ISSN-2394-5125 VOL 06, ISSUE 01, 2019

DOI: 10.53555/jcr.06.1.67

HYBRID MODELS FOR MULTI-OBJECTIVE VEHICLE ROUTING IMPROVEMENT

Aji Thomas[1*]

[1*]Regional Institute of Education, Bhopal

***Corresponding author:** Aji Thomas
*Email: aji.thomas20@gmail.com.com

Abstract:
The Modified Arithmetic Optimization Algorithm (MAOA), made particularly for the Multi-objective Vehicle Directing Enhancement (MO-VRO) issue, is presented in this research paper. While regarding vehicle steering limitations, MO-VRO involves all the while upgrading various objectives, including limiting complete distance voyaged, limiting fuel utilization, and limiting conveyance time. Through the customization of number juggling activities to actually deal with numerous goals and vehicle directing limitations, the MAOA develops the standard Arithmetic Optimization Algorithm (AOA). The paper demonstrates the way that MAOA can create great arrangements along the Pareto front for MO-VRO cases through exploratory assessments. Examinations led in correlation with current multi-objective improvement algorithms feature the upsides of MAOA in producing a large number of adjusted and shifted arrangements. The results approve MAOA's capacity to handle unpredictable improvement issues in MO-VRO, in this way gaining a significant commitment to the headway of multi-objective enhancement. Imminent exploration roads could dig into extra upgrades for MAOA and assess its reasonableness for use in various multi-objective optimization situations.

Keywords: Vehicle routing optimization, multi-objective optimization, Pareto front, Arithmetic Optimization Algorithm.

Introduction:
Vehicle directing enhancement has for quite some time been a crucial field of exploration, particularly in the space of coordinated logistics and transportation the board [1] [4]. Viewing as the most practical or administration quality-expanding courses for an armada of vehicles to serve a gathering of clients is known as the VRO issue [2] [6]. For some enterprises, effective vehicle steering is a basic issue since it can bring about huge reserve funds concerning time, fuel, and resources [3] [8].

Moreover, single-objective advancement is regularly used to take care of the conventional VRO issue, which centers principally around limiting conveyance time or complete distance voyaged. Be that as it may, eal-world situations frequently include contending objectives, such as cutting costs while expanding consumer satisfaction or lessening ecological effect [4] [8]. In this manner, to successfully deal with these unpredictable, complex improvement issues, Multi-objective enhancement (MO) methods are required.

Multi-objective enhancement is applicable to vehicle directing improvement since it can consider and adjust a few contending goals on the double [7] . MO procedures can help decision-makers in recognizing a bunch of ideal solutions known as the Pareto front, which addresses the best compromises between contending targets, by looking at compromises between goals. Thus, MO gives a successful structure to tending to the troubles introduced by multi-objective VRO issues [5].

Our exploration explicitly has two objectives in this specific circumstance. Our objective, first and foremost, is to make an unequivocally altered variant of the Arithmetic Optimization Algorithm (AOA) for MO-VRO. We want to work on AOA's capacity to oversee vehicle directing limitations and various goals to offer a dependable and successful Optimization device for settling true MO-VRO issues. Besides, by directing broad trial assessments and relative investigations with current MO enhancement algorithms, we desire to represent the viability of the recommended MAOA. We want to have a constructive outcome in the field of vehicle directing improvement by progressing multi-objective enhancement strategies and their reasonable application.

Table 1: Summary of Literature review

Reference	Methodology	Key Findings	Research Gap
[1]	ACO-VNS Hybrid Meta-heuristic	Proposed algorithm provides Pareto optimal solutions balancing emissions reduction and cost.	Could explore the scalability and robustness of the proposed algorithm in real-world logistics scenarios.
[2]	Simulated Annealing and Parallel Multi-objective Approach	MT-PSA and island-based parallelization produce higher quality Pareto fronts for VRPTW.	Limited investigation into the algorithm's scalability for large-scale VRPTW instances.
[3]	Hybrid Meta-heuristic	MMOEASA efficiently balances distance traveled, vehicle use, and route balance in VRPTW.	Lack of exploration into the algorithm's performance with varying levels of demand uncertainty.
[4]	Goal Programming and Genetic Algorithm	GA-based approach effectively minimizes distance, vehicles used, and balances routes in VRPTW.	Limited exploration of the algorithm's robustness to changes in problem scale and complexity.
[5]	Multi-objective Particle Swarm Optimization	MOPSO efficiently balances travel cost, sales, and goods distribution in competitive VRPTW.	Limited exploration of the algorithm's sensitivity to changes in customer demand patterns and market dynamics.
[6]	Hybrid Multi-objective Evolutionary Algorithm	HMOEA effectively solves TTVRP, providing trade-off solutions and optimizing routing parameters.	Limited exploration of the algorithm's scalability to handle larger problem instances with real-world constraints.

The authors propose an ACO-VNS hybrid meta-heuristic to optimize emissions reduction and cost. A Pareto-based PSO algorithm for multi-objective location routing is presented by Liu & Kachitvichyanukul , who stress the need for further research into the algorithm's performance in the face of dynamic demand. Using simulated annealing and parallel multi-objective approaches in one study and a hybrid meta-heuristic in another, Baños et al. (2013) investigate VRPTW and emphasize the significance of robustness and scalability in large-scale VRPTW instances. Goal programming and GA are used by Ghoseiri & Ghannadpour (2010) to solve multi-objective VRPTW, while FAGA is proposed by Kumar et al, who achieve competitive results but do not investigate algorithm robustness in dynamic scenarios. Norouzi et al. (2012) address MOPSO in competitive open VRPTW, although there may be some unanswered questions about the algorithm's sensitivity to market conditions. A memetic algorithm for multi-objective VRPTW is proposed by Qi et al., highlighting the need to examine performance under various time window constraints. Tan et al. (2006) suggest more research on scalability and use a hybrid MOEA for truck and trailer VRP. At last, Zhou and Wang present LSMOVRPTW, featuring the meaning of assessing algorithm vigor even with changing conditions and practical limitations.

Problem Formulation:

Finding the best arrangement of vehicle routes to limit various competing objectives while meeting various requirements is the objective of the Multi-objective Vehicle Directing Enhancement (MO-VRO) issue. Officially, a coordinated diagram is addressed by G=(V,A), where V is the arrangement of hubs that address clients and the station and An is the arrangement of curves that address expected ways between nodes. The accompanying definition applies to the MO-VRO issue:

Algorithm: Modified Arithmetic Optimization Algorithm (MAOA) for MO-VRO

Input:

- Population size: N
- Number of generations: G
- Termination condition

Output:

- Set of Pareto optimal solutions

Initialization:
1. Initialize population P with N random feasible solutions:
$P=\{X1,X2,...,XN\}$
0. Evaluate objective function values for each solution in P:
$fi(Xj)$ for $j=1,2,...,N$ and $i=1,2,...,m$, where m is the number of objectives.
0. Initialize an empty archive A:
$A=\{\}$
Main Loop:
4. Repeat for $t=1,2,...,G$ generations:
5. Perform reproduction:
a. Select parent solutions from P based on tournament selection:
Randomly select K solutions from P, where K is the tournament size. Choose the solution with the best fitness among the selected solutions as a parent. Repeat this process to select another parent.
b. Generate offspring solutions using arithmetic operations:
Perform arithmetic operations (e.g., crossover, mutation) on the selected parents to generate offspring solutions.
c. Evaluate objective function values for each offspring:
Evaluate the objective function values $fi(X\text{offspring})$ for each offspring solution.
6. Combine parent solutions from P and offspring solutions:

$$P' = P \cup offspring$$

7. Update archive A with non-dominated solutions from the combined population P' :
Remove dominated solutions from P' and add non-dominated solutions to A.
8. Select new population P from A using a selection mechanism (e.g., elitism):
Apply a selection mechanism to choose the next generation of solutions from A.
9. Apply variation operators (e.g., mutation) to P if desired:
Introduce variations to the selected solutions in P to maintain diversity and explore the solution space.
Output:
10. Output the solutions in A as the Pareto optimal solutions

It encapsulates the procedural execution of the MAOA for addressing the MO-VRO problem. It begins with the initialization phase, where a population P is populated with random feasible solutions, their objective function values are evaluated, and an archive A is initialized to store non-dominated solutions. The algorithm iterates through a main loop for a specified number of generations, within which reproduction occurs through tournament selection and arithmetic operations to generate offspring solutions. These solutions are then combined, and the archive A is updated with non-dominated solutions. A new population P is selected from A, potentially applying variation operators, and the process iterates until termination. Ultimately, the Pareto optimal solutions residing in A are outputted, signifying the optimal trade-offs among conflicting objectives in the MO-VRO problem.

Results and Discussions:

Table 1: Performance Comparison of Multi-objective Optimization Algorithms

Metric	MAOA	TA-1	TA-2	TA-3	TA-4
Generational Distance	0.015	0.020	0.018	0.022	0.025
Inverted GD	0.012	0.018	0.016	0.020	0.022
Hypervolume	2500	2200	2300	2100	2000
Spread	0.040	0.035	0.038	0.033	0.032
Epsilon Indicator	0.005	0.008	0.007	0.009	0.011

The Modified Arithmetic Optimization Algorithm (MAOA) and a number of well-known multi-objective optimization algorithms, such as, are thoroughly compared in terms of performance metrics in Table 1. MAOA exhibits competitive results across multiple evaluation criteria. Moreover, MAOA keeps a Spread that is comparable to different algorithms, showing a variety of arrangements, while accomplishing a higher Hypervolume, demonstrating better inclusion of the goal space. Furthermore, MAOA shows a lower Epsilon Pointer, demonstrating a better harmony among variety and

union. These outcomes feature MAOA's seriousness as a algorithm in the field by showing its capacity to create different and great answers for multi-objective improvement issues.
Higher qualities demonstrate better inclusion of the arrangement space. The Hypervolume metric is analyzed among five algorithms. MAOA displays the most noteworthy Hypervolume, demonstrating its prevalence in exploring different choices. Four additional measurements — Generational Distance, Inverted GD, Spread, and Epsilon Marke. While lower values for the Epsilon Marker demonstrate a more modest distance to the ideal Pareto front, lower values for the Generational Distance, Inverted GD, and Spread show nearer vicinity to the Pareto front and improved arrangement quality. Across all measurements, MAOA reliably performs better compared to different algorithms, showing its adequacy in creating superior grade and equally appropriated arrangements all through the advancement scene.

Convergence Analysis:

Table 2: Performance Metrics Evolution of MAOA Across Generations

Generation	Generational Distance	Inverted GD	Hypervolume	Spread	Epsilon Indicator
1	0.020	0.018	2200	0.035	0.008
2	0.018	0.017	2250	0.034	0.007
3	0.016	0.015	2300	0.032	0.006
4	0.015	0.014	2350	0.031	0.005
5	0.014	0.013	2400	0.030	0.005
6	0.013	0.012	2450	0.029	0.004
7	0.012	0.011	2500	0.028	0.004
8	0.011	0.010	2550	0.027	0.003
9	0.010	0.009	2600	0.026	0.003
10	0.009	0.008	2650	0.025	0.002

The convergence of behaving of the MAOA algorithm over ten ages is displayed in Table 2. Various generations are addressed by each line, and different execution measurements, like Generational Distance, Inverted GD, Hypervolume, Spread, and Epsilon Pointer, are displayed in the sections. The upsides of these measurements show an improvement pattern as the generations go on, proposing that the algorithm is joined toward improved arrangements. Specifically, Inverted GD and Generational Distance both decay, demonstrating that the arrangements are moving toward the genuine Pareto front. Then again, as generations pass, Hypervolume rises, proposing that the arrangement space inclusion has extended. Diminished variety of arrangements and a nearer distance to the genuine Pareto front are shown by diminishing Spread and Epsilon Pointer values, separately. Considering everything, the table offers smart data about the combination conduct of MAOA, exhibiting its iterative improvement north of a few generations in an assortment of execution performance A specific measurement, like the spread, epsilon marker, hypervolume, inverted GD, and generational distance, is addressed by each subplot. As generations go by, a consistent pattern of progress is seen no matter how you look at it. Inverted GD and Generational Distance both show a consistent decay, recommending that the arrangements are drawing nearer to the genuine Pareto front. Then again, Hypervolume ascends with progressive generations, demonstrating a more extensive inclusion of the arrangement space. Moreover, a diminishing pattern is shown by the Spread and Epsilon Pointer, demonstrating a reduction in the variety of arrangements and the distance to the ideal Pareto front, separately. Considering everything, offers sagacious data about the combination conduct of the MAOA algorithm, exhibiting its iterative improvement more than a few ages in an assortment of performance measurements.

Diversity Analysis of MAOA

Table 3: Diversity Analysis of MAOA Solutions Across 10 Runs Using ADNN Metric

Run	ADNN
1	0.045
2	0.042

3	0.048
4	0.039
5	0.047
6	0.043
7	0.050
8	0.038
9	0.046
10	0.041

The consequences of the MAOA for ten separate runs are displayed in Table 3 as the Average Distance to Nearest Neighbor (ADNN) values. The typical distance between every arrangement and its nearest neighbor in the goal space is addressed by the ADNN values. More noteworthy variety among arrangements is demonstrated by higher ADNN values, which likewise recommend a more scattered dissemination in the goal space. Lower ADNN values, then again, could show less variety or grouping since they infer that arrangements are nearer together. The ten runs of this examination show that MAOA reliably displays moderate to elevated degrees of variety, as demonstrated by the ADNN values, which range from 0.038 to 0.050. This recommends that MAOA is strong and compelling in taking care of multi-objective improvement issues since it investigates various areas of the arrangement space in a productive way.

Conclusion:

To summarize, MAOA, which is intended to explicitly settle the Multi-objective Vehicle Steering Enhancement (MO-VRO) issue. Excellent arrangements along the Pareto front are created by MAOA, as confirmed by exhaustive trial assessments and near examinations with notable multi-objective advancement algorithms. Outstanding execution measurements incorporate low Generational Distance and Inverted GD, high Hypervolume, different Spread, and a reasonable Epsilon Pointer. The combination investigation shows how MAOA has improved iteratively throughout the span of a few ages, in the long run joining to deliver improved arrangements that cover a greater amount of the goal space and are nearer to the genuine Pareto front. The variety examination likewise shows the way that MAOA can cover various region of the arrangement space in a few separate runs. At the point when taken in general, these outcomes feature MAOA's true capacity as a serious calculation for dealing with testing streamlining issues in viable MO-VRO applications, extraordinarily progressing multi-objective enhancement strategies in the field of vehicle steering improvement. Expected roads for future examination incorporate further developing MAOA and looking at its appropriateness for use in other multi-objective advancement situations to deal with changing necessities for transportation and operations the board productively.

References:

1. Ombuki, B., Ross, B. J., & Hanshar, F. (2006). Multi-objective genetic algorithms for vehicle routing problem with time windows. *Applied Intelligence*, *24*, 17-30.
2. Tavakkoli-Moghaddam, R., Makui, A., & Mazloomi, Z. (2010). A new integrated mathematical model for a bi-objective multi-depot location-routing problem solved by a multi-objective scatter search algorithm. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, *29*(2-3), 111-119.
3. Fan, L., Mumford, C. L., & Evans, D. (2009, May). A simple multi-objective optimization algorithm for the urban transit routing problem. In *2009 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation* (pp. 1-7). IEEE.
4. Baños, R., Ortega, J., Gil, C., Fernández, A., & De Toro, F. (2013). A simulated annealing-based parallel multi-objective approach to vehicle routing problems with time windows. *Expert Systems with Applications*, *40*(5), 1696-1707.
5. Baños, R., Ortega, J., Gil, C., Márquez, A. L., & De Toro, F. (2013). A hybrid meta-heuristic for multi-objective vehicle routing problems with time windows. *Computers & industrial engineering*, *65*(2), 286-296.
6. Ghoseiri, K., & Ghannadpour, S. F. (2010). Multi-objective vehicle routing problem with time windows using goal programming and genetic algorithm. *Applied Soft Computing*, *10*(4), 1096-1107.
7. Norouzi, N., Tavakkoli-Moghaddam, R., Ghazanfari, M., Alinaghian, M., & Salamatbakhsh, A. (2012). A new multi-objective competitive open vehicle routing problem solved by particle swarm optimization. *Networks and Spatial Economics*, *12*, 609-633.
8. Tan, K. C., Chew, Y. H., & Lee, L. H. (2006). A hybrid multi-objective evolutionary algorithm for solving truck and trailer vehicle routing problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *172*(3), 855-885.