

Route planning of mobile sensing fleets for repeatable visits

Wen Ji^a Ke Han^{b,*} Qian Ge^a

^a*School of Transportation and Logistics, Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu, China*

^b*School of Economics and Management, Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu, China*

April 23, 2024

Abstract

Vehicle-based mobile sensing is an emerging data collection paradigm that leverages vehicle mobilities to scan a city at low costs. Certain urban sensing scenarios require dedicated vehicles for highly targeted monitoring, such as volatile organic compounds (VOCs, a type of air pollutant) sensing, road surface monitoring, and accident site investigation. A hallmark of these scenarios is that the points of interest (POIs) need to be repeatedly visited by a set of agents, whose routes should provide sufficient sensing coverage with coordinated overlap at certain important POIs. For these applications, this paper presents the *open team orienteering problem with repeatable visits* (OTOP-RV). The adaptive large neighborhood search (ALNS) algorithm is tailored to solve the OTOP-RV considering specific features of the problem. Test results on randomly generated datasets show that: (1) For small cases, the ALNS matches Gurobi in terms of optimality but with shorter computational times; (2) For large cases, the ALNS significantly outperforms the greedy algorithm (by 9.7% to 25.4%), and a heuristic based on sequential orienteering problems (by 6%). Finally, a real-world case study of VOCs sensing is presented, which highlights the unique applicability of the OTOP-RV to such specific sensing tasks, as well as the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms in optimizing the sensing utilities.

Keywords: Drive-by sensing; team orienteering problem; route planning; large neighborhood search; multi-visit vehicle routing problem

1 Introduction

Drive-by sensing has gained significant popularity in smart city applications, such as air quality (Mahajan et al., 2021, Song et al., 2021), traffic state (Guo et al., 2022, Zhu et al., 2014), noise pollution (Alsina-Pagés et al., 2017), heat island phenomena (Fekih et al., 2021), and infrastructure health inspection (Malekjafarian et al., 2022, Wang et al., 2014). Depending on how the fleets are sourced, sensing vehicles can be categorized as crowd-sourced and dedicated vehicles. The former include taxis (O’Keeffe et al., 2019), buses (Dai and Han, 2023, Ji et al., 2023b), trams (Saukh et al., 2012) and logistics vehicles (deSouza et al., 2020), and are suitable for large-scale pervasive sensing at relatively low operating costs (Ji et al., 2023a), including air quality, heat island, and traffic state sensing. The latter refer to vehicles that are

*Corresponding author, e-mail: kehan@swjtu.edu.cn;

used for the sole purpose of sensing, with full controllability but at higher costs. Examples of this category include volatile organic compounds (VOCs, a type of air pollutant) monitoring, road surface condition sensing, and accident on-site investigation (Glock and Meyer, 2020, Li et al., 2020, Messier et al., 2018). Such application scenarios require detailed route planning for a fleet of dedicated vehicles (DVs).

DV route planning for monitoring tasks with resource constraints can be regarded as TOP (Chao et al., 1996b) and its variants proposed in the literature. Glock and Meyer (2020) introduce the concept of mission planning into UAV routing for accident site investigation, and defined a generalized correlated TOP for selecting POIs, taking into account spatial correlations and priorities. Li et al. (2020) consider a Min-Time Max-Coverage issue in sweep coverage where a set of UAVs are dispatched to efficiently patrol the POIs in the given area to achieve maximum coverage in minimum time for forest fire monitoring. Ding et al. (2021) design an actor-centric heterogeneous collaborative reinforcement learning algorithm to schedule different UAVs to maximize sensing coverage, coverage fairness, and cost-effectiveness. Fang et al. (2023) design a neural network heuristic for routing multi-UAVs to monitor scattered landslide-prone areas, with mandatory visits on those in poorly stable states. The above research focuses on the route planning problem when there are insufficient agents (DVs or UAVs) to cover all the POIs, so it is necessary to select a subset of POIs based on specific priorities.

It is essential to note that the OP and its variants proposed in the literature require that each POI is visited at most once. In reality, however, there are a significant number of cases where certain POIs need to be visited multiple times, e.g. to collect sufficient information, such as urban mobile sensing (air quality, noise, heat island, etc.), or to perform tasks that require repetition, such as disaster relief (forest fire containment, emergency food supply). Such needs vary among different POIs, and it is important to allow overlap of the agents’ routes in a way that meets application-specific requirements.

We take, as an example, drive-by sensing of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) performed by a single DV, which needs to consistently monitor a number of factories and collect VOCs measurements. The factories are associated with different sensing importance (weights). The agent needs to execute two routes per day, with a distance budget of 20km per route, which amounts to a total of 10 routes per week (5 workdays). These 10 routes are expected to have a certain overlap since factories with higher sensing weights should be visited more frequently. Figure 1 shows the 10 routes generated by our proposed algorithm (see Section 6.3). No existing variant of TOP is suited for such a situation.

Motivated by this, we propose the *open team orienteering problem with repeatable visits* (OTOP-RV), which aims to determine a set of routes, each within a given time/distance budget and covering a subset of POIs, such that the total sensing utility is maximized. Here, ‘open’ means the agent routes do not need to start or end at a fixed depot. Furthermore, if the POIs are arcs instead of vertices, the OTOP-RV can be applied to the route planning of road sprinkler operation (Zhu et al., 2022) and road surface condition monitoring (Ali and Dyo, 2017), which can be seen as an extension of the classical capacitated arc routing problem (CARP) (Golden and Wong, 1981), with heterogeneous link coverage.

Specific contributions of this work are as follows: We present a mathematical formulation of the OTOP-RV as a nonlinear integer program, and design an adaptive large neighborhood search (ALNS) algorithm to solve large-scale instances. Test results on randomly generated datasets show that: (1) For small cases, the ALNS algorithm can find the same optimal solutions as Gurobi but in shorter time; (2) For large cases, the ALNS significantly outperform a greedy algorithm (by 9.7% to 25.4%) and a heuristic based on sequential OPs (by 6%). Finally, a real-world case study of mobile VOCs sensing on a road network is presented and




Figure 1: Demonstration of the OTOP-RV solution: (a) A road network where the nodes are POIs with varying weights; (b) the 10 routes generated to visit these POIs.

formulated as OTOP-RV. Such a case study highlights the unique applicability of OTOP-RV to certain real-world scenarios, as well as the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms in achieving a sensible solution.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. Section 3 articulates the OTOP-RV with a mathematical formulation. Sections 4 present the ALNS solution approach to the OTOP-RV. A discussion on model extensions is presented in Section 5. Section 6 presents extensive numerical and application studies. Finally, Section 7 presents some concluding remarks.

2 Related work

Work related to this study is divided into three parts: DV-based drive-by sensing, team orienteering problem, and multi-visit vehicle routing problem.

2.1 DV-based drive-by sensing

DVs have been used in many drive-by sensing scenarios due to their high controllability and flexibility. The data requirements of drive-by sensing depend on the sensing object and the underlying application. Based on the different sensing requirements, we can categorize DV-based drive-by sensing related research into three groups. The first type, which is typically appropriate for scenarios with low sensing frequency requirements, such as built environment monitoring (Li and Long, 2024, Li et al., 2023), attempts to achieve complete coverage of the monitored area at the lowest cost. These problems are known as the Traveling Salesman Problem (Bektas, 2006) or the Chinese postman problem (Ahr and Reinelt, 2006). The second type, which is typically appropriate for scenarios with high response speed, such as search and rescue (Yu et al., 2022), seeks to maximize the total monitoring reward by selecting a subset of locations to visit with limited monitoring resources. These problems are known as

the Orienteering Problem (Golden et al., 1987, Gunawan et al., 2014) or the Prize-Collecting Vehicle Routing Problem (Long et al., 2019, Riahi et al., 2021). The third type is typically appropriate for scenarios with higher sensing frequency requirements, therefore, multiple visits to locations within a period can lead to an increase in sensing reward. The applications include VOC (Volatile Organic Compounds) sensing, road surface condition monitoring, or accident site investigation. However, there is currently no research on vehicle route planning for this type of problem.

This study aims to plan the inspection routes of the DV fleet for the third type of problem, to achieve a balance between monitoring coverage and monitoring frequency. This is a complex problem that requires careful consideration of both the breadth and depth of data collection, ensuring that critical locations are not only covered but also monitored frequently enough to capture relevant changes.

2.2 Team orienteering problem

The orienteering problem (OP) is a routing problem, which determines a subset of nodes (or Points of Interest, POIs) to visit, and the order in which they are visited, so that the total collected profits are maximized within a given time or distance budget (Chao et al., 1996a, Golden et al., 1987). The team orienteering problem (TOP) is a natural extension of the OP by generating multiple routes (Chao et al., 1996b, Dang et al., 2013, Ke et al., 2015). Typical application scenarios of the TOP include athlete recruiting (Chao et al., 1996b), home fuel delivery (Golden et al., 1984), search and rescue operations (Yu et al., 2022) and tourist trip planning (Vansteenwegen and Van Oudheusden, 2007).

Several variants of the TOP have been proposed and studied in the literature, including the (team) orienteering problem with time window, in which each POI can only be visited within a given time window (Duque et al., 2015, Gambardella et al., 2012, Lin and Yu, 2012); the time-dependent orienteering problem, in which the traveling time between two POIs is time-dependent (Gunawan et al., 2014, Verbeeck et al., 2014); the stochastic orienteering problem, in which the traveling time and the reward at each POI have stochastic attributes (Ilhan et al., 2008, Zhang et al., 2014); the (team) orienteering problem with variable profits, in which the profit depend on the arrival time or the service time at each POI (Tang et al., 2007, Yu et al., 2022, 2019); and the team orienteering problem with mandatory visits, in which some high priority POIs require mandatory visit (Fang et al., 2023, Palomo-Martínez et al., 2017). For a more comprehensive review of the OP, its variants, and their applications, we refer the reader to Vansteenwegen et al. (2011) and Gunawan et al. (2016).

In this study, we introduce a new variant of the team orienteering problem, in which each POI may be visited by multiple routes to accumulate rewards, named an open team orienteering problem with repeatable visits.

2.3 Multi-visit vehicle routing problem

Some vehicle routing problems are inspired by real-world applications and involve multiple visits. Hanafi et al. (2020) propose a new variant of TOP, called multi-visit TOP with precedence constraints, with an application scenario of on-site assembly of kitchen furniture and appliances. In this problem, each customer has a set of tasks to be performed by a heterogeneous set of technicians according to a predefined order. When a customer is selected, all the tasks have to be performed by possibly different technicians, so the customer may be visited more than once by possibly different technicians. To solve the problem, the authors proposed a compact MILP formulation and a kernel search heuristic algorithm. Pereira et al.

(2020) study a new workforce scheduling and routing problem where the requested services consist of tasks to be performed over one or more days by teams of workers with different skills. Each customer can be visited more than once, as long as precedence constraints are not violated. To solve the problem, the authors proposed a MILP formulation and an ant colony metaheuristic algorithm. Atefi et al. (2023) introduces a vehicle routing problem for a specific application in the monitoring of a water distribution network (WDN). In this problem, multiple technicians must visit a sequence of nodes in the WDN and perform a series of tests to check the quality of water. Some special nodes (i.e., wells) require technicians to first collect a key from a key center and the key must then be returned to the same key center after the test has been performed, thus introducing multiple visits in the routes. To solve the problem, the authors proposed a MILP formulation and an iterated local search heuristic algorithm. In addition, the pickup-and-delivery problem with split loads and transshipments also allows multiple visits to the same locations (Bruck and Iori, 2017, Wolfinger, 2021, Wolfinger and Salazar-González, 2021). This is common when split deliveries are allowed, or multiple pickup and delivery operations can be performed at a single location.

In summary, the studies mentioned above all consider multi-visit as a necessary constraint for vehicle routing problems, and the number of visits to different locations has no impact on the rewards. In contrast, this study proposes a new multi-visit vehicle routing problem where the visit reward of each location is closely related to the number of visits.

3 Problem Statement and Model Formulation

3.1 Problem description

We consider a target monitoring area with a given set of points of interest (POIs), to be visited by a set of agents¹. To capture the unique characteristic of our problem, which is the repeatable visit, we define a sensing reward function for each POI i , which depends on the number of distinct agents that have visited it, denoted $q_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ². Specifically, such a reward function, $\phi(q_i)$, needs to satisfy the following conditions:

1. $\phi(0)=0$, and $\phi(\cdot)$ is monotonically increasing;
2. The marginal gain of the reward is decreasing:

$$\phi(q_i + 1) - \phi(q_i) > \phi(q_j + 1) - \phi(q_j) \quad \forall 0 \leq q_i < q_j$$

The first condition is straightforward. The second condition implies, as the visits accumulate, the need to visit the POI one more time decreases. It is necessary to avoid over-concentration of visits at a few high-value POIs. The following function, which satisfies these conditions, will be used in this paper.

$$\phi(q_i) = (q_i)^\beta \quad \beta \in (0, 1) \tag{3.1}$$

Finally, the objective of the OTOP-RV is to maximize the following weighted sum:

$$\Phi = \sum_{i \in I} w_i \phi(q_i) = \sum_{i \in I} w_i (q_i)^\beta \tag{3.2}$$

¹In the following analyses of the orienteering problem and its variants, we use the term agents in replacement of vehicles or vehicle trips.

²Visits performed by the same agent can be counted at most once. This stipulation eliminates inefficient routes that intersect themselves.

where the parameter w_i is the weight of POI i . Intuitively, when $\beta \rightarrow 1$, the agents tend to visit high-weighting POIs more frequently; as $\beta \rightarrow 0$, their visits are more evenly distributed among all POIs. The parameters w_i 's and β should be jointly determined based on the underlying application.

The OTOP-RV is articulated as follows.

Definition 3.1. *The Open Team Orienteering Problem with Repeatable Visits (OTOP-RV) Given a set of POIs $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$, each with a sensing weight w_i and a reward function $\phi(q_i) = (q_i)^\beta$, and a total of n_K agents. The OTOP-RV needs to determine n_K routes, each within a fixed time or distance budget, and do not need to start and end at the same depot. The goal is to maximize the total reward collected from visiting these POIs $\sum_{i \in I} w_i (q_i)^\beta$.*

The open team orienteering problem allows each route to start and end at any nodes in the network, which is suitable for sensing or surveillance tasks, unlike conventional logistics scenarios. The time or distance budget could be related to the agent's travel limit, or the working hours of operating personnel.

3.2 Mathematical model

Table 1 lists some key notations used in the model.

Table 1: Notations and symbols

Sets	
I	Set of POIs;
K	Set of agents;
N	Set of vertices in the graph G ;
A	Set of arcs on the graph G ;
Parameters and constants	
n_K	Number of agents;
n	Number of POIs;
t_{ij}	Travel time from vertex i to vertex j ;
w_i	The weight of POI i ;
Δ	The length of time or distance budget.
β	The parameter in the reward function (3.1) that ensures diminishing marginal gain.
Auxiliary variables	
$y_{i,k}$	Binary variable that equals 1 if POI i is visited by agent k ;
$a_{i,k}$	The visiting time of POI i by agent k ;
q_i	The total number of times the POI i is covered by the agents;
Decision variables	
$x_{i,j,k}$	Binary variable that equals 1 if agent k travels directly from vertex i to vertex j .

We consider a network represented as an undirected graph $G = (N, A)$, where N is the set of vertices, and A is the set of arcs. Although it is not necessary to ensure that the starting and ending points of each route are the same depot in this study, we still need to introduce virtual starting depot 0 and ending depot $n + 1$ to ensure the flow balance and consistency constraints. The arc set consists of two parts: those connecting any pair of POIs, as well as those connecting the virtual starting/ending depots to the POIs: $A = \{(0, i) | i \in I\} \cup \{(i, j) | i, j \in I; t_{ij} \neq \inf\} \cup \{(j, n + 1) | j \in I\}$. The full OTOP-RV model is formulated as:

$$\max_{s=\{x_{i,j,k}:i,j \in I, k \in K\}} \sum_{i \in I} w_i q_i^\beta \quad (3.3)$$

$$\sum_{i \in I} x_{0,i,k} = 1 \quad \forall k \in K \quad (3.4)$$

$$\sum_{i \in I} x_{i,n+1,k} = 1 \quad \forall k \in K \quad (3.5)$$

$$\sum_{(i,l) \in A} x_{i,l,k} = \sum_{(l,j) \in A} x_{l,j,k} \quad \forall l \in I, \forall k \in K \quad (3.6)$$

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in A} x_{i,j,k} = y_{i,k} \quad \forall i \in I, \forall k \in K \quad (3.7)$$

$$q_i = \sum_{k \in K} y_{i,k} \quad \forall i \in I \quad (3.8)$$

$$a_{i,k} + t_{ij} - a_{j,k} \leq M(1 - x_{i,j,k}) \quad \forall i, j \in N, k \in K \quad (3.9)$$

$$a_{n+1} \leq \Delta \quad (3.10)$$

$$x_{i,j,k} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i, j \in N, \forall k \in K \quad (3.11)$$

$$y_{i,k} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in I, \forall k \in K \quad (3.12)$$

$$a_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}_+ \quad \forall i \in I, \forall k \in K \quad (3.13)$$

The objective function (3.3) maximizes the weighted rewards within time or distance budget Δ . Constraints (3.4) and (3.5) ensure that each agent departs from the virtual starting depot and returns to the virtual ending depot, respectively. Constraint (3.6) ensures flow conservation for each agent. Constraint (3.7) couples variables $x_{i,j,k}$ with indicator variable $y_{i,k}$. Constraint (3.8) calculates the total number of times the POI i is visited by the agents. Constraint (3.9) acts as sub tour elimination constraint (Miller et al., 1960) and ensure that a route cannot visit the same POI multiple times. Constraint (3.10) ensures that the time or distance budget is not exceeded.

4 ALNS applied to the OTOP-RV

This section describes a solution framework based on adaptive large neighborhood search (ALNS) for the OTOP-RV. As summarized in Windras Mara et al. (2022), the ALNS has the following important parts: (1) initial solution s_0 ; (2) a set of destroy operators $\Omega^- = \{\Omega_1^-, \dots, \Omega_{|\Omega^-|}^-\}$; (3) a set of repair operators $\Omega^+ = \{\Omega_1^+, \dots, \Omega_{|\Omega^+|}^+\}$; (4) adaptive mechanism; (5) acceptance criterion and (6) termination criterion. In each iteration of ALNS, a single destroy and a single repair operator are selected according to the **adaptive mechanism**. The destroy operator is first implemented to remove parts of a feasible solution s and the resulting solution is stored in s' . The repair operator then re-inserts parts of elements to s' so that s' becomes a complete solution. Let $f(s), f(s'), f(s^*)$ be the objective of the current solution, the newly obtained solution, and the best-known solution, respectively. At each iteration, an **acceptance criterion** is used to determine whether the newly obtained solution s' is accepted as the current solution s . When the **termination criterion** is met, the algorithm outputs the optimal solution s^* . The framework of ALNS is shown in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 (The framework of ALNS)

Input: An initial solution s_0 (Section 4.1), set of destroy operators Ω^- , set of repair operators Ω^+ .

Output: Best-known solution s^* .

```
1: Initialize  $s^* \leftarrow s_0, s' \leftarrow s_0$ 
2: while Termination Criterion (Section 4.6) not met do
3:   Select a destroy operator (Section 4.2) and a repair operator (Section 4.3) from  $\Omega^-$  and
    $\Omega^+$  according to the adaptive mechanism in Section 4.4.
4:    $s' \leftarrow \text{repair}(\text{destroy}(s))$ 
5:   if  $s'$  is better than  $s^*$  then
6:      $s^* \leftarrow s'$ 
7:      $s \leftarrow s'$ 
8:   end if
9:   if  $\text{accept}(s')$  (Section 4.5) then
10:     $s \leftarrow s'$ 
11:   end if
12:   Update the parameters of the adaptive mechanism
13: end while
```

The rest of this section instantiates each step of the ALNS for solving the OTOP-RV.

4.1 Initial Solution

We generate an initial solution for the OTOP-RV via a straightforward heuristic, by sequentially solving single-agent open orienteering problems, once for each agent. This requires the following definition.

Definition 4.1. (Marginal gain) Given a POI $i \in I$ and the number of visits q_i already made by the routes, the marginal gain refers to the additional reward obtained from one more visit, namely $\eta_i = w_i((q_i + 1)^\beta - (q_i)^\beta)$.

The idea is to sequentially generate a route for each agent by maximizing the marginal gain, which is defined by all previously generated routes. The pseudo-code for the generation of the initial solution is shown in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 (Generation of initial solution)

Input: Number of agents n_K , the length of time or distance budget Δ , marginal gains $\{\eta_i, i \in I\}$

Output: Initial routing solutions R_0

```
1: for  $v = 1, \dots, n_K$  do
2:   Generate a new route by solving the Model (4.14)-(4.23), which can maximize the
   marginal gain.
3:   Update the marginal gain of each POI based on the new route.
4: end for
```

The single-agent routing problem can be described as a classic orienteering problem. Let $x_{i,j}$ be a binary variable taking the value 1 if the new route directly connects vertex i to vertex j , y_i be a binary variable taking the value 1 if POI i is visited by the new route. Let z_i be the

order in which POI i is visited in the new route, and we set $z_0 = 0$ and $z_{n+1} = n + 1$ (where 0 and $n + 1$ are deemed the virtual starting and ending depots).

$$\max_{x_{i,j}} \sum_{i \in I} \eta_i y_i \quad (4.14)$$

$$\sum_{i \in I} x_{0,i} = 1 \quad (4.15)$$

$$\sum_{i \in I} x_{i,n+1} = 1 \quad (4.16)$$

$$\sum_{(i,l) \in A} x_{i,l} = \sum_{(l,j) \in A} x_{l,j} \quad \forall l \in I \quad (4.17)$$

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in A} x_{i,j} = y_i \quad \forall i \in I \quad (4.18)$$

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in A} t_{ij} x_{i,j} \leq \Delta \quad (4.19)$$

$$z_i - z_j + 1 \leq n(1 - x_{i,j}) \quad \forall (i,j) \in A \quad (4.20)$$

$$1 \leq z_i \leq n \quad \forall i \in I \quad (4.21)$$

$$x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall (i,j) \in A \quad (4.22)$$

$$y_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in I \quad (4.23)$$

The objective function (4.14) maximizes the total marginal gain collected by the new route. Constraints (4.15) and (4.15) ensure that the route starts from node 0 and ends with node $n + 1$ (i.e. the depots). Constraints (4.17) expresses flow conservation. Constraints (4.18) relates variables $x_{i,j}$ to the indicator variable y_i . Constraint (4.19) ensures that the time or distance budget is not exceeded. Constraints (4.20) and (4.21) act as sub-tour elimination constraints (Miller et al., 1960).

We note that the Model (4.14)-(4.23) is an orienteering problem, which already has mature solutions. In this study, we solve this model by the heuristic algorithm proposed by Tsiligirides (1984).

4.2 Destroy Operators

This section describes four removal heuristics: random removal, worst removal, related removal, and route removal. All four heuristics take the current solution s as input. The output of the heuristic is a temporary solution s'_{temp} after applying the destroy operator, which removes some points from the current solution s .

4.2.1 Random removal

In the random removal heuristic, we randomly remove $m\%$ of the points (any decimals will be rounded to the nearest integer) from the route of each agent using a uniform probability distribution.

4.2.2 Worst removal

As proposed in Ropke and Pisinger (2006), the worst removal heuristic removes points to obtain the most savings. For the OTOP-RV, we need to consider the trade-off between

collecting rewards and the time/distance required. Specifically, we aim to remove the POIs that have limited impact on the total reward, while resulting in the most time/distance savings.

Let \mathcal{V} be the set of visited POIs in the current solution s . Given a POI $i \in \mathcal{V}$, we use $f(s)$ to represent the reward of the current solution s , and $T(s)$ to represent the total time/distance used by all agents in the current solution s . Next, we define the reward lost by removing i from the current solution s as $r(i, s) = f(s) - f_{-i}(s)$, and the time/distance saved as $t(i, s) = T(s) - T_{-i}(s)$. We define the value of each POI in the current solution s as $value(i, s)$:

$$value(i, s) = \frac{r(i, s)}{t(i, s)} \quad (4.24)$$

Building on such a notion, this operator iteratively removes POIs with relatively low values. Following [Ropke and Pisinger \(2006\)](#), we introduce random factors to avoid situations where the same points are removed over and over again. In addition, randomization is applied in a way that favors the selection of POIs with lower values. The pseudo-code for the worst removal heuristic is shown in [Algorithm 3](#).

Algorithm 3 (Worst removal)

Input: A current solution s , proportion $m\%$ of point removal, parameter $p > 0$

Output: Temporary solution s'_{temp} after destroy operator

- 1: Calculate the number of POIs to be removed based on $m\%$, denoted as n_p ;
 - 2: **for** $n = 1, \dots, n_p$ **do**
 - 3: List of all visited POIs in the current solution s , denoted as \mathcal{V} ;
 - 4: \mathcal{V}_{new} = Sorted list of \mathcal{V} in an increasing order of $value(i, s)$, $i \in \mathcal{V}$;
 - 5: Draw a random number y from the uniform distribution $U(0, 1)$;
 - 6: Let x be the $\lfloor y^p |\mathcal{V}| \rfloor$ -th element in the ordered set \mathcal{V}_{new} ($\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the floor operator);
 - 7: Remove point x from the current solution s .
 - 8: **end for**
-

4.2.3 Related removal

The purpose of the related removal heuristic is to remove a set of points that, in some way, are closely related and hence easy to interchange among different routes during repairs ([Pisinger and Ropke, 2007](#)). For the OTOP-RV, we remove some adjacent POIs, with the understanding that points closer to each other are more likely to be interchanged. Specifically, we first randomly select a POI $o \in I$ as the center point, and then remove the $m\%$ points closest to o in the current solution s .

4.2.4 Route removal

This operator is commonly used in the vehicle routing problem ([Demir et al., 2012](#)). For the OTOP-RV, the operator randomly removes $\lceil n_K \times m\% \rceil$ of the routes from the solution s , where n_K is the number of routes ($\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is the rounding operator).

4.3 Repair Operators

This section describes some insertion heuristics: greedy insertion and (k)-regret insertion. Insertion heuristics are typically divided into two categories: sequential and parallel. The difference between the two is that the former builds one route at a time while the latter

constructs several routes simultaneously (Potvin and Rousseau, 1993). The insertion heuristics adopted in this paper are all parallel, which will be used to repair the temporary solution s'_{temp} following the destroy operator. The output of the insertion heuristic is a new feasible solution s' .

4.3.1 Greedy insertion

Definition 4.2. (Minimum-cost position) Given a POI $i \in I$ and a route R_k , there are $|R_k| + 1$ possible insertion positions for this POI. Let $\Delta t_{ik}(m)$ be the extra time/distance incurred by inserting i into the m -th position of R_k . We define the minimum-cost position to be $m_{ik}^* = \arg \min_{m=\{1, \dots, |R_k|+1\}} \Delta t_{ik}(m)$ and the minimum cost as $\Delta t_{ik}(m_{ik}^*)$.

Let $\Delta r_{i,k}$ be the increased reward after inserting point i into the route of agent k at the minimum-cost position. If the POI i cannot insert to the route of agent k , we set $\Delta r_{i,k} = 0$

Definition 4.3. Similar to the reward efficiency defined in (7), the reward efficiency of inserting point i is defined as the extra reward collected per unit time/distance required to accommodate such insertion:

$$\Psi_{i,k} \doteq \frac{\Delta r_{i,k}}{\Delta t_{ik}(m_{ik}^*)}$$

Then, we define the maximum insertion value of i to be

$$v(i) \doteq \max_{k \in K} \Psi_{i,k} \quad (4.25)$$

The greedy insertion operator iteratively selects and inserts a candidate POI i that has the maximum insertion value $v(i)$. This process continues until no more POIs can be inserted into any route.

4.3.2 (k)-Regret insertion

The regret heuristic tries to improve upon the greedy heuristic by incorporating look-ahead information when selecting the point for insertion (Ropke and Pisinger, 2006). In prose, the algorithm performs the insertion that will be most regretted if it is not done now. Recalling the notions from Section 4.3.1:

$$\Delta v_{ik}(m) = \frac{\Delta r_{i,k}}{\Delta t_{ik}(m)} \quad \forall i \in I, \quad k \in K, \quad m = \{1, \dots, |R_k| + 1\} \quad (4.26)$$

We sort the list $\{\Delta v_{ik}(m) : i \in I, k \in K, 1 \leq m \leq |R_k| + 1\}$ in descending order to obtain $\{\Delta v_{ik}^{(n)}(m) : i \in I, k \in K, 1 \leq m \leq |R_k| + 1\}$ where n indexes the ordered elements in the list. Then, the k -regret heuristic chooses to insert the POI that maximizes c_k^* in each step.

$$c_k^* = \sum_{j=1}^k (\Delta v_{ik}^j(m) - \Delta v_{ik}^1(m)) \quad (4.27)$$

where c_k^* is the k -regret value. This process continues until no POI can be inserted into any route.

4.4 Adaptive Mechanism

We defined, in Section 4.2, four destroy operators (random, worst, related, and route removal), and in Section 4.3 a class of repair operators (greedy insertion, k -regret). This section explains a strategy to adaptively select the destroy and repair operators at each iteration of ALNS.

We assign weights to different operators and implement the classical roulette wheel mechanism (Ropke and Pisinger, 2006). If we have L operations with weights μ_l , $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$, we select operator l with probability p_l given as:

$$p_l = \frac{\mu_l}{\sum_{l=1}^L \mu_l} \quad (4.28)$$

Initially, we set the same weight for each operator. Then, we continuously update the weight by keeping track of a score for each operator, which measures how well the heuristic has been performing recently. Operators with higher scores have a higher probability of being selected during the iteration. The entire search is divided into several segments, indexed by h . A segment contains a few iterations of the ALNS, hereafter defined to be δ iterations. The score of all operators is set to zero at the start of each segment. The scores of the operators are updated according to the following rules:

- (a) if the score of the new solution is better than the best-known solution, the operator score increases by σ_1 ;
- (b) if the score of the new solution is worse than the best-known solution but better than the current solution, the operator score increases by σ_2 ;
- (c) if the score of the new solution is worse than the current solution, but is accepted, the operator score increases by σ_3 ;
- (d) if the new solution is not accepted, the operator score increases by σ_4 .

It is reasonable to set $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \sigma_3 > \sigma_4$. At the end of each segment, we calculate new weights using the recorded scores. Let $\mu_{l,h}$ be the weight of operator l used in segment h , and the probability $p_{l,h}$ is calculated according to (4.28). At the end of each segment h we update the weight for operator l to be used in segment $h + 1$ as follows:

$$\mu_{l,h+1} = \mu_{l,h}(1 - \varepsilon) + \varepsilon \frac{\pi_{l,h}}{\theta_{l,h}} \quad (4.29)$$

where $\pi_{l,h}$ is the score of operator l obtained during the last segment and $\theta_{l,h}$ is the number of times operator l was used during the last segment. The reaction factor ε controls how quickly the weight adjustment algorithm reacts to changes in the effectiveness of the operators.

4.5 Acceptance Criterion

A simulated annealing framework is used to decide whether to accept the newly obtained solution s' given the current solution s . If the objective value $f(s') > f(s)$, then s' is accepted as the current solution. Otherwise, the probability of s' being accepted is $P(s \leftarrow s')$.

$$P(s \leftarrow s') = \exp \left\{ \frac{f(s') - f(s)}{T} \right\} \quad (4.30)$$

where $T > 0$ is the temperature, which begins with T_{\max} and decreases at every iteration according to $T = T \cdot c$, where $c \in (0, 1)$ is the cooling rate. When T is below t_{\min} , take reheating measures and set T to T_{\max} .

4.6 Termination Criterion

The algorithm stops after (1) a maximum number of iterations N_1^{\max} ; or (2) a certain number of non-improving iterations N_2^{\max} .

5 Discussion and extension

This section provides some discussion on the OTOP-RV when modeling various real-world problems.

5.1 Completeness of graphs

The OTOP-RV proposed in this paper takes as input the POI set I , their weights in the objective $\{w_i : i \in I\}$, and the adjacency matrix. In practice, the adjacency matrix is replaced by the travel time (or distance) matrix $\{t_{ij} : i, j \in I\}$, where t_{ij} denotes the travel time (or distance) from vertex i to j .

- In application scenarios like UAV routing, the spatial domain of the problem is a subset of a Euclidean space, in which any two vertices are directly connected. In this case, any element of the adjacency matrix t_{ij} is a finite number. In other words, all the POIs can be seen as vertices in a complete graph.
- In application scenarios like car routing, the spatial domain is a road network represented as a directed graph $G(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A})$, where \mathcal{V} is the set of vertices and \mathcal{A} is the set of arcs, we set $t_{ij} = \infty$ whenever the arc $(i, j) \notin \mathcal{A}$. In other words, road networks can be seen as incomplete graphs.

5.2 Arcs as POIs

In some applications based on road networks, the rewards are collected on arcs instead of nodes. Examples include road surface sprinkling (aiming at reducing fugitive dust), or road roughness monitoring (for regular maintenance and repair). Such tasks need to be repeatedly performed, and the weights of these arcs are heterogeneous. These problems fall within the purview of OTOP-RV because one can simply augment the original network with artificial nodes (with rewards assigned) in the middle of relevant arcs. For example, if arc $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A}$ carries rewards, we insert a node k to form two new arcs (i, k) and (k, j) , and set $t_{ik} = t_{kj} = \frac{1}{2}t_{ij}$. Then, the weight and reward of arc (i, j) in the original network are transferred to node k in the augmented network. Such a simple technique converts arc-based OTOP-RV to node-based OTOP-RV, which can be solved with the proposed algorithms.

6 Computational studies

All the computational performances reported below are based on a Microsoft Windows 10 platform with Intel Core i9 - 3.60GHz and 16 GB RAM, using Python 3.8 and Gurobi 9.1.2.

6.1 Instances sets and parameter settings

As the proposed OTOP-RV is a new variant of TOP, no existing benchmark instances are available to evaluate the solution’s performance. Therefore, we randomly generate 20 instances containing 8, 50, 100, and 200 POIs, as shown in Figure 2. Each set of problems consists of 5 instances. All the results reported below for each case are averaged over 5 instances. Note that in this case, the travel times t_{ij} are directly calculated as the Euclidean distance between two points. In other words, those POIs depicted in Figure 2 are vertices in complete graphs.




Figure 2: Four test datasets with randomly generated locations and weights of POIs.

The performance of the ALNS algorithm is sensitive to the settings of parameters. In our tests, the range and interval of each parameter are determined by extensive tests. In each test, we draw an initial value from the range of each parameter and tune it gradually. The final settings of the parameters are as follows. The destroy operators are parameterized by m , we set $m = 0.4$. The insertion heuristics in the repair operators are parameter-free. The weight adjustment algorithm is parameterized by $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \sigma_4$ and learning rate ε . We set $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \sigma_4, \varepsilon) = (20, 10, 3, 0, 0.7)$. To manage the acceptance criterion we use three parameters, T_{\max}, t_{\min} and c . The start temperature T_{\max} is determined based on the value of the initial solution $f(s_0)$ and the formula is $T_{\max} = 0.05 \times \frac{f(s_0)}{\ln(2)}$, which allows for a 50% probability that

non-improving solutions generated at the initial solution temperature is accepted. In addition, we set $t_{\min} = 0.1$ and $c = 0.95$. We also need to determine N_1^{\max} and N_2^{\max} that govern algorithm termination. We set N_1^{\max} to a large number 2000, and mainly rely on N_2^{\max} to terminate the algorithm. The value of parameter N_2^{\max} set to 200.

6.2 Algorithm performance

Because we are the first to explore the OTOP-RV, there are no existing solution approaches to benchmark with. so we use the following three benchmarks for comparison.

- (1) **Gurobi solver:** For small cases, we prove the effectiveness of the ALNS algorithm by comparing it with- the exact solution of the solver.
- (2) **Greedy algorithm:** For large cases, we compare the ALNS algorithm with a greedy algorithm. The idea is to sequentially select the next POI that maximizes the reward efficiency among all feasible POIs. For a detailed description of this method, see the Appendix, and the pseudo-code for the greedy algorithm is shown in Algorithm 4.
- (3) **Sequential OP:** This method aims to sequentially generate a route for each agent by maximizing the marginal gain, which is defined by all the previously generated routes. The pseudo-code is shown in Algorithm 2.

We evaluated the effectiveness of the ALNS algorithm through testing on Case 1 (8 POIs) as shown in Figure 2. The test results under different parameters are shown in Table 2. As the n_K and Δ increases, the computational time of Gurobi grows faster than that of ALNS. For small cases, the ALNS algorithm can find the same optimal solutions as Gurobi but in a shorter time.

Table 2: Computational results comparing the Gurobi and ALNS in a small case. The computational time limit of Gurobi is set to 7200s.

n_K	Δ	Gurobi			ALNS		
		obj	gap	CPU(s)	obj	CPU(s)	Increase
2	20	13.5	0.0%	21	13.5	1.0	0.0%
2	30	16.0	0.0%	75	16.0	1.2	0.0%
2	40	17.9	0.0%	220	17.9	2.0	0.0%
3	20	17.2	0.0%	477	17.2	2.0	0.0%
3	30	20.8	0.7%	3004	20.5	3.2	-1.4%
3	40	22.8	1.1%	6177	22.8	4.4	0.0%
4	20	20.1	23.4%	7200	20.1	5	0.0%
4	30	23.7	18.9%	7200	23.8	5.4	0.4%
4	40	26.2	7.7%	7200	26.2	6.8	0.0%

We compare the objective value of the greedy algorithm, sequential OP, and ALNS on the three datasets (Case 2, 3, 4) as shown in Figure 2. The test results under different n_K (number of routes) are shown in Figure 3 and Table 3. It is shown that:

- (1) The ALNS significantly outperforms the greedy algorithm in objective value, with improvements ranging from 9.7% to 25.4%;

- (2) The ALNS can further improve the solution of sequential OP by neighborhood search, with improvements ranging about 6%;
- (3) Such improvements are less pronounced for larger n_K (number of routes), because of (i) the diminishing marginal gain by design; and (ii) the relatively high saturation of agent routes.




Figure 3: Objective values in three test cases with different values of n_K .

Table 3: Comparison of objective values among greedy algorithm, sequential OP and ALNS. The ‘Increase’ column represents improvements over the greedy algorithm.

		Comparison of objective values				
		n_K	Greedy Obj.	Sequential OP Obj.	Increase	ALNS Obj.
Case 2 50 POIs $\Delta = 30$	4	80.7	88.4	9.6%	93.5	15.9%
	6	104.0	113.2	8.9%	117.4	12.9%
	8	120.9	132.5	9.5%	136.5	12.9%
	10	138.7	149.2	7.6%	153.6	10.7%
	12	153.5	164.6	7.3%	168.3	9.7%
Case 3 100 POIs $\Delta = 30$	4	118.2	139.0	17.6%	148.2	25.4%
	6	169.0	182.7	8.1%	196.2	16.1%
	8	201.7	217.7	7.9%	229.9	14.0%
	10	232.2	248.0	6.8%	261.6	12.7%
	12	257.3	274.6	6.7%	287.7	11.8%
Case 4 200 POIs $\Delta = 30$	4	102.2	124.8	22.1%	128.2	25.4%
	6	146.6	174.7	19.2%	183.8	25.4%
	8	192.6	221.0	14.7%	231.0	20.0%
	10	225.8	261.0	15.6%	276.0	22.2%
	12	264.5	297.3	12.4%	312.8	18.3%

Figure 4 provides a visualization of the OTOP-RV solution for Case 2, with four routes and different distance budget Δ . It can be seen that, even for a small-scale problem, the solution displays some complexity, especially for larger Δ where the routes have considerable overlap. Moreover, such overlap took place at high-value nodes, which reflects the effectiveness of our proposed algorithms. Such solutions cannot be obtained via conventional TOPs or their variants.




Figure 4: Solution visualization of Case 2 (50 POIs) with four routes. Δ is the distance budget for each route. Nodes visited more than once are labeled with the number of visits.

6.3 Real-world case study

The OTOP-RV is demonstrated in a real-world case of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) monitoring in the Longquanyi District, Chengdu, China. VOCs include a wide variety of chemicals, some of which have adverse health effects and act as catalysts of processes that form $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ and O_3 (Mishra et al., 2023, Yang et al., 2020). VOCs are emitted from the manufacturing activities of 141 factories in Longquanyi, and a single VOCs sensing vehicle, operated by a local environmental protection agency, needs to perform regular monitoring tasks of the area by moving along designated routes.

The 141 factories are categorized into four classes: A, B, C, and D, where class A has the lowest sensing priority and D has the highest; see Figure 5(a). Based on the locations of these factories and their relative positions to the road network, their sensing priorities are transformed into the weights of the network nodes, which are treated as the POIs in our model; see Figure 5(b).

To assess the validity of the solution in a mobile sensing context, we assume that the sensing vehicle needs to perform two routes per day, each within a distance budget of 20 km^3 . Therefore, 10 routes need to be generated for a week’s (5 working days) monitoring task. This is formulated as an OTOP-RV and solved by the ALNS. Figure 5(c) shows the 10 routes generated by the algorithm. In this solution, 7 routes are located in the southern part of the area where the majority of the POIs are located. Moreover, Table 4 shows that many of the high-value POIs (with higher weights) are covered by multiple routes, which means those factories with higher sensing priority are more frequently visited, which is a desired feature of the routing plan.

Table 4: Number of POIs meeting different coverage times

Weight	Number of POIs					Sum
	Covered by 4 routes	Covered by 3 routes	Covered by 2 routes	Covered by 1 route	Not covered	
3	6	18	17	19	2	62
2	13	20	16	13	4	66
1	0	1	4	4	3	12
0	0	0	2	4	76	82

³These are in line with real-world operations in Longquanyi




Figure 5: (a): Road network and distribution of factories of Longquanyi District, Chengdu. (b): The sensing weights of all the road network nodes. (c) Visualization of the 10 routes generated by the ALNS algorithm.

7 Conclusion

This paper proposes an extension of the team orienteering problem (TOP), named OTOP-RV, by allowing a POI to be visited multiple times to accumulate rewards. Such an extension is important because many real-world applications such as mobile sensing and disaster relief require that the POIs are repeatable visited, and such needs are heterogeneous. To model such scenarios, we present the OTOP-RV as a nonlinear integer program and propose an ALNS-based heuristic algorithm. The following findings are made from extensive numerical tests.

- The ALNS is effective in finding good-quality solutions, where high-value POIs are visited more frequently. This is not achievable through solution approaches for conventional TOPs.
- For small cases, the ALNS algorithm can find the same optimal solutions as Gurobi but in a shorter time.
- For large cases, the ALNS significantly outperforms the greedy algorithm in objective value, with improvements ranging from 9.7% to 25.4%.
- The ALNS can further improve the solution of sequential OP by neighborhood search, with improvements ranging about 6%.
- The OTOP-RV is transferrable to treat scenarios where the demands are concentrated on arcs instead of vertices/nodes. The resulting model can be applied to anti-dust (road sprinkler) operations or road surface condition monitoring.

Appendix

A Greedy algorithm for the OTOP-RV

This greedy algorithm generates the routes of each agent in sequence. The calculation of the marginal gain η_i of point i as shown in Definition 4.1. We begin with the POI $j \in I$ with the highest marginal gain as the starting location for the agent. The idea is to sequentially select the next POI i^* that maximizes the reward efficiency ψ_{ji} among all feasible POIs:

$$i^* = \arg \max_i \psi_{ji} = \arg \max_i \frac{\eta_i}{t_{ji}}$$

In prose, the reward efficiency refers to the reward collected per unit spending of time (or distance). The pseudo-code for the generation of the initial solution is shown in Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 4 (Greedy heuristic algorithm)

Input: Number of agents n_K , the length of time or distance budget Δ , marginal gains $\{\eta_i, i \in I\}$

Output: Initial routing solutions R_0

```
1: for  $v = 1, \dots, n_K$  do
2:   Initialize  $t = 0$ , list of candidate points  $I_{temp} = I$ ;
3:   Set the starting point of agent  $v$  as  $s_v = \arg \max_i \eta_i$ ;
4:   while  $t < \Delta$  do
5:     Find the next visiting point  $i^* = \arg \max_i \psi(i)$ ;
6:     Add the point  $i^*$  to the agent route  $R_0^v$  and update the marginal gains  $\{\eta_i | i \in I\}$ ;
7:     Update  $t = t + t_{j,i^*}$ ;
8:     Set the current point is  $j \leftarrow i^*$ ;
9:     Remove  $j$  from the list of candidate points  $I_{temp}$ .
10:  end while
11: end for
```

Data availability

The datasets that support the findings of this study are openly available in <https://github.com/Shenglin807/OTOP-RV-Dataset>.

Acknowledgement

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China through grants 72071163 and 72101215, and the Natural Science Foundation of Sichuan Province through grants 2022NSFSC0474 and 2022NSFSC1906.

References

Ahr, D., Reinelt, G., 2006. A tabu search algorithm for the min-max k-Chinese postman problem. *Computers & Operations Research* 33, 3403-3422.

- Ali, J., Dyo, V., 2017. Coverage and Mobile Sensor Placement for Vehicles on Predetermined Routes: A Greedy Heuristic Approach, in Proceedings of the 14th International Joint Conference on e-Business and Telecommunications. Madrid, Spain, 83-88.
- Alsina-Pagés, R., Hernandez-Jayo, U., Alías, F., Angulo, I., 2017. Design of a Mobile Low-Cost Sensor Network Using Urban Buses for Real-Time Ubiquitous Noise Monitoring. *Sensors*, 17(1), 57.
- Atefi, R., Iori, M., Salari, M., Vezzali, D., 2023. Solution of a practical Vehicle Routing Problem for monitoring Water Distribution Networks. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 1–19.
- Bektas, T., 2006. The multiple traveling salesman problem: an overview of formulations and solution procedures. *Omega* 34, 209–219.
- Bruck, B. P., Iori, M., 2017. Non-Elementary Formulations for Single Vehicle Routing Problems with Pickups and Deliveries. *Operations Research*, 65(6), 1597–1614.
- Chao, I., Golden, B., Wasil, E., 1996a. A fast and effective heuristic for the orienteering problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 88, 475–489.
- Chao, I.-M., Golden, B. L., Wasil, E. A., 1996b. The team orienteering problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 88(3), 464–474.
- Dai, Z., Han, K., 2023. Exploring the drive-by sensing power of bus fleet through active scheduling. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, 171, 103029.
- Dang, D.-C., Guibadj, R. N., Moukrim, A., 2013. An effective PSO-inspired algorithm for the team orienteering problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 229(2), 332–344.
- Demir, E., Bektaş, T., Laporte, G., 2012. An adaptive large neighborhood search heuristic for the Pollution-Routing Problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 223, 346–359.
- deSouza, P., Anjomshoaa, A., Duarte, F., Kahn, R., Kumar, P., Ratti, C., 2020. Air quality monitoring using mobile low-cost sensors mounted on trash-trucks: Methods development and lessons learned. *Sustainable Cities and Society* 60, 102239.
- Ding, L., Zhao, D., Cao, M., Ma, H., 2021. When Crowdsourcing Meets Unmanned Vehicles: Toward Cost-Effective Collaborative Urban Sensing via Deep Reinforcement Learning. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 8 (15), 12150-12162.
- Duque, D., Lozano, L., Medaglia, A. L., 2015. Solving the orienteering problem with time windows via the pulse framework. *Computers & Operations Research*, 54, 168–176.
- Fan, G., Zhao, Y., Guo, Z., Jin, H., Gan, X., Wang, X., 2021b. Towards Fine-Grained Spatio-Temporal Coverage for Vehicular Urban Sensing Systems. in: *IEEE INFOCOM 2021 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, IEEE, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 1-10.
- Fang, C., Han, Z., Wang, W., Zio, E., 2023. Routing UAVs in landslides Monitoring: A neural network heuristic for team orienteering with mandatory visits. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, 175, 103172.

- Fekih, M.A., Bechkit, W., Rivano, H., Dahan, M., Renard, F., Alonso, L., Pineau, F., 2021. Participatory Air Quality and Urban Heat Islands Monitoring System. *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, 70, 1-14.
- Gambardella, L. M., Montemanni, R., Weyland, D., 2012. Coupling ant colony systems with strong local searches. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 220(3), 831–843.
- Glock, K., Meyer, A., 2020. Mission Planning for Emergency Rapid Mapping with Drones. *Transportation Science*, 54, 534–560.
- Golden, B. L., Wong, R. T., 1981. Capacitated routing problems. *Networks*, 11:305-31.
- Golden, B., Assad, A., Dahl, R., 1984. Analysis of a large-scale vehicle routing problem with an inventory component, *Large Scale Systems*, 7, 181-190.
- Golden, B. L., Levy, L., Vohra, R., 1987. The orienteering problem. *Naval Research Logistics*, 34(3), 307–318.
- Gunawan, A., Yuan, Z., Lau, H. C., 2014. A mathematical model and metaheuristics for time dependent orienteering problem. In *Proceedings of the 10th international conference of the practice and theory of automated timetabling (patat 2014)*, York, United Kingdom, 202–217.
- Gunawan, A., Lau, H.C., Vansteenwegen, P., 2016. Orienteering Problem: A survey of recent variants, solution approaches and applications. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 255, 315–332.
- Guo, S., Qian, X., Dasgupta, S., Rahman, M., Jones, S., 2022. Sensing and monitoring of urban roadway traffic state with large-scale ride-sourcing vehicles. in: *The Rise of Smart Cities*. 551-582.
- Hanafi, S., Mansini, R., Zanotti, R., 2020. The multi-visit team orienteering problem with precedence constraints. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 282(2), 515–529.
- Ilhan, T., Iravani, S. M. R., Daskin, M. S., 2008. The orienteering problem with stochastic profits. *IIE Transactions*, 40(4), 406–421.
- Ji, W., Han, K., Liu, T., 2023a. A survey of urban drive-by sensing: An optimization perspective. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 99, 104874.
- Ji, W., Han, K., Liu, T., 2023b. Trip-based mobile sensor deployment for drive-by sensing with bus fleets. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 157, 104404.
- Ke, L., Zhai, L., Li, J., Chan, F. T. S., 2015. Pareto mimic algorithm: an approach to the team orienteering problem. *Omega*, 61, 155–166.
- Li, Y., Long, Y., 2024. Inferring storefront vacancy using mobile sensing images and computer vision approaches. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 108, 102071.
- Li Y., Meng X., Zhao H., Li W., Long Y., 2023. Identifying abandoned buildings in shrinking cities with mobile sensing images. *Urban Informatics*, 2, 3.
- Li, J., Xiong, Y., She, J., Wu, M., 2020. A Path Planning Method for Sweep Coverage With Multiple UAVs. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 7, 8967–8978.

- Lin, S. W., Yu, V. F., 2012. A simulated annealing heuristic for the team orienteering problem with time windows. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 217(1), 94–107.
- Long, J., Sun, Z., Pardalos, P.M., Hong, Y., Zhang, S., Li, C., 2019. A hybrid multi-objective genetic local search algorithm for the prize-collecting vehicle routing problem. *Information Sciences* 478, 40–61.
- Mahajan, S., Luo, C. H., Wu, D. Y., Chen, L. J., 2021. From Do-It-Yourself (DIY) to Do-It-Together (DIT): Reflections on designing a citizen-driven air quality monitoring framework in Taiwan. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 66, 102628.
- Malekjafarian, A., Corbally, R., Gong, W., 2022. A review of mobile sensing of bridges using moving vehicles: Progress to date, challenges and future trends. *Structures*. 44, 1466-1489.
- Messier, K.P., Chambliss, S.E., Gani, S., Alvarez, R., Brauer, M., Choi, J.J., Hamburg, S.P., Kerckhoffs, J., LaFranchi, B., Lunden, M.M., Marshall, J.D., Portier, C.J., Roy, A., Szpiro, A.A., Vermeulen, R.C.H., Apte, J.S., 2018. Mapping Air Pollution with Google Street View Cars: Efficient Approaches with Mobile Monitoring and Land Use Regression. *Environmental Science & Technology* 52 (21), 12563-12572.
- Miller, C. E., Tucker, A. W., Zemlin, R. A., 1960. Integer programming formulation of traveling salesman problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 7(4), 326–329.
- Mishra, M., Chen, P.-H., Bisquera, W., Lin, G.-Y., Le, T.-C., Dejchanchaiwong, R., Tekasakul, P., Jhang, C.-W., Wu, C.-J., Tsai, C.-J., 2023. Source-apportionment and spatial distribution analysis of VOCs and their role in ozone formation using machine learning in central-west Taiwan. *Environmental Research*, 232, 116329.
- O’Keeffe, K.P., Anjomshoaa, A., Strogatz, S.H., Santi, P., Ratti, C., 2019. Quantifying the sensing power of vehicle fleets. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(26), 12752–12757.
- Palomo-Martínez, P.J., Angélica Salazar-Aguilar, M., Laporte, G., Langevin, A., 2017. A hybrid variable neighborhood search for the Orienteering Problem with mandatory visits and exclusionary constraints. *Computers & Operations Research*, 78, 408–419.
- Pereira, D. L., Alves, J. C., Moreira, M. C. D. O., 2020. A multiperiod workforce scheduling and routing problem with dependent tasks. *Computers & Operations Research*, 118, 104930.
- Pisinger, D., Ropke, S., 2007. A general heuristic for vehicle routing problems. *Computers & Operations Research*, 34, 2403–2435.
- Potvin, J.-Y., Rousseau, J.-M., 1993. A parallel route building algorithm for the vehicle routing and scheduling problem with time windows. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 66, 331–340.
- Riahi, V., Hakim Newton, M.A., Sattar, A., 2021. A scatter search algorithm for time-dependent prize-collecting arc routing problems. *Computers & Operations Research* 134, 105392.
- Ropke, S., Pisinger, D., 2006. An Adaptive Large Neighborhood Search Heuristic for the Pickup and Delivery Problem with Time Windows. *Transportation Science*, 40, 455–472.

- Saukh, O., Hasenfratz, D., Thiele, L., 2012. Route selection for mobile sensor nodes on public transport networks. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing* 5 (3), 307-321.
- Song, J., Han, K., Stettler, M.E.J., 2021. Deep-MAPS: Machine learning based mobile air pollution sensing. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 8(9), 7649-7660.
- Tang, H., Miller-Hooks, E., Tomastik, R., 2007. Scheduling technicians for planned maintenance of geographically distributed equipment. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, 43(5), 591-609.
- Tsiligirides, T., 1984. Heuristic Methods Applied to Orienteering. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 35(9), 797-809.
- Vansteenwegen, P., Van Oudheusden, D., 2007. The mobile tourist guide: an OR opportunity. *OR Insights*, 20(3), 21-27.
- Vansteenwegen P., Souffriau W., Oudheusden D. V., 2011. The orienteering problem: A survey. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 209(1), 1-10.
- Verbeeck, C., Sörensen, K., Aghezzaf, E. H., Vansteenwegen, P., 2014. A fast solution method for the time-dependent orienteering problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 236(2), 419-432.
- Wang, M., Birken, R., Shahini Shamsabadi, S., 2014. Framework and implementation of a continuous network-wide health monitoring system for roadways. in: *Nondestructive Characterization for Composite Materials, Aerospace Engineering, Civil Infrastructure, and Homeland Security 2014 (International Society for Optics and Photonics, Bellingham, WA, 2014)*, vol.9063, p.90630H.
- Windras Mara, S.T., Norcahyo, R., Jodiawan, P., Lusiantoro, L., Rifai, A.P., 2022. A survey of adaptive large neighborhood search algorithms and applications. *Computers & Operations Research*, 146, 105903.
- Wolfinger, D., 2021. A Large Neighborhood Search for the Pickup and Delivery Problem with Time Windows, Split Loads and Transshipments. *Computers & Operations Research*, 126, 105110.
- Wolfinger, D., Salazar-González, J.-J., 2021. The Pickup and Delivery Problem with Split Loads and Transshipments: A Branch-and-Cut Solution Approach. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 289(2), 470-484.
- Yang, H.-H., Gupta, S.K., Dhital, N.B., 2020. Emission factor, relative ozone formation potential and relative carcinogenic risk assessment of VOCs emitted from manufacturing industries. *Sustainable Environment Research*, 30, 28.
- Yu, Q., Adulyasak, Y., Rousseau, L.-M., Zhu, N., Ma, S., 2022. Team Orienteering with Time-Varying Profit. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 34, 262-280.
- Yu, Q., Fang, K., Zhu, N., Ma, S., 2019. A matheuristic approach to the orienteering problem with service time dependent profits. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 273, 488-503.

- Zhang, S., Ohlmann, J. W., Thomas, B. W., 2014. A priori orienteering with time windows and stochastic wait times at customers. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 239(1), 70–79.
- Zhu, B., Sun, Z., Zhou, C., Wang, X., Zhang, P., 2022. The capacitated arc routing problem for anti-dust vehicles with heterogeneous services and time-dependent profits. in: *Proceedings of the Transportation Research Board of the National Academies*.
- Zhu, N., Liu, Y., Ma, S., He, Z., 2014. Mobile Traffic Sensor Routing in Dynamic Transportation Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 15, 2273-2285.