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# Article summary:

1. The growth of Arctic shipping requires effective tools to assess safety and resilience levels, especially in the enforcement of the Polar Code.

2. A resilience index has been developed using the Fuzzy Analytical Hierarchy Process (FAHP) to monitor safety and resilience practices in Arctic shipping.

3. The findings indicate that factors that rank high on importance are not always high on satisfaction, presenting dilemmas regarding the effectiveness of current practices in promoting safe and resilient Arctic shipping management practices.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article "Developing a resilience index for safer and more resilient arctic shipping" presents an important topic regarding the growth of Arctic shipping and the need for effective tools to assess safety and resilience levels. The authors use the Fuzzy Analytical Hierarchy Process (FAHP) to develop a resilience index, which is based on data collected during a research voyage along the Northwest Passage in Canada.

One potential bias in this article is that the data collection was limited to one research voyage, which may not be representative of all Arctic shipping practices. Additionally, the sample size of 61 valid responses may not be sufficient to draw generalizable conclusions about Arctic shipping practices.

The article also highlights dilemmas regarding the effectiveness of current practices in promoting safe and resilient Arctic shipping management practices. However, it does not explore potential counterarguments or alternative perspectives on this issue.

Furthermore, while the article notes that factors ranking high on importance are often not high on satisfaction, it does not provide specific examples or evidence to support this claim. This lack of evidence weakens the credibility of the authors' argument.

Overall, while this article presents an important topic and methodology for assessing safety and resilience levels in Arctic shipping, it could benefit from further exploration of potential biases and limitations in its data collection methods, as well as more thorough analysis and evidence to support its claims.

# Topics for further research:

* Counterarguments to current practices promoting safe and resilient Arctic shipping management
* Limitations of data collection methods in assessing Arctic shipping practices
* Alternative perspectives on the growth of Arctic shipping and its impact on safety and resilience
* Examples of factors ranking high on importance but low on satisfaction in Arctic shipping practices
* Best practices for promoting safe and resilient Arctic shipping management
* Potential risks and challenges associated with Arctic shipping and their impact on safety and resilience
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