, D. Kindred, and Y. Miao, “Mapping paddy rice fields by applying machine learning algorithms to multi-temporal sentinel-1A and landsat data,” *Int. J. Remote Sens.*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1042–1067, 2018.
[20] Z. Maddahi, A. Jalalian, M. M. K. Zarkesh, and N. Honarjo, “Land suitability analysis for rice cultivation using a GIS-based fuzzy multi-criteria decision making approach: Central part of amol district, Iran,” *Soil Water Res.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 29–38, 2017.
[21] A. Barakat, W. Ennaji, A. El Jazouli, R. Amediaz, and F. Touhami, “Multivariate analysis and GIS-based soil suitability diagnosis for sustainable intensive agriculture in Beni-Moussa irrigated subperimeter (Tadla plain, Morocco),” *Model. Earth Syst. Environ.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 1–8, 2017.
[22] J. Kihoro, N. J. Bosco, and H. Murage, “Suitability analysis for rice growing sites using a multicriteria evaluation and GIS approach in great Mwea region, Kenya,” *Springerplus*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2013.
[23] D. N. Kuria and E. Waithaka, “Using geographic information systems (GIS) to determine land suitability for rice crop growing in the Tana delta,” *J. Geogr. Reg. Plan.*, vol. 4, no. 9, pp. 525–532, 2011.
[24] I. Nahib *et al.*, “Integration of logistic regression and multicriteria land evaluation to simulation establishment of sustainable paddy field zone in Indramayu Regency, West Java Province, Indonesia,” in *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 2018, vol. 149, no. 012005, pp. 1–12.
[25] M. K. S. David W Miller, *Executive Decisions and Operations Research*. Prentice-Hall; 1St Edition, 1960.
[26] Y. Li, Z. Sun, and F. Accatino, “Spatial distribution and driving factors determining local food and feed self-sufficiency in the eastern regions of China,” *Food Energy Secur.*, no. May, pp. 1–17, 2021.
[27] V. Talasila, C. Prasad, G. T. S. Reddy, and A. Aparna, “Analysis and prediction of crop production in Andhra region using deep convolutional regression network,” *Int. J. Intell. Eng. Syst.*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 1–9, 2020.
[28] E. Boltürk, A. Karaşan, and C. Kahraman, “Simple additive weighting and weighted product methods using

neutrosophic sets," in *Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing*, vol. 369, 2019, pp. 647–676.
[29] A. Kolios, V. Mytilinou, E. Lozano-Minguez, and K. Salonitis, "A comparative study of multiple-criteria decision-making methods under stochastic inputs," *Energies*, vol. 9, no. 7. 2016.
[30] D. M. Martin and M. Mazzotta, "Non-monetary valuation using Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis: Sensitivity of additive aggregation methods to scaling and compensation assumptions," *Ecosyst. Serv.*, vol. 29, no. February, pp. 13–22, 2018.
[31] C. H. Yeh, "A Problem-based Selection of Multi-attribute Decision-making Methods," *Int. Trans. Oper. Res.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 169–181, 2002.
[32] R. Blanquero, E. Carrizosa, and P. Ramírez-cobo, "Variable selection for Naïve Bayes classification," *Comput. Oper. Res.*, vol. 135, no. November, p. 105456, 2021.
[33] H. Zhang, L. Jiang, and L. Yu, "Attribute and instance weighted naive Bayes," *Pattern Recognit.*, vol. 111, no. March, p. 107674, 2021.
[34] R. Liu *et al.*, "Assessing spatial likelihood of flooding hazard using naïve Bayes and GIS: a case study in Bowen Basin, Australia," *Stoch. Environ. Res. Risk Assess.*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 1575–1590, 2016.
[35] D. G. & M. G. Nir Friedman, "Bayesian Network Classifier," *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. (including Subser. Lect. Notes Artif. Intell. Lect. Notes Bioinformatics)*, vol. 29, no. PART 3, pp. 131–163, 1997.
[36] M. Benjumeda, C. Bielza, and P. Larrañaga, "Tractability of most probable explanations in multidimensional Bayesian network classifiers," *Int. J. Approx. Reason.*, vol. 93, no. October, pp. 74–87, 2018.
[37] T. Gärtner and P. Flach, "WBCSVM: Weighted Bayesian Classification based on Support Vector Machines," in *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2001, pp. 154–161.
[38] M. Miao, H. Zeng, A. Wang, C. Zhao, and F. Liu, "Discriminative spatial-frequency-temporal feature extraction and classification of motor imagery EEG: An sparse regression and Weighted Naïve Bayesian Classifier-based approach," *J. Neurosci. Methods*, vol. 278, no. February, pp. 13–24, 2017.
[39] C. Mao, L. Lu, and B. Hu, "Local probabilistic model for Bayesian classification: A generalized local classification model," *Appl. Soft Comput. J.*, vol. 93, no. August, p. 106379, 2020.
[40] M. Kabak, M. Erbaş, C. Çetinkaya, and E. Özceylan, "A GIS-based MCDM approach for the evaluation of bike-share stations," *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 201, no. November, pp. 49–60, 2018.
[41] Y. Qin, Y. Liu, Z. Hong, and H. Jia, "Hesitant fuzzy Muirhead mean operators and its application to multiple attribute decision making," *Int. J. Innov. Comput. Inf. Control*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 1223–1238, 2018.
[42] S. Drobne and A. Lisec, "Multi-attribute decision analysis in GIS: Weighted linear combination and ordered weighted averaging," *Informatica*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 459–474, 2009.
[43] A. V. Vitianingsih, I. Wisnubhadra, S. S. K. Baharin, R. Marco, and A. L. Maukar, "Classification of pertussis vulnerable area with location analytics using multiple attribute decision making," *Int. J. Innov. Comput. Inf. Control*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1943–1957, 2020.
[44] M. J. Zhang and J. X. Nan, "A compromise ratio ranking method of triangular intuitionistic fuzzy numbers and its application to MADM problems," *Iran. J. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 21–37, 2013.
[45] E. Triantaphyllou, *Multi-Criteria Decision Making Methods: A Comparative Study*. Springer, Boston, MA, 2000.
[46] H. Jafaryeganeh, M. Ventura, and C. Guedes Soares, "Effect of normalization techniques in multi-criteria decision making methods for the design of ship internal layout from a Pareto optimal set," *Struct. Multidiscip. Optim.*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 1849–1863, 2020.
[47] K. Yoon, "The propagation of errors in multiple-attribute decision analysis: A practical approach," *J. Oper. Res. Soc.*, vol. 40, no. 7, pp. 681–686, 1989.
[48] Y. Yang and J. He, "A novel method based on fixed point iteration and improved topsis method for multi-attribute group decision making," *Int. J. Innov. Comput. Inf. Control*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 15–29, 2021.
[49] D. Soria, J. M. Garibaldi, F. Ambrogi, E. M. Biganzoli, and I. O. Ellis, "A 'non-parametric' version of the naive Bayes classifier," *Knowledge-Based Syst.*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 775–784, 2011.
[50] P. Tsangaratos and I. Ilia, "Comparison of a logistic regression and Naïve Bayes classifier in landslide susceptibility assessments: The influence of models complexity and training dataset size," *Catena*, vol. 145, no. October, pp. 164–179, 2016.
[51] and R. W. S.Kusumadewi, S.Hartati, , A.Harjoko, *Fuzzy multi-attribute decision making (fuzzy madm)*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Graha Ilmu.
[52] L. Guttman, "The Determinacy Of Factor Score Matrices With Implications For Five Other Basic Problems Of Common-Factor Theory," *Br. J. Stat. Psychol.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 65–81, 1955.
[53] L. Guttman, "A Basis for Scaling Qualitative Data," *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, vol. 9, no. 2, p. 139, 1944.
[54] R. E. Tractenberg, F. Yumoto, P. S. Aisen, J. A. Kaye, and R. J. Mislevy, "Using the Guttman scale to define and estimate measurement error in items over time: The case of cognitive decline and the meaning of 'points lost,'" *PLoS One*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 1–8, 2012.
[55] A. Stegeman, "A new method for simultaneous estimation of the factor model parameters, factor scores, and

unique parts," *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.*, vol. 99, no. July, pp. 189–203, 2016.
[56] R. A. and C. M. Walker, *Categorical Data Analysis for the Behavioral and Social Sciences*. Taylor & Francis Group, 2021.
[57] M. Sokolova and G. Lapalme, "A systematic analysis of performance measures for classification tasks," *Inf. Process. Manag.*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 427–437, 2009.
[58] Max Bramer, *Principles Data Mining*. London-Spinger: http://www.springer.com/series/7592, 2007.
[59] M. G. Jesse Davis, "The relationship between Precision-Recall and ROC curves," in *ICML '06: Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, 2006.
[60] L. Torgo and R. Ribeiro, "Utility-Based Regression Luis," in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science book series*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007, pp. 597–604.
[61] A. Tripathy, A. Agrawal, and S. K. Rath, "Classification of sentiment reviews using n-gram machine learning approach," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 57, no. September, pp. 117–126, 2016.

Author Biography

Anik Vega Vitianingsih is Ph.D. candidate at the Faculty of Information and Communication Technology (FTMK), Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka, Malaysia. Bachelor's degree in Informatics Engineering, Master's degree in Game Tech, her research interests are in Spatial Analysis, Spatial Data Modeling, and Artificial Intelligence in Geographical Information Systems. Being lecturer in the Informatics Department, she is also editor in chief of the International Journal of Artificial Intelligence & Robotics from Universitas Dr. Soetomo. With several papers in various Scopus Journal, she has been reviewer for various international journal.

Robert Marco is Ph.D candidate at the Faculty of Information and Communication Technology (FTMK), Universiti Teknik Malaysia Melaka, Malaysia with earned Bachelor's degree in Electrical Engineering and Masters in Engineering. Experienced papers writer in various Scopus Journal, the author is a lecturer in the Department of Informatics, Amikom University, Yogyakarta with research interests in software engineering, machine learning and deep learning, systems analysis.

Anastasia Lidya Maukar is a lecturer in the Industrial Engineering program at President University, Cikarang, West Java. The author received the Bachelor's degree in Industrial Engineering from the University of Surabaya, Master of Science in Information System Development from the University of Hertfordshire, UK and Master of Technology Management in Industrial Engineering from the Sepuluh Nopember Institute of Technology, Surabaya. Her research and teaching interests are facility layout, databases and information systems, industrial statistics, and production systems. The author is also active in managing national journals and a reviewer in several national journals

Erri Wahyu Puspitarini is currently attending Ph.D program in Information and Communication Technology at Universiti Teknologi Malaysia Melaka (UTeM), with Bachelor's degree in Information System and Master's in Information and Technology Management. Her research interest includes behaviour analysis, technology acceptance, system analysis, data science and eLearning Technology.

Seftin Fitri Ana Wati graduated with a bachelor's degree in informatics at UPN "Veteran" East Java and Master of Information Systems from the Sepuluh Nopember Institute of Technology, Surabaya. Interested in conducting research in the field of System Dynamic Modeling, Forecasting, GIS, Analysis systems, Enterprise Systems, she is currently a lecturer in Information Systems at UPN "Veteran" East Java.

5) Paper Proof (IJICIC-2107-006) (14 Februari 2022)

ANIK VEGA V, S.Kom.,MT unitomo <vega@unitomo.ac.id>

Paper Proof (IJICIC-2107-006)

3 pesan

office@ijicic.net <office@ijicic.net> 14 Februari 2022 pukul 14.38
Kepada: vega@unitomo.ac.id
Cc: www.erri@stmik-yadika.ac.id, seftin.fitri.si@upnjatim.ac.id, robertmarco@amikom.ac.id, almaukar@president.ac.id

Dear Ms. Anik vega Vitianingsih,

I am glad to inform you that your accepted paper (IJICIC-2107-006) has been edited for the publication in IJICIC. It is extremely important that you go over the galley proof very carefully for errors and any necessary changes such as updating status of papers in the reference (volume, issue, page numbers, year). At this stage, only minor changes can be accepted, and any changes should be marked in the PDF file (IJICIC-2107-006 (edit)) that you downloaded from the online submission system (http://www.ijicic.net).

Proof must be received within **Three Days** from the date of this letter. You should also upload the edited PDF file to the submission system even if there is no change needed.

If we do not hear from you within **Three Days** or your paper proof is not proper, your paper may not be published as scheduled.

Thanks for your cooperation and understanding.

Kind regards,

Dr. Yan SHI

Executive Editor, IJICIC

Professor, School of Industrial and Welfare Engineering, Tokai University

9-1-1, Toroku, Kumamoto 862-8652, Japan

Tel.: 81-96-386-2666

E-mail: office@ijicic.net

office@ijicic.net <office@ijicic.net> 16 Februari 2022 pukul 13.10
Kepada: vega@unitomo.ac.id
Cc: www.erri@stmik-yadika.ac.id, seftin.fitri.si@upnjatim.ac.id, robertmarco@amikom.ac.id, almaukar@president.ac.id

Dear Ms. Anik vega Vitianingsih,

Your reply to paper proof has been received.

Thanks again for your support to IJICIC.

IJICIC has been indexed in ESCI, INSPEC, JDream III, SCOPUS, and Ei COMPENDEX. We would like you to refer to IJICIC publications especially your own works in your future research. We believe it will help you promote your article and enhance its visibility.

Best Regards,

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

ANIK VEGA V, S.Kom.,MT unitomo <vega@unitomo.ac.id> 16 Februari 2022 pukul 13.50
Kepada: office@ijicic.net

Dear Editors,

Thank you for the suggestions for improvement,
I've uploaded a revision according to the suggestions for improvement given "IJICIC-2107-006(edit)-RV.pdf"

However, I have not succeeded in uploading the supplementary file (attached)

Thank you
[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

---

2 lampiran

IJICIC-2107-006(edit)-Material.docx
2853K

IJICIC-2107-006(edit)-RV.pdf
3353K

International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control
Volume **18**, Number **2(tentative)**, April **2022**

ICIC International ©2022 ISSN 1349-4198
pp. **1–2107-006**

SPATIAL DATA MODELING USING MADM FOR CLASSIFICATION OF FOOD SELF-SUFFICIENCY REGIONS

Anik Vega Vitianingsih[1,*], Robert Marco[2], Anastasia Lidya Maukar[3]
Erri Wahyu Puspitarini[4] and Seftin Fitri Ana Wati[5]

[1]Department of Informatics
Universitas Dr. Soetomo
Surabaya, Indonesia
[*]Corresponding author: vega@unitomo.ac.id

[2]Department of Informatics
Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
robert.marco@amikom.ac.id

[3]Department of Industrial Engineering
President University
Jl. Ki Hajar Dewantara, Kota Jababeka, Cikarang Baru, Bekasi 17550, Indonesia
almaukar@president.ac.id

[4]Department of Informatics Engineering
STMIK Yadika Bangil
Jl. Bader No. 9, Kalirejo Bangil, Pasuruan 67153, Indonesia
www.erri@stmik-yadika.ac.id

[5]Department of Information System
UPN "Veteran" Jawa Timur
Jl. Raya Rungkut Madya, Gunung Anyar, Surabaya, Indonesia
seftin.fitri.si@upnjatim.ac.id

Received July 2021; revised January 2022

Abstract. *A population increase without equivalent rice production can lead to a decrease in food security. Efforts are required to identify agricultural land for its self-sufficient rice field areas. It is presented in this research how spatial data modeling can be used to categorize and predict food self-sufficiency zones utilizing Multi-Attribute Decision-Making (MADM) technology on Geographical Information System (GIS) technology. The classification of food self-sufficient areas uses the Weighted Product (WP) method applying multi-attribute parameters of agricultural production, total food demand, and the area of the agricultural sub-districts. The Naïve Bayes method predicts food self-sufficiency based on several parameters: seed type, fertilizer, season, and terrain type. The results of the method test show superiority in classifying food self-sufficient areas by having an average coefficient value in the kappa index test of 0.78. The trial results conclude that it was determined that this method has a high degree of agreement strength when used for spatial data analysis of the food self-sufficient areas classification utilizing the MADM methodology.*
Keywords: GIS, Spatial data modeling, Food self-sufficiency, MADM, WP, Naïve Bayes

DOI: 10.24507/ijicic.18.02.xxx

1. **Introduction.** Rice is a staple food in many countries throughout the world, and it is one of the most widely consumed grains in the world. Because of this, mapping rice fields in a timely and efficient manner is critical to ensuring agricultural sustainability and food security in the future. The agricultural land mapping remains challenging in fragmented landscapes, such as rice-growing areas, because the information on rice farming areas is still dominated by small-scale agriculture compared to large-scale agriculture. Thus, land use is one of the functions in accelerating the production of agricultural products aimed at meeting food needs and improving people's welfare [1]. Based on the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) survey, it is estimated that the growth rate of agricultural production declines to 1.5% between 2015 and 2030, further to 0.9% between 2030 and 2050. Thus, it is necessary to apply a spatial pattern to producing information on the distribution/mapping of rice fields, which is very much needed as a strategic policy of food security [2].

Spatial data analysis is essential for monitoring and controlling agricultural land mapping. In recent decades, there has been an increase in research interest in presenting MADM-based models for assessing spatial data in domains such as healthcare [3,4], agriculture [5,6], and population [7]. It was developed based on climatic, soil, and topographical conditions to determine the rank of various suitability factors and weights as a map of the suitability of production and rice fields [8]. In order to determine the appropriateness of rice farming land based on spatial climate maps, researchers employed Extracting Criteria Maps for Agro-climatic Zoning and weighted overlay as a spatial analysis technique, which was also applied in determining the suitability of other crops [9].

In geocoding and mapping GIS, spatial data modeling is the act of analyzing spatial data in order to design a decision-making system that is utilized for stakeholder policy development and implementation [10,11]. At present, the rapid development of the GIS through the integration process and precise analysis can be performed using different methods. The model approach uses MADM to determine the factors and their weights for mapping the suitability of rice farming land [12], such as analytical hierarchical process [13-15], and simple additive weighting [16]. Meanwhile, modeling and analyzing spatial patterns through a machine learning-based Artificial Intelligence (AI) algorithm used for mapping the suitability of rice farming land, includes Naïve Bayes and radial basis function networks [12], decision tree [17], Bayesian [18], support vector machine and random forest [19].

The suitability analysis of land mapping and the preparation of land use maps using GIS is the most practical application in land resource planning and management [20]. GIS technology has been widely used in evaluating the suitability of agricultural land mapping because it leads to the rapid creation of static maps and map estimates by combining several information data to produce a layer suitability map [20-23]. Based on previous research, GIS technology uses spatial analysis to identify agricultural land suitability with spatial, temporal, and spatial-temporal methods. The development of sustainable rice was analyzed by integrating the logistic regression and multi-criteria land evaluation, such as characteristics of local land-use conversions [24]. An agricultural spatial data-driven Bayesian autoregressive framework was utilized to create a predictive smoothing model for the Self-Sufficiency Index (SSI) as a subset of clusters, which was then used to test the model's predictions [18,24]. However, the approach and parameters offered in this study, namely, the multi-criteria parameter approach, were not used in earlier studies to explore the need for supporting factors in the analysis process. AI using mathematical modeling is suitable to produce a mapping distribution of agricultural land areas with multi-class classification and experts to determine criteria, weighting, and ranking attributes.

According to the most relevant literature and theory of the methodologies utilized in this study [25], the categorization of agricultural land mapping areas based on food self-sufficiency status is the most appropriate classification. Several literature studies have attempted to improve results in scientifically mapping an area. Also, previous researchers have suggested developing mathematical models, GIS MADM methods, and AI. Thus, in the theoretical background section, we will discuss research on MADM, artificial intelligence, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), and combinations of these technologies. A variety of multi-criteria decision-making methods, including the Analytic Network Process (ANP), Simple Additive Weighting (SAW), and Vlse Kriterijumska Optimizacija I Kompromisno Resenje-Analytical Hierarchical Process (VIKOR-AHP), were used in a GIS environment to investigate an ecological model framework with the goal of selecting a suitable location for agricultural land use [16]. Another study combined Geographic Information System (GIS) technology with Multi-Criteria Decision-Making (MCDM) and the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) to determine the suitability of agricultural land for crop development in a different part of the world [15]. According to this study [17], which makes use of the MCDM spatial method and the AHP-based GIS, the value of each criterion layer is calculated by multiplying the parameters for each factor obtained from the pair comparison matrix by adding weights, and the appropriate evaluation of several criterion factors affecting agricultural land is performed.

Application of the AHP approach is used to rank various appropriateness factors in order to make comparisons. The weights obtained as a result of the analysis are utilized to create a suitability map layer on the ArcGIS 10.1 platform, using the weighted sum overlay tool. Furthermore, a map is made that describes the suitability of rice production based on specific regions [8]. [18] proposed machine learning vector machine (SVM) and Random Forest (RF) classification techniques to map the spatial distribution of rice fields in order to map the spatial distribution of rice. [19] presented a predictive smoothing model to determine the Self-Sufficiency Index (SSI) based on the Bayesian autoregressive framework by utilizing available agricultural data in each region. The researchers devised a fuzzy multi-criteria decision-making technique that was combined with Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to assess optimal rice-growing regions in the Amol District of Iran. In accordance with the FAO framework and expert opinion [20], it included soil qualities, meteorological conditions, terrain, and accessibility. In accordance with the findings of the literature study, there are still a limited number of studies that combine different methodologies for mapping agricultural land.

There are various difficulties in mapping land suitable for rice growing based on food self-sufficiency status, which is a difficult task. One issue is spatial information about the surrounding population, which is reflected in the demand for rice as a food security strategy to agricultural productivity as a result of increased agricultural productivity. Then, geographic information about the surrounding environment, the network structure, the qualities of the surrounding environment in relation to climatic conditions, and pest attacks are required, and the network structure is required. Several studies have stated that population density is the most significant criterion for food security [2,26]. Another study stated that essential factors in agricultural yield models are climate, soil properties, and water availability [27]. There is an analysis related to land suitability that must be applied in the final decision to meeting the needs and reflecting local conditions well [2,6], which is used to produce information on spatial mapping and the areas of rice fields as a strategic form of food security [2]. Previous studies have not used the proposed multi-parameter criteria for modeling spatial data with WP and Naïve Bayes methods. The authors proposed a spatial data modelling using MADM to define the mapping of agricultural areas based on the scope of food self-sufficiency category to address the challenges of mapping rice farming areas to determine food self-sufficiency status. This proposed approach is still very limited so far.

Multi-Attribute Decision-Making (MADM) approaches are commonly used to find the best solution, choose a single option, or rate options from most to least appropriate [28]. As one of the MADM methods, the Weighted Product (WP) method aims to evaluate and compare to the rest through the multiplication of ratios related to every criterion and select the most applicable alternatives [29]. This method is more straightforward and more efficient [28]. The WP method is considered suitable for both single and multi-dimensional problems/having high subjectivity [30], and produces a short calculation time [31]. In addition, the WP method has a moderate agreement strength category, which can be applied for modelling spatial data using GIS for regional classification [4]. While the use of Naïve Bayes classification in determining the class based on the hypothesis, there is no dependence between attributes in maximizing the posterior probability [32,33]. This method can quickly build simple structures without learning procedures and has a shorter computation time, resulting in higher efficiency [34]. Naïve Bayes is one of the algorithms that have advantages and outperforms many sophisticated classifications, especially when the attributes are not strongly correlated [33,35,36]. Meanwhile, limited studies combine Naïve Bayes classification with weighting features [37-39].

The results of this study could be part of an effort to observe, monitor, and control food self-sufficiency as a strategic policy of food security in developing torpical countries. The mapping results can help stakeholders, or the food security agency classify and predict self-sufficient food areas. AI is used as a framework in spatial data modeling, using GIS technology to visualize the classification of food self-sufficient areas. From implementation and testing results, it can be concluded that web-GIS applications of mapping food self-sufficiency in Mojokerto district can provide information on the productivity of rice products, determine the regional potential for self-sufficiency, and predict areas of potential self-sufficiency. The analysis results using the WP and Naïve Bayes methods based on the parameters of land area, productivity, population, irrigation system, rainfall, and agricultural equipment in the Mojokerto district show that the prediction of self-sufficiency is good. Kohen Kappa index is 0.78, and the analysis results determine the number of areas with abundant agricultural products and high self-sufficiency.

2. **Method.** When GIS and MADM approaches are used for decision-making, a powerful tool is created that may be used to handle a variety of challenges, including the selection of a feasible location [40]. Identifying the most desirable from a small number of choices based on a predefined quality [41] is a useful approach for comparative analysis. Using MADM, decision-making systems using spatial data can be equipped to do spatial data analysis [42,43]. MADM is capable of integrating and managing geographic data as well as attribute data. Agricultural land mapping classification based on food self-sufficiency status is the major data used in the spatial data modelling discussed in this section. Figure 1 shows a flowchart depicting the stages of the spatial data modelling process for classification.

Step 1: This process is necessary to determine the necessity for spatial datasets and attribute data in the spatial shapefile dataset (*.*shp*). This paper uses two types of datasets, namely spatial datasets including district maps in each sub-district and quantitative attribute datasets. The base map spatial datasets of the Mojokerto Regency consist of 18 sub-districts with information coverage at the village level. The quantitative attribute dataset for food self-sufficiency spatial data modeling (Table 1) contains attributes, such as population (households/sub-district), land in hectare (Ha), productivity in quintal (= 100 kg) per hectare (Qt/Ha), Plant Pest Organisms (Pest), and Rainfall (Month). The



FIGURE 1. Flowchart of spatial data modeling for food self-sufficiency classification

quantitative attribute dataset for spatial data modelling predicting food self-sufficiency (see Table 2) contains attributes, such as types of seeds, type of fertilizer, irrigation system, agricultural land area, and agricultural tools.

Step 2: The spatial data modelling to determine food self-sufficiency areas using the WP method on the MADM model is explained in Section 2.1. The WP method is part of the MADM model in decision making which will process the criterion value of each parameter to get the V_i preference value. The spatial data modelling for predicting food self-sufficiency using the Naïve Bayes method on machine learning is explained in Section 2.2.

Step 3: Compute the ranking value to determine the classification of food self-sufficiency areas using the Guttman scale as described in Section 2.3. The classification value comprises the level of food self-sufficiency in each region, with circumstances ranging from very good, good, average, fair, and poor.

Step 4: Calculate the degree of agreement for both assessment methods using Cohen's kappa method based on the process of Section 2.5. Then, calculate the measuring of classification model performance using APR based on Section 2.6.

2.1. **Multiple-Attribute Decision-Making (MADM).** MADM in the field of spatial analysis is part of a Multi-Criteria Decision-Making system (MCDM) and Multi-Objective Decision-Making (MODM) [44]. MADM is used for discrete retrieval, where alternative decision support systems are predetermined [45]. The Weighted Product (WP) approach is a prominent weighting method that is used as part of a decision-making system that employs MADM multi-parameter criteria to make decisions [30]. In addition, WP method has a limited set of decision alternatives that provide explanations for several decision criteria. WP method's primary process is multiplication, which is used to connect attribute ratings in situations where each attribute must be ranked with attribute weights in order to be considered. This process has similarities to the normalization process [46,47]. The weight is computed based on the level of importance. The more important, the higher the weight value, value of 1 is "very unimportant" and 5 is "very important".

The WP method approach is to assign a score to each alternative multiplied by the weighted value for each parameter attribute, with the following steps.

Step 1: Determine the criteria (C_j) of rice farming land that has the suitability status of a food self-sufficient area based on expert judgment. In MADM, using expert weight rationality directly influences the accuracy of the decision results [48].

Step 2: Determine the weight value of each existing criteria (w) or relative importance of each criterion (C_j) given by experts. The process in Equation (1) normalizes the criterion weight (W), $\sum w_j = 1$, with $W(w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n)$ as the weighted importance value of each criterion.

$$W = \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n\} \tag{1}$$

Step 3: Simplify the weight criteria according to Equation (2). Normalize or increase the weights to produce a value of $w_j = 1$ where $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ criteria and $\sum w_j$ is the sum of weights.

$$W_j = \frac{w_j}{\sum w_j} \tag{2}$$

Step 4: Calculate the value of vector S_i as an alternative preference based on Equation (3).

$$S_i = \prod_{j=1}^{n} X_{ij} W_j, \text{ with } i = 1, 2, \ldots, m \tag{3}$$

where S_i is the result of decisions normalization on the i-th alternative (preference criteria), and X_{ij} is an alternative rating per attribute (value of the criteria). The weight attribute is represented by W_j, and the number of criteria is represented by n. The W_j variable is the rank of positive value for the profit attribute and negative value for the cost attribute in the profit and cost attributes, respectively.

Step 5: Calculate the vector V_i value, using Equation (4), as the relative preference of each alternative on vector V by dividing each number of vector values S with the total value of vector S.

$$V_i = \frac{S_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} S_i}, \text{ with } i = 1, 2, \ldots, m \tag{4}$$

2.2. **Naïve Bayes.** The Naïve Bayes technique is a straightforward probability classification approach that calculates the likelihood of a new observation being classified into a predetermined category based on previous observations [34,47]. On the basis of this assumption, the classification can be estimated by computing the conditional probability density function and the posterior probability density function [49], to determine the posterior probability using Equation (5) and Equation (6) [50].

$$P(c|x) = \frac{P(x|c)P(c)}{P(x)} \tag{5}$$

$$P(c|x) = P(x_1|c) \times P(x_2|c) \times \cdots \times P(x_n|c) \times P(c) \tag{6}$$

where $P(c|x)$ is defined as the posterior probability of class (c, target) given predictor (x, attribute), $P(c)$ is defined as the probability of the preceding class, and $P(x)$ is defined as the prior probability of the predictor. The $P(x|c)$ variable denotes the possibility, which is the class probability given the predictor in the case of the possibility.

2.3. **Spatial dataset.** This section explains the weighting process for various attributes using the WP method as shown in Table 1. In order to establish the level of importance/influence on the classification of each spatial dataset, a weighted value will be assigned to each one. The level of importance used for weighting in each attribute [51] is as follows: the value of X_i is 95 for category “Very good”; value 85 for category “Good”;

TABLE 1. Weighting parameters of self-sufficiency attributes using WP method

Attribute	Parameter	Category	Weight value
Population (X_1)	< 500	Very good	95
	500-1000	Good	85
	> 1000	Average	75
Agricultural land area (X_2)	> 250	Very good	95
	250-200	Good	85
	200-150	Average	75
	150-100	Fair	65
	100-0	Poor	55
Productivity (Qt/Ha) (X_3)	> 90	Very good	95
	$\leq 90 - > 70$	Good	85
	$\leq 70 - > 50$	Average	75
	$\leq 50 - > 30$	Fair	65
	< 30	Poor	55
O.P.T. (Pest) (X_4)	0-8%	Very good	95
	8%-15%	Good	85
	15%-25%	Average	75
	25%-45%	Fair	65
	$> 45\%$	Poor	55
Rainfall (Month) (X_5)	≥ 150 mm	Very good	95
	< 150 mm $- \geq 100$ mm	Good	85
	< 100 mm $- \geq 50$ mm	Average	75
	< 50 mm	Fair	65

value 75 for category "Average"; value 65 for category "Fair"; value 55 for category "Poor".

By analyzing the data presented in Table 2, the Naïve Bayes approach is used to calculate the weights assigned to each feature of self-sufficiency prediction.

2.4. **The Guttman scale.** When evaluating a classification, the Guttman scale can be used [52] to determine its importance. In order to draw conclusions from qualitative data [53], this scale is used as a basis for measurement [52]. It also helps to reduce uncertainty from an intervention outcome value in the projected categorization value [54]. The sort of dataset that employs scores/weights in the analysis process will produce a value based on the uncertainty factor of the class of variables described, which may be assessed using the Guttman scale [55] based on Equation (4). (7).

$$I = \frac{R}{K} \tag{7}$$

The I variable is the result of the interval value derived from the R variable, which denotes the range of values in the data set. Very good, good, average, fair, and poor are among the potential classifications that will be generated; the K variable is the number of such classifications. As shown in this paper, the value of the R variable can be calculated by looking at the range of values between the maximum value of V_i and the V_i lowest value.

2.5. **Method consistency examination.** For determining the consistency of the two methods used in this experiment, the Cohen's kappa approach was employed. It specifies

TABLE 2. Weighting parameters of self-sufficiency prediction attributes using Naïve Bayes

Attribute	Parameter	Category
Types of seeds	Hybrid	Very good
	Superior	Good
	Local	Average
Type of fertilizer	Organic and Inorganic (Mix)	Very good
	Inorganic	Good
	Organic	Average
Irrigation system	Technical Irrigation Rice Fields	Very good
	Semi-Technical Irrigation Rice Fields	Good
	Rainfed Rice Fields	Average
Agricultural land area	> 250	Very good
	250-200	Good
	200-150	Average
	150-100	Fair
	100-0	Poor
Agricultural tools TR2: Tractor RT/TRAY: Rice Transplanter with tray	TR2 +RT/TRAY (Mix)	Very good
	TR2	Good
	RT/TRAY	Average

that this measurement should be utilized for qualitative data based on Equation (8) [56].

$$K = \frac{\Pr(a) - \Pr(e)}{1 - \Pr(e)} \tag{8}$$

The measuring coefficient between the WP and Naïve Bayes methods is denoted by the K variable. The percentage of the number of consistent measurements used for comparisons between methods is denoted by the $\Pr(a)$ variable. The percentage change is denoted by the $\Pr(e)$ variable. The method, based on the range of coefficient values, gives results "poor" agreement strength if the value of the variable $K < 0.21$, "fair" for value between 0.21 and 0.40, "moderate" for value between 0.41 and 0.60, "good" for value between 0.61 and 0.80, "very good" for value between 0.81 and 1.00.

2.6. **Confusion matrix measuring model.** The confusion matrix consists of two positive and two negative classes comparing the actual and classification data [57,58] as seen in Table 3. Measuring model melalui assessment dengan mengetahui nilai akurasi, presisi, and recall. Precision and recall are commonly defined as the ratio of correctly classified events (usually referred to as true positives in classification) to important occurrences (precision), or actual events (recall) [60].

TABLE 3. Confusion matrix

Actual data	Predicted classification	
	Positive (+)	Negative (−)
Positive (+)	True positives (TP)	False negatives (FN)
Negative (−)	False positives (FP)	True negatives (TN)

3. **Results and Discussion.** Table 4 represents the findings of the Guttman scale examination using Equation (9) as the result of the classification scale value using the WP method.

$$\begin{cases} \text{very good}, & \text{if } V_i \geq 0.20786 \\ \text{good}, & \text{if } V_i \geq 0.20412 \text{ and } V_i < 0.20786 \\ \text{average}, & \text{if } V_i \geq 0.20038 \text{ and } V_i < 0.20412 \\ \text{fair}, & \text{if } V_i \geq 0.19664 \text{ and } V_i < 0.20038 \\ \text{very good}, & \text{if } V_i < 0.19664 \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

TABLE 4. The findings of the Guttman scale examination

WP method
$R = V_{i_{Max}} - V_{i_{Min}} = 0.21160 - 0.1929 = 0.0187$ $K = 5$ and $I = \frac{0.0187}{5} = 0.00374$
Assessment very good criteria: Highest score $- I = 0.21160 - 0.00374 = 0.20786$ *Assessment good criteria: Very good criteria* $- I = 0.20786 - 0.00374 = 0.20412$ *Assessment average criteria: Good criteria* $- I = 0.20412 - 0.00374 = 0.20038$ *Assessment fair criteria: Average criteria* $- I = 0.20038 - 0.00374 = 0.19664$

Table 5 shows implementation datasets of self-sufficiency attributes assessment from Jolotundo villages.

TABLE 5. Weighted product implementation datasets

Village	Attributes (X)				
	Population (X_1)	Land area (X_2)	Productivity (X_3)	O.P.T. (X_4)	Rainfall (X_5)
Jolotundo	75	95	75	96	75

Step 1: The WP method requires weights and attributes to determine food self-sufficiency.

Step 2: The decision-maker assigned the preference weights for each attribute (X_i) as in Table 6.

TABLE 6. Weights of each self-sufficiency attribute preferences

Weight	Attribute (X_i)					
	Population (X_1)	Land area (X_2)	Productivity (X_3)	O.P.T. (X_4)	Rainfall (X_5)	$\sum w_i$
w	95	75	65	80	95	395

Step 3: The normalization is performed using Equation (2), and the result can be seen in Table 7.

TABLE 7. Result of normalization of self-sufficiency attributes

Weight	$\left(\frac{X_1}{\sum W}\right)$	$\left(\frac{X_2}{\sum W}\right)$	$\left(\frac{X_3}{\sum W}\right)$	$\left(\frac{X_4}{\sum W}\right)$	$\left(\frac{X_5}{\sum W}\right)$	$\sum w_i$
w	0.24	0.19	0.24	0.16	0.16	1.00

Step 4: Calculate S vector using Equation (3), with the elaboration of Equation (10). The result of vector calculations of each village for self-sufficiency attributes are shown in Table 8.

$$S_i = \left(X_1{}^{\wedge attribute\ weight\_x}{}_1\right) * \left(X_2{}^{\wedge attribute\ weight\_x}{}_2\right) * \left(X_3{}^{\wedge attribute\ weight\_x}{}_3\right) * \left(X_4{}^{\wedge attribute\ weight\_x}{}_4\right) * \left(X_5{}^{\wedge attribute\ weight\_x}{}_5\right) \tag{10}$$

Step 5: Determine the preference (V_i) using Equation (4) and the results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Preference calculation results

Vector S_i	Vector V_i
81.03	0.21160

Preference (V_i) is used to determine the distribution of the mapping classification of food self-sufficient areas. Figure 2(a) shows the analysis map of the irrigation system of each village, with green color for technical irrigation conditions, yellow for semi-technical conditions, and blue for rain-fed conditions. Figure 2(b) shows population data for each village. The yellow color indicates population less than 1,000 households, the green for more than 1,000 but less than 2,000 households, the red for more than 2,000 but less than 3,000 households, the gray for more than 3,000 households, and the turquoise green for not populated.

Data of the rice planting area is shown in Figure 2(c). The yellow color represents the planting area less than 200 Hectares (Ha), the green for more than 200 Ha, and the gray for no rice planting area. Figure 2(d) shows each village's rice harvest productivity data. The yellow color represents the yield of less than 50 Qt/Ha, the green for more than 100 Qt/Ha, and the gray for no rice planting land area. Figure 2(e) displays the deployment of agricultural tools in every village with red color for the area with RT/TRAY tools, the yellow for TR2 only, the green for a combination of RT/TRAY and TR2, and the gray for the area with no subsidy due to no agricultural land for rice. Figure 2(f) shows the results of the self-sufficiency classification analysis using the WP method with the blue for very good self-sufficiency, the green for good, the yellow for quite good, the orange for poor, and the red for very poor.

Using the Naïve Bayes method, the potential self-sufficiency area uses five parameters: types of seeds, type of fertilizer, irrigation system, agricultural land area, and agricultural tools. Using Equations (5) and (6), the status of each village can be determined as in Table 7. For a numerical example, the calculation is performed for Village 11 with the following steps.

Step 1: Compute the probability of the appearance of "Yes" status and the appearance of "No" status.

Step 2: Compute the probability of the appearance of "Yes" status when X variable is established ($P(Yes/X)$) and the probability of the appearance of "No" status when X is established ($P(No/X)$). Here, x_1 = superior; x_2 = mix; x_3 = technical irrigation; x_4 = 300-400; x_5 = TR2; x_6 = '?'.

Step 3: Compute the $P(Yes/x)$ and $P(No/X)$ using Equation (11) and Equation (12).

$P(Yes/x) = 0.081$; $P(No/x) = 0$

$$P(Yes|x) = P(x_1|Yes) \times P(x_2|Yes) \times P(x_3|Yes) \times P(x_4|Yes) \times P(x_5|Yes) \times P(Yes) \tag{11}$$

$$P(No|x) = P(x_1|No) \times P(x_2|No) \times P(x_3|No) \times P(x_4|No) \times P(x_5|No) \times P(No) \tag{12}$$



(a) Classification of irrigation (b) Classification of population

(c) Classification of rice plant area (d) Classification of productivity

(e) Classification of agricultural tool (f) Self-sufficiency analysis results

FIGURE 2. (color online) Mapping classification results using the WP method

Step 4: Compare the $P(Yes/x)$ and $P(No/X)$. Since the $P(Yes/x)$ is greater than the $P(No/x)$, the status of Village 11 is "Yes".

Figure 2(f) shows blue color for areas predicted to be self-sufficient food, and yellow for being able to be self-sufficient.

Using the WP method on Equation (4) resulting Table 6 and Naïve Bayes method on Equation (5) resulting Table 7, evaluate the classification performance on the analysis result. Measuring algorithm performance in classification metrics usually revolves around using precision and recall evaluation frameworks [59]. To evaluate categorical classifiers for areas of food self-sufficiency uses precision, recall, and performance metric accuracy. Precision is intended to assess the accuracy of the classification findings, whereas recall is intended to measure the completeness of the classification results. The accuracy of the categorization process, on the other hand, is the most commonly used confusion metric [61].



FIGURE 3. (color online) The result of mapping classification with the Naïve Bayes

TABLE 9. Food self-sufficient prediction datasets from 11 villages

Village No	Food self-sufficient prediction attributes					Status
	Types of seeds (x_1)	Type of fertilizer (x_2)	Irrigation system (x_3)	Agricultural land area (x_4)	Agricultural tools (x_5)	
1	Local	Organic	Technical Irrigation	100-200	TR2	Yes
2	Superior	Inorganic	Semi-Technical	0-100	RT/TRAY	Yes
3	Local	Organic	Rainfed	300-400	MIX	No
4	Local	Mix	Semi-Technical	> 400	TR2	Yes
5	Superior	Mix	Rainfed	300-400	RT/TRAY	No
6	Hybrid	Organic	Semi-Technical	200-300	TR2	Yes
7	Local	Inorganic	Rainfed	> 400	RT/TRAY	No
8	Hybrid	Organic	Technical Irrigation	300-400	MIX	Yes
9	Local	Organic	Semi-Technical	200-300	TR2	Yes
10	Hybrid	Mix	Technical Irrigation	> 400	MIX	Yes
11	Superior	Mix	Technical Irrigation	300-400	TR2	?

The testing of the spatial analysis for food self-sufficiency mapping application is performed by calculating the success rate of predictive analysis using the WP method. The correct predictions are 12 times out of 20 experiments. The Naïve Bayes method results in eight accurate predictions out of 15 experiments. The WP method is carried out to map food self-sufficiency using GIS. The validation of the predictive result shows 69% of precision, 85% of recall, and 75% of accuracy. Moreover, the Naïve Bayes method's precision, recall, and accuracy are 62%, 80%, and 70%, respectively.

4. **Conclusion.** This research examines the combination of WP and Naïve Bayes methods in classifying multi-attribute for spatial data modelling. The WP method on MADM allows comparative mapping results according to the priority level of importance of the parameters, weights, and priority rankings given to each multiparameter attribute in providing spatial sensitivity analysis. This paper considers quantitative data and computes

the Guttman scale classification parameter, and this research derives the V_i preference value from the WP approach and presents it. This is crucial in the decision-making process for selecting regions that are self-sufficient in terms of food production. While the Naïve Bayes method predicts the mapping of self-sufficient food areas, by maximizing the posterior probability, the method can quickly produce a structured result with a shorter processing time. The result of WP and Naïve Bayes methods combination unlocks new potential for further research in combining several different methods in spatial data modeling. Based on the test results, they have a good category agreement strength for GIS spatial data modeling to classify self-sufficient food areas. Kohen Kappa index is 0.78, and the analysis results determine the number of regions with abundant agricultural products and high self-sufficiency. The MADM method, classification method with optimization parameters, and datasets can be considered for further research for better accuracy.

Acknowledgments. This paper is collaborative research in GIS for spatial analysis and model estimation. The authors give the highest appreciation to the Department of Agriculture and Food Security, Mojokerto Regency, East Java Province, Indonesia, which has provided access to private data and multi-criteria parameters used for model testing.

REFERENCES

[1] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, *Farming Must Change to Feed the World*, http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/9962/icode/, 2009.
[2] X. Xiao et al., Mapping paddy rice agriculture in southern China using multi-temporal MODIS images, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, vol.95, no.4, pp.480-492, 2005.
[3] B. Zhu, Y. Fu, J. Liu and Y. Mao, Spatial distribution of 12 class B notifiable infectious diseases in China: A retrospective study, *PLoS One*, vol.13, no.4, pp.1-17, 2018.
[4] A. Vitianingsih, A. Choiron, D. Cahyono, A. Umam and S. Suyanto, Spatial data modeling on GIS for classification of measles-prone region using multiple attribute decision making, *Int. J. Intell. Eng. Syst.*, vol.12, no.3, pp.97-107, 2019.
[5] A. A. Mustafa, M. Singh, R. N. Sahoo, N. Ahmed, M. Khanna and A. Sarangi, Land suitability analysis for different crops: A multi criteria decision making approach using remote sensing and GIS, *Water Technol.*, vol.3, no.12, pp.61-84, 2011.
[6] T. Prakash, *Land Suitability Analysis for Agricultural Crops: A Fuzzy Multicriteria Decision Making Approach*, Master Thesis, 2003.
[7] M. Javari, M. Saghaei and F. F. Jazi, Analyzing the resilience of urban settlements using multiple-criteria decision-making (MCDM) models (case study: Malayer city), *Sustain. Environ.*, vol.7, no.1, 1889083, 2021.
[8] G. T. Ayehu and S. A. Besufekad, Land suitability analysis for rice production: A GIS based multi-criteria decision approach, *Am. J. Geogr. Inf. Syst.*, vol.4, no.3, pp.95-104, 2015.
[9] A. Ezra, A. A. Adebayo and A. S. Umar, Application of multi-criteria decision making (MCDM) model in agro-climatic zoning of Taraba state for Ofada rice production, *FUTY J. Environ.*, vol.14, no.1, pp.108-120, 2020.
[10] R. N. Parker and E. K. Asencio, *GIS and Spatial Analysis for the Social Sciences: Coding, Mapping and Modeling*, Taylor & Francis Group, 2009.
[11] G. P. M. Spagnuolo, *Heterogenous Spatial Data: Fusion, Modeling, and Analysis for GIS Applications*, Morgan & Claypool, 2016.
[12] X. Lei, W. Chen and B. T. Pham, Performance evaluation of GIS-based artificial intelligence approaches for landslide susceptibility modeling and spatial patterns analysis, *ISPRS Int. J. Geo-Information*, vol.9, no.7, pp.1-20, 2020.
[13] M. Otgonbayar, C. Atzberger, J. Chambers, D. Amarsaikhan, S. Böck and J. Tsogtbayar, Land suitability evaluation for agricultural cropland in Mongolia using the spatial MCDM method and AHP based GIS, *J. Geosci. Environ. Prot.*, vol.5, no.9, pp.238-263, 2017.
[14] B. Feizizadeh and T. Blaschke, Land suitability analysis for Tabriz County, Iran: A multi-criteria evaluation approach using GIS, *J. Environ. Plan. Manag.*, vol.56, no.1, pp.1-23, 2013.

[15] P. Zolfaghary, M. Zakerinia and H. Kazemi, A model for the use of urban treated wastewater in agriculture using multiple criteria decision making (MCDM) and geographic information system (GIS), *Agric. Water Manag.*, vol.243, 106490, 2021.

[16] H. R. Pourkhabbaz, S. Javanmardi and H. A. F. Sabokbar, Suitability analysis for determining potential agricultural land use by the multi-criteria decision making models SAW and VIKOR-AHP (case study: Takestan-Qazvin plain), *J. Agric. Sci. Technol.*, vol.16, no.5, pp.1005-1016, 2014.

[17] A. Nurkholis and I. S. Sitanggang, A spatial analysis of soybean land suitability using spatial decision tree algorithm, *Proceedings of SPIE*, p.65, 2019.

[18] K. T. Morrison, T. A. Nelson, F. S. Nathoo and A. S. Ostry, Application of Bayesian spatial smoothing models to assess agricultural self-sufficiency, *Int. J. Geogr. Inf. Sci.*, vol.26, no.7, pp.1213-1229, 2012.

[19] A. O. Onojeghuo, G. A. Blackburn, Q. Wang, P. M. Atkinson, D. Kindred and Y. Miao, Mapping paddy rice fields by applying machine learning algorithms to multi-temporal Sentinel-1A and Landsat data, *Int. J. Remote Sens.*, vol.39, no.4, pp.1042-1067, 2018.

[20] Z. Maddahi, A. Jalalian, M. M. K. Zarkesh and N. Honarjo, Land suitability analysis for rice cultivation using a GIS-based fuzzy multi-criteria decision making approach: Central part of Amol District, Iran, *Soil Water Res.*, vol.12, no.1, pp.29-38, 2017.

[21] A. Barakat, W. Ennaji, A. E. Jazouli, R. Amediaz and F. Touhami, Multivariate analysis and GIS-based soil suitability diagnosis for sustainable intensive agriculture in Beni-Moussa irrigated subperimeter (Tadla plain, Morocco), *Model. Earth Syst. Environ.*, vol.3, no.3, pp.1-8, 2017.

[22] J. Kihoro, N. J. Bosco and H. Murage, Suitability analysis for rice growing sites using a multicriteria evaluation and GIS approach in great Mwea region, Kenya, *Springerplus*, vol.2, no.1, pp.1-9, 2013.

[23] D. N. Kuria and E. Waithaka, Using geographic information systems (GIS) to determine land suitability for rice crop growing in the Tana delta, *J. Geogr. Reg. Plan.*, vol.4, no.9, pp.525-532, 2011.

[24] I. Nahib et al., Integration of logistic regression and multicriteria land evaluation to simulation establishment of sustainable paddy field zone in Indramayu Regency, West Java Province, Indonesia, *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, vol.149, 012005, pp.1-12, 2018.

[25] D. W. Miller and M. K. Starr, *Executive Decisions and Operations Research*, 1st Edition, Prentice-Hall, 1960.

[26] Y. Li, Z. Sun and F. Accatino, Spatial distribution and driving factors determining local food and feed self-sufficiency in the eastern regions of China, *Food Energy Secur.*, pp.1-17, 2021.

[27] V. Talasila, C. Prasad, G. T. S. Reddy and A. Aparna, Analysis and prediction of crop production in Andhra region using deep convolutional regression network, *Int. J. Intell. Eng. Syst.*, vol.13, no.5, pp.1-9, 2020.

[28] E. Boltürk, A. Karaoan and C. Kahraman, Simple additive weighting and weighted product methods using neutrosophic sets, *Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing*, vol.369, pp.647-676, 2019.

[29] A. Kolios, V. Mytilinou, E. Lozano-Minguez and K. Salonitis, A comparative study of multiple-criteria decision-making methods under stochastic inputs, *Energies*, vol.9, no.7, 2016.

[30] D. M. Martin and M. Mazzotta, Non-monetary valuation using multi-criteria decision analysis: Sensitivity of additive aggregation methods to scaling and compensation assumptions, *Ecosyst. Serv.*, vol.29, pp.13-22, 2018.

[31] C. H. Yeh, A problem-based selection of multi-attribute decision-making methods, *Int. Trans. Oper. Res.*, vol.9, no.2, pp.169-181, 2002.

[32] R. Blanquero, E. Carrizosa and P. Ramrez-cobo, Variable selection for Naïve Bayes classification, *Comput. Oper. Res.*, vol.135, 105456, 2021.

[33] H. Zhang, L. Jiang and L. Yu, Attribute and instance weighted Naïve Bayes, *Pattern Recognit.*, vol.111, 107674, 2021.

[34] R. Liu et al., Assessing spatial likelihood of flooding hazard using Naïve Bayes and GIS: A case study in Bowen Basin, Australia, *Stoch. Environ. Res. Risk Assess.*, vol.30, no.6, pp.1575-1590, 2016.

[35] N. Friedman, D. Geiger and M. Goldszmidt, Bayesian network classifier, *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. (Including Subser. Lect. Notes Artif. Intell. Lect. Notes Bioinformatics)*, vol.29, no.Part3, pp.131-163, 1997.

[36] M. Benjumeda, C. Bielza and P. Larrañaga, Tractability of most probable explanations in multidimensional Bayesian network classifiers, *Int. J. Approx. Reason.*, vol.93, pp.74-87, 2018.

[37] T. Gärtner and P. Flach, WBCSVM: Weighted Bayesian classification based on support vector machines, *Proc. of the 18th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp.154-161, 2001.

[38] M. Miao, H. Zeng, A. Wang, C. Zhao and F. Liu, Discriminative spatial-frequency-temporal feature extraction and classification of motor imagery EEG: A sparse regression and weighted Naïve Bayesian classifier-based approach, *J. Neurosci. Methods*, vol.278, pp.13-24, 2017.
[39] C. Mao, L. Lu and B. Hu, Local probabilistic model for Bayesian classification: A generalized local classification model, *Appl. Soft Comput. J.*, vol.93, 106379, 2020.
[40] M. Kabak, M. Erbao, C. Çetinkaya and E. Özceylan, A GIS-based MCDM approach for the evaluation of bike-share stations, *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol.201, pp.49-60, 2018.
[41] Y. Qin, Y. Liu, Z. Hong and H. Jia, Hesitant fuzzy Muirhead mean operators and its application to multiple attribute decision making, *International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control*, vol.14, no.4, pp.1223-1238, 2018.
[42] S. Drobne and A. Lisec, Multi-attribute decision analysis in GIS: Weighted linear combination and ordered weighted averaging, *Informatica*, vol.33, no.4, pp.459-474, 2009.
[43] A. V. Vitianingsih, I. Wisnubhadra, S. S. K. Baharin, R. Marco and A. L. Maukar, Classification of pertussis vulnerable area with location analytics using multiple attribute decision making, *International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control*, vol.16, no.6, pp.1943-1957, 2020.
[44] M. J. Zhang and J. X. Nan, A compromise ratio ranking method of triangular intuitionistic fuzzy numbers and its application to MADM problems, *Iran. J. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol.10, no.6, pp.21-37, 2013.
[45] E. Triantaphyllou, *Multi-Criteria Decision Making Methods: A Comparative Study*, Springer, Boston, MA, 2000.
[46] H. Jafaryeganeh, M. Ventura and C. G. Soares, Effect of normalization techniques in multi-criteria decision making methods for the design of ship internal layout from a Pareto optimal set, *Struct. Multidiscip. Optim.*, vol.62, no.4, pp.1849-1863, 2020.
[47] K. Yoon, The propagation of errors in multiple-attribute decision analysis: A practical approach, *J. Oper. Res. Soc.*, vol.40, no.7, pp.681-686, 1989.
[48] Y. Yang and J. He, A novel method based on fixed point iteration and improved TOPSIS method for multi-attribute group decision making, *International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control*, vol.17, no.1, pp.15-29, 2021.
[49] D. Soria, J. M. Garibaldi, F. Ambrogi, E. M. Biganzoli and I. O. Ellis, A 'non-parametric' version of the Naïve Bayes classifier, *Knowledge-Based Syst.*, vol.24, no.6, pp.775-784, 2011.
[50] P. Tsangaratos and I. Ilia, Comparison of a logistic regression and Naïve Bayes classifier in landslide susceptibility assessments: The influence of models complexity and training dataset size, *Catena*, vol.145, pp.164-179, 2016.
[51] and R. W. S. Kusumadewi, S. Hartati, A. Harjoko, *Fuzzy Multi-Attribute Decision Making (Fuzzy MADM)*, Graha Ilmu, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
[52] L. Guttman, The determinacy of factor score matrices with implications for five other basic problems of common-factor theory, *Br. J. Stat. Psychol.*, vol.7, no.2, pp.65-81, 1955.
[53] L. Guttman, A basis for scaling qualitative data, *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, vol.9, no.2, p.139, 1944.
[54] R. E. Tractenberg, F. Yumoto, P. S. Aisen, J. A. Kaye and R. J. Mislevy, Using the Guttman scale to define and estimate measurement error in items over time: The case of cognitive decline and the meaning of 'points lost', *PLoS One*, vol.7, no.2, pp.1-8, 2012.
[55] A. Stegeman, A new method for simultaneous estimation of the factor model parameters, factor scores, and unique parts, *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.*, vol.99, pp.189-203, 2016.
[56] R. Azen and C. M. Walker, *Categorical Data Analysis for the Behavioral and Social Sciences*, Taylor & Francis Group, 2021.
[57] M. Sokolova and G. Lapalme, A systematic analysis of performance measures for classification tasks, *Inf. Process. Manag.*, vol.45, no.4, pp.427-437, 2009.
[58] M. Bramer, *Principles Data Mining*, Spinger, London, http://www.springer.com/series/7592, 2007.
[59] J. Davis and M. Goadrich, The relationship between precision-recall and ROC curves, *Proc. of the 23rd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML'06)*, 2006.
[60] L. Torgo and R. Ribeiro, Utility-based regression, in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science Book Series*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, pp.597-604, 2007.
[61] A. Tripathy, A. Agrawal and S. K. Rath, Classification of sentiment reviews using n-gram machine learning approach, *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol.57, pp.117-126, 2016.

Author Biography

Anik Vega Vitianingsih is Ph.D. candidate at the Faculty of Information and Communication Technology (FTMK), Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka, Malaysia. Bachelor's degree in Informatics Engineering, Master's degree in Game Tech, her research interests are in spatial analysis, spatial data modeling, and artificial intelligence in geographical information systems. Being lecturer in the Informatics Department, she is also editor in chief of the International Journal of Artificial Intelligence & Robotics from Universitas Dr. Soetomo. With several papers in various Scopus Journal, she has been reviewer for various international journals.

Robert Marco is Ph.D. candidate at the Faculty of Information and Communication Technology (FTMK), Universiti Teknik Malaysia Melaka, Malaysia with earned Bachelor's degree in Electrical Engineering and Master's in Engineering. Experienced papers writer in various Scopus Journal, the author is a lecturer in the Department of Informatics, Amikom University, Yogyakarta with research interests in software engineering, machine learning and deep learning, systems analysis.

Anastasia Lidya Maukar is a lecturer in the Industrial Engineering Program at President University, Cikarang, West Java. The author received the Bachelor's degree in Industrial Engineering from the University of Surabaya, Master of Science in Information System Development from the University of Hertfordshire, UK and Master of Technology Management in Industrial Engineering from the Sepuluh Nopember Institute of Technology, Surabaya. Her research and teaching interests are facility layout, databases and information systems, industrial statistics, and production systems. The author is also active in managing national journals and a reviewer in several national journals.

Erri Wahyu Puspitarini is currently attending Ph.D. program in Information and Communication Technology at Universiti Teknologi Malaysia Melaka (UTeM), with Bachelor's degree in Information System and Master's in Information and Technology Management. Her research interest includes behaviour analysis, technology acceptance, system analysis, data science and eLearning Technology.

Seftin Fitri Ana Wati graduated with a bachelor's degree in informatics at UPN "Veteran" East Java and Master of Information Systems from the Sepuluh Nopember Institute of Technology, Surabaya. Interested in conducting research in the field of system dynamic modeling, forecasting, GIS, analysis systems, enterprise systems, she is currently a lecturer in Information Systems at UPN "Veteran" East Java.