

Highlights

A biobjective Home Care Scheduling Problem with dynamic breaks

Isabel Méndez-Fernández, Silvia Lorenzo-Freire, Ángel Manuel González-Rueda

- We present a real biobjective Home Care Scheduling Problem.
- We propose a biobjective Mixed Integer Linear Programming formulation.
- We design a custom metaheuristic based on the Multi-Directional Local Search (MDLS) technique.
- We compare the MDLS algorithm with other two well known multiobjective methods: AUGMECON2 and NSGA-II.
- An extensive computational analysis is conducted including a real case study.

A biobjective Home Care Scheduling Problem with dynamic breaks

Isabel Méndez-Fernández^a, Silvia Lorenzo-Freire^a, Ángel Manuel González-Rueda^{b,c,*}

^a*MODES Research Group, Department of Mathematics and Centre for Information and Communications Technology Research (CITIC)*

Faculty of Computer Science, University of A Coruña, Campus de Elviña, A Coruña, Spain

^b*MODESTYA Research Group, Department of Statistics, Mathematical Analysis and Optimization and. University of Santiago de Compostela. Santiago de Compostela, Spain*

^c*CITMaga (Galician Center for Mathematical Research and Technology), 15782 Santiago de Compostela, Spain*

Abstract

This paper presents a multiobjective Home Care Scheduling Problem (from now on multiobjective HCSP) related to a home care company for elderly and dependent people located in the North of Spain. In particular, a biobjective problem is considered, with the following two conflicting objectives: the welfare of users and the cost of schedules.

To tackle the problem, a custom metaheuristic algorithm based on the Multi-Directional Local Search (MDLS) was designed, obtaining good approximations of the Pareto frontier in efficient computational times. This biobjective algorithm can be divided into three steps: initializing the set of non dominated solutions, generating solutions composed by different routes and obtaining non dominated solutions.

The performance of the biobjective algorithm was analyzed by implementing two other well known methods in the literature: the exact method AUGMECON2, which is just an improved version of the Epsilon Constraint approach, and an NSGA-II-based algorithm.

Finally, an extensive computational study was developed to compare the three methods over a set of instances from the literature, where the biobjective algorithm exhibited a superior behaviour. Furthermore, the algorithm was also applied to real instances providing solutions to the company with a good trade-off between the two objectives.

Keywords: Home Care Scheduling, Multiobjective Optimization, Metaheuristics, Epsilon Constraint

1. Introduction

Home care is a service that allows elderly and/or dependent people to continue living in their homes despite being in a situation of dependency or in need of assistance to undertake day-to-day tasks. This type

*Corresponding author. Postal code: 15782, Santiago de Compostela, Spain.

Email addresses: isabel.mendez.fernandez@udc.es (Isabel Méndez-Fernández), silvia.lorenzo@udc.es (Silvia Lorenzo-Freire), angelmanuel.gonzalez.rueda@usc.es (Ángel Manuel González-Rueda)

of service improves the quality of life of users and their families, providing domestic and care services to ensure that users are able to enjoy the best possible living conditions.

A multiobjective Home Care Scheduling Problem (multiobjective HCSP) involves designing routes and schedules for caregivers, indicating the services to carry out, in which order and at what time while optimizing more than one factor. In recent years, the demand of home care services has grown, which has resulted in an increase of the literature on this type of problems. Table 1 shows the most common characteristics of the multiobjective HCSP studied in the literature.

Reference	Service hard time windows	Service soft time windows	Caregiver time windows	Fixed services duration	Maximum working time	Compatibility	Continuity of care
Ait Haddadene et al. [1]	X	-	-	X	X	X	-
Belhor et al. [2]	X	X	-	-	X	-	-
Braekers et al. [3]	X	X	X	X	X	X	-
Decerle et al. [4]	-	X	X	X	-	X	-
Decerle et al. [5]	-	X	X	X	-	X	-
Fathollahi-Fard et al. [6]	X	-	-	X	-	-	-
Fathollahi-Fard et al. [7]	X	-	-	X	-	-	-
Fathollahi-Fard et al. [8]	X	-	-	X	-	-	-
Habibnejad-Ledari et al. [9]	-	-	-	-	X	X	-
Haddadene et al. [10]	X	-	-	X	X	X	-
Khodabandeh et al. [11]	X	-	-	X	-	X	-
Liu et al. [12]	-	-	-	-	X	X	X
Ma et al. [13]	-	X	-	X	X	X	-
Vieira et al. [14]	X	-	X	X	X	X	X
Xiang et al. [15]	X	-	-	X	X	X	X
Yang et al. [16]	-	X	-	-	X	-	X
Our approach	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Table 1: Brief summary of the multiobjective HCSP characteristics in the literature.

In this class of problems, two types of services can be considered: social care services (which include tasks like cleaning, cooking, etc) and health care services, more related to medical tasks. In certain problems, both types of tasks are combined. This is the case of Vieira et al. [14], where there are also time dependencies between services.

In most cases, there is a period of time that establishes when each service can be performed, called service hard time window. In case it is desirable that the service is carried out over a period of time, the service soft time window is indicated. Both characteristics are available in Braekers et al. [3], providing two soft time windows per service: a tight one and a loose one. Since soft time windows are not mandatory requirements, it is usual to penalize the deviation from them in the objective function. With the aim of avoiding an excessive deviation, in Decerle et al. [4] and Decerle et al. [5] the rate of the penalization increases in case the deviation exceeds a certain threshold. It is also very common in HCSP to consider fixed services duration, although in some HCSP the duration of the services may depend on other factors, such as the skills or the efficiency of the caregivers that will perform them (Belhor et al. [2] , Habibnejad-Ledari et al.

[9], Liu et al. [12] and Yang et al. [16]).

As in the case of services, caregivers may indicate a period of availability, known as caregiver time windows. In most of the problems there is a maximum working time (per day, week or month or even a combination of them) that cannot be surpassed. In the case of Fathollahi-Fard et al. [6], Fathollahi-Fard et al. [7] and Fathollahi-Fard et al. [8], the maximum working time is replaced with a limit for the travel distance. In turn, Belhor et al. [2] consider a maximum daily working time and establish a maximum size for the set of patients each caregiver will attend.

To assign caregivers to services, it is important to take into account the compatibility of the caregiver with the service to carry out. In many cases, it is considered that the caregiver and the service are compatible if the caregiver possesses the skills required to successfully carry out the service. Ait Haddadene et al. [1], Haddadene et al. [10], Ma et al. [13] and Xiang et al. [15] study problems where any caregiver can perform a service with lower requirements but services cannot be assigned to caregivers that do not reach the required skill. According to Khodabandeh et al. [11], the over-qualification of caregivers can lead to economic losses as caregivers are paid according to their skills. In other cases, the compatibility between services and caregivers is determined by the preferences of the users who demand the services. In Braekers et al. [3] users may establish their preferences regarding the caregivers, which are indicated by a penalty (0, 1 or 2).

The continuity of care is a concept that also appears in some contributions related to HCSP, although the interpretation of the term also depends on the context of the problem to be tackled. In Liu et al. [12] the continuity of care is interpreted by setting a maximum number of medical teams that can be assigned to a patient. For Vieira et al. [14], the continuity of care depends on the type of service: in the case of health services only one caregiver per user is allowed, whereas for social services it is desirable not to exceed two caregivers per user and week.

The problem under study is based on a real company located in the Northwest of Spain, which provides home care services (mainly social care services) to elderly and dependent people. As it can be seen in Table 1, services are characterized by a fixed duration, a soft time window and a hard time window. Caregivers also have a time window that establishes when they are willing to work. Moreover, there is a agreed working time per week and a daily maximum working time for caregivers. The weekly time can be surpassed as long as the daily one is not exceeded and caregivers are paid for their overtime. In accordance with the company's guidelines, on the basis of its previous experience and needs, a combination of caregiver-user compatibility and continuity of care is adopted, measuring its importance in terms of six different levels, which reflect the degree of affinity between caregivers and users.

Additionally, it is necessary to introduce a new feature into the problem, since the longest break that a caregiver takes during the working day will be deducted from her worked time, in case it reaches a certain duration. In contrast to other works (see, for instance, Vieira et al. [14], where part time caregivers have a 20 minutes break, if they work at least 2 consecutive hours, and full time caregivers have a meal break

that typically takes 30 minutes), the duration of the break is not previously fixed and is determined by the final daily schedule of the caregiver. This dynamic break may not even exist if there is no rest between consecutive services for more than a specified duration. Moreover, the dynamic break will have a significant impact on the cost of caregivers, since it will be deducted from their daily working times.

Reference	Issue					No. issues	No. objectives	Solution method	
	Overtime	Idle time	Travel time	Service soft time windows	User preferences			Exact	(Meta)heuristic
Ait Haddadene et al. [1]	-	-	X	-	X	2	2	-	NSGA-II
Belhor et al. [2]	-	-	X	X	-	3	2	-	NSGA-II/SPEA2
Braekers et al. [3]	X	-	X	X	X	4	2	ϵ -constraint	MDLS
Decerle et al. [4]	-	X	X	X	-	5	3	-	MDLS/NSGA-II
Decerle et al. [5]	-	-	X	X	-	4	3	-	MDLS
Fathollahi-Fard et al. [6]	-	-	X	-	X	6	2	-	MOSA
Fathollahi-Fard et al. [7]	-	-	X	-	-	8	2	-	MOSA
Fathollahi-Fard et al. [8]	-	-	X	-	-	3	2	-	MOSA
Habibnejad-Ledari et al. [9]	-	-	-	-	X	4	3	-	NSGA-II
Haddadene et al. [10]	-	-	X	-	X	2	2	-	NSGA-II
Khodabandeh et al. [11]	-	-	X	-	-	2	2	ϵ -constraint	-
Liu et al. [12]	X	-	X	-	-	4	2	ϵ -constraint	MOSA/NSGA-II
Ma et al. [13]	-	-	-	X	-	2	2	-	MOBSO/NSGA-II
Vieira et al. [14]	-	X	X	-	-	4	3	-	Heuristic
Xiang et al. [15]	X	X	X	-	X	7	2	ϵ -constraint	NSGA-II
Yang et al. [16]	-	-	X	X	-	5	3	-	MOABC
Our approach	X	X	X	X	X	5	2	ϵ -constraint	MDLS/NSGA-II

MDLS = Multi-Directional Local Search, MOABC= Multi-Objective Artificial Bee Colony, MOBSO= Multi-Objective Brain Storm Optimization, MOSA= Multi-Objective Simulated Annealing, NSGA= Non-dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm, SPEA= Strength Pareto Evolutionary Algorithm.

Table 2: Brief summary of issues, objectives and solution methods in multiobjective HCSP.

Multiple issues get involved in the objective functions of multiobjective HCSP. It can be seen in Table 2, which also includes some common issues to evaluate the quality of solutions on this type of problems. Usually, the quality of solutions is influenced by the total travel time between consecutive services of the schedules of caregivers, since the working time of caregivers depends on it. Another relevant factor that may impact on the working time of caregivers is the idle or free time of caregivers between services. Idle times can be produced when caregivers wait to match the time windows of services or with the aim of synchronizing visits of several caregivers if they share services. When caregivers have an agreed working time that can be surpassed, the cost of schedules can be reduced by optimizing the resulting overtime. On the other hand, the satisfaction of users can be increased by taking into account the preferences of users in terms of the caregivers who could care for them or respecting the soft time windows of services as much as possible.

Although the different multiobjective HCSP often involve common issues, their treatment in the objective functions may vary. In some cases, the authors consider the issues under study individually, but it is also possible to group related issues into a weighted sum to reduce the number of objectives to optimize (in fact, the number of objectives in multiobjective HCSP is usually no more than 3). Thus, in terms of the cost of schedules, Braekers et al. [3] combine overtime and travel time into a single objective, whereas Ma et al. [13] interpret it in terms of travel and service costs. In Vieira et al. [14] the non effective working time is composed

of travel and idle times. For Yang et al. [16] the cost of schedules depends on travel, service and soft time window penalization costs. Regarding satisfaction, Braekers et al. [3] measure satisfaction of users in terms of respecting their preferences and soft time windows of services. Similarly, Decerle et al. [4] and Decerle et al. [5] consider the quality of services as a combination of soft time window and synchronization penalization. In addition to these more common objectives, Fathollahi-Fard et al. [7] optimize the environmental impact of schedules, which is the result of environmental pollution and CO₂ emissions.

As presented in Table 2, the issues considered in the problem under study are: overtime, travel time, idle time, service soft time windows and preferences of users. These factors are combined into two objectives:

- Minimize the cost of schedules, which is just a combination of the overtime and working time of caregivers. Since the duration of services is fixed, total working time can be minimized by reducing travel or idle times. Notice that, as explained before, the largest daily break is not considered as idle time if it reaches certain duration.
- Maximize the welfare of users, interpreted in terms of the preferences of users and the soft time window penalization for services. The soft time window penalization takes into account the performance of the services both before and after their time window. The preferences of users are indicated by the affinity level between services and caregivers.

The problem of obtaining the schedule for this company was also studied in Méndez-Fernández et al. [17] and Méndez-Fernández et al. [18], but there are significant differences with the problem presented in this framework. In Méndez-Fernández et al. [17] the goal was to solve the initial problem presented by the company, which consisted in updating the prearranged schedules of the caregivers in order to solve a set of incidents that regularly arose in the company. To solve the problem, a simulated annealing algorithm was developed to slightly modify the prearranged schedules of the services. Méndez-Fernández et al. [18] tackled the problem in a more general manner, considering that the goal was to obtain the best possible schedules without being restricted to modifying previous schedules. Although the pursued objectives were the same that the ones in this framework, the welfare of users and the cost of schedules, they were studied in a lexicographic way prioritizing the welfare of users over the cost of schedules. To solve the problem, a combination of the Adaptive Large Neighborhood Search (ALNS) and a custom heuristic method was used.

In contrast to previous ones, in this work the problem of the company is studied as a biobjective HCSP, that is, the goal is to study the trade off between the two objectives. Thus, the purpose is to obtain the Pareto frontier of the problem or a good approximation, which results in a set of solutions with different objective values from which the company can choose the one that best suits its needs.

Different methods have been used in the literature to solve multiobjective HCSP. Some frameworks of multiobjective HCSP apply exact methods to solve small instances, such as the ϵ -constraint approach [19], which consists of expressing some objectives as constraints. However, the complexity of this kind of problems

(NP-Hard problems, since they are variants of VRP), requires the application of other techniques in realistic scenarios, such as metaheuristic/heuristic methods.

Hence, to solve all the instances (both simulated and real instances), in this framework we design an algorithm based on the Multi-Directional Local Search (MDLS) metaheuristic method [20], which is based on exploring neighborhoods using single-objective searches. In addition, we use other techniques to show the good performance of this algorithm. On one hand, we develop an algorithm based on an improvement of the ϵ -constraint approach and apply it to solve small instances. On the other hand, we adapt another metaheuristic technique, the Non-dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm (NSGA-II) implemented in jMetal framework, to compare it with the MDLS algorithm.

Section 2 is devoted to the mathematical model. In Section 3 the MDLS algorithm is explained in detail. Section 4 describes an improved version of the ϵ -constraint method, the AUGMECON2, and the adaptation of the NSGA-II algorithm to this context. Finally, Section 5 deals with computational experiments.

2. The biobjective HCSP model

The goal of the problem under study is to correctly attend users needs, which should be carried out by the caregivers of the company. Each user requires a set of services with a predetermined duration, which depends on the corresponding task. Every service is assigned a time slot (morning, noon, afternoon or evening) on a specific day of the week. In this way, the user is allowed to indicate two types of time windows for any service: a hard time window establishing the time interval within which the service must be scheduled, and a soft time window, defining the time preferences of the user.

Figure 1 presents a real schedule and the associated route of a caregiver of the company in a working day, with 6 services of different durations and travel times between them.


The daily working time of the caregivers computes from the first service of the day to the last one. As it can be seen in Figure 1b, the route of the caregiver starts at service 123 and ends at service 58. According to the company policy, the largest break of the day (i.e., the time they are not attending users nor travelling between their homes) should be discounted from the working day of the caregiver, as long as it is greater than or equal to 2 hours. The caregiver has a break between services 86 and 52 with a duration of 172 minutes (see Figure 1a), which means that it will not be paid.

The maximum amount of time they can work each day, as well as the weekly agreed working time, are specified in the contract of each caregiver. The weekly time can be surpassed as long as the daily one is not exceeded and the caregivers are paid for their overtime. According to Figure 1a, the caregiver has a scheduled working time of 7 hours and 43 minutes, which will not surpass the daily maximum of 8 hours.

With the aim of maintaining users' satisfaction, six levels of affinity are considered, determining how suitable is a caregiver to attend a user. These levels go from 0 to 5, where the higher the level, the more compatible is the assignation caregiver-user.

Service 123 09:53 – 10:53
Travel: 7 min
Service 82 11:00 – 12:00
Travel: 6 min
Service 86 12:06 – 13:06
Travel: 2 min
Break: 172 min
Service 52 16:00 – 18:30
Travel: 4 min
Service 36 18:34 – 19:34
Travel: 4 min
Service 58 19:38 – 20:38

(a) Schedule



(b) Route

Figure 1: Example of a working day for a caregiver.

Next, we will formally introduce the sets, parameters and variables for the mathematical formulation of the optimization problem.

Sets	
$D = \{1, \dots, 7\}$	Set of days.
$N = \{1, \dots, n\}$	Set of caregivers.
$S = \{1, \dots, s - 1\}$	Set of services.
$S^0 = S \cup \{0\}$	Set of services and the initial dummy.
$S^1 = S \cup \{s\}$	Set of services and the ending dummy.
$S^{01} = S \cup \{0, s\}$	Set of services and the initial and ending dummies.
$S_{-k} = S \setminus \{k\}$	Set of services except $k \in S$. Analogously, $S_{-k}^0 = S^0 \setminus \{k\}$ and $S_{-k}^1 = S^1 \setminus \{k\}$.
Parameters	
ρ_j^i	It indicates if caregiver $i \in N$ can perform service $j \in S$.
λ_j^i	Affinity level between caregiver $i \in N$ and service $j \in S$.
η_j	Duration of service $j \in S$.
$[\underline{\alpha}_j^d, \bar{\alpha}_j^d]$	Hard time window of service $j \in S$ in day $d \in D$. Note that, if service $j \in S$ does not belong to day $d \in D$, we set $\underline{\alpha}_j^d = \bar{\alpha}_j^d$.
$[\underline{\beta}_j^d, \bar{\beta}_j^d]$	Soft time window of service $j \in S$ in day $d \in D$.
$[\underline{\gamma}^{id}, \bar{\gamma}^{id}]$	Availability time period of caregiver $i \in N$ at day $d \in D$.
θ_{jk}	Travel time between services $j \in S$ and $k \in S^1$. Note that, if $k = s$, then $\theta_{js} = 0$.
ν^i	Agreed weekly working time of caregiver $i \in N$.
ν^{id}	Maximum time caregiver $i \in N$ is allowed to work at day $d \in D$.
π_{min}	Minimum length of time required for the largest break to be unpaid.

Variables	
x_{jk}^{id}	It indicates if caregiver $i \in N$ goes from service $j \in S^0$ to service $k \in S^1$ at day $d \in D$.
t_j^{id}	For caregiver $i \in N$, it represents the starting time of service $j \in S^{01}$ at day $d \in D$.
y_{jk}^{id}	For caregiver $i \in N$, it indicates if the break between services $j \in S$ and $k \in S$ has been selected to be discounted from the working day $d \in D$.
\bar{y}^{id}	It states if there is no break for caregiver $i \in N$ at day $d \in D$.
r^{id}	Greatest break of caregiver $i \in N$ at day $d \in D$.
u^{id}	It indicates if the largest break of caregiver $i \in N$ at day $d \in D$ is at least π_{min} .
\hat{r}^{id}	Greatest break of caregiver $i \in N$ at day $d \in D$ if it is at least π_{min} . Otherwise, it will be 0.
z^i	Amount of overtime of caregiver $i \in N$.
v_j^{start}	Penalization for carrying out service $j \in S$ before its soft time window.
v_j^{end}	Penalization for carrying out service $j \in S$ after its soft time window.

The objective functions and the constraints of the problem are:

$$f_1 = \min \omega_1 \sum_{i \in N} z^i + \omega_2 \sum_{i \in N} \sum_{d \in D} (t_s^{id} - t_0^{id} - \hat{r}^{id}) \quad (1)$$

$$f_2 = \min \omega_3 \sum_{i \in N} \sum_{d \in D} \sum_{j \in S} \sum_{k \in S^1} \lambda_j^i x_{jk}^{id} + \omega_4 \sum_{j \in S} (v_j^{start} + v_j^{end}) \quad (2)$$

Subject to

$$\sum_{i \in N} \sum_{d \in D} \sum_{k \in S_{-j}^1} x_{jk}^{id} = 1 \quad \forall j \in S \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{i \in N} \sum_{d \in D} \sum_{j \in S_{-k}^0} x_{jk}^{id} = 1 \quad \forall k \in S \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{d \in D} \sum_{k \in S_{-j}^1} x_{jk}^{id} \leq \rho_j^i \quad \forall i \in N, \forall j \in S \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_{k \in S^1} x_{0k}^{id} = 1 \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_{j \in S^0} x_{js}^{id} = 1 \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (7)$$

$$\sum_{j \in S_{-h}^0} x_{jh}^{id} - \sum_{k \in S_{-h}^1} x_{hk}^{id} = 0 \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D, \forall h \in S \quad (8)$$

$$\alpha_j^d \sum_{k \in S_{-j}^1} x_{jk}^{id} \leq t_j^{id} \leq (\bar{\alpha}_j^d - \eta_j) \sum_{k \in S_{-j}^1} x_{jk}^{id} \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D, \forall j \in S \quad (9)$$

$$t_j^{id} + (\eta_j + \theta_{jk}) x_{jk}^{id} \leq t_k^{id} + \bar{\alpha}_j^d (1 - x_{jk}^{id}) \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D, \quad (10)$$

$$\forall j \in S, \forall k \in S^1, j \neq k$$

$$t_0^{id} \geq \underline{\gamma}^{id} \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (11)$$

$$t_s^{id} \leq \bar{\gamma}^{id} \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (12)$$

$$t_0^{id} \leq t_k^{id} + \bar{\gamma}^{id}(1 - x_{0k}^{id}) \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D, \forall k \in S^1 \quad (13)$$

$$t_0^{id} \geq t_k^{id} - \bar{\gamma}^{id}(1 - x_{0k}^{id}) \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D, \forall k \in S^1 \quad (14)$$

$$t_s^{id} \leq (t_j^{id} + \eta_j) + \bar{\gamma}^{id}(1 - x_{js}^{id}) \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D, \forall j \in S \quad (15)$$

$$t_s^{id} - t_0^{id} - \hat{r}^{id} \leq \nu^{id} \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (16)$$

$$z^i \geq \sum_{d \in D} (t_s^{id} - t_0^{id} - \hat{r}^{id}) - \nu_{con}^i \quad \forall i \in N \quad (17)$$

$$r^{id} \geq t_k^{id} - (t_j^{id} + \eta_j + \theta_{jk}) - \bar{\gamma}^{id}(1 - x_{jk}^{id}) \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D, \quad (18)$$

$$\forall j \in S, \forall k \in S, j \neq k$$

$$r^{id} \leq t_k^{id} - (t_j^{id} + \eta_j + \theta_{jk}) + \bar{\gamma}^{id}(1 - x_{jk}^{id}) + \bar{\gamma}^{id}(1 - y_{jk}^{id}) \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D, \quad (19)$$

$$\forall j \in S, \forall k \in S, j \neq k$$

$$r^{id} \leq \bar{\gamma}^{id}(1 - \bar{y}^{id}) \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (20)$$

$$\sum_{j \in S} \sum_{k \in S_{-j}} y_{jk}^{id} + \bar{y}^{id} = 1 \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (21)$$

$$y_{jk}^{id} \leq x_{jk}^{id} \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D, \quad (22)$$

$$\forall j \in S, \forall k \in S, j \neq k$$

$$r^{id} - \pi_{min} \geq \pi_{min}(u^{id} - 1) \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (23)$$

$$r^{id} - \pi_{min} + \varepsilon \leq (\bar{\gamma}^{id} - \underline{\gamma}^{id})u^{id} \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (24)$$

$$\hat{r}^{id} \leq (\bar{\gamma}^{id} - \underline{\gamma}^{id})u^{id} \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (25)$$

$$\hat{r}^{id} \leq r^{id} \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (26)$$

$$\hat{r}^{id} \geq r^{id} - (\bar{\gamma}^{id} - \underline{\gamma}^{id})(1 - u^{id}) \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (27)$$

$$v_j^{start} \geq \sum_{d \in D} \left(\beta_{-j}^d \sum_{i \in N} \sum_{k \in S_{-j}^1} x_{jk}^{id} - \sum_{i \in N} t_j^{id} \right) \quad \forall j \in S \quad (28)$$

$$v_j^{end} \geq \sum_{d \in D} \left(\sum_{i \in N} t_j^{id} + (\eta_j - \bar{\beta}_j^d) \sum_{i \in N} \sum_{k \in S_{-j}^1} x_{jk}^{id} \right) \quad \forall j \in S \quad (29)$$

$$x_{jk}^{id} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D, \quad (30)$$

$$\forall j \in S^0, \forall k \in S^1, j \neq k$$

$$y_{jk}^{id} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D, \quad (31)$$

$$\forall j \in S, \forall k \in S, j \neq k$$

$$\bar{y}^{id}, u^{id} \in \{0, 1\}; r^{id}, \hat{r}^{id} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (32)$$

$$z^i \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in N \quad (33)$$

$$t_j^{id} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in N, \forall j \in S^{01}, \forall d \in D \quad (34)$$

$$r^{id}, \hat{r}^{id} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in N, \forall d \in D \quad (35)$$

$$v_j^{start}, v_j^{end} \geq 0 \quad \forall j \in S \quad (36)$$

There are two objectives in this problem: the cost of schedules and the welfare of users. The cost of schedules is addressed in Objective (1) and it is divided into two elements: the overtime of caregivers and their worked time. Since both of them depend on the same time units, we consider their weights as $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 1$. On the other hand, Objective (2) accounts for the welfare and includes the penalization of carrying out the services outside their soft times and the affinity caregivers-services. Since we want to prioritize the affinity over the soft time windows penalization we set $\omega_3 = -\max\{1, \sum_{j \in S} [\max_{d \in D} \{\beta_j^d - \alpha_j^d\} + \max_{d \in D} \{\bar{\alpha}_j^d - \bar{\beta}_j^d\}]\}$ and $\omega_4 = 1^1$.

Regarding the constraints, (3) - (4) guarantee that all services will be assigned to an available caregiver. Constraints (6) - (7) state that every caregiver starts and finishes each working day with the dummy services. Constraint (8) checks that routes are not segmented. Constraint (9) imposes that services are performed within their required time windows. Travel times and caregivers time windows availability are upheld in Constraints (10) - (12). The schedule of the dummy services is controlled in Constraints (13) - (15). Constraint (16) ensures that the daily maximum number of working hours will not be exceeded. The lower bound of the overtime for every caregiver is set at Constraint (17). Constraints (18) - (22) are related with the computation of the single daily largest break for each caregiver. Constraints (23) - (24) check whether the largest daily break of the caregiver should be remunerated or not. In case this break is not paid, Constraints (25) - (27) claim that it will be discounted from working time. The time to carry a service outside its soft time window is obtained in Constraints (28) - (29). Lastly, Constraints (30)-(36) establish variables domain.

3. The main approach: the BIALNS algorithm

In this section we propose an algorithm to solve the biobjective HSCP of Section 2. The fundamentals of the algorithm are based on the Multi-Directional Local Search (MDLS) metaheuristic method [20]. In this context, it will be necessary to obtain solutions that prioritize the welfare over the cost, and vice versa. To this aim, an Adaptive Large Neighbourhood Search (ALNS) algorithm is combined with a customized scheduling heuristic method.

Algorithm 1 shows the method designed to solve the biobjective problem. A solution of the problem is $\omega = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ and it is composed by the routes (\mathbf{x}) and the schedules (\mathbf{t}). The routes describe the order of services to be performed by each caregiver and the schedules are the starting times of each service. The goal

¹This is based on the fact that $v_j^{start} \leq \max_{d \in D} \{\beta_j^d - \alpha_j^d\}$ and $v_j^{end} \leq \max_{d \in D} \{\bar{\alpha}_j^d - \bar{\beta}_j^d\}$ for all $j \in S$.

of the algorithm is to obtain the set of non dominated solutions (Ω), so it relies on a set of solutions that are composed by different routes ($\hat{\Omega}$).

Algorithm 1: BIALNS algorithm

Data: Services (S), Caregivers (N), Lexicographic function welfare-cost (f_{wc}), Lexicographic function cost-welfare (f_{cw})

```

// Initialize the non dominated set
1  $\omega_{wc} \leftarrow \mathit{initialSolution}(S, N, f_{wc})$  // Get initial solution for welfare-cost
2  $\omega_{cw} \leftarrow \mathit{initialSolution}(S, N, f_{cw})$  // Get initial solution for cost-welfare
3  $\omega_{wc}, \hat{\Omega} \leftarrow \mathit{ALNS}(f_{wc}, \omega_{wc}, \hat{\Omega} = \emptyset)$  // ALNS for the lexicographic welfare-cost
4  $\omega_{cw}, \hat{\Omega} \leftarrow \mathit{ALNS}(f_{cw}, \omega_{cw}, \hat{\Omega})$  // ALNS for the lexicographic cost-welfare
5  $\Omega \leftarrow \mathit{updateNonDominatedSet}(\Omega, \omega_{wc})$  // Get non dominated solutions
6  $\Omega \leftarrow \mathit{updateNonDominatedSet}(\Omega, \omega_{cw})$  // Get non dominated solutions
// Obtain solutions composed by different routes
7 while stopping criteria not met do
8    $\bar{\omega} \leftarrow \mathit{chooseRandomSolution}(\hat{\Omega}, \Omega)$  // Get solution to modify
9    $\omega_{wc}, \hat{\Omega} \leftarrow \mathit{ALNS}(S, N, f_{wc}, \bar{\omega})$  // ALNS for the lexicographic welfare-cost
10   $\omega_{cw}, \hat{\Omega} \leftarrow \mathit{ALNS}(S, N, f_{cw}, \bar{\omega})$  // ALNS for the lexicographic cost-welfare
11   $\Omega \leftarrow \mathit{updateNonDominatedSet}(\Omega, \omega_{wc})$  // Update the non dominated solutions
12   $\Omega \leftarrow \mathit{updateNonDominatedSet}(\Omega, \omega_{cw})$  // Update the non dominated solutions
// Get non dominated solutions
13 while stopping criteria not met do
14    $\bar{\omega} \leftarrow \mathit{chooseRandomSolution}(\hat{\Omega}, \Omega)$  // Get solution to modify
15    $\Omega \leftarrow \mathit{modifyScheduleWelf}(\bar{\omega}, \Omega)$  // Modify the schedule to improve welfare
16    $\Omega \leftarrow \mathit{modifyScheduleCost}(\bar{\omega}, \Omega)$  // Modify the schedule to improve cost
17 return  $\Omega$ 

```

The algorithm is divided into three steps. In the first one, the initial solutions (lines 1 - 2) are obtained by applying a random greedy insertion operator, either prioritizing welfare over cost or cost over welfare. To enhance the solutions, the ALNS philosophy adapted to our particular context (Algorithm 2) is implemented for each lexicographic objective (lines 3 - 4). Then, these solutions are used to update the set of non dominated solutions (lines 5 - 6).

The second step consists in generating solutions composed by different routes. Thus, a solution is selected at random from the ones already found (line 8) and then it is updated using the ALNS method for both lexicographic objectives (lines 9 - 10). The set of solutions composed by different routes is updated during the ALNS. The new solutions are used to update the set of non dominated solutions (lines 11 - 12).

Finally, during the third step, non dominated solutions are generated. To this aim, a solution is chosen at random at random (line 14), modifying its schedule in order to improve welfare (line 15) and cost (line 16). The methods used to modify the schedule are described in Subsections 3.2 and 3.3.

3.1. ALNS method

Algorithm 2 describes the ALNS method. The input data are the initial solution (ω), the removal (Σ_{rem}) and insertion (Σ_{ins}) operators, their weights ($\sigma_{rem}, \sigma_{ins}$) and the set of solutions composed by different routes ($\hat{\Omega}$).

Algorithm 2: ALNS - Adaptive Large Neighbourhood search

Data: Objective function (f), initial solution (ω), set of solutions ($\hat{\Omega}$)

```

1  $\sigma_{rem} \leftarrow (1, \dots, 1), \sigma_{ins} \leftarrow (1, \dots, 1), \omega' \leftarrow \omega$ 
  // Improve the solution
2 while stopping criteria not met do
3    $\varsigma_{rem} \leftarrow \mathbf{chooseRandom}(\sigma_{rem}, \Sigma_{rem}), \varsigma_{ins} \leftarrow \mathbf{chooseRandom}(\sigma_{ins}, \Sigma_{ins})$  // Get operators
4    $\bar{\omega} \leftarrow \mathbf{destroySolution}(\omega, \varsigma_{rem}, f), \omega^* \leftarrow \mathbf{repairSolution}(\bar{\omega}, \varsigma_{ins}, f)$  // Obtain new solution
5   if  $f(\omega^*) < f(\omega')$  then
6     |  $\omega' \leftarrow \omega^*$  // Update best solution
  // Update the set of multiple routes
7    $add \leftarrow true$ 
8   for  $\hat{\omega} \in \hat{\Omega}$  do
9     | if  $x = \hat{x}$  then // Check if the routes are equal
10    | |  $add \leftarrow false$ 
11    | | break
12  if  $add = true$  then
13    |  $\hat{\Omega} \leftarrow \hat{\Omega} \cup \{\omega^*\}$  // Add the solution to the set
  // Update current solution
14   $\omega \leftarrow \mathbf{acceptanceCriteria}(\omega^*, \omega')$ 
  // Update the weights of the operators
15   $\sigma_{rem} \leftarrow \mathbf{updateWeights}(\sigma_{rem}, f, \omega', \omega^*), \sigma_{ins} \leftarrow \mathbf{updateWeights}(\sigma_{ins}, f, \omega', \omega^*)$ 
16 return  $\omega', \hat{\Omega}$ 

```

The ALNS consists of destroying and repairing a given solution using randomly chosen operators (lines 3 - 4). The newly generated solution is used to update the best solution found so far (lines 5 - 6). Then, we check if the routes of the new solution differ from the ones on the set, in which case the solution is added to the set (lines 7 - 13). Finally, the current solution and the weights of the operators are updated (lines 14 - 15).

The new solution is accepted with probability $\exp(-(f(\omega^*) - f(\omega'))/T_i)$, where T_i is the temperature that decreases after each iteration i according to formula $T_i = \beta^i T_0$, a cooling parameter $0 < \beta < 1$ and the initial temperature $T_0 > 0$. The weights of the removal and insertion operators are increased, after each iteration, if they generated an improved solution. Table 3 describes all the operators used in the ALNS method.

Since a HCSP is a routing and scheduling problem, to evaluate the insertion operators it is not only necessary to know the routes of each caregiver, but also the starting times of every service. Because of this, after obtaining a new route using any of the insertion operators, it is necessary to define its schedule.

Operator	Description
Random removal	Services to remove from the route are selected at random.
Related removal	This operator iteratively removes from the route the service that is most related to a random already removed service.
Cost removal	Services that contribute the most to the objective function value are removed from the routes.
1-Route removal	Randomly selected routes are removed from the solution until the required number of services have been deleted.
2-Route removal	Two routes selected at random are removed from the solution.
Basic greedy (BG) insertion	Service that results in the least objective function increase is added to the solution.
Random greedy (RG) insertion	A randomly selected service is scheduled in the best possible position.
Different caregiver BG insertion	Basic greedy insertion but trying to guarantee that services will be assigned to a different caregiver.
Different caregiver RG insertion	Basic greedy insertion but trying to guarantee that services will be assigned to a different caregiver.

Table 3: Removal and insertion operators.

When prioritizing welfare over cost, the schedule of a route is obtained using the scheme of the heuristic algorithm presented in Figure 2 (a complete description of this method can be found in Méndez-Fernández et al. [18]). The algorithm is divided into two steps. In the first one, schedule with best penalization value is found. In the second step, schedule is modified in order to improve the cost.




Figure 2: Scheme to prioritize welfare over cost.

The scheme of the algorithm to obtain a route schedule prioritizing cost over welfare is presented in Figure 3 (a full description of the method can be found in Méndez-Fernández [21]).




Figure 3: Scheme to prioritize cost over welfare.

The algorithm is divided into two steps: in the first one schedules with best cost value are found and, in the second step, schedules are modified in order to improve the soft time window penalization.

3.2. Modify the schedule to improve the welfare

The algorithm developed to modify a schedule in order to improve the welfare, which only consists in the preferred time window penalization because the route is fixed, is shown in Figure 4 and thoroughly described in Méndez-Fernández [21].

The algorithm is divided into three phases:

- a. In the first step a route and a service are randomly selected. Then maximum times to advance and delay the service, so that penalization is not increased, are computed.
- b. The maximum time to delay the service, without increasing the route penalization, is obtained. The service is then delayed a random amount of time between 0 and the maximum. Then, non dominated set is updated.
- c. The maximum time to advance the service, without increasing the route penalization, is obtained. The service is then advanced a random amount of time between 0 and the maximum. Finally, non dominated set is updated.




Figure 4: Scheme to improve welfare.

Next, we propose an example to explain the practical application of the algorithm.

Example 3.1 Figure 5 shows an example of a modification of the schedule of a caregiver route to improve welfare. The route is composed of 6 services with its corresponding hard and soft time windows. The cost of the initial schedule is $f_1 = 570$ minutes and its soft time window penalization is $f_2 = 30$ minutes².




Figure 5: Initial schedule.

The earliest and latest starting times of the services are: $t_1^e = 0$, $t_2^e = 120$, $t_3^e = 180$, $t_4^e = 240$, $t_5^e = 450$, $t_6^e = 540$ and $t_1^l = 180$, $t_2^l = 270$, $t_3^l = 450$, $t_4^l = 600$, $t_5^l = 720$, $t_6^l = 780$.

²Note that in this case both objectives are measured in minutes because the route is already fixed. Moreover, once the route is fixed, the affinity is disregarded in the computation of f_2 .

Let us consider that, for instance, our purpose is to move service 4. Since its earliest and latest times are in the soft time window, the service will be advanced or delayed without increasing its penalization. The maximum delay time is $\delta_d = \min\{\bar{\beta}_4^d - \eta_4 - t_4, t_4^l - t_4\} = \min\{600 - 60 - 390, 600 - 390\} = 150$, while the maximum advance time is $\delta_a = \min\{t_4 - \underline{\beta}_4^d, t_4 - t_4^e\} = \min\{390 - 240, 390 - 240\} = 150$.

Next, the effect of the delay of service 4 in the schedule is studied. The delay times of service 4 that could result in a change of penalization are given by $D = \{120, 150\}$ (see Figure 6). To choose the best option it is necessary to compute the penalization. In Figure 6a the penalization remains unchanged, because services 4, 5 and 6 are scheduled within their soft time windows. But, in the schedule presented in Figure 6b the penalization of service 5 increases. Therefore, the best option is $\delta_{max} = 120$.




Figure 6: Possible movements of service 4.

So, to delay the service a number between $\delta_{min} = 0$ and $\delta_{max} = 120$ is chosen, in this case 90. The resulting schedule, in Figure 7, has a cost of $f_1^* = 420$ and a soft time window penalization of $f_2^* = 30$. That means that the new solution dominates the original one ($f_1^* = 420 < f_1 = 570$ and $f_2^* = 30 = f_2$).




Figure 7: Delayed schedule.

As far as the advance of service 4 is concerned, it could result in a change of penalization given by $A = \{150\}$ (see Figure 8). In this case, even though we can see that the penalization of services 2 and 3 increases, we set $\delta_{max} = 150$. Although the main objective is to improve the penalization, there is still a chance of increasing the penalization in case a non dominated solution is found.




Figure 8: Advance of 150 min.

To advance the service we choose a number between $\delta_{min} = 0$ and $\delta_{max} = 150$, in this case 90. The resulting schedule (see Figure 9) has a cost of $f'_1 = 450$ and a soft time window penalization of $f'_2 = 120$. This means that the new schedule is a non dominated solution ($f'_1 = 420 < f_1^* = 450$ and $f'_2 = 120 > f_2^* = 30$).




Figure 9: Advanced schedule.

3.3. Modify the schedule to improve cost

The algorithm developed to modify a schedule in order to improve cost, which in this case only consists in modifying the breaks of the solution, is shown in Figure 10 and thoroughly described in Méndez-Fernández [21].

The algorithm is divided into 6 steps:

- The method starts by selecting a route and a service at random. After that, the maximum time to advance or delay a service is computed.
- The feasible delay of a service, in order to reduce the breaks that happen after it in the initial schedule of the route, is obtained.
- The maximum and minimum times to delay a service, to increase the duration of the break that happens right before it, are computed.
- The feasible advance of a service, in order to reduce the breaks that happen before it in the initial schedule of the route, is obtained.
- The maximum and minimum times to advance a service, to increase the duration of the break that happens right after it, are computed.
- Finally the service is moved a random amount of time, according to the times obtained before. That results in several solutions that are used to update the non dominated set.




Figure 10: Scheme to improve cost.

Next example shows the modification of the schedule of Example 3.1 to improve cost.

Example 3.2 After the modifications of the schedule suggested in Example 3.1, two non dominated solutions, with objective function values $(f_1^* = 450, f_2^* = 30)$ and $(f_1' = 420, f_2' = 120)$, are obtained³.

³The original schedule was dominated.




Figure 11: Route that we want to modify to improve the cost.

The service to be moved is $j = 4$, its maximum delay time is $\delta_d = t_j^l - t_j = 600 - 390 = 210$ and the maximum advance time is $\delta_a = t_j - t_j^e = 390 - 240 = 150$ (line 12). The cost can be improved by moving service 4 according to the options described below.

The first option is to delay the service, which would result in reducing the breaks after it. In this case, setting $\delta_{max} = 90$ completely removes the breaks after j (lines 13 - 26). To delay the service, a number between $\delta_{max} = 0$ and $\delta_{max} = 90$ is chosen, in this case 60. The resulting schedule, in Figure 12, has a cost of $f_1^1 = 570$ and a soft time window penalization of $f_2^1 = 30$. That means that the new solution is dominated ($f_1^1 = 570 > f_1^* = 450$ and $f_2^1 = f_2^* = 30$).




Figure 12: Delayed schedule.

The second option is to delay the service in order to guarantee that the break before it will have a duration of $\pi_{max} = 120$ or more, which happens if we set $\delta_{min} = 90$ and $\delta_{max} = 210$. To delay the service, a number between $\delta_{max} = 90$ and $\delta_{max} = 210$ is chosen, in this case 180. The resulting schedule, in Figure 13, has a cost of $f_1^2 = 450$ and a soft time window penalization of $f_2^2 = 150$. That means that the new solution is dominated ($f_1^2 = 450 = f_1^*$ and $f_2^2 = 150 > f_2^* = 30$).




Figure 13: Delayed schedule.

The third option consists of advancing the service to reduce the breaks that happen before it. If we set

$\delta_{max} = 120$ we remove all breaks. To advance the service, a number between $\delta_{max} = 0$ and $\delta_{max} = 120$ is chosen, in this case 30. The resulting schedule, Figure 14, has a cost of $f_1^3 = 570$ and a soft time window penalization of $f_2^3 = 30$. That means that the new schedule is dominated ($f_1^3 = 570 > f_1^* = 450$ and $f_2^3 = f_2^* = 30$).




Figure 14: Advanced schedule.

The final option is to get the advance times that make the break after the service of, at least, a duration of $\pi_{max} = 120$. It can be achieved by setting $\delta_{min} = 60$ and $\delta_{max} = 150$. To advance the service, a number between $\delta_{min} = 60$ and $\delta_{max} = 150$ is chosen, in this case 120. The resulting schedule, Figure 15, has a cost of $f_1^4 = 390$ and a soft time window penalization of $f_2^4 = 180$. That means that the new schedule is a non dominated solution ($f_1^4 = 390 < f_1^* = 450$ and $f_2^4 = 180 > f_2^* = 30$, $f_1^4 = 390 < f_1' = 420$ and $f_2^4 = 180 > f_2' = 120$).




Figure 15: Advanced schedule.

4. The AUGMECON2 method and the NSGA-II-based algorithm

This section is devoted to introduce other two known state of the art multiobjective methods, with the objective of analysing the relative quality of the BIALNS algorithm. First, an exact method is described, the AUGMECON2, which is an improved version of the ϵ -constraint method. Then, an alternative metaheuristic algorithm is proposed, based on the Non-Dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm II (NSGA-II) technique.

4.1. The AUGMECON2

Now we describe the version of the AUGMECON2 method specific to our biobjective problem, P , which is:

$$\begin{aligned} \min & f_1(\mathbf{x}), f_2(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{st. } & \mathbf{x} \in F \end{aligned}$$

Given two feasible solutions \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} , it is said that \mathbf{x} dominates \mathbf{y} (denoted as $\mathbf{x} \succ \mathbf{y}$) if $f_k(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_k(\mathbf{y})$ $\forall k \in \{1, 2\}$ and $f_k(\mathbf{x}) < f_k(\mathbf{y})$ for at least one $k \in \{1, 2\}$. When solving a biobjective problem we look for the Pareto front, which is the set composed by the non dominated solutions.

The exact Pareto frontier can be obtained using the improved version of the augmented ϵ -constraint method (AUGMECON2), presented by [22].

According to this method, the problem needs to satisfy two conditions to determine the exact Pareto set: the objective function coefficients must be integer and the nadir points of the Pareto set must be known. The first condition can always be achieved by multiplying the coefficients of the objective functions by the appropriate power of 10. The second condition is met because we work with two objectives, which means that the nadir points can be obtained by calculating the pay-off table.

Basically, the AUGMECON2 method solves iteratively the following problem (denoted by \hat{P}):

$$\begin{aligned} \min & [f_1(\mathbf{x}) + \varepsilon(S_2/r_2)] \\ \text{st. } & f_2(\mathbf{x}) - S_2 = e_2 \\ & \mathbf{x} \in F, \end{aligned}$$

where F represents the Constraints (3) - (36) of our problem, S_2 is the surplus variable for f_2 , ub_2 is the upper bound of f_2 , r_2 is the range of f_2 , g_2 indicates the number of intervals that divide the range, i_2 is the grid point counter, $e_2 = ub_2 - (i_2 \times (r_2/g_2))$ is the right hand side of the new constraint and ε is a small number (usually between 10^{-3} and 10^{-6}).




Figure 16: Example illustrating the AUGMECON2 method.

To obtain ub_2 and r_2 it is necessary to solve the two lexicographical versions of our problem. It results in two solutions: one that prioritizes welfare over cost (\mathbf{x}_{wc}) and another that prioritizes cost over welfare (\mathbf{x}_{cw}). As it can be seen in Figure 16, the upper bound is $ub_2 = f_2(\mathbf{x}_{wc})$ and the range is $r_2 = f_2(\mathbf{x}_{wc}) - f_2(\mathbf{x}_{cw})$. In the example of Figure 16 it is illustrated how the values of e_2 are obtained after dividing the range in $g_2 = 3$ intervals.

Algorithm 3: AUGMECON2 method

Data: Epsilon parameter (ε), range (r_2), upper bound (ub_2), number of intervals (g_2)

```

1  $i_2 \leftarrow 1$ 
2 while  $i_2 \leq g_2$  do
3    $\hat{P} \leftarrow \text{generateMILP}(ub_2, r_2, g_2, i_2, \varepsilon)$  // Generate the problem
4    $x \leftarrow \text{solveMILP}(\hat{P})$  // Obtain a solution to the problem
5   if  $x$  is feasible then
6      $\Omega \leftarrow \Omega \cup \{x\}$  // Add the solution to the non dominated set
7      $b \leftarrow \lfloor S_2 / (r_2 / g_2) \rfloor$ ,  $i_2 \leftarrow i_2 + b$  // Get the number of iterations we can skip
8   else
9     break // The solution is not feasible
10  if  $i_2 < g_2$  then
11     $i_2 \leftarrow i_2 + 1$  // Next grid point
12 return  $\Omega$ 

```

The AUGMECON2 method, presented in Algorithm 3, initializes the grid point counters, i_2 , (line 1) and iterates through them to solve the problem \hat{P} (lines 3 - 4). If the solution found is feasible then it is added to the non dominated set (lines 5 - 6). The bypass coefficient, $b = \lfloor S_2 / (r_2 / g_2) \rfloor$, indicates the number of consecutive iterations that we can skip, $i_2 = i_2 + b$ (line 7). If the solution of \hat{P} is not feasible (lines 8 - 9) or if we iterated through all the grid points (lines 10 - 11) the algorithm ends.

4.2. The NSGA-II based algorithm

In this part a Non-Dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm II (NSGA-II) [23] is introduced, adapting it to our specific problem. To this aim, we divide the problem in two phases: on one hand, determining the routes of caregivers per day and, on the other hand, obtaining the optimal schedules for those routes. Note that the main decision variables involved in the routing phase are (x_{jk}^{id}) , while in the scheduling phase are the ones giving the starting times of the services (t_j^{id}) .

The solution encoding is really relevant when implementing this type of algorithms. For each day $d \in D$ and caregiver $i \in N$, we use a string vector to encode the routes assigned to each caregiver represented by $R^{id} = \{s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \dots, s_{i_d}\}$, where $s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \dots, s_{i_d}$ are the services IDs to be visited by the caregiver i in the order from s_{i_1} to s_{i_d} . Therefore, the routes of all caregivers in a day d can be encoded by concatenating (using a unique identifier separator between the router of each caregiver) the string vectors of all caregivers in that day:

$$R^d = \{R^{1d} + d_1 + R^{2d} + d_2 + \dots + d_{n-1} + R^{nd}\}$$

where d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{n-1} are unique separators to identify the routes associated to each caregiver.

In this way, the codification of the solution inside the NSGA-II is a chromosome divided into two parts represented by a tuple $\langle R, T \rangle$, where R is the string representing the routes of the solution previously explained, and T contains the information about the schedule of each route. The general strategy we follow is:

- The traditional operators of NSGA-II (crossover and mutation operators) are applied to the first part of the solution encoding related to the routes of the solutions, R .
- Once the routes are known, it is necessary to obtain a schedule T associated to them in order to evaluate the objective function. Thus, the algorithms presented in Subsections 3.2 and 3.3 to find a schedule improving the welfare and the cost, respectively, are employed. It is important to note that giving a route, these algorithms can achieve several schedules. For this reason, it has been necessary to adapt NSGA-II so that, during the evaluation phase, all solutions obtained when calling those algorithms are incorporated into the existing population. By proceeding in this manner, it is possible to get solutions that aim to improve both objective functions at each iteration of the algorithm.

The procedure used to generate the initial solution is the same as the one employed for BIALNS. Specifically, the random greedy insertion operator is applied, either prioritizing welfare over cost or cost over welfare. Further, a uniform distribution in the selection of the initial population is applied to ensure that a similar number of individuals is created according to each one of the objectives of our problem.

5. Computational experiments

In this section we present the computational study carried out in order to check the behaviour of the biobjective algorithm described in the previous section.

Since there are two different objectives involved in the problem, it is not immediate to evaluate the quality of a solution or to decide which solutions are the best ones. Therefore, to compare the solutions of the biobjective problem, a set of performance indicators are used. The formal definition of the indicators is presented in Table 4 and they measure the convergence and the diversity of the solutions. To introduce them, it is necessary to consider an approximation of the Pareto frontier, A , and a reference set, RF . The set A is the solution of the problem that has to be evaluated (for example, an approximation of the Pareto frontier obtained using BIALNS). Meanwhile, the reference set RF is composed exclusively of non dominated points (since this set is usually not known a priori, a common approach is to define RF by selecting the non dominated points of the solutions that are being evaluated by the indicator).

The indicators studied are the following ones.

Coverage. It represents the percentage of elements of A dominated by RF . The smaller the value of this measure, the better the quality of the approximation of the Pareto front.

Generational Distance. It measures how far are the elements of A from those of RF . This indicator is obtained using d_i , which is the euclidean distance between the elements $i \in A$ and the nearest one of RF . The smaller the value of this measure, the closer A is to RF .

Inverted Generational Distance. This variant of GD measures how far are the elements of the reference set RF to the set A . Now, it takes the euclidean distance between the element $i \in RF$ and the nearest one of A , represented by \tilde{d}_i . For this indicator, smaller values are preferred because it means that RF is close to the approximation A .

Epsilon. It computes the minimum distance needed to translate every element of A so it dominates the solution RF . It is said that $x \succ_\epsilon y$ if, for each objective $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, $f_k(x) < \epsilon + f_k(y)$. If the value of this indicator is small, all the elements of solution A are close to solution RF , because it is necessary to translate them a small distance in order to achieve the dominance of RF . The smaller the value, the better the quality of the approximation of the Pareto front.

Indicator	Formula
Coverage (CV)	$CV(RF, A) = \frac{ \{x \in A : \exists y \in RF / y \succ x\} }{ A }$
Generational Distance (GD)	$GD(RF, A) = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{ A } d_i^2}}{ A }$
Inverted Generational Distance (IGD)	$IGD(RF, A) = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{ RF } \tilde{d}_i^2}}{ RF }$
Epsilon (EPS)	$EPS(RF, A) = \inf_{\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}} \{\forall y \in RF \exists x \in A : x \succ_{\epsilon} y\}$

Table 4: Performance indicators for the biobjective problem.

All these indicators, except coverage, are implemented in the jMetal framework, described in Durillo and Nebro [24]. The resolution approaches, BIALNS, AUGMECON2 and NSGA-II, were implemented in Python 3.7 (Van Rossum and Drake [25]). Specifically, the NSGA-II algorithm has been implemented using the library jMetalPy [26]. Furthermore, the MILP problem has been solved with Gurobi 9.1.1 (Gurobi Optimization, LLC [27]) via its Python interface. All experiments were run in a machine Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6146 CPU 3.20GHz, with 16GB of RAM, 2 cores and 100GB of hard drive, located in Centre for Information and Communications Technology Research (CITIC).

5.1. Parameter study

The analysis presented below is used to adjust the parameters involved in the algorithm. This is done using the instances presented in Solomon [28], which capture diverse scenarios in terms of service location and caregivers availability. The instances specify duration, location and hard time windows of services, as well as caregivers availability and maximum working time. Thus, the soft time windows of the services and the affinity levels between caregivers and services were randomly generated. To carry out the computational study, two types of Solomon instances were considered (with 10 and 15 services) and, for each of them, 10 different instances were randomly generated.

5.1.1. AUGMECON2 solutions

The AUGMECON2 method was used to solve the Solomon instances with 10 and 15 services. For this purpose, a time limit of 12 hours has been established to solve each lexicographical MILP with the optimization solver Gurobi, in order to obtain the range of the objective functions necessary to define the grid points. Then, the MILP associated to each grid point has been solved with Gurobi with a time limit of 1 hour. Table 5 presents the computational times, in hours, needed to solve each instance⁴. The fastest

⁴Notice that, because of the time limit considered, there is no guarantee that the Pareto frontier of AUGMECON2 method is the optimal one.

one is solved in 2.58 hours, while the slowest one needs 236.69 hours. Therefore, the AUGMECON2 method will not be suitable to solve large size instances. However, the results obtained with this method might be useful to evaluate the performance of the BIALNS algorithm.

Instance	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
10	4.92	2.58	7.23	20.39	5.22	5.83	7.08	5.13	14.99	3.58
15	77.68	36.67	13.05	58.97	86.51	236.69	143.44	124.00	164.72	90.29

Table 5: AUGMECON2 computational times (in hours).

5.1.2. BIALNS parameter analysis

This section focuses on studying BIALNS. The first step of the study is to evaluate the different parameters of the algorithm, in order to select the ones that find best solutions.

The algorithm is divided into three parts and, for each of them, different parameters were considered:

Step 1: Initialize the sets. In the first step it is necessary to establish the parameters for each lexicographic ALNS method. The values used are the ones obtained in [21]:

ALNS. Number of iterations (n): 1000. Proportion of solution to destroy (p): *auto_100%*.

Step 2: Generate different solutions. This step deals with the parameters related to the stopping criteria, as well as the parameters for each lexicographic ALNS method.

Stopping criteria. Number of iterations (nroutes): 1000, 2000, 3000, 4000, **5000**, **6000**, 7000, 8000, 9000 and 10000.

ALNS. Number of iterations (nalns): **5**, **10**, 25, 50. Proportion of solution to destroy (pr): **auto_5%**, **auto_10%** and auto_25%.

Step 3: Get non dominated solutions. In the third step, it is necessary to fix the stopping criteria parameter.

Stopping criteria. Number of iterations (nsols): 1×10^5 , **2×10^5** and **3×10^5** .

The values highlighted in bold are the ones that provided best results (when comparing the solutions found by the algorithm with the ones obtained with AUGMECON2 method using performance indicators) for the instances with 10 and 15 services.

To illustrate it, Figures 17 and 18 show the number of non dominated points for the different values of the parameter nroutes. For instances with 10 services it can be observed that, when the best solution is chosen, the algorithm is very competitive with AUGMECON2 in terms of the number of non dominated points. However, this is not the case of the worse solution. Specifically, the number of non dominated points for the worst solution increases with the iterations, reaching its best value from 2000 onward. In terms of the instances with 15 services, the best solution is practically not affected by the parameter, usually finding more non dominated points than AUGMECON2 method. Meanwhile, when considering a small number of

iterations, the number of points is notably smaller for the worst solution. However, from 5000 iterations onward the worst solutions are similar to AUGMECON2 results.




Figure 17: Number of non dominated points per iterations (10 services).




Figure 18: Number of non dominated points per iterations (15 services).

Tables 6 and 7 present the indicator values for the instances with 10 and 15 services with 6000 and 8000 iterations, respectively. The number of iterations considered is chosen according to the results presented in

Figures 17 and 18, but a more detailed analysis can be found in Méndez-Fernández [21], where confidence intervals are used. In terms of the instances with 10 services, Table 6 shows that no method performs better than the other. Instead, the behaviour of the methods is instance dependant. Regarding the instances with 15 services, CV values indicate that the proportion of dominated points of the algorithm is larger than the one of the AUGMECON2 method. Meanwhile, indicators EPS, GD and IGD show that BIALNS solutions are better than the ones of AUGMECON2.

Instances	AUGMECON2				BIALNS			
	CV	EPS	GD	IGD	CV	EPS	GD	IGD
10.01	0	0	0	0	2.1e-2	3.8e-3	5.8e-5	1.2e-4
10.02	0	2.6e-5	0	2.4e-5	7.4e-2	2.3e-3	1.6e-5	1.2e-4
10.03	0	5.2e-5	0	3.9e-4	0	0	0	0
10.04	8.3e-2	6.5e-2	1.6e-2	3.1e-2	0	0	0	0
10.05	0	4.7e-5	0	1.6e-4	0	0	0	0
10.06	0	0	0	0	4.4e-2	1.4e-2	5.1e-4	5.4e-4
10.07	0	1.5e-4	0	1.4e-4	4.8e-2	8.4e-3	1.7e-4	3e-4
10.08	0	0	0	0	4.6e-2	3.3e-3	6.1e-5	9.2e-5
10.09	1.3e-2	1.3e-2	2.1e-4	6.3e-4	2.1e-2	7.6e-3	9.6e-5	1.4e-4
10.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 6: Comparison of AUGMECON2 and BIALNS (10 services).

Instances	AUGMECON2				BIALNS			
	CV	EPS	GD	IGD	CV	EPS	GD	IGD
15.01	1.0e-2	1.4e-3	1.0e-6	2.9e-5	1.6e-1	4.4e-3	3.2e-4	1.1e-4
15.02	1.7e-2	2.8e-2	9.7e-3	1.5e-3	4.6e-3	1.2e-3	4.7e-6	1.6e-4
15.03	0	3.8e-5	0	9.1e-5	0	1.5e-4	0	1.2e-4
15.04	5.4e-3	2.2e-3	3.2e-4	3.5e-4	1.8e-2	3.0e-3	1.5e-5	6.5e-5
15.05	3.9e-2	4.3e-2	2.9e-3	2.8e-3	1.6e-1	3.4e-3	3.9e-4	2.8e-4
15.06	7.1e-3	6.8e-2	1.9e-3	1.1e-2	4.7e-3	2.2e-3	2.2e-5	1.1e-5
15.07	6.5e-2	1.2e-1	1.9e-3	2.0e-2	2.6e-1	2.5e-3	6.3e-4	6.0e-4
15.08	3.6e-2	5.3e-2	7.7e-4	2.6e-2	2.5e-1	4.1e-3	3.2e-4	1.4e-3
15.09	2.0e-2	1.3e-1	3.9e-3	5.9e-2	5.8e-1	4.3e-3	1.9e-3	2.7e-3
15.10	2.5e-2	9.7e-3	1.5e-3	2.6e-4	2.6e-1	1.1e-3	2.4e-5	6.8e-5

Table 7: Comparison of AUGMECON2 and BIALNS (15 services).

Figures 19 and 20 show computational times⁵ after solving the instances with 10 and 15 services, respec-

⁵Notice that the algorithm was run 5 times. Therefore, the figure presents the mean time employed to solve each instance for each value of the parameter.

tively. Notice that, in both methods, the behavior of the instances in terms of computational time is similar but in different magnitudes. For the 10 service instances, the AUGMECON2 method needs more than 4 hours to solve most of the considered instances, meanwhile the BIALNS solves all of them in less than 10 minutes. Interestingly, the comparison of the two figures shows that the most time-consuming instances for the AUGMECON2 method (10_04 and 10_09) are also the slowest ones for the algorithm. Similarly, in case of the 15 service instances, the computational times for the AUGMECON2 vary from 13.05 to 236.69 hours, meanwhile the highest computational time is lower than 20 minutes.




Figure 19: Computational times (10 services).




Figure 20: Computational times (15 services).

5.1.3. Comparison with NSGA-II

The parameters of the NSGA-II algorithm have been selected after some preliminary experiments. In particular, the configuration employed is:

- Population size: 250.

- Generations size: 500.
- Crossover operator: Partially Mapped Crossover (PMX) with probability 0.8.
- Mutation operator: Permutation Swap Mutation with probability 0.3.
- Selection operator: Binary Tournament Selection.

Table 8 reports performance indicators comparing NSGA-II with BIALNS⁶ over instances of 10 services. As in the case of BIALNS, NSGA-II was run five times per instance, reporting mean values for the metrics. Furthermore, a time limit of 600 seconds is considered as a stopping criterion for NSGA-II (a time limit greater than the slowest instance solved by BIALNS). Table 8 clearly shows that BIALNS outperforms NSGA-II according to the four metrics presented for all the instances. Considering CV, it shows that practically all solutions found by NSGA-II are dominated by the ones found by BIALNS. Analysing remaining metrics, it can be seen that the values for NSGA-II are larger than those for BIALNS (it practically are always 0). It is worth highlighting instance R202_025, in which NSGA-II exhibits its best performance, achieving the lowest metric values among the instances, although still larger than those of BIALNS.

Instances	NSGA-II				BIALNS			
	CV	EPS	GD	IGD	CV	EPS	GD	IGD
10_01	0.8310	0.1705	0.0920	0.1325	0	0	0	0
10_02	0.9800	0.0749	0.2516	0.1093	0	0	0	0
10_03	1.0000	0.0465	0.2949	0.0864	0	0	0	0
10_04	1.0000	0.3567	0.2160	0.2524	0	0	0	0
10_05	0.8159	0.1508	0.0832	0.0643	0.0784	0.0082	0.0043	0.0063
10_06	0.9778	0.2123	0.1252	0.1205	0	0	0	0
10_07	0.9314	0.1750	0.2380	0.1579	0	0	0	0
10_08	0.8776	0.0947	0.0743	0.0582	0	0	0	0
10_09	1.0000	0.2204	0.2144	0.2057	0	0	0	0
10_10	1.0000	0.6083	0.2310	0.4824	0	0	0	0

Table 8: Comparison of NSGA-II and BIALNS (10 services).

In order to get a deeper understanding, Figure 21 represents the approximation of the Pareto front obtained with BIALNS and NSGA-II for one of the instances of 10 services⁷. It is clear that BIALNS obtains a better set of points than NSGA-II. Although NSGA-II finds more scattered points (it captures more “jumps” corresponding to changes in the welfare, due to variations in the affinity levels caregiver-services), practically all of them are dominated by the points obtained by NSGA-II. These observations are in accordance with the performance metrics results discussed above.

⁶BIALNS is run employing the best configuration parameters obtained after the analysis showed in previous section.

⁷The behaviour for the remaining instances is similar.




Figure 21: Approximations of the Pareto fronts of BIALNS (red points) and NSGA-II (blue points) (10 services).

The results for the instances with 15 services are similar, so for the sake of clarity, they are not included.

5.2. Real instances

The real instances were obtained during consecutive weeks between 2016 and 2017. Next, the behaviour of BIALNS will be shown in one of these instances. The instance deals with 808 services to be carried out throughout a week by the 36 available caregivers. To solve the instance, next values of the parameters were taken into account:

Step 1: Initialize the sets. Proportion of solution to destroy: *auto_1%*. Time limit: 90 minutes.

Step 2: Generate different solutions. Number of iterations (nroutes): 10000. Number of iterations (nalns): 1. Proportion of solution to destroy (pr): 1%.

Step 3: Get non dominated solutions. Number of iterations (nsols): 3×10^5 .

Figure 22 shows the Pareto frontier for week 9. To analyze the solutions found, six points along the frontier have been selected (denoted as A - F). Point A (F) is the solution of the hierarchical problem that prioritizes welfare over cost (cost over welfare). Points B, C, D and E are intermediate solutions.




Figure 22: Pareto frontier for week 9.

Since all points presented in the frontier are non dominated, to improve welfare it is necessary to increase cost. This can be seen in more detail in Table 9, which presents the objective values of the selected points, as well as the ones of the solution considered by the company. Regarding cost, all the solutions considered are better than the one of the company, which can also be assessed analyzing the overtime and working time of the solutions. In terms of welfare, the solution of the company is between points B and C, although the penalization value of C is much better than the one of the company.

Solution	Cost	Overtime	Worked time	Welfare ($\times e8$)	Affinity	Penalization
Company	69744	11525	58219	-2.71	3576	10518
A	57780	4692	53088	-2.74	3631	3342
B	56294	3761	52533	-2.73	3622	4005
C	55044	2733	52311	-2.71	3595	4436
D	53913	1670	52243	-2.68	3563	5218
E	52965	722	52243	-2.65	3516	7900
F	52292	273	52019	-2.60	3450	9961

Table 9: Objective values of the solutions.

To complete the comparison, Figures 23 and 24 are presented. Figure 23 represents the mean overtime,

idle time (i.e. paid break time), break time (i.e. unpaid break time) and travel time per caregiver according to the considered solutions. Figure 24 displays the mean soft time window penalization per user. According to these figures it is clear that the six solutions taken from the Pareto frontier are better than the one of the company. Specifically, it can be seen that solution A (which prioritizes welfare over cost) is the one with highest overtime and idle time but, as more priority is given to cost, idle time disappears and overtime decreases. In a similar way, Figure 24 shows that as the priority of welfare decreases, soft time window penalization increases.




Figure 23: Mean weekly time per caregiver (week 9).




Figure 24: Mean soft time window penalization per user (week 9).

6. Concluding remarks

In this work, a real problem of a home care company is tackled by considering it as a biobjective HCSP. The problem shares many of the characteristics of other routing and scheduling multiobjective problems in home care. The work was motivated by the company's interest in finding a solution that balances two objectives: the welfare of users and caregivers, and the cost associated with the planning. Furthermore, there is a special feature that substantially distinguishes it from the others and makes its study of great interest: the longest break between two daily consecutive services of each caregiver will not be included as part of her working day, provided that it is greater than a fixed number of hours.

The problem is approached from several perspectives. First, a metaheuristic MDLS algorithm, called BIALNS, is proposed. BIALNS involves generating different solutions and then modifying the schedules to obtain non-dominated solutions using an ALNS technique and two heuristic scheduling methods designed for hierarchical problems. BIALNS is compared with other two well-known multiobjective techniques, which were adapted to the problem specific requirements: AUGMECON2 and NSGA-II. The idea behind the implementation of AUGMECON2 was to obtain the exact Pareto front, to guarantee that the BIALNS algorithm provides good approximation in reasonable computational times. The widespread used of NSGA-II in multiobjective problems, makes it a good choice for comparison with BIALNS.

To validate the algorithm, several computational experiments using literature instances were run, considering different configurations for BIALNS algorithm, in order to select the ones that provide the best solutions. The quality of the solutions was analyzed by comparing them to the ones obtained with the AUGMECON2 and NSGA-II methods. After thorough experimentation, we can assert that our approach yields solutions of superior quality (based on common multiobjective performance metrics) compared to those generated by NSGA-II. On the other hand, AUGMECON2 managed to attain the exact Pareto frontier in some small instances, despite the high computational costs. In those cases, our approach was able to achieve very good approximations much more rapidly.

The algorithm presented in this work is devoted to help the company to make quick decisions about the routes and schedules of the caregivers of the company. For this reason, BIALNS is applied over a real instance of the company, showing several configurations for the schedules of the caregivers in terms of a trade-off between the welfare of users/caregivers and the cost of the schedules. Due to the good behaviour of BIALNS, it would be in the future a good choice to improve the expert system of the company.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Isabel Méndez-Fernández: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Silvia Lorenzo-Freire:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Ángel Manuel González-Rueda:** Conceptualization, Methodology,

Software, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by MICINN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033/ and ERDF/EU through R+D+I project grants MTM2017-87197-C3-1-P and PID2021-124030NB-C31. Isabel Méndez-Fernández and Silvia Lorenzo-Freire also acknowledge support from Grupos de Referencia Competitiva ED431C-2020/14 and Centro de Investigación del Sistema universitario de Galicia ED431G- 2019/01; and Ángel M. González-Rueda from Grupos de Referencia Competitiva ED431C-2021/24, all of them funded by Consellería de Cultura, Educación e Universidades, Xunta de Galicia.

References

- [1] S. R. Ait Haddadene, N. Labadie, C. Prodhon, Bicriteria vehicle routing problem with preferences and timing constraints in home health care services, *Algorithms* 12 (2019).
- [2] M. Belhor, A. El-Amraoui, A. Jemai, F. Delmotte, Multi-objective evolutionary approach based on k-means clustering for home health care routing and scheduling problem, *Expert Systems with Applications* 213 (2023) 119035.
- [3] K. Braekers, R. F. Hartl, S. N. Parragh, F. Tricoire, A bi-objective home care scheduling problem: Analyzing the trade-off between costs and client inconvenience, *European Journal of Operational Research* 248 (2016) 428–443.
- [4] J. Decerle, O. Grunder, A. Hajjam El Hassani, O. Barakat, A memetic algorithm for multi-objective optimization of the home health care problem, *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation* 44 (2019) 712–727.
- [5] J. Decerle, O. Grunder, A. H. E. Hassani, O. Barakat, Impact of the workload definition on the multi-objective home health care problem, *IFAC-PapersOnLine* 51 (2018) 346–351.
- [6] A. M. Fathollahi-Fard, A. Ahmadi, F. Goodarzian, N. Cheikhrouhou, A bi-objective home healthcare routing and scheduling problem considering patients’ satisfaction in a fuzzy environment, *Applied Soft Computing* 93 (2020) 106385.
- [7] A. M. Fathollahi-Fard, K. Govindan, M. Hajiaghahi-Keshteli, A. Ahmadi, A green home health care supply chain: New modified simulated annealing algorithms, *Journal of Cleaner Production* 240 (2019) 118200.
- [8] A. M. Fathollahi-Fard, M. Hajiaghahi-Keshteli, R. Tavakkoli-Moghaddam, A bi-objective green home health care routing problem, *Journal of Cleaner Production* 200 (2018) 423–443.
- [9] H. Habibnejad-Ledari, M. Rabbani, N. Ghorbani-Kutenaie, Solving a multi-objective model toward home care staff planning considering cross-training and staff preferences by NSGA-II and NREGA, *Scientia Iranica* 26 (2019) 2919–2935.
- [10] S. A. Haddadene, N. Labadie, C. Prodhon, NSGAI enhanced with a local search for the vehicle routing problem with time windows and synchronization constraints, *IFAC-PapersOnLine* 49 (2016) 1198–1203.
- [11] P. Khodabandeh, V. Kayvanfar, M. Rafiee, F. Werner, A bi-objective home health care routing and scheduling model with considering nurse downgrading costs, *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18 (2021).
- [12] M. Liu, D. Yang, Q. Su, L. Xu, Bi-objective approaches for home healthcare medical team planning and scheduling problem, *Computational and Applied Mathematics* 37 (2018) 4443–4474.
- [13] X. Ma, Y. Fu, K. Gao, A. Sadollah, K. Wang, Integration routing and scheduling for multiple home health care centers using a multi-objective cooperation evolutionary algorithm with stochastic simulation, *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation* 75 (2022) 101175.
- [14] B. Vieira, J. de Armas, H. Ramalhinho, Optimizing an integrated home care problem: A heuristic-based decision-support system, *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 114 (2022) 105062.
- [15] T. Xiang, Y. Li, W. Y. Szeto, The daily routing and scheduling problem of home health care: based on costs and participants’ preference satisfaction, *International Transactions in Operational Research* 30 (2023) 39–69.
- [16] M. Yang, Y. Ni, L. Yang, A multi-objective consistent home healthcare routing and scheduling problem in an uncertain environment, *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 160 (2021) 107560.
- [17] I. Méndez-Fernández, S. Lorenzo-Freire, I. García-Jurado, J. Costa, L. Carpenente, A heuristic approach to the task planning problem in a home care business, *Health Care Management Science* 23 (2020) 556–570.
- [18] I. Méndez-Fernández, S. Lorenzo-Freire, Ángel Manuel González-Rueda, An adaptive large neighbourhood search algorithm for a real-world home care scheduling problem with time windows and dynamic breaks, *Computers & Operations Research* 159 (2023) 106351.
- [19] M. Laumanns, L. Thiele, E. Zitzler, An efficient, adaptive parameter variation scheme for metaheuristics based on the epsilon-constraint method, *European Journal of Operational Research* 169 (2006) 932–942.
- [20] F. Tricoire, Multi-directional local search, *Computers & Operations Research* 39 (2012) 3089–3101.
- [21] I. Méndez-Fernández, Decision support systems for scheduling and routing problems in a home care business, PhD Thesis (2023).
- [22] G. Mavrotas, K. Florios, An improved version of the augmented ϵ -constraint method (AUGMECON2) for finding the exact pareto set in multi-objective integer programming problems, *Appl. Math. Comput.* 219 (2013) 9652–9669.

- [23] K. Deb, S. Agrawal, A. Pratap, T. Meyarivan, A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: Nsga-ii, *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.* 6 (2002) 182–197. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:9914171>.
- [24] J. J. Durillo, A. J. Nebro, jmetal: A Java framework for multi-objective optimization, *Advances in Engineering Software* 42 (2011) 760–771.
- [25] G. Van Rossum, F. L. Drake, *Python 3 Reference Manual*, CreateSpace, Scotts Valley, CA, 2009.
- [26] A. Benítez-Hidalgo, A. J. Nebro, J. García-Nieto, I. Oregi, J. Del Ser, jmetalpy: A python framework for multi-objective optimization with metaheuristics, *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation* 51 (2019) 100598.
- [27] Gurobi Optimization, LLC, *Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual*, 2021. URL: <https://www.gurobi.com>.
- [28] M. M. Solomon, Algorithms for the vehicle routing and scheduling problems with time window constraints, *Operations Research* 35 (1987) 254–265.