

Memetic Search for Vehicle Routing with Simultaneous Pickup-Delivery and Time Windows

Shengcai Liu, *Student Member, IEEE*, Ke Tang, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Xin Yao, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—The vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup-delivery and time windows (VRPSPDTW) has attracted much attention in the last decade, due to its wide application in modern logistics involving bi-directional flow of goods. In this paper, we propose a memetic algorithm with efficient local search and extended neighborhood, dubbed MATE, for solving this problem. The novelty of MATE lies in three aspects: 1) an initialization procedure which integrates an existing heuristic into the population-based search framework, in an intelligent way; 2) a new crossover involving route inheritance and regret-based node reinsertion; 3) a highly-effective local search procedure which could flexibly search in a large neighborhood by switching between move operators with different step sizes, while keeping low computational complexity. Experimental results on public benchmark show that MATE consistently outperforms all the state-of-the-art algorithms, and notably, finds new best-known solutions on 44 instances (65 instances in total). A new benchmark of large-scale instances, derived from a real-world application of the JD logistics, is also introduced, which could serve as a new and more practical test set for future research.

I. INTRODUCTION

REVERSE logistics plays an important role in modern transportation. Generally, it is related to bi-directional flow of goods regarding delivery and pickup activities, where the former refers to shipping commodities to the customers, while the latter refers to the opposite. Because of its significant effect on lowering costs associated with energy consumption and reducing the environmental impact, many enterprises have incorporated reverse logistics into their regular delivery systems. As a consequence, the integrated system is becoming increasingly popular in many fields, including library books distribution [1], grocery distribution [2], parcel delivery [3], home health care service [4], [5], bicycle sharing systems [6] and urban courier service [7].

In the literature, the problem involving bi-directional flow of goods has been often referred to as the pickup and delivery problem (PDP). According to the surveys on PDP [8], [9], it could be further categorized into 3 different types: 1) many-to-many PDP where each commodity may have multiple origins and destinations and any location may be the origin or destination of multiple commodities; 2) one-to-many-to-one PDP where some commodities are delivered from a depot to many customers, while other commodities are collected at customers and delivered to the depot; 3) one-to-one PDP where

each commodity has a single origin and a single destination between which it must be delivered. The most widely studied variant of the second type or one-to-many-to-one PDP, is the vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup and delivery (VRPSPD) [1], [10], due to the ever-growing trend toward recycling and product reuse.

This paper studies an extended situation of VRPSPD, in which customers can request their goods to be delivered and picked up within predefined time windows. In the literature this problem is referred to as the vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup-delivery and time windows (VRPSPDTW) [11]–[13]. Such a problem is frequently encountered in modern logistics systems, e.g., JD logistics and CAINIAO logistics. In these systems, in addition to delivering commodities purchased by customers from online, one must also plan the collection of used, defective, or obsolete products from customers; moreover, in order to provide satisfactory service, either delivery or pickup needs to be operated within predefined time windows.

It has been shown that VRPSPDTW is NP-hard since it can be trivially reduced to VRPSPD (which is NP-hard) [14]. Hence exact algorithms [12], [14] can only be used to find optimal solutions for small-scale instances (with number of customers smaller than 25). As a result, researchers and practitioners are usually interested in developing heuristics and meta-heuristics to find high-quality solutions within reasonable computational time. The proposed approaches include differential evolution [11], genetic algorithm [12], simulated annealing [13], [15], [16], swarm intelligence optimization [17], ant colony optimization [18] and tabu search [19]. Considering the practical significance of VRPSPDTW, one could observe that there is an absence of memetic algorithms (MAs) for this problem. As an important area of evolutionary computation, MAs combine global search strategies (e.g., crossover) with local search heuristics, and have been shown to be very effective on a wide variety of combinatorial optimization problems [20]–[24]. More importantly, MAs are the state-of-the-art approaches for many variants of the vehicle routing problems (VRP) [25]–[31]. It is thus expected that there exists considerable merit to apply MAs to solve VRPSPDTW.

On the other hand, since MA is a generic framework, appropriately instantiating it for a specific problem is non-trivial. Generally, effective MAs should make good use of domain-specific knowledge in its main algorithm components (e.g., initialization, crossover operator and local search), and meanwhile achieve a good balance between global and local search. This paper proposes a highly-effective MA for solving VRPSPDTW. The main contributions of this work could be

Shengcai Liu, Ke Tang and Xin Yao are with the Guangdong Key Laboratory of Brain-Inspired Intelligent Computation, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen 518055, China (e-mail: liuscyyf@mail.ustc.edu.cn, tangk3@sustech.edu.cn, xiny@sustech.edu.cn). Corresponding Author: Ke Tang.

summarized as follows.

- 1) From the algorithmic perspective, the proposed MA integrates several novel ingredients. First, we propose an initialization procedure by combining an existing construction heuristic with population-based search, in an intelligent way, which is expected to construct an initial population with high diversity. Second, we simultaneously leverage the ideas of route inheritance and regret-based insertion, and propose a new crossover operator for VRPSPDTW. Third, we design a highly-effective local search procedure for VRPSPDTW, which could flexibly search in a large neighborhood of a solution by switching between move operators with different step sizes. Moreover, we describe a sophisticated move evaluation process, which enables evaluating any neighborhood solution (generated by move operators) in constant time, thus dramatically improving the search efficiency. Finally, we incorporate these components into the MA framework, and propose the Memetic algorithm with efficient local search and Extended neighborhood (MATE) for VRPSPDTW.
- 2) From the computational perspective, MATE shows excellent performance on existing benchmark instances (65 instances in total). In particular, it consistently outperforms all the four state-of-the-art algorithms. Notably, on 44 instances from the benchmark, MATE finds **new** best-known solutions.
- 3) From the benchmarking perspective, we introduce a new instance set for VRPSPDTW, which could serve as a new and more practical benchmark in this field. Compared to existing synthetic ones, the new instances are derived from a real-world application of JD logistics, and are with larger scales. The evaluation results of MATE on the new benchmark are also reported.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II presents a literature review on the areas closely related to VRPSPDTW. Section III formally defines the problem. Section IV first presents the framework of MATE, followed by its detailed implementation. Section V compares MATE against the state-of-the-art algorithms on the existing benchmark and introduces a new benchmark derived from a real-world application. Finally, Section VI concludes the paper.

II. RELATED WORK

As aforementioned, VRPSPDTW is a variant of VRPSPD. The latter was first studied in [1] for a book distribution system involving 22 customers and two vehicles. The solution was obtained by clustering customers into two groups and then solving the traveling salesman problem (TSP) for each group. The results in [1] showed that, compared to traditional one-directional logistics, bi-directional logistics could achieve substantial time/distance savings. Since then numerous studies have been conducted on VRPSPD. The proposed approaches could be categorized into three groups: exact approaches, heuristics and meta-heuristics. There exists several exact algorithms for VRPSPD in the literature, including branch-and-price algorithm [32] with commodity-flow formulation,

branch-and-cut algorithm [33], [34] and branch-and-cut-and-price algorithm [35] with vehicle-flow formulation.

Compared to exact approaches, heuristics and meta-heuristics for solving VRPSPD have attracted much more research interest in the last decade, due to the fact that the problem is NP-hard. A number of construction heuristics, such as cluster insertion [36], tour partitioning [37], parallel savings heuristic [38], and residual capacity and radical surcharge (RCRS) heuristic [2], have been proposed for VRPSPD. These approaches have also been used as initialization procedures for later proposed meta-heuristics [13], [16]. Compared to construction heuristics, meta-heuristics combining local search procedures could often obtain much better solutions. Early research on meta-heuristics for solving VRPSPD mainly focused on tabu search (TS). Various techniques, such as record-to-record travel approximation [39], reactive mechanism [40] and guided local search (GLS) [41], have been proposed to enhance the performance of TS. Many other meta-heuristics have also been applied to solve VRPSPD, such as variable neighborhood search (VNS) [42], iterated local search (ILS) [43], adaptive local search (ADL) [44], simulated annealing (SA) [45], ant colony optimization (ACO) [46]–[49], particle swarm optimization (PSO) [50], [51], and genetic algorithm (GA) [52], [53]. One may refer to [10] for a comprehensive review on existing approaches for VRPSPD.

VRPSPD with time-window constraints, i.e., VRPSPDTW, is probably the most studied variant of VRPSPD, due to its wide application in modern logistics. The problem was first introduced in [14], where the considered objective is to minimize the total travel distance (TD). A branch-and-cut-and-price algorithm was also proposed. Optimal solutions were obtained on small-scale instances with up to 20 customers. Later the same objective was considered in [11], [15], in which a differential evolution (DE) approach and a SA approach were proposed, respectively. The DE approach uses a decimal coding to construct an initial population and involves several new problem-specific move operators. It was tested on instances with 8 and 40 customers, and the results were competitive. The SA approach uses a sequential route construction heuristic to generate an initial solution, and then uses a SA procedure to improve the solution by searching in its neighborhood. The evaluation results of the approach on instances with 10, 15 and 50 customers were also reported.

Another line of research in VRPSPDTW takes into account the number of used vehicles (NV), since the usage of a vehicle would result in its depreciation. In particular, the primary goal is to minimize NV, and the second one is to minimize TD. Such a setting was first considered in [12], in which a co-evolutionary GA (Co-GA) was proposed. Co-GA uses modified cheapest-insertion heuristics to generate initial solutions, and maintains two populations in the evolutionary process for diversification and intensification. The well-known Solomon benchmark [54] was modified in [12] to generate 65 instances with 10, 25, 50, and 100 customers. Co-GA was then compared with CPLEX and the results showed the former could find better solutions within a comparatively shorter period of time. It is noted that the benchmark introduced in [12] has become the most widely used benchmark in this area.

For convenience, we refer to this benchmark as *wc* (authors' initials) set in this paper.

Following [12], a number of approaches, including a SA approach [13], a parallel SA approach (p-SA) [16], a swarm intelligence approach (IGAFSA) [17], an ACO approach (EAC) [18], and a TS approach (ETSP) [19], have been proposed to solve VRPSPDTW concerning minimizing NV and TD. The SA approach adopts a slow cooling schedule and a randomized local search procedure. It was tested on three 10-customer instances, three 25-customer instances, three 50-customer instances and six 100-customer instances from the *wc* set. On average, the solutions found by it were 0.22% better (regarding TD) than Co-GA. p-SA could be seen as a parallel variant of the SA approach. It uses the RCRS heuristic to generate initial solutions and adopts a master-slave paradigm in which multiple SA procedures are run independently and simultaneously. Competitive results on the *wc* set were obtained, with 28 new best-known solutions in total (12 with lower NV and 16 with lower TD). In addition, the evaluation results of p-SA on 30 large-scale instances, with customers of 200, 400, 600, 800 and 1000, were also reported. However, the large-scale benchmark is not publically available. IGAFSA is a nature-inspired approach that allows infeasible solutions to enhance diversification. On 39 instances from the *wc* set, it found better solutions with lower TD than p-SA. EAC is an ACO approach involving a local search procedure. It was tested on twelve 100-customer instances from the *wc* set, and on 6 instances it obtained better solutions (regarding TD) than Co-GA, p-SA and IGAFSA. ETSP is the most recent approach for VRPSPDTW. It is composed of two types of TS strategies for intensification and diversification. The testing results of ETSP on 27 instances with 100 customers from the *wc* set were reported. On 14 instances it found better solutions (regarding TD) than Co-GA and p-SA.

Two observations could be made from the above review. First, currently MAs have not been applied to VRPSPDTW, which directly motivated this paper. Second, the commonly used benchmark in the area, i.e., the *wc* set, is a synthetic data set containing instances with up to 100 customers, which might not represent real-world cases very well, especially considering the large scale of modern logistics [55]. This motivated us to introduce a new large-scale VRPSPDTW benchmark derived from a real-world application.

III. NOTATIONS AND PROBLEM DEFINITION

Given a number of customers who require both pickup service and delivery service within certain time windows, the target of VRPSPDTW is to send out a fleet of capacitated vehicles, which are stationed at a depot, to meet the customer demands with the minimum total cost. Formally, the problem is defined on a complete graph $G = (V, E)$ with $V = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, M\}$ as the node set and E as the arc set defined between each pair of nodes, i.e., $E = \{\langle i, j \rangle | i, j \in V, i \neq j\}$. For convenience, the depot is always denoted as 0 and the customers are denoted as $1, \dots, N$. Each arc $\langle i, j \rangle \in E$ is associated with a travel distance $dist(i, j)$ and a travel time $time(i, j)$. Each node $i \in V$ is associated with 5 attributes,

i.e., a delivery demand d_i , a pickup demand p_i , a time window $[a_i, b_i]$ and a service time s_i . d_i is the amount of goods to deliver from the depot to customer i and p_i is the amount of goods to pick up from customer i that must be delivered to the depot. a_i and b_i are the start and the end of the time window in which the customer receives service. Arrival of a vehicle at customer i before a_i results in a wait before service can begin; while arrival after b_i is infeasible. Finally, s_i is the time spent by the vehicle to unload/load goods at customer i . Note that for the depot, i.e., 0, a_0 and b_0 are the earliest time the vehicles can depart from the depot and the latest time the vehicles can return to the depot, respectively, and $d_0 = p_0 = s_0 = 0$.

A fleet of J identical vehicles, each with a capacity of Q and a dispatching cost u_1 , is initially located at the depot. The vehicles depart from the depot and then serve the customers, and finally return to the depot. Thus a solution S to VRPSPDTW could be represented by a set of vehicle routes, i.e., $S = \{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_K\}$, in which each route R_i consists of a sequence of nodes that the vehicle visits, i.e., $R_i = (h_{i,1}, h_{i,2}, \dots, h_{i,L_i})$, where $h_{i,j}$ is the j -th node visited in R_i , and L_i is the length of R_i . For the sake of brevity, in the following we temporarily omit the subscript i in R_i , i.e., $R = (h_1, h_2, \dots, h_L)$. The total travel distance of R , denoted as $TD(R)$, is:

$$TD(R) = \sum_{j=1}^{L-1} dist(h_j, h_{j+1}). \quad (1)$$

The time of arrival at and the time of departure from h_j , denoted as $arr(h_j)$ and $dep(h_j)$, respectively, could be computed recursively via the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} dep(h_1) &= a_0 \\ arr(h_j) &= dep(h_{j-1}) + time(h_{j-1}, h_j), \quad j > 1. \\ dep(h_j) &= \max\{arr(h_j), a_{h_j}\} + s_{h_j}, \quad j > 1 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The vehicle load on arrival at h_j , denoted as $load(h_j)$, is:

$$\begin{aligned} load(h_1) &= \sum_{j=1}^L d_{h_j} \\ load(h_j) &= load(h_{j-1}) - d_{h_{j-1}} + p_{h_{j-1}}, \quad j > 1 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The total cost of S , denoted as $TC(S)$, consists of two parts: the dispatching cost of the used vehicles, which is $u_1 \cdot K$, and the transportation cost, which is the total travel distance of S multiplied by cost per unit of travel distance u_2 . The objective is to find a S with the minimum TC, as presented in Eq. (4):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_S TC(S) &:= u_1 \cdot K + u_2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^K TD(R_i) \\ s.t. : K &\leq J \\ h_{i,1} &= h_{i,L_i} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq K \\ \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{j=2}^{L_i-1} \mathbb{I}[h_{i,j} = x] &= 1, \quad 1 \leq x \leq M \\ load(h_{i,j}) &\leq Q, \quad 1 \leq i \leq K, 1 \leq j \leq L_i \\ arr(h_{i,j}) &\leq b_{h_{i,j}}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq K, 2 \leq j \leq L_i \\ dep(h_{i,1}) &\geq a_0 \text{ and } arr(h_{i,L_i}) \leq b_0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq K \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where the constraints are: 1) the number of used vehicles cannot exceed the number of available ones; 2) each route must start from and return to the depot; 3) each customer must be served exactly once (note $\mathbb{I}[\cdot]$ is the indicator function); 4) vehicles cannot be overloaded during transportation; 5) service to each customer must be performed within that customer's time window; 6) vehicles can only depart after the start of the time window of the depot (a_0) and must return to the depot before the end of its time window (b_0).

It is noted that the two different objectives considered in the literature of VRPSPDTW (see Section II) are both special cases of Eq. (4). Specifically, the dispatching cost u_1 could be set to 0 to only minimize TD. On the other hand, the ratio of u_1 to u_2 , i.e., u_1/u_2 , could be set to a sufficiently large number such that minimizing NV is the primary goal and minimizing TD is the second one.

IV. MEMETIC ALGORITHM FOR VRPSPDTW

In this section we first describe the general framework of the proposed MA, and then elaborate each component in turn.

A. General Framework

As presented in Algorithm 1, the proposed algorithm, called MATE, follows the general memetic framework that combines population-based evolutionary search and local optimization, which have been shown very effective in solving VRPs [25]–[31]. The search space of MATE is limited to the feasible region. That is, each individual is a feasible solution to the VRPSPDTW instance, and its fitness is the inverse of its total cost as defined in Eq. (4). More specifically, the population consists of N individuals, where N is a parameter. After initialization (line 1), MATE enters an evolutionary process. In each generation (lines 4-11), each individual in the population is selected once as parent p_1 and once as parent p_2 , in a random order (lines 4 and 6). Such a mechanism could promote the population diversity since each individual has exactly the same chance of being selected. For each pair of parents, MATE generates an offspring solution via the crossover operator (line 7), and then tries to improve it by local search (line 8). After that, the better one among the offspring solution and p_1 will replace the population member selected as p_1 (line 9). Therefore, no replacement will take place if the offspring solution is worse than p_1 . In other words, the loss of population diversity is allowed only if the average fitness of the population is improved. The iterations of generation in MATE terminate when the best found solution has not been improved (line 11) in the last consecutive G_{max} generations (line 12), in which case the algorithm is considered to have converged. Finally, the best found solution is returned (line 13).

B. Initialization

The initial population is constructed using the RCRS heuristic, which is an extension of the cheapest-insertion heuristic. A detailed description of the RCRS heuristic could be found in [2]. Specifically, it first chooses an arbitrary unassigned customer as the “seed” customer and builds a route from

Algorithm 1: The General Framework of MATE

input : A VRPSPDTW instance; population size, N ;
longest consecutive generations without
improvement, G_{max}
output: the best found solution x^*

- 1 $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\} \leftarrow \text{Initialization}()$;
- 2 $x^* \leftarrow \text{Select_Best}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$;
- 3 **repeat**
- 4 $\pi(\cdot) \leftarrow$ a random permutation of $1, \dots, N$;
- 5 **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** N **do**
- 6 $p_1 \leftarrow x_{\pi(i)}, p_2 \leftarrow x_{\pi(i+1)}$;
- 7 $x_{child} \leftarrow \text{Crossover}(p_1, p_2)$;
- 8 $x_{child} \leftarrow \text{Local_Search}(x_{child})$;
- 9 $x_{\pi(i)} \leftarrow \text{Select_Best}(x_{child}, p_1)$;
- 10 **end**
- 11 $x^* \leftarrow \text{Select_Best}(x^*, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$;
- 12 **until** x^* not improved in the last G_{max} generations;
- 13 **return** x^*

the depot to it and back to the depot. Then the remaining unassigned customers are iteratively inserted into the route at the position with the best value of the RCRS criterion until no feasible insertion exists. Then the next route is built following the same way with an arbitrarily chosen “seed” customer. This route building is repeated until all customers are assigned. After that, the total cost of the obtained complete solution is calculated. The whole of the above described procedure is repeated until all unassigned customers have served as the initial “seed” customer, thus producing a number of different complete solutions. Finally, the best solution is returned.

The core of the RCRS heuristic is the RCRS criterion, which is used to assess how good a potential insertion is. The conventional cheapest-insertion heuristic uses the TD criterion, i.e., the extra travel distance caused by inserting a customer, which is usually considered short-sighted. The RCRS criterion extends the TD criterion in two aspects. First, the remaining vehicle capacity after an insertion is taken into account, i.e., the residual capacity (RC) criterion, which measures the degrees of freedom for future insertions. Second, the distances of customers to the depot are considered, i.e., the radial surcharge (RS) criterion, which seeks to avoid the unfavorable extra travel distances caused by inserting the remotely located customers which are “left over” to a late stage of the insertion procedure. RCRS criterion is a combination of RC criterion and RS criterion, with two weighting parameters $\lambda, \gamma \in [0, 1]$. Generally, the best values of λ and γ vary across different problem instances. For a given instance it is hard to determine a good choice of λ and γ in advance.

However, in MATE we could take advantage of the population-based search by trying different values of λ and γ for different individuals. As presented in Algorithm 2, for each of λ and γ , we start with the value of 0, and gradually increase it with a step size of $1/(\sqrt{N} - 1)$ until it reaches 1 (lines 4-5). In summary, for each of λ and γ , we use \sqrt{N} different values ranging from 0 to 1 that are equally spaced, thus obtaining a total of N different combinations of (λ, γ) ,

Algorithm 2: The Initialization Procedure

```

input : population size,  $N$ 
output:  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\}$ 
1  $count \leftarrow 1$ ;
2 for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $\sqrt{N}$  do
3   for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $\sqrt{N}$  do
4      $\lambda \leftarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{N-1}} \cdot (i-1)$ ;
5      $\gamma \leftarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{N-1}} \cdot (j-1)$ ;
6      $x_{count} \leftarrow \text{RCRS}(\lambda, \gamma)$ ;
7      $count \leftarrow count + 1$ ;
8   end
9 end
10 return  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\}$ 

```

based on each of which the RCRS heuristic is used to construct an initial solution (line 6). Such an approach enables a good coverage on the design space of (λ, γ) , and is expected to construct an initial population with high diversity. Finally, it is required that the parameter N , i.e., the population size, is a square number., e.g., 4, 9, 16, 25, etc.

C. Crossover Operator

An effective crossover operator should be able to transmit useful building blocks from parents to offspring, and meanwhile incorporate domain-specific heuristics to generate high-quality offspring that are significantly different from either of the parents. In this paper, we propose a new route-assembly-regret-insertion (RARI) crossover. As presented in Algorithm 3, RARI crossover first repeatedly chooses a random route from each parent solution in turns to insert into the offspring solution until no feasible insertion exists (lines 2-5). In other words, the offspring solution would inherit as many routes as possible from each parent equally.

After that, the remaining unassigned customers (if there exist) will be inserted into the offspring solution to form a complete solution. In the literature of VRP, one commonly used procedure to insert these nodes is the two-step strategy [56]. First, the insertion of them are tested in existing routes of the offspring solution. If some nodes continue to be unassigned, they will be inserted into new empty routes by cheapest-insertion heuristic. Here, RAI crossover simultaneously simplifies and improves this insertion procedure by regret-based insertion [57] (lines 7-15). More specifically, regret-based insertion uses a so-called regret value, which represents the expected cost of inserting a node not in this iteration but in a future iteration, to assess how good a potential insertion is. Such a look-ahead information could help avoid the postponing issue of cheapest-insertion heuristic—placing “difficult” nodes (which are expensive to insert) late in the process where there exist few opportunities for inserting them as many of the routes are already “full”. The regret value for a node v is obtained as follows. Supposing that there exist m routes in the current partial solution, i.e., $\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_m\}$. For each route R_i , the position and the cost c_i of the best feasible insertion (based on the objective value) of v into R_i

Algorithm 3: The RARI Crossover Operator

```

input : parent solutions  $p_1, p_2$ 
output:  $x_{child}$ 
1  $x_{child} \leftarrow$  initialize an empty solution with no routes;
2 repeat
3   copy random route from  $p_1$  to  $x_{child}$ ;
4   copy random route from  $p_2$  to  $x_{child}$ ;
5 until no more inherited routes are feasible;
6 /* --- regret-based insertion --- */
7  $U \leftarrow$  all the remaining unassigned customers;
8 while  $U \neq \emptyset$  do
9   foreach node  $v \in U$  do
10    calculate  $regret(v)$  according to Eq. (5);
11   end
12    $v^* \leftarrow \arg \max_{v \in U} regret(v)$ ;
13   Insert  $v^*$  into  $x_{child}$  at its best insertion position;
14    $U \leftarrow U / \{v^*\}$ ;
15 end
16 return  $x_{child}$ 

```

is calculated. Moreover, the cost of inserting v into an empty route, i.e., a route from the depot to v and back to the depot, is also calculated, which is denoted as c_0 . Then c_0, c_1, \dots, c_m are sorted in ascending order, and the sorting results are denoted as $c_{\pi(0)}, c_{\pi(1)}, \dots, c_{\pi(m)}$, i.e., $c_{\pi(0)} \leq c_{\pi(1)} \leq \dots \leq c_{\pi(m)}$. The regret value of v , denoted as $regeret(v)$, is the difference in the cost of inserting v in its best route and its second best route:

$$regret(v) = c_{\pi(1)} - c_{\pi(0)}. \quad (5)$$

In each iteration of the regret-based insertion (lines 9-14), first the regret value of each currently unassigned customer is calculated (lines 9-11), and then the one with the maximum regret value (ties are broken by selecting the insertion with lowest cost) will be inserted at its best position (lines 12-14). Informally speaking, in each iteration the insertion that we will regret most if it is not done now will be carried out. The iterations terminate when all unassigned customers have been inserted into the offspring solution.

D. Local search Procedure

The local search procedure is the core component of MATE. Its effectiveness has a decisive impact on the performance of the algorithm. In particular, we have simultaneously considered three different goals when designing the local search procedure. First, it should be able to quickly identify high-quality local optima. Second, it should be able to jump out from the current local optimum to other promising regions. Third, its computational complexity should be as low as possible such that the incurred computational cost is reasonable. As demonstrated in Algorithm 4, the local search in MATE utilizes the idea of switching between move operators with different step sizes to accomplish the first two goals. Specifically, given a solution x , it first finds the local optimum around x in a small region defined by several traditional move operators (line 1). Then, it extends the search step size

Algorithm 4: The Local Search Procedure

input : solution x ; the lower and upper bounds for the proportion of the removed nodes, ω_1, ω_2

output: x

```

1  $x \leftarrow \text{Find\_Local\_Optimum}(x)$ ;
2 while true do
3    $x' \leftarrow x$ ;
4   /* escape from local optimum */
5    $q \leftarrow$  a random number  $\in [\omega_1 M, \omega_2 M]$ ;
6    $U \leftarrow$  remove  $q$  nodes from  $x'$  via the Shaw's
   removal heuristic [59];
7   Insert  $U$  into  $x'$  via regret-based insertion;
8   /* exploit the new local region */
9    $x' \leftarrow \text{Find\_Local\_Optimum}(x')$ ;
10  if  $x'$  is better than  $x$  then  $x \leftarrow x'$ ;
11  else break;
12 end
13 return  $x$ 

```

by applying the removal-and-reinsertion operator (lines 3-7), trying to jump out from the local optimum. After that, the step size will be reduced again to identify the local optimum x' in the new local region (line 9). If x' is better than the current solution x , the latter will be updated and then used as the base solution for the next iteration of jumping to other regions and then identifying a new local optimum (line 10). Otherwise the procedure would terminate (line 11) and the current solution x is returned (line 13).

1) *Finding Local Optimum:* To identify the local optimum around a given solution, the embedded Find_Local_Optimum sub-procedure in Algorithm 4 utilizes several traditional move operators [58], namely *2-opt*, *2-opt**, *or-opt* and *swap*, as described in the following. The *2-opt* operator inverts a subsequence of two consecutive customers in a route. The *2-opt** operator removes two arcs from two different routes to divide each route into two parts, and then reconnects the first part of the first route with the second part of the second route and vice versa. The *or-opt* operator removes a subsequence of one or two consecutive customers from a route, and then reinserts it into another position of the same route or a different route. The *swap* operator exchanges two subsequences of one or two consecutive customers, which may be on the same route (but not overlapping with each other), or on different routes.

Given a solution x , a best-improvement search is conducted in the neighborhoods of x defined by the four above-described move operators. That is, all solutions that can be reached by applying either of the four operators to x are evaluated, and the best feasible solution among them, say \bar{x} , is then compared with x . If \bar{x} is better than x , the latter will be updated. This procedure is repeated until no further improvement can be found. By this means, it is ensured that a local optimum has been reached in each neighborhood w.r.t the move operators.

2) *Escaping from Local Optimum:* The above-described move operators modify only a small part (one or two routes) of the solution; thus the neighborhoods defined by them are actually a small region around the solution. Once a local opti-

um has been found in the region, an operator with a bigger step size is needed for jumping out of it. Here a removal-and-reinsertion operator, which is similar to the destroy-and-repair procedure in the Large Neighborhood Search (LNS) algorithm [59], is used to accomplish this goal. This operator first removes a number of customers from the solution (lines 5-6 in Algorithm 4), and then reinserts them into the solution again (line 7 in Algorithm 4). The number of the removed nodes, i.e., q , is a random number in $[\omega_1 M, \omega_2 M]$, where M is the total number of customers and ω_1, ω_2 are two parameters satisfying $0 < \omega_1 < \omega_2 < 1$. In this paper, ω_1, ω_2 are set to 0.2 and 0.4, respectively. In other words, 20-40% of all customers in the solution are rearranged by the removal-and-reinsertion operator; thus it is very likely that the obtained new solution will be quite different from the original one.

The node removal is conducted using the Shaw's removal heuristic [59]. Its general idea is to remove customers that are correlated. More specifically, this heuristic first randomly removes a customer. Then two customers that are most correlated to the last removed customer are identified. After that, roulette wheel selection is used to select one of these two customers to remove. This procedure is repeated until q customers have been removed in total. Unlike [59] which adopts a correlation definition measuring how similar two customers are, we propose to define the correlation of a customer j to a customer i as the weighted sum of the distance, the minimum waiting time, and the minimum time-window violation on a direct service from i to j :

$$\begin{aligned} corr(i, j) = & dist(i, j) + \eta \cdot [\max\{a_j - time(i, j) - s_i - b_i, 0\} \\ & + \gamma \cdot \max\{a_i + s_i + time(i, j) - b_j, 0\}], \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where η is a factor that rescales time into distance and equals to the average distance between all nodes divided by the average travel time between all nodes. γ is a positive penalty factor (i.e., 10) for the time-window violation. The lower $corr(i, j)$ is, customer j is more correlated to customer i . Intrinsically, Eq. (6) measures how good customer j is as the next serviced one after customer i . Therefore it is expected to be reasonably easy to shuffle those highly-correlated customers (which have been removed from the current solution) around and thereby create perhaps new better solutions. The node reinsertion is conducted once again using the regret-based insertion heuristic (see lines 6-15 in Algorithm 3).

3) *Move Evaluation in Constant Time:* To accomplish the third design goal of the local search procedure, i.e., keeping its computational complexity as low as possible, we propose to optimize the time complexity of move evaluation, i.e., calculating the cost and checking the feasibility of the solutions generated by the move operators (*2-opt*, *2-opt**, *or-opt* and *swap*), since it is the most time-consuming part of the local search procedure with a huge number of solutions being generated and evaluated. Recall that these move operators will modify at most two routes of a solution. Hence, to evaluate a move, one only needs to evaluate the changed routes, which could be trivially done in $O(n)$ by traversing the routes, where n is the route length. Recently, a sequence-based evaluation approach [60] with constant time complexity, i.e., $O(1)$, has

been proposed for evaluating moves when solving VRPTW. In this paper, we extend this approach by taking into account the impact of pickup and delivery on the vehicle load, and propose a new move evaluation approach for VRPSPDTW.

The basic idea of sequence-based evaluation is that any move can be viewed as a separation of routes into subsequences, which are then concatenated into new routes. For example, supposing the 2-opt operator is applied to a route $R = (h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4, h_5)$ and a new route $R' = (h_1, h_2, h_4, h_3, h_5)$ is generated, i.e., the subsequence (h_3, h_4) is inverted, this move can be viewed as $\sigma^1 \oplus \sigma^2 \oplus \sigma^3$, where $\sigma^1 = (h_1, h_2)$, $\sigma^2 = (h_4, h_3)$ and $\sigma^3 = (h_5)$ being three subsequences, and \oplus represents the concatenation operator. To evaluate a move, one could equivalently evaluate the concatenation of the subsequences. More specifically, following [60], for each subsequence σ , the minimum duration $D(\sigma)$, the earliest arrival time $E(\sigma)$ and the latest arrival time $L(\sigma)$ to the first node of σ allowing the minimum duration, and the cumulative travel distance $S(\sigma)$ are computed. In addition, in this paper three new attributes, i.e., the initial load $C_E(\sigma)$, the highest load $C_H(\sigma)$ during σ and the final load $C_L(\sigma)$, are computed for checking capacity violation. These attributes are straightforward to compute for a sequence σ^0 involving a single node i , as $D(\sigma^0) = s_i$, $E(\sigma^0) = a_i$, $L(\sigma^0) = b_i$, $R(\sigma^0) = 0$, $C_E(\sigma^0) = d_i$, $C_L(\sigma^0) = p_i$ and $C_H(\sigma^0) = \max\{C_E(\sigma^0), C_L(\sigma^0)\}$. Eq. (7) then enables computing the same data on the concatenation of two subsequences σ^1, σ^2 :

$$\begin{aligned}
 D(\sigma^1 \oplus \sigma^2) &= D(\sigma^1) + D(\sigma^2) + \text{time}(i, j) + \Delta_{WT} \\
 E(\sigma^1 \oplus \sigma^2) &= \max\{E(\sigma^2) - \Delta, E(\sigma^1)\} - \Delta_{WT} \\
 L(\sigma^1 \oplus \sigma^2) &= \min\{L(\sigma^2) - \Delta, L(\sigma^1)\} \\
 R(\sigma^1 \oplus \sigma^2) &= R(\sigma^1) + R(\sigma^2) + \text{dist}(i, j) \\
 C_E(\sigma^1 \oplus \sigma^2) &= C_E(\sigma^1) + C_E(\sigma^2) \\
 C_H(\sigma^1 \oplus \sigma^2) &= \max\{C_H(\sigma^1) + C_E(\sigma^1), C_L(\sigma^1) + C_H(\sigma^2)\} \\
 C_L(\sigma^1 \oplus \sigma^2) &= C_L(\sigma^1) + C_L(\sigma^2),
 \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\Delta_{WT} = \max\{E(\sigma^2) - \Delta - L(\sigma^1), 0\}$, $\Delta = D(\sigma^1) + \text{time}(i, j)$, i is the last node of σ^1 and j is the first node of σ^2 . Let $\Delta_{TW} = E(\sigma^1) + D(\sigma^1) + \text{time}(i, j) - L(\sigma^2)$; then $\sigma^1 \oplus \sigma^2$ is feasible regarding time-window constraint if $\Delta_{TW} \leq 0$. Moreover, $\sigma^1 \oplus \sigma^2$ is feasible regarding capacity constraint if $C_H(\sigma^1 \oplus \sigma^2) \leq C$, where C is the vehicle capacity. The transportation cost of $\sigma^1 \oplus \sigma^2$ is $u \cdot R(\sigma^1 \oplus \sigma^2)$, where u_2 is the cost per unit of travel distance.

The sequence-based evaluation approach is used in the best-improvement search in the neighborhoods of solution S , i.e., the Find_Local_Optimum sub-procedure. Specifically, first the attributes of subsequences (and their reversal) of S are precomputed, which will then be used in the search process for checking the feasibility and computing the costs of routes issued from the moves. The four move operators used in this paper correspond to a concatenation of less than five subsequences. Hence, given the data on subsequences, any move evaluation is performed in constant time. Note that if S is updated, the attributes of the changed routes need to be recomputed in $O(n^2)$, where n is the route length. However,

this is acceptable since in the search process the number of updates is smaller in orders of magnitude than the number of move evaluation.

4) *Infeasible Arc Set*: To further improve the search efficiency, a pre-processing step is applied to remove infeasible arcs of the VRPSPDTW instance. Specifically, an arc $\langle i, j \rangle (i \neq j)$ will be added to the so-called *infeasible set* if any of the following conditions hold (according to the capacity and time-window violations):

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_i + d_j > Q \text{ or } p_i + p_j > Q \\
 a_i + s_i + \text{time}(i, j) > b_j
 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

In the local search procedure, the *infeasible set* is used to prohibit introducing arcs that are in it into the generated solutions. In our experiments, this step is able to perceptibly reduce the total number of considered arcs.

V. COMPUTATIONAL STUDY

To evaluate the effectiveness of MATE, we compared it with a number of state-of-the-art algorithms on existing benchmark set and a new benchmark set derived from a real-world application. After that, we conducted a comprehensive ablation study to assess the contribution of the novel components integrated in MATE. Finally, the effect of different values of the parameter N (the population size) was investigated. The source code of MATE, as well as all the benchmark sets used in the experiments, are available at: <https://github.com/senshineL/VRPenstein>.

A. Benchmark Sets

The commonly used (also the only publically available) benchmark set in the literature of VRPSPDTW, referred to as the *wc* set in this paper (see Section II), was generated by [12] through modifying the well-known Solomon benchmark [54]. The *wc* set contains 65 instances in total, including 9 small-scale instances (three 10-customer instances, three 25-customer instances, and three 50-customer instances) and 56 medium-scale instances (100-customer instances). Note all these instances are defined in the two-dimensional Euclidean space; that is, each node i (customer or depot) has a coordinate (x_i, y_i) and the distance between two nodes i and j is the Euclidean distance, i.e., $\sqrt{(x_i - x_j)^2 + (y_i - y_j)^2}$. This is a special case of the problem formulation given in this paper (see Section III), where the distances between nodes are explicitly given no matter whether they are defined in the Euclidean plane. According to the distribution of the customers' locations in the space and intensity of the time-window constraints and the capacity constraints, instances in the *wc* set could be further categorized into 6 types (subsets), namely Cdp1~, Cdp2~, Rdp1~, Rdp2~, RCdp1~ and RCdp2~, where the categories refer to:

- 1) Cdp: customers' locations are clustered;
- 2) Rdp: customers' locations are uniform randomly distributed;
- 3) RCdp: customers' locations are a mix of random and clustered locations;

- 4) Type 1: customers have narrow time windows and vehicle's capacity is small;
- 5) Type 2: customers have large time windows and vehicle's capacity is large.

For all instances in the wc set, minimizing NV (number of used vehicles) is the primary goal and minimizing TD (total distance) is the second one. To meet this, for the objective function Eq. (4), the ratio of the dispatching cost of each vehicle (u_1) to the cost per unit of travel distance (u_2), i.e., u_1/u_2 , should be set to a sufficiently large number (see Section III). Following [12], in the experiments for these instances we set u_1 and u_2 to 2000 and 1, respectively.

As aforementioned, the wc set contains only synthetic instances of small or medium scales. To further assess the potential of the algorithms, we introduce a new benchmark set derived from the distribution system of JD logistics. In this system, in addition to delivering the goods purchased by customers, one also needs to collect goods (e.g., defective goods or goods in need of maintenance) from customers, and both of these operations must be executed in predefined time windows to provide satisfactory service. Therefore in essence it could be modeled as the VRPSPDTW problem considered here. Further, original data was collected from this system, which contains requests occurring during a period of time in a city. The total number of requests is 3000. We then sampled from the data to generate instances with 200, 400, 600, 800, and 1000 customers. For each scale, we generated 4 instances, which finally gave us a benchmark set of 20 instances. The new benchmark set is called the jd set. Unlike the wc set, for this new set there is no priority for minimizing either NV or TD. Instead, u_1 and u_2 are directly given based on the estimated values in the application, and the objective is to minimize TC (total cost), the sum of the dispatching cost and the transportation cost, as defined in Eq. (4).

B. Compared Algorithms and Algorithm Settings

We considered four state-of-the-art algorithms¹ in the comparative study, including Co-GA [12], p-SA [16], IGAFSA [17], and ETSP [19]. Each of these algorithms has been tested on part or all of the instances in the wc set, and for each instance in the wc set, at least one of the four algorithms has been reported to obtain the best-known solution (BKS). Hence, for the wc set, we directly obtained the best testing results of these algorithms from the original publications. For the new jd set, we chose Co-GA as the competitor since it is the only open sourced algorithm among the four, and the parameter settings reported in the original publication were used.

The detailed settings of MATE are summarized in Table I. MATE has four parameters that need to be set, i.e., N , G_{max} , ω_1 and ω_2 , where N is the population size, G_{max} is the longest consecutive generations without improvement, and ω_1, ω_2 are the lower and upper bounds for the proportion of the nodes

¹The well-known TSP solver LKH (version 3.0) [61] is also applicable to VRPSPDTW. However, in our preliminary experiments, we found LKH generally took prohibitively long time (typically two days) to find a feasible solution to the problem instances considered. Therefore we did not consider it during our experiments.

TABLE I
ALGORITHM SETTINGS OF MATE.

| | Description | Value |
|----------------------|--|---|
| G_{max} | longest consecutive generations without improvement | 50 |
| ω_1, ω_2 | lower and upper bounds for the proportion of the removed nodes | 0.2, 0.4 |
| N | population size | $\begin{cases} 16, & M \leq 100 \\ 36, & M > 100 \end{cases}$ |
| T | maximum running time | $\begin{cases} 3s, & M \leq 25 \\ 15s, & M = 50 \\ 300s, & M = 100 \\ 7200s, & M > 200 \end{cases}$ |

M : the number of the customers.

removed by the removal-and-reinsertion operator in the local search procedure (see Algorithm 4). We set G_{max} to 50. To make fair comparison, when testing on the wc set, MATE will also be terminated as long as it running for time T , where T was set according to the reported running time of the compared algorithms in the original publications; when testing on the jd set, a larger T was set for both MATE and Co-GA. We set ω_1 and ω_2 to considerably large values, i.e., 0.2 and 0.4, respectively, such that the newly generated solution is likely to be very different from the original one. For parameter N , given finite time budgets, there exists a trade-off between promoting the exploration in larger search space (i.e., large N) and facilitating more refined search in local areas (i.e., small N). We consider the latter has direct and decisive impact on the algorithm's performance, especially when the search space is too large to sufficiently explore. Therefore, for instances with $M \leq 100$, we set N to 16. Otherwise, we set N to 36 (note N must be a square number). The effect of different values of N will be further analyzed in Section V-F.

All the experiments went through 30 independent runs, on an Intel Xeon machine with 128 GB RAM and 24 cores each (2.20 GHz, 30 MB Cache), running Centos 7.5. Both MATE and Co-GA were implemented in C++.

C. Results on Small-scale and Medium-scale Instances

The commercial linear programming software CPLEX has been used in [12] to find the optimal solutions for the small-scale instances ($M \leq 50$) in the wc set. The best results of CPLEX on these instances, obtained from [12], in comparison with the testing results of MATE, are presented in Table II. In addition, the testing results of Co-GA and p-SA, obtained from the original publications, are also included in Table II. Note that for instances in the wc set, minimizing NV has a higher priority than minimizing TD; this is achieved by setting u_1 and u_2 in Eq. (4) to 2000 and 1, respectively. Therefore for these instances, the TC of a solution equals to $2000 \cdot NV + TD$, and a solution is better than another if the former has smaller TC. From Table II it could be observed that CPLEX managed to solve five of the instances,

TABLE II
COMPARISON BETWEEN CPLEX, Co-GA, p-SA AND THE PROPOSED MATE ON SMALL-SCALE INSTANCES IN THE *wc* SET.

| Instance <i>M</i> | CPLEX | | | Co-GA | | p-SA | | MATE Avg±std | | Best | |
|--------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| | NV | TD | T | NV | TD | NV | TD | NV | TD | NV | TD |
| | RCdp1001 10 | 3 | 348.98 | 1 | 3 | 348.98 | 3 | 348.98 | 3.00±0.00 | 348.98±0.00 | 3 |
| RCdp1004 10 | 2 | 216.69 | 1503 | 2 | 216.69 | 2 | 216.69 | 2.00±0.00 | 216.69±0.00 | 2 | 216.69 |
| RCdp1007 10 | 2 | 310.81 | 25 | 2 | 310.81 | 2 | 310.81 | 2.00±0.00 | 310.81±0.00 | 2 | 310.81 |
| RCdp2501 10 | 5 | 551.05 | 16 | 5 | 551.05 | 5 | 552.21 | 5.00±0.00 | 551.05±0.00 | 5 | 551.05 |
| RCdp2504 25 | 7 ^a | 738.32 ^a | 485660 | 4 | 473.46 | 4 | 473.46 | 4.00±0.00 | 473.46±0.00 | 4 | 473.46 |
| RCdp2507 25 | 7 ^a | 634.20 ^a | 439321 | 5 | 540.87 | 5 | 540.87 | 5.00±0.00 | 540.87±0.00 | 5 | 540.87 |
| RCdp5001 25 | 9 | 994.18 | 327404 | 9 | 994.18 | 9 | 994.70 | 9.00±0.00 | 994.18±0.00 | 9 | 994.18 |
| RCdp5004 50 | 14 ^a | 1961.53 ^a | 839320 | 6 | 725.59 | 6 | 725.90 | 6.00±0.00 | 733.21±0.00 | 6 | 733.21 |
| RCdp5007 50 | 13 ^a | 1814.33 ^a | 1546429 | 7 | 809.72 | 7 | 810.04 | 7.00±0.00 | 809.72±0.00 | 7 | 809.72 |

For each instance, the best performance regarding TC (i.e., $2000 \cdot NV + TD$) is highlighted in grey.

M: the number of customers in the instance.

T: computation time in seconds executed on the reference machine in [12].

^a: the “out-of-memory” values.

Avg±std: the average and the standard deviation of NV and TD of the 30 solutions found by the 30 independent runs.

Best: The best solution regarding TC among the 30 solutions found by the 30 independent runs.

on which MATE and Co-GA also found optimal solutions. For the other four instances, CPLEX prematurely terminated due to the “out-of-memory” condition, while the three meta-heuristic algorithms quickly found much better solutions than CPLEX, in a much shorter time (within 15s, see Table I). It is worth mentioning that MATE performed very stably on these instances, achieving the standard deviation of 0 across the solutions found by 30 independent runs. In conclusion, on the small-scale instances, all the compared meta-heuristic algorithms performed very closely, and all of them performed much better than CPLEX, with the performance gap becoming even bigger as the problem scale increasing.

In general, the algorithms’ performance on instances of larger scales is of more interest. Table III presents the best results of the four compared algorithms, obtained from the original publications, and the testing results of MATE on the medium-scale instances ($M = 100$) in the *wc* set. The efficacy of MATE can be evaluated from two perspectives, i.e., the best and the average performance it has achieved in 30 independent runs. We first take a closer look at the best performance since the compared algorithms’ results reported in Table III are their best performance, although the number of their independent runs was not reported. Considering the row headed “No.best”, it can be found that MATE obtained the best solutions on 47 out of 56 instances, which is much better than all compared algorithms. More importantly, MATE managed to find **new** BKS (best-known solutions) on 44 instances (15 of them are of fewer NV than before), including 10 out of 12 in the Rdp1~ subset, 9 out of 9 in the Cdp1~ subset, 8 out of 8 in the RCdp1~ subset, 9 out of 11 in the Rdp2~ subset, and 8 out of 8 in the RCdp2~ subset. Considering the node distribution and constraint intensity are different across different instance types (see Section V-A), these results indicate that MATE performs both strongly and robustly. There is only one subset, Cdp2~, where MATE is not the best-performing algorithm. Recall that the instances in Cdp2~ have clustered customers’ locations and loose constraints (large time windows and large vehicle capacity). It is conceivable that in the solutions to these instances, customers from the same cluster are very likely to appear in the same route, finally leading to long routes.

Since MATE limits the maximum length of the subsequences manipulated by its local-search operators (*2-opt*, *or-opt* and *swap*) to 2 to ensure search efficiency (see Section IV-D), in cases of long routes this may unexpectedly exclude high-quality solutions from the search space, finally resulting in unsatisfactory performance. We consider this as a valuable direction for further improving MATE.

The row headed “w-d-l” in Table III presents the results of comparing the average performance of MATE with the best performance of other algorithms. It could be seen even in this case, MATE still shows great advantage over the competitors. It is worth mentioning on almost half of the instances, i.e., 26 out of 56, the average performance of MATE across 30 independent runs is the same as its best performance. This demonstrates that MATE performs very stably, although it is a randomized algorithm in nature. In conclusion, all of the above observations are evidence that MATE performs consistently better than the state-of-the-art algorithms on a wide range of problem instances, and in particular, it has significantly raised the performance bar on the *wc* set.

D. Results on Large-scale Instances

Table IV presents the testing results of Co-GA and MATE on large-scale instances in the *jd* set. Unlike the *wc* set, for this set there is no priority for minimizing either NV or TD; thus the TC of the solutions are reported. In the experiments, Co-GA kept crashing on instances with 1000 customers; for these instances “N/A” is reported. Moreover, nonparametric tests (Wilcoxon rank-sum test with significance level $p = 0.05$) were conducted to compare the performance of Co-GA and MATE, with p-value shown in the last column. Overall, MATE performs significantly better than Co-GA on every instance in the *jd* set. The gap between the best performance of Co-GA and MATE across 30 independent runs, i.e., $[TC_1 - TC_2]/TC_2$ where TC_1 and TC_2 are the best performance of Co-GA and MATE respectively, is 5.37%, 6.65%, 9.48% and 13.12%, averaged on 200-customer, 400-customer, 600-customer and 800-customer instances, respectively. For average performance, the corresponding gaps are

TABLE III
COMPARISON BETWEEN CO-GA, P-SA, IGAFSA, ETSP AND THE PROPOSED MATE ON MEDIUM-SCALE INSTANCES IN THE *wc* SET.

| Instance | Co-GA | | p-SA | | IGAFSA | | ETSP | | MATE Avg±std | | Best | |
|----------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|-----------------|---------------|---------|----------|
| | NV | TD | NV | TD | NV | TD | NV | TD | NV | TD | NV | TD |
| Rdp101 | 19 | 1653.53 | 19 | 1660.98 | 19 | 1720.20 | N/A | N/A | 19.00±0.00* | 1650.80±0.00* | 19* | 1650.80* |
| Rdp102 | 17 | 1488.04 | 17 | 1491.75 | 17 | 1470.45 | N/A | N/A | 17.00±0.00 | 1486.12±0.00 | 17 | 1486.12 |
| Rdp103 | 14 | 1216.16 | 14 | 1226.77 | 14 | 1203.40 | N/A | N/A | 13.00±0.00* | 1294.64±0.00* | 13* | 1294.64* |
| Rdp104 | 10 | 1015.41 | 10 | 1000.65 | 10 | 1003.65 | N/A | N/A | 10.00±0.00* | 984.81±0.00* | 10* | 984.81* |
| Rdp105 | 15 | 1375.31 | 14 | 1399.81 | 14 | 1346.41 | N/A | N/A | 14.00±0.00 | 1377.11±0.00 | 14 | 1377.11 |
| Rdp106 | 13 | 1255.48 | 12 | 1275.69 | 12 | 1258.89 | N/A | N/A | 12.00±0.00* | 1252.03±0.00* | 12* | 1252.03* |
| Rdp107 | 11 | 1087.95 | 11 | 1082.92 | 12 | 1074.72 | N/A | N/A | 10.00±0.00 | 1129.46±2.01 | 10* | 1124.90* |
| Rdp108 | 10 | 967.49 | 10 | 962.48 | 10 | 962.48 | N/A | N/A | 9.00±0.00 | 973.02±3.22 | 9* | 965.54* |
| Rdp109 | 12 | 1160.00 | 12 | 1181.92 | 12 | 1173.52 | N/A | N/A | 11.93±0.25 | 1161.71±18.43 | 11* | 1219.45* |
| Rdp110 | 12 | 1116.99 | 11 | 1106.52 | 11 | 1105.32 | N/A | N/A | 10.97±0.18 | 1084.39±15.24 | 10* | 1166.47* |
| Rdp111 | 11 | 1065.27 | 11 | 1073.62 | 11 | 1055.42 | N/A | N/A | 10.00±0.00* | 1098.84±0.00* | 10* | 1098.84* |
| Rdp112 | 10 | 974.03 | 10 | 966.06 | 10 | 957.40 | N/A | N/A | 10.00±0.00 | 956.41±1.86 | 10* | 953.63* |
| Cdp101 | 11 | 1001.97 | 11 | 992.88 | 11 | 990.96 | N/A | N/A | 11.00±0.00* | 976.04±0.00* | 11* | 976.04* |
| Cdp102 | 10 | 961.38 | 10 | 955.31 | 10 | 953.05 | N/A | N/A | 10.00±0.00* | 941.49±0.00* | 10* | 941.49* |
| Cdp103 | 10 | 897.65 | 10 | 958.66 | 10 | 960.74 | N/A | N/A | 10.00±0.00 | 895.14±0.58 | 10* | 892.98* |
| Cdp104 | 10 | 878.93 | 10 | 944.73 | 10 | 940.62 | N/A | N/A | 10.00±0.00* | 871.40±0.00* | 10* | 871.40* |
| Cdp105 | 11 | 983.10 | 11 | 989.86 | 11 | 992.78 | N/A | N/A | 10.00±0.00* | 1074.51±0.00* | 10* | 1074.51* |
| Cdp106 | 11 | 878.29 | 11 | 878.29 | 11 | 868.93 | N/A | N/A | 10.00±0.00* | 963.45±0.00* | 10* | 963.45* |
| Cdp107 | 11 | 913.81 | 11 | 911.90 | 11 | 903.63 | N/A | N/A | 10.43±0.50 | 960.99±47.86 | 10* | 988.60* |
| Cdp108 | 10 | 951.24 | 10 | 1063.73 | 10 | 1067.43 | N/A | N/A | 10.00±0.00 | 932.55±0.13 | 10* | 932.49* |
| Cdp109 | 10 | 940.49 | 10 | 947.90 | 10 | 938.01 | N/A | N/A | 10.00±0.00* | 909.27±0.00* | 10* | 909.27* |
| RCdp101 | 15 | 1652.90 | 15 | 1659.59 | 15 | 1648.29 | N/A | N/A | 14.00±0.00* | 1708.21±0.00* | 14* | 1708.21* |
| RCdp102 | 14 | 1497.05 | 13 | 1522.76 | 14 | 1512.26 | N/A | N/A | 12.00±0.00 | 1586.62±7.31 | 12* | 1570.28* |
| RCdp103 | 12 | 1338.76 | 11 | 1344.62 | 11 | 1324.62 | N/A | N/A | 11.00±0.00 | 1284.66±0.85 | 11* | 1282.53* |
| RCdp104 | 11 | 1188.49 | 10 | 1268.43 | 10 | 1248.23 | N/A | N/A | 10.00±0.00 | 1172.37±1.06 | 10* | 1171.37* |
| RCdp105 | 14 | 1581.26 | 14 | 1581.54 | 14 | 1557.34 | N/A | N/A | 13.87±0.34 | 1566.46±46.91 | 13* | 1651.93* |
| RCdp106 | 13 | 1422.87 | 13 | 1418.16 | 13 | 1425.76 | N/A | N/A | 12.00±0.00* | 1392.47±0.00* | 12* | 1392.47* |
| RCdp107 | 12 | 1282.10 | 11 | 1360.17 | 11 | 1347.85 | N/A | N/A | 11.00±0.00* | 1252.79±0.00* | 11* | 1252.79* |
| RCdp108 | 11 | 1175.04 | 11 | 1169.57 | 11 | 1148.78 | N/A | N/A | 10.83±0.37 | 1163.77±27.35 | 10* | 1208.58* |
| Rdp201 | 4 | 1280.44 | 4 | 1286.55 | 4 | 1266.55 | 4 | 1268.52 | 4.00±0.00 | 1252.55±0.29 | 4* | 1252.37* |
| Rdp202 | 4 | 1100.92 | 4 | 1150.31 | 4 | 1150.31 | 4 | 1099.61 | 3.70±0.46 | 1141.45±94.90 | 3* | 1275.15* |
| Rdp203 | 3 | 950.79 | 3 | 997.84 | 3 | 987.68 | 3 | 981.48 | 3.00±0.00 | 946.18±1.32 | 3* | 943.50* |
| Rdp204 | 3 | 775.23 | 2 | 848.01 | 2 | 848.01 | 3 | 775.93 | 2.70±0.46 | 789.85±62.60 | 2 | 852.07 |
| Rdp205 | 3 | 1064.43 | 3 | 1046.06 | 3 | 1034.45 | 3 | 1045.12 | 3.00±0.00 | 997.83±2.55 | 3* | 994.43* |
| Rdp206 | 3 | 961.32 | 3 | 959.94 | 3 | 938.67 | 3 | 973.44 | 3.00±0.00 | 908.69±2.10 | 3* | 906.14* |
| Rdp207 | 3 | 835.01 | 2 | 899.82 | 2 | 894.59 | 3 | 841.24 | 3.00±0.00 | 814.90±0.63 | 3 | 812.76 |
| Rdp208 | 3 | 718.51 | 2 | 739.06 | 2 | 739.06 | 2 | 740.82 | 2.00±0.00 | 733.41±2.44 | 2* | 727.92* |
| Rdp209 | 3 | 930.26 | 3 | 947.80 | 3 | 929.38 | 3 | 999.06 | 3.00±0.00 | 917.77±1.82 | 3* | 913.14* |
| Rdp210 | 3 | 983.75 | 3 | 1005.11 | 3 | 995.64 | 3 | 964.59 | 3.00±0.00 | 950.44±3.69 | 3* | 942.17* |
| Rdp211 | 3 | 839.61 | 3 | 812.44 | 3 | 804.21 | 3 | 805.53 | 3.00±0.00 | 778.62±1.50 | 3* | 774.71* |
| Cdp201 | 3 | 591.56 | 3 | 591.56 | 3 | 591.56 | 3 | 591.56 | 3.00±0.00 | 591.56±0.00 | 3 | 591.56 |
| Cdp202 | 3 | 591.56 | 3 | 591.56 | 3 | 582.42 | 3 | 591.56 | 3.00±0.00 | 591.56±0.00 | 3 | 591.56 |
| Cdp203 | 3 | 591.17 | 3 | 591.17 | 3 | 580.45 | 3 | 591.17 | 3.00±0.00 | 591.17±0.00 | 3 | 591.17 |
| Cdp204 | 3 | 590.60 | 3 | 594.07 | 3 | 578.86 | 3 | 599.87 | 3.00±0.00 | 590.60±0.00 | 3 | 590.60 |
| Cdp205 | 3 | 588.88 | 3 | 588.88 | 3 | 588.88 | 3 | 588.88 | 3.00±0.00 | 588.88±0.00 | 3 | 588.88 |
| Cdp206 | 3 | 588.49 | 3 | 588.49 | 3 | 579.95 | 3 | 588.49 | 3.00±0.00 | 588.49±0.00 | 3 | 588.49 |
| Cdp207 | 3 | 588.29 | 3 | 588.29 | 3 | 588.29 | 3 | 588.29 | 3.00±0.00 | 588.29±0.00 | 3 | 588.29 |
| Cdp208 | 3 | 588.32 | 3 | 599.32 | 3 | 587.98 | 3 | 588.32 | 3.00±0.00 | 588.32±0.00 | 3 | 588.32 |
| RCdp201 | 4 | 1587.92 | 4 | 1513.72 | 4 | 1508.57 | 4 | 1441.52 | 4.00±0.00 | 1407.16±0.36 | 4* | 1406.94* |
| RCdp202 | 4 | 1211.12 | 4 | 1273.26 | 4 | 1258.59 | 4 | 1216.59 | 4.00±0.00* | 1161.29±0.00* | 4* | 1161.29* |
| RCdp203 | 4 | 964.65 | 3 | 1123.58 | 3 | 1094.97 | 3 | 1106.72 | 3.00±0.00 | 1071.13±4.05 | 3* | 1060.45* |
| RCdp204 | 3 | 822.02 | 3 | 897.14 | 3 | 897.14 | 3 | 900.65 | 3.00±0.00 | 798.82±0.21 | 3* | 798.46* |
| RCdp205 | 4 | 1410.18 | 4 | 1371.08 | 4 | 1376.45 | 5 | 1253.44 | 4.00±0.00* | 1297.65±0.00* | 4* | 1297.65* |
| RCdp206 | 3 | 1176.85 | 3 | 1166.88 | 3 | 1183.75 | 4 | 1161.89 | 3.00±0.00 | 1156.23±2.96 | 3* | 1146.32* |
| RCdp207 | 4 | 1036.59 | 3 | 1089.85 | 3 | 1099.97 | 3 | 1125.50 | 3.00±0.00 | 1073.42±1.94 | 3* | 1066.94* |
| RCdp208 | 3 | 878.57 | 3 | 862.89 | 3 | 848.43 | 3 | 873.28 | 3.00±0.00 | 833.40±1.11 | 3* | 832.36* |
| w-d-l | 48-8-0 | | 48-6-2 | | 44-3-9 | | 20-7-0 | | N/A | | 0-26-30 | |
| No.best | 3 | | 4 | | 12 | | 3 | | 19 | | 47 | |

For each instance, the best performance regarding TC (i.e., 2000 · NV + TD) is highlighted in grey.
 Avg±std: the average and the standard deviation of NV and TD of the 30 solutions found by 30 independent runs.
 Best: the best performance achieved among 30 independent runs.
 N/A: not applicable.
 w-d-l: the number of “win-draw-lose” of the average results of MALONE versus the results of other algorithms.
 No.best: the number of instances on which the algorithm finds the best solution.
 *: new best known solutions (i.e., never found before).

TABLE IV
COMPARISON BETWEEN CO-GA AND THE PROPOSED MATE ON
LARGE-SCALE INSTANCES IN THE jd SET.

| Instance M | Co-GA | | MALONE | | p-value |
|---------------|-------------------|--------|--------------------------|--------|---------|
| | Avg \pm std | Best | Avg \pm std | Best | |
| F201 200 | 67506 \pm 712 | 69301 | 66097 \pm 292 | 65106 | 0.0000 |
| F202 200 | 66734 \pm 766 | 68513 | 66038 \pm 422 | 65012 | 0.0002 |
| F203 200 | 67651 \pm 713 | 69480 | 67090 \pm 332 | 65980 | 0.0010 |
| F204 200 | 66247 \pm 590 | 67557 | 65851 \pm 326 | 64747 | 0.0071 |
| F401 400 | 127626 \pm 960 | 129258 | 123261 \pm 446 | 122319 | 0.0000 |
| F402 400 | 133307 \pm 1069 | 135032 | 128091 \pm 410 | 126887 | 0.0000 |
| F403 400 | 126660 \pm 1212 | 129191 | 122306 \pm 682 | 120130 | 0.0000 |
| F404 400 | 130807 \pm 993 | 133203 | 125242 \pm 359 | 124517 | 0.0000 |
| F601 600 | 195250 \pm 1599 | 198688 | 184119 \pm 608 | 182504 | 0.0000 |
| F602 600 | 202907 \pm 1235 | 205101 | 188891 \pm 645 | 187236 | 0.0000 |
| F603 600 | 201579 \pm 1809 | 205827 | 188050 \pm 621 | 186644 | 0.0000 |
| F604 600 | 200232 \pm 1830 | 203499 | 188110 \pm 790 | 186289 | 0.0000 |
| F801 800 | 235445 \pm 2870 | 241995 | 214634 \pm 561 | 213661 | 0.0000 |
| F802 800 | 238457 \pm 1500 | 240912 | 213276 \pm 292 | 212752 | 0.0000 |
| F803 800 | 236211 \pm 2136 | 241150 | 214870 \pm 318 | 214126 | 0.0000 |
| F804 800 | 231765 \pm 1959 | 237389 | 210845 \pm 429 | 209431 | 0.0000 |
| F1001 1000 | N/A | N/A | 314914 \pm 1096 | 312606 | N/A |
| F1002 1000 | N/A | N/A | 311718 \pm 1153 | 309158 | N/A |
| F1003 1000 | N/A | N/A | 313989 \pm 981 | 311377 | N/A |
| F1004 1000 | N/A | N/A | 311415 \pm 943 | 308816 | N/A |

For each instance, the best performance is highlighted in grey; the average performance of an algorithm is indicated in bold if it is significantly better than the other algorithm based on 30 independent runs.

M : the number of customers in each instance in the subset.

Avg \pm std: the average and the standard deviation of TC of the 30 solutions found by 30 independent runs.

Best: the best performance achieved among the 30 independent runs.

1.16%, 3.90%, 6.78%, and 10.34%. It can be observed as the problem scale grows, the performance gap between Co-GA and MATE also becomes larger.

E. Assessing the Effectiveness of Each Component in MATE

An ablation study was conducted to further assess the effectiveness of the novel components integrated into MATE. More specifically, we tested the following three different variants of MATE on the wc set, each of which is different from MATE in one component:

- 1) w/o EQ: In initialization, it uses random values drawn from [0,1] for (λ, γ) , instead of the proposed evenly-distributed values (lines 4-5 of Algorithm 2);
- 2) w/o RI: After doing route inheritance during crossover, it adopts the two-step strategy as described in [56] (see Section IV-C) to reinsert the unassigned customers, instead of the proposed regret-based insertion strategy (lines 7-15 of Algorithm 3);
- 3) w/o LS: It has no local search procedure, i.e., line 8 in Algorithm 1 is removed;

For each of the above variant, the performance degradation ratio (PDR) is computed as $[TC_1 - TC_2]/TC_2$ for each instance, where TC_1 and TC_2 are the average TC obtained by the variant and MATE across 30 independent runs. Therefore, the component being examined is useful for this specific instance only if the PDR > 0 , and the larger it is, the greater the component contributes to the performance of MATE. Table V presents the PDR averaged on each instance subset of the wc set, where wc_{small} refers to all the small-scale instances. In can be observed that, on average, none of the examined components has negative effect on the performance

TABLE V
AVERAGE PDR FOR 3 MATE VARIANTS ON EACH SUBSUET OF THE wc
SET.

| Subset | w/o EQ | w/o RI | w/o LS |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|
| wc_{small} | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.01% |
| Rdp1 \sim | 0.90% | 0.66% | 1.49% |
| Cdp1 \sim | 1.54% | 1.43% | 0.69% |
| RCdp1 \sim | 1.23% | 0.67% | 0.99% |
| Rdp2 \sim | 1.29% | 1.18% | 1.17% |
| Cdp2 \sim | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.17% |
| RCdp2 \sim | 0.11% | 1.15% | 2.47% |
| Avg | 0.76% | 0.74% | 1.02% |

For each subset, the highest average PDR is highlighted in grey.

Avg: the average PDR on all instances in the wc set.

of MATE, and in most cases, they make MATE perform better. In particular, the results in the “w/o EQ” column indicate that using evenly-distributed values for (λ, γ) is better than using random values, since the former enables more sufficient exploration in the design space. The results in the “w/o RI” column indicate the regret-based insertion performs better than the two-step strategy; this is especially appealing considering the former is simpler. Finally, as we expect, the local search procedure has the most significant contribution to the algorithm’s performance, and it is also the only one achieving positive affect on all subsets.

One may notice that the new move evaluation approach was left out from the above analysis. Since it does not affect any algorithmic behavior of MATE, but serves as an accelerator, in the experiments we kept track of the average computation time spent on move evaluation at different route lengths, with the new approach turned on/off. Note when it was turned off, the traditional approach which would traverse the involved routes was used. The results are presented in Figure 1, where “ $O(1)$ eval” refers to the new evaluation approach. In addition, the proportions of different lengths of routes encountered through the whole experiments are also shown. It can be clearly seen that the move evaluation time for the traditional approach grows linearly with route length, while for the new approach, the time is almost constant. These results have verified that the new approach indeed has time complexity of $O(1)$, and the longer the route is, the more time it saves. On instances in the wc set, the route lengths that occur most frequently are 1~10 and 21~30, on which the new approach could achieve nearly 1.5 \times and 3.5 \times speedups over the traditional approach, respectively. Averaged on all instances in the wc set, it offers nearly 3.3 \times speedup over the traditional approach.

F. Sensitivity Analysis of the Population Size N

The population size N is a user-defined parameter that has an important impact on the algorithm’s performance. A larger N directly enables more adequate coverage on the design space of (λ, γ) in the initialization procedure (see Section IV-B), leading to higher diversity among the initial population and therefore better exploration. On the other hand, a smaller N facilitates MATE to search more sufficiently in local areas, leading to better exploitation. To quantitatively




Fig. 1. Average evaluation time at different route lengths and proportions of different route lengths when turning on/off the new evaluation approach.

investigate its impact, we tested MATE with different N , i.e., 4, 9, 16, 25, 36, 49 and 64, on instances of different scales. More specifically, we considered all the seven subsets of the wc set, and two additional subsets F20~ (containing four 200-customer instances) and F40~ (containing four 400-customer instances) of the jd set. On each instance, MATE with each considered N , denoted as N_i , was tested for 30 independent runs, and the average TC, denoted as TC_i , was computed. Then as before, for N_i the PDR against the best-performing N was computed, i.e., $[TC_i - TC_{best}]/TC_{best}$, where TC_{best} is the best performance achieved among all the considered N . Therefore a PDR of 0.00% means the corresponding N achieves the best performance on the instance. For each considered N , its average PDR on each subset is presented in Table VI. Note the larger the average PDR is, the worse the corresponding N performs on the subset, and an average PDR of 0.00% means the corresponding N performs the best on every instance in the subset.

One could make three important observations from Table VI. First, on the small-scale instances (the wc_{small} subset), the performance of MATE is completely insensitive to the value of N . Second, the same phenomenon also occurs on the Cdp2~ subset. However, considering on this subset MATE is inferior to an existing algorithm (see Table III), these results have verified our previous speculation (see Section V-C) that currently MATE is not good at optimizing very lengthy routes due to the limitation of its move operators, no matter what population size is used. Third, for instances of medium scales ($M = 100$), larger values of N (36, 49 and 64) enabling better exploration perform better. In particular, each of the three values has achieved the best average PDR on two such subsets, besides Cdp2~. On the other hand, as problem scale increases, the search space grows exponentially. In this case more sufficient search in local areas is becoming more important under limited time budgets; therefore a smaller value of N (4, 9 and 16) is better. In summary, the above results show that the parameter N is indeed important for MATE,

TABLE VI
AVERAGE PDR FOR 7 DIFFERENT N VALUES ON DIFFERENT SUBSETS.

| Subset M | $N=4$ | $N=9$ | $N=16$ | $N=25$ | $N=36$ | $N=49$ | $N=64$ |
|-----------------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| $wc_{small} 10,25,50$ | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Rdp1~ 100 | 0.67% | 0.48% | 0.90% | 0.67% | 0.09% | 1.16% | 1.27% |
| Cdp1~ 100 | 0.79% | 1.37% | 1.17% | 1.38% | 0.42% | 0.00% | 1.38% |
| Rdp2~ 100 | 1.19% | 1.21% | 1.17% | 1.78% | 0.28% | 1.79% | 0.00% |
| Cdp2~ 100 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| RCdp1~ 100 | 1.01% | 1.40% | 0.92% | 2.13% | 0.95% | 0.09% | 1.49% |
| RCdp2~ 100 | 0.09% | 0.09% | 0.08% | 0.10% | 0.00% | 0.11% | 0.09% |
| F20~ 200 | 0.00% | 0.56% | 0.77% | 1.88% | 2.11% | 2.48% | 2.22% |
| F40~ 400 | 0.42% | 0.29% | 0.21% | 0.68% | 0.64% | 0.57% | 0.63% |

For each subset, the lowest average PDR is highlighted in grey.
M: the number of customers in each instance in the subset.

and setting N to 36 in case of $M \leq 100$, and 16 in case of $M > 100$, is a reasonably good default choice if no other prior knowledge is suggested.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed a memetic algorithm, dubbed MATE, for solving VRPSPDTW. Compared to existing algorithms, MATE is novel in three aspects: initialization procedure, crossover operator and local search procedure. Based upon our comprehensive experimental studies, two main conclusions can be drawn. First of all, MATE is capable of finding better solutions than the state-of-the-art algorithms on a wide range of problem instances. Second, each novel component integrated into MATE has contributed to its overall performance, and the local search procedure is the one with the biggest contribution. It is worth noting that these new components can also be easily applied to other algorithms/problems. For example, the RARI crossover is not specially designed for VRPSPDTW, but is a general-purpose crossover for a wide range of VRP variants as long as its solution can be represented by a set of routes. Moreover, the efficient move evaluation approach is applicable to all traditional move operators (not just the ones used in this paper), and is a plug-and-play acceleration module for existing VRPSPDTW algorithms.

Despite the fact that MATE has shown excellent performance in the computational study, it has some disadvantages. As aforementioned, currently MATE cannot satisfactorily optimize lengthy routes, due to the fact that it limits the maximum length of the subsequences manipulated by its local-search operators to 2. Using a larger maximum length, on the other hand, will cause higher computational costs. An option is to enhance MATE with self-adaptation that dynamically adjusts the maximum length according to the routes being manipulated. Another impossible improvement to MATE is a more refined scheme of conducting local search. It has been well recognized in the literature that not all individuals in the population deserve local search. Hence, mechanisms (e.g., heuristics or learned models) can be integrated into MATE to exclude those “unpromising” individuals from the local search procedure to further reduce the computational costs.

Another interesting direction is to gradually build MATE into a highly parameterized algorithm framework that supports solving more VRP variants, e.g., multi-depot VRP and VRP with electric fleet. In this way, one who needs to solve a specific type of VRP can utilize automation tools [62]–[65] to

search in the configuration space built upon MATE, to obtain an effective algorithm for the specific VRP of interest.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Min, "The multiple vehicle routing problem with simultaneous delivery and pick-up points," *Transportation Research Part A: General*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 377–386, 1989.
- [2] J. Dethloff, "Vehicle routing and reverse logistics: The vehicle routing problem with simultaneous delivery and pick-up," *OR Spectrum*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 79–96, 2001.
- [3] G. Berbeglia, J. Cordeau, and G. Laporte, "Dynamic pickup and delivery problems," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 202, no. 1, pp. 8–15, 2010.
- [4] R. Liu, X. Xie, V. Augusto, and C. Rodriguez, "Heuristic approaches for a special simultaneous pickup and delivery problem with time windows in home health care industry," in *Proceedings of the 14th IFAC Symposium on Information Control Problems in Manufacturing, INCOM'2012*, Bucharest, Romania, May 2012.
- [5] —, "Heuristic algorithms for a vehicle routing problem with simultaneous delivery and pickup and time windows in home health care," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 230, no. 3, pp. 475–486, 2013.
- [6] J. Schuijbroek, R. C. Hampshire, and W. van Hoes, "Inventory rebalancing and vehicle routing in bike sharing systems," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 257, no. 3, pp. 992–1004, 2017.
- [7] S. Mitrović-Minić and G. Laporte, "The pickup and delivery problem with time windows and transshipment," *INFOR: Information Systems and Operational Research*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 217–227, 2006.
- [8] G. Berbeglia, J.-F. Cordeau, I. Gribkovskaia, and G. Laporte, "Static pickup and delivery problems: a classification scheme and survey," *Top*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–31, 2007.
- [9] M. Battarra, J. Cordeau, and M. Iori, "Pickup-and-delivery problems for goods transportation," in *Vehicle Routing*, ser. MOS-SIAM Series on Optimization, P. Toth and D. Vigo, Eds., 2014, vol. 18, pp. 161–191.
- [10] Ç. Koç, G. Laporte, and İ. Tükenmez, "A review of vehicle routing with simultaneous pickup and delivery," *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 122, p. 104987, 2020.
- [11] L. Mingyong and C. Erbao, "An improved differential evolution algorithm for vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickups and deliveries and time windows," *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 188–195, 2010.
- [12] H. Wang and Y. Chen, "A genetic algorithm for the simultaneous delivery and pickup problems with time window," *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 84–95, 2012.
- [13] C. Wang, F. Zhao, D. Mu, and J. W. Sutherland, "Simulated annealing for a vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup-delivery and time windows," in *Part II of Proceedings of the IFIP WG 5.7 International Conference on Advances in Production Management Systems. Sustainable Production and Service Supply Chains, APMS'2013*, State College, PA, Sep 2013, pp. 170–177.
- [14] E. Angelelli and R. Mansini, "The vehicle routing problem with time windows and simultaneous pick-up and delivery," in *Quantitative Approaches to Distribution Logistics and Supply Chain Management*, ser. Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems, A. Klose, M. G. Speranza, and L. N. V. Wassenhove, Eds., 2002, vol. 519, pp. 249–267.
- [15] S. Kassem and M. Chen, "Solving reverse logistics vehicle routing problems with time windows," *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, vol. 68, no. 1–4, pp. 57–68, 2013.
- [16] C. Wang, D. Mu, F. Zhao, and J. W. Sutherland, "A parallel simulated annealing method for the vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup-delivery and time windows," *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, vol. 83, pp. 111–122, 2015.
- [17] W. Huang and T. Zhang, "Vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pick-up and delivery and time-windows based on improved global artificial fish swarm algorithm," *Computer Engineering and Applications*, vol. 52, no. 21, pp. 21–29, 2016.
- [18] X. Pu and K. Wang, "An evolutionary ant colony algorithm for a vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pick-up and delivery and hard time windows," in *Proceedings of the 30th Chinese Control and Decision Conference, CCDC'2018*, Shenyang, China, Jun 2018, pp. 6499–6503.
- [19] Y. Shi, T. Boudouh, and O. Grunder, "An efficient tabu search based procedure for simultaneous delivery and pick-up problem with time window," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 51, no. 11, pp. 241–246, 2018.
- [20] G. Lin, W. Zhu, and M. M. Ali, "An effective hybrid memetic algorithm for the minimum weight dominating set problem," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 892–907, 2016.
- [21] Y. Chen and J. Hao, "Memetic search for the generalized quadratic multiple knapsack problem," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 908–923, 2016.
- [22] Y. Jin and J. Hao, "Solving the latin square completion problem by memetic graph coloring," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 1015–1028, 2019.
- [23] R. J. Preen and J. Smith, "Evolutionary n-level hypergraph partitioning with adaptive coarsening," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 962–971, 2019.
- [24] S. Starke, N. Hendrich, and J. Zhang, "Memetic evolution for generic full-body inverse kinematics in robotics and animation," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 406–420, 2019.
- [25] K. Tang, Y. Mei, and X. Yao, "Memetic algorithm with extended neighborhood search for capacitated arc routing problems," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 1151–1166, 2009.
- [26] P. P. Repoussis, C. D. Tarantilis, and G. Ioannou, "Arc-guided evolutionary algorithm for the vehicle routing problem with time windows," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 624–647, 2009.
- [27] L. Xing, P. Rohlfshagen, Y. Chen, and X. Yao, "An evolutionary approach to the multidepot capacitated arc routing problem," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 356–374, 2010.
- [28] Y. Mei, K. Tang, and X. Yao, "A memetic algorithm for periodic capacitated arc routing problem," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 1654–1667, 2011.
- [29] L. Feng, Y. Ong, M. Lim, and I. W. Tsang, "Memetic search with interdomain learning: A realization between CVRP and CARP," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 644–658, 2015.
- [30] Y. Qi, Z. Hou, H. Li, J. Huang, and X. Li, "A decomposition based memetic algorithm for multi-objective vehicle routing problem with time windows," *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 62, pp. 61–77, 2015.
- [31] Y. Zhang, Y. Mei, K. Tang, and K. Jiang, "Memetic algorithm with route decomposing for periodic capacitated arc routing problem," *Applied Soft Computing*, vol. 52, pp. 1130–1142, 2017.
- [32] M. Dell'Amico, G. Righini, and M. Salani, "A branch-and-price approach to the vehicle routing problem with simultaneous distribution and collection," *Transportation Science*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 235–247, 2006.
- [33] J. Rieck and J. Zimmermann, "Exact solutions to the symmetric and asymmetric vehicle routing problem with simultaneous delivery and pick-up," *Business Research*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 77–92, 2013.
- [34] A. Subramanian, E. Uchoa, A. A. Pessoa, and L. S. Ochi, "Branch-and-cut with lazy separation for the vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup and delivery," *Operations Research Letters*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 338–341, 2011.
- [35] —, "Branch-cut-and-price for the vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup and delivery," *Optimization Letters*, vol. 7, no. 7, pp. 1569–1581, 2013.
- [36] S. Salhi and G. Nagy, "A cluster insertion heuristic for single and multiple depot vehicle routing problems with backhauling," *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, vol. 50, no. 10, pp. 1034–1042, 1999.
- [37] F. A. T. Montané and R. D. Galvão, "Vehicle routing problems with simultaneous pick-up and delivery service," *Opsearch*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 19–33, 2002.
- [38] Y. Gajpal and P. L. Abad, "Saving-based algorithms for vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup and delivery," *Journal of Operational Research Society*, vol. 61, no. 10, pp. 1498–1509, 2010.
- [39] J. Chen and T. Wu, "Vehicle routing problem with simultaneous deliveries and pickups," *Journal of Operational Research Society*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 579–587, 2006.
- [40] N. A. Wassan, A. H. Wassan, and G. Nagy, "A reactive tabu search algorithm for the vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickups and deliveries," *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 368–386, 2008.
- [41] E. E. Zachariadis, C. D. Tarantilis, and C. T. Kiranoudis, "A hybrid metaheuristic algorithm for the vehicle routing problem with simultaneous delivery and pick-up service," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 1070–1081, 2009.
- [42] N. Bianchessi and G. Righini, "Heuristic algorithms for the vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pick-up and delivery," *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 578–594, 2007.

- [43] A. Subramanian, L. M. d. A. Drummond, C. Bentes, L. S. Ochi, and R. Farias, "A parallel heuristic for the vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup and delivery," *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 37, no. 11, pp. 1899–1911, 2010.
- [44] M. Avci and S. Topaloglu, "An adaptive local search algorithm for vehicle routing problem with simultaneous and mixed pickups and deliveries," *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, vol. 83, pp. 15–29, 2015.
- [45] D. Mu, C. Wang, F. Zhao, and J. W. Sutherland, "Solving vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup and delivery using parallel simulated annealing algorithm," *International Journal of Shipping and Transport Logistics*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 81–106, 2016.
- [46] Y. Gajpal and P. Abad, "An ant colony system (acs) for vehicle routing problem with simultaneous delivery and pickup," *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 36, no. 12, pp. 3215–3223, 2009.
- [47] B. Çatay, "A new saving-based ant algorithm for the Vehicle Routing Problem with Simultaneous Pickup and Delivery," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 37, no. 10, pp. 6809–6817, 2010.
- [48] F. Johnson, J. Vega, G. Cabrera, and E. Cabrera, "Ant colony system for a problem in reverse logistic," *Studies in Informatics and Control*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 133–140, 2015.
- [49] M. Sayyah, H. Larki, and M. Yousefikhoshbakht, "Solving the vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup and delivery by an effective ant colony optimization," *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 15–38, 2016.
- [50] J. Ai and V. Kachitvichyanukul, "A particle swarm optimization for the vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup and delivery," *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 1693–1702, 2009.
- [51] F. P. Goksal, I. Karaoglan, and F. Altiparmak, "A hybrid discrete particle swarm optimization for vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup and delivery," *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 39–53, 2013.
- [52] A. S. Tasan and M. Gen, "A genetic algorithm based approach to vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pick-up and deliveries," *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 755–761, 2012.
- [53] T. Vidal, T. G. Crainic, M. Gendreau, and C. Prins, "A unified solution framework for multi-attribute vehicle routing problems," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 234, no. 3, pp. 658–673, 2014.
- [54] M. M. Solomon, "Algorithms for the vehicle routing and scheduling problems with time window constraints," *Operations Research*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 254–265, 1987.
- [55] K. Tang, J. Wang, X. Li, and X. Yao, "A scalable approach to capacitated arc routing problems based on hierarchical decomposition," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 47, no. 11, pp. 3928–3940, 2017.
- [56] G. B. Alvarenga, G. R. Mateus, and G. F. C. de Tomi, "A genetic and set partitioning two-phase approach for the vehicle routing problem with time windows," *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 1561–1584, 2007.
- [57] J.-Y. Potvin and J.-M. Rousseau, "A parallel route building algorithm for the vehicle routing and scheduling problem with time windows," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 331–340, 1993.
- [58] O. Bräysy and M. Gendreau, "Vehicle routing problem with time windows, Part i: Route construction and local search algorithms," *Transportation Science*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 104–118, 2005.
- [59] P. Shaw, "A new local search algorithm providing high quality solutions to vehicle routing problems," Department of Computer Science, University of Strathclyde, Scotland, Tech. Rep., 1997.
- [60] T. Vidal, T. G. Crainic, M. Gendreau, and C. Prins, "A hybrid genetic algorithm with adaptive diversity management for a large class of vehicle routing problems with time-windows," *Computers & Operational Research*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 475–489, 2013.
- [61] K. Helsgaun, "An extension of the Lin-Kernighan-Helsgaun TSP solver for constrained traveling salesman and vehicle routing problems," Technical Report, Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark, Tech. Rep., 2017.
- [62] S. Liu, K. Tang, Y. Lei, and X. Yao, "On performance estimation in automatic algorithm configuration," in *Proceedings of the 34th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI' 2020*, New York, NY, Feb 2020, pp. 2384–2391.
- [63] S. Liu, K. Tang, and X. Yao, "Automatic construction of parallel portfolios via explicit instance grouping," in *Proceedings of the 33rd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI' 2019*, Honolulu, HI, Jan 2019, pp. 1560–1567.
- [64] —, "Generative adversarial construction of parallel portfolios," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 2020, to be published, DOI:10.1109/TCYB.2020.2984546.
- [65] K. Tang, S. Liu, P. Yang, and X. Yao, "Few-shots parameter tuning via co-evolution," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.00501*, 2020.