

# A hybrid heuristic algorithm for the resource-constrained project scheduling problem

Evgenii Goncharov<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Sobolev Institute of Mathematics, Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk, 630090, Russia*

---

## Abstract

This study presents a hybrid metaheuristic for the resource-constrained project scheduling problem (RCPSP), which integrates a genetic algorithm (GA) and a neighborhood search strategy (NS). The RCPSP consists of a set of activities that follow precedence relationship and consume resources. The resources are renewable, and the amount of the resources is limited. The objective of RCPSP is to find a schedule of the activities to minimize the project makespan. The algorithm uses two crossovers in the GA and two neighborhoods in the NS, as well as a resource ranking heuristic. The computational results with instances from the PCPLIB library validate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm. We have obtained some of the best average deviations of the solutions from the critical path lower bound. The best heuristic solutions have been updated for some instances from PCPLIB.

*Keywords:* Project management, resource-constrained project scheduling problem, renewable resources, genetic algorithm, neighborhood search, PCPLIB  
*2020 MSC:* 05C09, 05C12, 05C92

---

## 1. Introduction

The Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem (RCPSP) may be stated as follows: a project consists of a set of activities  $V$  where each activity has to be processed without interruption. A partial order on the set of activities is defined by a directed acyclic graph. The duration, the set, and the amounts of consumed resources are assumed to be known for every activity. The resource availability is assumed to be constant at each unit time interval within the planning horizon of  $\hat{T}$ . The resources outside the project horizon  $\hat{T}$  considered to be unlimited. All resources are renewable. The objective is to schedule the activities of a project to minimize the project makespan.

The RCPSP is a generalization of the Job Shop Scheduling problem. This problem denoted as  $m, 1|cpm|C_{\max}$  using the classification scheme of Herroelen et al. [23] or as  $PS | prec | C_{\max}$  using the scheme of Brucker et al. [5]. The RCPSP is NP-hard in the strong sense [4]. It may be conceivable to use exact optimal methods only for projects

---

*Email address:* gon@math.nsc.ru (Evgenii Goncharov)

of small size. For the large-size instances, one needs heuristics to get the best solution within a convenient response time, and heuristics remain the best way to solve these problems efficiently. It is worth noting that the RCPSP with cumulative resources can be solved with polynomial complexity [16].

The RCPSP is an important and challenging problem that has been widely studied over the past few decades. Some of the most promising directions for developing heuristic methods are based on genetic algorithms, local search methods, bee and ant colony optimization, scatter search, and others. We refer to the surveys provided by Abdolshah (2014) [1], Vanhoucke (2012) [42], Kolisch and Hartmann (2006) [26].

Several new hybrid approaches have been put forward. Rather than purely following the concept of one single metaheuristic, these methods combine various metaheuristic strategies, components, and other optimization techniques. A survey of hybrid metaheuristics for the RCPSP provided by Pellerin et al. (2020) [35]. Researchers are also working on algorithms that integrate metaheuristics and exact techniques to solve this problem. The hybridization of these two alternative solution methods is known as a matheuristic. Many extensions to the RCPSP have been proposed, and an overview can be found in Hartmann and Briskorn (2010, 2021) [21], [22].

The combination of GA algorithms with neighborhood search metaheuristics is one of the most popular ways to hybridize metaheuristics. We introduce a hybrid algorithm of this type. It is based on the previously developed GA algorithm [18], [19] and NS operator [20]. The GA algorithm uses crossovers in which the total resource utilization of the current schedule is high as possible. We also emphasize the significance of unequal resources importance and aim to maximize the use of the more valuable (scarce) resources. A resource ranking is performed using a relaxed problem with cumulative resources.

The proposed algorithm was tested on standard instance datasets j60, j90, and j120 from the electronic library PSPLIB [28]. We have gotten some of the best average percent deviations of the obtained solutions from the critical path lower bound. We have improved the best heuristic solutions for some instances (4 instances from the dataset j90 and several dozen instances from the dataset j120). The results of numerical experiments are also presented.

## 2. Problem Setting

The RCPSP problem can be defined as follows. A project is taken as a directed acyclic graph  $G = (N, A)$ . Denote by  $N = \{1, \dots, n\} \cup \{0, n + 1\}$  the set of activities in the project where activities 0 and  $n + 1$  are dummy. These dummy activities define the start and the completion of the project, respectively. The precedence relation on the set  $N$  is defined with a set of pairs  $A = \{(i, j) \mid i \text{ precedes } j\}$ . If  $(i, j) \in A$ , then activity  $j$  cannot start before activity  $i$  has been completed. The set  $A$  contains all pairs  $(0, j)$  and  $(j, n + 1)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

Denote by  $K$  the set of renewable resources. For each resource type  $k \in K$ , there is a constant availability  $R_k \in Z^+$  throughout the project horizon  $\hat{T}$ . Activity  $j$  has deterministic duration  $p_j \in Z^+$ . The profile of resource consumption is assumed to be constant for every activity. So, activity  $j$  requires  $r_{jk} \geq 0$  units of resource of type  $k$ ,  $k \in K$ , at every time instant when it is processed. We assume that  $r_{jk} \leq R_k$ ,  $j \in N$ ,  $k \in K$ .

Let's introduce the problem variables. Denote by  $s_j \geq 0$  the starting time of activity  $j \in N$ . Since activities are executed without preemptions, the completion time of activity

$j$  is equal to  $c_j = s_j + p_j$ . Define a schedule  $S$  as an  $(n + 2)$ -vector  $(s_0, \dots, s_{n+1})$ . The completion time  $T(S)$  of the project corresponds to the moment when the last activity  $n + 1$  is completed, i.e.,  $T(S) = c_{n+1}$ . Denote by  $J(t) = \{j \in N \mid s_j < t \leq c_j\}$  the set of activities which are executed in the unit time interval  $[t - 1, t)$  under schedule  $S$ . The problem is to find a feasible schedule  $S = \{s_j\}$  respecting the resource and precedence constraints so that the completion time of the project is minimized. It can be formalized as follows: minimize the makespan of the project

$$T(S) = \max_{j \in N} (s_j + p_j) \quad (1)$$

under constraints

$$s_i + p_i \leq s_j, \quad \forall (i, j) \in A; \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_{j \in J(t)} r_{jk} \leq R_k, \quad k \in K, \quad t = 1, \dots, \hat{T}; \quad (3)$$

$$s_j \in \mathbf{Z}^+, \quad j \in N. \quad (4)$$

The objective function (1) minimizes the makespan of the project. Constraints (2) enforce the precedence constraints between activities. Relation (3) corresponds to the resource constraints, and condition (4) defines the decision variables.

### 3. Resource ranking

As Coelho and Vanhoucke [8] noted, solving resource conflicts lies at the heart of the RCPSP, and quite a number of studies have shown that the presence of resources with limited availability is the main driver of the hardness of the problem. They analyzed the hardness of RCPSP from an experimental point-of-view and proposed an approach to transform easy RCPSP instances into very hard ones. These instances should be as small as possible in terms of the number of activities and resources. One of the steps in this procedure is to reduce the number of resources needed to search for bottleneck resources that really define the instance's hardness.

We conducted numerical experiments on standard PCPLIB instances. Of course, we do not remove resources from these instances. However, we try to predict less significant resources and reduce their influence on the solution, while increasing the influence of more significant ones. In our opinion, this approach echoes the approach of Coelho and Vanhoucke.

We use the concept of greater or lesser degrees of "scarcity" for resources. Resources are ranked according to their degree of scarcity. The ranking of resources can be obtained by solving a relaxed problem with cumulative resources.

Let us consider a relaxed problem with cumulative resources:

$$T(S) = \max_{j \in N} (s_j + p_j) \quad (5)$$

under constraints

$$s_i + p_i \leq s_j, \quad \forall (i, j) \in A; \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_{t'=1}^t \sum_{j \in J(t')} r_{jk} \leq \sum_{t'=1}^t R_k, \quad k \in K, \quad t = 1, \dots, \hat{T}; \quad (7)$$

$$s_j \in \mathbf{Z}^+, \quad j \in N. \quad (8)$$

The relation (7) ensures the fulfillment of resource constraints with cumulative resources, and (5)–(8) is a scheduling problem with cumulative resources.

The problem (5)–(8) can be resolved with a well-known fast approximate method. This algorithm is asymptotically exact with the deviation tending to zero as the problem dimension increases [15]. An exact algorithm is also known for this relaxed problem, where the activity duration is an integer [16]. We use a fast approximate algorithm [15]. As a result of using this algorithm, we obtain the remaining cumulative resources, as well as the approximate solution for the relaxed problem. We will consider resources with less unused balance to be more important (more scarce). We hypothesize that the ranking of resources in the relaxed problem is also conserved in the original RCPSP problem. Let's renumber the resources in order of their ranks and assign weights  $w_k, k \in K$  to resources according to their ranks. These weights can be defined in different ways (see Section 8).

#### 4. Genetic Algorithm

We use the previously developed genetic algorithm for the RCPSP problem [18, 19]. The process employs two crossovers. The algorithm uses a heuristic rule to select promising segments (genes) from the parent chromosomes, with the goal of incorporating these segments into the offspring. We call these genes as dense genes and their total resource utilization during the current schedule is as high as possible. Let's briefly describe the GA algorithm (we refer to [18, 19] for more details).

Represent a feasible solution as a list of activities  $L = (j_0, \dots, j_{n+1})$ . We use two algorithms for constructing schedules of activities with serial (S-SGS) and parallel (P-SGS) decoders. The serial decoding procedure [27] calculates an active schedule  $S(L)$  for an arbitrary list  $L$ . A schedule is called active if none of the activities can be started earlier without delaying some other activity. It is known that there is an optimal schedule among active schedules. The parallel decoder (P-SGS) processes schedule time in sequence, identifying all the activities that can be initiated prior to the scheduled time.

Each schedule for the *initial population*  $\Gamma$  is constructed as follows. We generate a random feasible list of activities  $L$  and then construct a schedule  $S$  with the parallel decoder. Further, we apply a local improvement procedure FBI (the forward-backward improvement procedure) to the resulting schedule. The best schedule found through this process is then incorporated into the population  $\Gamma$ . These steps are repeated until  $\Gamma$  contains the necessary number of schedules.

**The set of parent schedules.** We look through the entire population  $\Gamma$  in non-decreasing order of schedule length and add each schedule to the *set of parents*  $\Gamma'$  with a certain probability. If we have looked through the entire population and have not collected the necessary number of schedules *ParentsSize* (an algorithm parameter), we choose the best among those which have not yet been added. A pair of parent schedules will be randomly selected for a crossover from the set of parent schedules  $\Gamma'$ . This strategy for choosing two parent schedules has been shown to be effective in problems of high dimension (see for instance [36]).

We transmit the segment of the parent chromosome (gene) to the offspring chromosome, and we aim to ensure that this gene is in high resource utilization of the current schedule. At every scheduled time, we discover a surplus of unused resources. When the

residue is less than a predefined admissible residue, we determine the set of activities accomplished during this time interval (a dense gene). In general, we can operate with the weighted residues of unused resources.

Let  $\Theta$  be the set of dense genes. Comparing gene weights allow us to prioritize those that utilize high-priority resources more rationally, leading to a decrease in surplus unused resources.

$$DenseActivities(S, R) \rightarrow \Theta.$$

1. Set  $t := 0$ ,  $\Theta = \emptyset$ .
2. While  $t < T(S)$ :
  - (a) find a weight  $v_t$  of the set  $J(t)$ :  $v_t = \sum_{k \in K} \left( R_k - \sum_{j \in J(t)} r_{jk} \right) w_k / R_k$ ;
  - (b) if  $v_t < R$ , then update the list of dense genes  $\Theta = \Theta \cup J(t)$ ;
  - (c)  $t := t + 1$ .

It may happen that some dense genes overlap. In this case, we will keep the gene that produces the smaller weighted surplus of unused resources  $v_t$ .

## 5. Crossovers

Once a parent chromosomes have been selected, a crossover operator will be applied on the chromosomes to construct offspring chromosomes. Two crossovers have been constructed.

**Crossover procedure A.** We consider the first dense genes in each parent schedule, and the leading gene should be the gene with the lowest weight. All the initial activities from the parent chromosome, including the leading gene, are incorporated into the offspring chromosome. We then remove this leading gene from the list of dense genes. Let's look at the first dense genes in the chromosomes that haven't had any activities added to a daughter chromosome. We choose the best of the two new genes and add the activities from the parental chromosome that contained them, excluding the activities that have already been added to the daughter chromosome. These steps are repeated until we have considered all dense genes. If it's necessary, we add the remaining activities to the daughter chromosome in the same order as they are located in the chromosome with minimal duration. The serial decoder is used to construct the daughter schedule from the daughter chromosome.

**Crossover procedure B.** A block of activity  $j$  in an active schedule  $S$  is a set of activities that overlap  $j$  in this feasible schedule, start immediately after  $j$ , or finish immediately before it. Graph  $G_S$  is the directed graph with the vertex set  $V = N$  and the arc set  $E = \{(i, j) \mid c_i = s_j, (i, j) \in A\}$ . The outgoing network of activity  $j$  for schedule  $S$  is the maximal (by inclusion) connected subgraph of graph  $G_S$ , with the only source being the vertex that corresponds to activity  $j$ . We select the dense genes with the lowest weight criteria from the both parent chromosomes. Identify these activities in the second chromosome and find the outgoing (or incoming) network for each of them. Then find a segment in the list of activities between the leftmost and rightmost activities in the block and outgoing (incoming) networks.

The mutation operator involves "mixing" activities from the list corresponding to the schedule and generates a schedule from the resulting combined list of activities. The algorithm applies the mutation operator on chromosomes to avoid being trapped in local

optimum solutions. The mutation is carried out in two phases. The first step involves selecting two random activities in the chromosome and swapping them if they do not violate the priority conditions. In the second step, we relocate a random activity to a different location without violating the priority conditions. This process is iterated a specified number of times.

We pick a given number (a parameter of the algorithm) of the top chromosomes from the set of offspring chromosomes  $\Gamma''$ . They are included in *the next generation*  $\Gamma$ . The same number of the worst chromosomes are removed from  $\Gamma$ .

## 6. Neighborhood search

Let's briefly describe the NS operator (for more details, we refer to [20]). For a given feasible schedule  $S = (s_0, \dots, s_{n+1})$  and a core activity  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , the NS operator reschedules a set of activities  $A_j^s$ , while maintaining the start times of all other activities. Let  $P$  be a predetermined number of activities to be rescheduled. A value of  $P$  affects the computation time to obtain a neighborhood solution by rescheduling. The smaller value of  $P$  usually means fewer activities that need to be rescheduled and less time to obtain a new schedule. The following Block selection method is used to create  $A_j^s$  [34].  $CreateBlock(j, S) \rightarrow A_j^s$ .

1.  $A_j^s = j$ ;  $b = 0$ ; create a random order for all activities in  $A/\{j\}$ . Let  $i$  be the first activity in the order.
2. If  $s_j - p_i - b \leq s_i \leq s_j + p_j + b$ , then  $A_j^s = A_j^s \cup \{i\}$ .
3. If  $|A_j^s| = P$ , go to Step 6.
4. If  $i$  is the last activity among the ones not belonging to  $A_j^s$  based on the order defined in Step 1,  $b = b + 1$ .
5. Let  $i$  be the next activity among the ones not belonging to  $A_j^s$  based on the order defined in Step 1. Go to Step 2.
6. END.

The Block selection method basically selects a set  $P$  of activities that overlap, or are close to an activity  $j$  in a given feasible schedule.

The NS method uses knowledge gained from the previously considered solutions. This knowledge is stored in a *tabu list*, which serves as a memory to avoid cyclicity. Each entry in the tabu list records the attributes of the last visited solutions. The length of a tabu list can vary based on the details of the NS operator's process. As the tabu status of an arbitrary solution  $L$ , we consider the sum of the start times:

$$TS(L) = \sum_{j=1}^n s_j$$

for the schedule  $S(L)$ .

The neighborhood search algorithm uses two types of neighborhoods [20]. The first neighborhood  $N_A(S)$  is a modification of the scheme proposed in [36]. For a given feasible schedule  $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_n, s_{n+1}\}$  and a core activity  $j \in A$ , we define the activity block  $A_j^s$ . The NS operator reschedules the set of activities  $A_j^s$ , keeping the start times of the remaining activities intact. The rescheduling sub-problem is formed by the following

steps. We fix the start time of all activities that are not part of the set  $A_j^s$  and release the resources used by all activities from  $A_j^s$  for each time period  $t$ . The available amount of resource  $k$  for activities in  $A_j^s$  in period  $t$  is equal to  $R_k$  minus the resources used by all the activities in  $A_j^s$  in period  $t$ . Then we derive the earliest start time (EST) and latest finish time (LFT) for each activity  $i \in A_j^s$  as  $EST_i = \max\{s_l + p_l, \forall l \notin A_j^s \text{ and } (l, i) \in A\}$  and  $LFT_i = \max\{s_l, \forall l \notin A_j^s \text{ and } (l, i) \in A\}$ . Interval  $(EST_i, LFT_i)$  establishes the time window for activity  $i$  that can be rescheduled to ensure that a new schedule remains feasible for all remaining activities. The rescheduling problem is to reschedule all activities in  $A_j^s$  so as to minimize their makespan, while meeting the resource restrictions of each period and the time window constraints defined by  $(EST_i, LFT_i)$ .

At each iteration, a new random vector is generated for the activities of  $A_j^s$  as a priority list. We order the activities in  $A_j^s$  by decreasing their weights  $v_j$ . The vector is created iteratively by randomly selecting the next activity from the ordered list among all unselected activities that preceded the ones in  $A_j^s$ . Each activity in the priority list is moved to the earliest (latest) start time that is precedence and resource feasible, and satisfies the time window  $(EST_i, LFT_i)$ . Following the rescheduling of all activities of  $A_j^s$ , activities outside of set  $A_j^s$  are incorporated to construct a complete feasible solution. All activities in  $A$  undergo a global left shift to minimize the makespan as much as possible. A new schedule is compared against the previous solution prior to applying the NS operator. If the makespan is improved, the resulting schedule replace the previous schedule. If no improvement occurs prior to reaching the predefined limit  $\lambda_{NS}$  of iterations, the S-SGS is then applied to the schedule with a fresh random priority list at the next iteration.

The neighborhood  $N_B(S)$  is defined as follows. We determine the block of activity  $A_j^s$  for a given list of activities  $L$  (and a correspondent active schedule  $S = \{s_0, \dots, s_{n+1}\}$ ), where  $j$  is a core activity. If the block contains at least one predecessor of activity  $j$ , then we set  $A_j^s$  to be empty. The list  $L$  is represented in the form of three successive lists  $L = A^1, A_j^s, A^2$ . For each activity  $j \in A$ , an element  $L'$  of the neighborhood  $N_B(S)$  is constructed using a non-empty block  $A_j^s$ . The list  $L'$  is generated from the list  $L$  by following these steps. For set  $A^1$ , the start times of all activities are adjusted, and the resources, occupied by all activities in set  $A^1$ , are relinquished at each time period  $t$ . A partial schedule for the activities in set  $A^1$  is generated by employing the serial decoding procedure. We then expand the partial schedule by incorporating activities from the set  $A_j^s$ , utilizing a parallel decoding technique. According to the procedure, for each schedule time  $t$  we have the corresponding eligible set  $E_t$ , i.e. a set of activities that can be started at time  $t$  without violating any constraints. There are exponentially number of possibilities to select a subset of activities from the eligible set to include into the schedule. We solve the multi-dimensional knapsack problem with an objective function that maximizes the weighted resource utilization ratio:

$$\max \sum_{j \in E_t} x_j \sum_{k \in K} \frac{w_k r_{jk}}{R_k}, \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{j \in E_t} r_{jk} x_j \leq R_k - \sum_{j \in J(t)} r_{jk} \quad k \in K, \quad (10)$$

$$x_j \in \{0, 1\}, \quad j \in N. \quad (11)$$

The right-hand side of the restriction represents the remaining capacity of resource type  $k$  at time  $t$ . The problem is resolved using Greedy Randomized Adaptive Search Procedures (GRASP).

Finally, we construct the list  $L'$  as follows. The activities from  $A_j^s$  are then added to the list  $L'$  in ascending order of their start times within the partial schedule. The remaining activities are ordered similarly in the list  $L'$  as in the list  $L$ . The schedule  $S(L')$  is referred to as a neighboring sample for the schedule  $S$ . The set comprising all adjacent samples is referred to as the neighborhood of the schedule  $S$  and is denoted by  $N_B(S)$ .

## 7. The GANS Algorithm

We propose a genetic algorithm for solving the RCPSP by integrating a neighborhood search approach. The proposed GANS algorithm seeks to preserve the randomness of the Genetic Algorithm search and enhance solution quality through a neighborhood search conducted at specific points during the GA iterations.

Numerical experiments were conducted using instances from the PSPLIB library. Separate analyses for the GA and NS algorithms had previously revealed varying degrees of efficiency across different groups of instances from PSPLIB. Let us find deviation of current upper bound from its critical path value for each instance from a group in the j120 and compute the average deviation for each group. Table 1 presents the top of the sorted list of instance groups in non-decreasing order of their average deviations. For each group, the average deviations of solutions, obtained with the GA and NS algorithms, are shown. The best performing results are highlighted. The performance of GA is equal to

Table 1: Average percent deviations from the critical path value for the some groups of j120.

Instance Set	GA operator [18]	NS operator [20]
J120_56	156,83	<b>154,51</b>
J120_16	145,39	<b>143,90</b>
J120_36	131,14	<b>129,37</b>
J120_51	125,85	<b>123,64</b>
J120_31	112,33	<b>111,15</b>
J120_11	108,15	<b>107,16</b>
J120_6	<b>76,97</b>	77,64
J120_46	<b>73,09</b>	73,46
J120_26	69,05	<b>68,66</b>
J120_37	<b>66,72</b>	66,94
J120_52	55,95	<b>55,40</b>
J120_57	<b>66,35</b>	66,41
J120_17	<b>60,64</b>	61,75

or better than NS operator for all remaining groups of instances not listed in the table.

A full factorial experimental design of instances is defined by combining three parameters: network complexity (NC), resource factor (RF), and resource strength (RS). The NC defines the average number of precedence relations per activity. The resource factor RF reflects the average portion of resources requested per activity. The RS measures



scarcity of the resources. A zero RS factor indicates the lowest amount of each resource type needed to complete all activities, whereas an RS value of one represents the required amount of each resource type allocated according to the early start time schedule. It is known [45] that values of the parameters  $RF = 4$ ,  $RS = 0.1$  or  $RS = 0.2$  match hard enough series. As shown in Table 1, a neighborhood search is more preferable on challenging instances with a small  $RS$  value.

This observation has led to the idea of dividing the PSPLIB's instances into three subsets. Instances from these subsets will be processed using the same hybrid algorithm, but with a separate set of problem parameters. This will allow us to efficiently coordinate the problem-solving process within each of the three subsets of instances. Let us establish the threshold values  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  to define subsets, where  $0 < \sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ . The process starts with the formation of the initial population by the Genetic Algorithm. Then we find the best chromosome in the initial population and calculate the value of the relative deviation of its makespan from the critical path length  $\sigma = (UB - Tkr)/Tkr$ . If  $\sigma < \sigma_1$ , then the instance is placed in the first subset. If  $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_2$ , then the instance is included in the second subset. If  $\sigma \geq \sigma_2$ , then the instance is added to the third subset. The primary distinction in applying the algorithm to each subset of instances lies in the varying proportions of GA and NS operators application. The first subset mainly employs the GA operator, whereas the third subset primarily utilizes the NS operator. The operators in the second subset have a proportion that is roughly equivalent.

The GA starts running and will persist until the count of its iterations reaches a pre-determined value without modifying the existing record (best solution). In this instance, the NS operator initiates. The number of schedules generated by a single NS operator is a parameter of the problem.

The initial solution in the NS operator can be chosen using any suitable method that is available. The choice of the algorithm for the initial solution is not critical for the local search methods. Gagnon et al. [14] noted that there is some dilemma concerning the choice of the initial solution used by a NS method adaptation. Starting with a very good solution doesn't let enough space to find a significant improvement. On the other side, it may take a long computation time to improve a bad starting solution. An initial solution will be chosen from the set of chromosomes in the population at random using a specified probability – a predefined parameter, and the selection process will begin with the best chromosome.

Denote by  $\lambda$  the maximum number of schedules generated. The number of schedules generated will increase every time the objective function is computed, and the algorithm stops when  $\lambda$  is exceeded. The general scheme of the algorithm is outlined below.

1. Solve the relaxed problem (5)–(8). Rank resources, renumber them in a descending order of their scarcity, and assign resource weights  $w_k, k \in K$ .
2. Construct the initial population  $\Gamma$  and store the best of its chromosomes as  $S^*$  along with its makespan  $T^*$ .
3. Calculate  $\sigma$  by setting  $UB$  equal to  $T^*$ . Then we decide to categorize the instance within one of the three subsets of the set of instances PSPLIB. Assign parameters of the problem based on the selected option.
4. Initiate a set of offspring schedules  $\Gamma'' := \emptyset$ .
5. While the number of schedules generated does not exceed  $\lambda$ , do:
  - (a) construct the set of parent chromosomes  $\Gamma'$ ,

- (b) until the necessary number of offspring chromosomes has been generated, do:
  - i. choose two parent chromosomes  $S_1$  and  $S_2 \in \Gamma'$  at random,
  - ii. choose crossover  $Crossing$  with equal probability from  $CrossingA$  and  $CrossingB$ ,
  - iii. cross the parent chromosomes  $S_1$  and  $S_2 : S' := Crossing(S_1, S_2)$ ,
  - iv. apply to  $S'$  sequentially the operations of mutation and local improvement FBI,
  - v. if the mutation has made  $S'$  worse, it is canceled,
  - vi. if  $T(S') < T(S^*)$ , then update the record  $S^* := S'$ ,
  - vii. update the set of offspring chromosomes  $\Gamma'' = \Gamma'' \cup S'$ ,
- (c) create a new population for the next generation,
- (d) if  $S^*$  has not been updated for a given number of steps, then
  - i. replace a given number of the worst schedules in the population with new chromosomes;
  - ii. Execute a particular number of steps (an algorithm parameter) in the NS operator:
    - A. choose the initial chromosomes  $S$ , and set  $T := T(S)$ . Tabu list  $TL$  is set empty,
    - B. Until the stopping criterion is satisfied, do:
      - choose the type of neighborhood ( $N_A(S)$  or  $N_B(S)$ ) equally probable,
      - Find the neighbor sample  $S'$ , not prohibited by the tabu list  $TL$ ,
      - If  $T(S') < T$ , then assume  $T := T(S')$ ,  $S := S'$ ,
      - Update the tabu list  $TL$ , and set  $S := S'$ .
    - C. If  $T < T^*$ , then assume  $T^* := T(S')$ ,  $S^* := S'$ ,

The chromosome  $S^*$  is the result of the algorithm.

## 8. Search intensification and parameters

The parameters of the problem exert a substantial influence on determining its solution. We adjust some parameters during the problem-solving process, introducing self-tuning elements into the algorithm.

Computational experiments indicate that  $\sigma_1$  should be set to 0.2 and  $\sigma_2$  to 0.6. We use a population size  $\Gamma$  ranging from 40 to 150 chromosomes. The population size is decreased for instances produced with a low NC value, and for a high NC value, the population size is increased. We assume an average population size of 60-80 chromosomes. If we expend considerable effort to replenish the population with new unique chromosomes, we will either decrease the population size or waive the requirement for chromosome uniqueness. Otherwise, we may be able to increase the population size.

The resource weights  $w$  are chosen with equal probability from the following set of options:  $(1, 0.8, 0.6, 0.4)$ ,  $(1, 0.9, 0.8, 0.7)$ ,  $(1, 1, 1, 1)$ , and  $w_k = 2 - \frac{\hat{R}_k}{R_4}$ ,  $k \in K$ . In the last case, the reduction in the value of  $w_k$  is directly proportional to the remaining unused resources  $\hat{R}_k$ ,  $k \in K$  in the relaxed problem. This version of weighting coefficients was also applied in a probabilistic implementation for the unlimited scenario. The parameter  $R$  in the operator  $DenseActivities(S, R)$  plays a key role in determining the quality of

the dense gene that is being identified. Relatively small  $R$  enable the discovery a high-quality dense gene. It's possible that we may not discover these genes or there are only a limited number of them. We aim to enhance the quality of the dense gene, which is achieved by reducing  $R$ , but in this case, we are compelled to increase it. Conversely, if the cardinality of the dense genes set is sufficiently great, then the algorithm can decrease the parameter  $R$ . We assume the initial value as  $R = 0.75$ .

A higher probability of a chromosome being included in the set of parent chromosomes results in better overall quality, however it may not be sufficient to produce offspring with sufficient genetic diversity. Under certain conditions, the algorithm has the capability to alter this parameter, either by reducing or enhancing it. We assume the initial value as  $probabilityParentSelection = 0.25$ .

If the current record  $S$  (the best chromosome) in the operator NS remains unchanged over a specified number of iterations, we modify the cardinality of the set  $A_j^s$  within the procedure  $CreateBlock(j, S)$ . This cardinality can be either increased or decreased based on the statistics of the previous iterations of the NS algorithm. If a proportion of non-empty neighboring solutions in a specified number of previous iterations meets or exceeds a predetermined threshold, we then increase the parameter  $P$  by one. A high proportion of empty neighbors implies that a predecessors of activities being frequently included in the set  $A_j^s$ . This means that the cardinality of this set is excessively high, we decrease the parameter  $P$  by one in this case. The intention behind such an adjustment is to enhance the size of the set  $A_j^s$ , with the goal of yielding new solutions. This increase can only proceed up to a certain limit: when the set often includes a predecessors and is forced to become empty, it is crucial to decrease the parameter  $P$ , thereby re-entering the domain of non-empty sets  $A_j^s$ . If the parameter  $P$  has undergone a fixed number of modifications and the value of  $T$  remains unchanged, then reset  $P$  to 1 and reassign the resource weights  $w_k, k \in K$ .

## 9. Numerical experiments.

The GANS algorithm was implemented in C++ using Visual Studio and executed on a computer featuring a 3.4 GHz CPU and 16 GB of RAM with the Windows 10 operating system. In evaluating the performance of the proposed algorithm, we employ the standard set of instances provided by Kolisch and Sprecher [28]. The project scheduling library PSPLIB contains these instances along with their best-known values. The instances are downloadable at <http://www.om-db.wi.tum.de/psplib/>.

The optimal solutions for the instances from datasets j60, j90, and j120 are unknown. The quality of the solutions is gauged by the average percent deviation (APD) of the received solutions from the lower bounds calculated by the critical path method. The stopping criterion is determined by the maximum number  $\lambda$  of schedules generated, as per Kolisch and Hartmann [26]. The selected limits on the number of generated schedules are 50000, 500000, and unlimited.

Comparisons between the performance of the GANS algorithm and previous results from experimental evaluations of competitive heuristics for the datasets j60, j90, and j120 are shown in Tables 2–4. The presented results confirm the high effectiveness of the proposed algorithm through a clear analysis.

For the dataset j60, the best known solutions (at the time of writing) were achieved for all instances except one (j609\_10). Note that for j60 the heuristic solutions have

Table 2: Average percent deviations from the critical path lower bound for the dataset j60.

Algorithm	Reference	APD, %		
		$\lambda = 50000$	$\lambda = 500000$	<i>unlimited</i>
GA + NS	this paper (2024)	<b>10,48</b>	<b>10,37</b>	<b>10,37</b>
GA	Goncharov [19] (2022)	10,50	10,40	
GA	Goncharov, Leonov[18] (2017)	10,52	10,42	
GANS	Proon, Jin [36] (2011)	10,52	–	10,52
TS,VNS	Goncharov [20] (2022)	10,55	10,44	
Sequential(SS(FBI))	Berthaut et al. [3] (2018)	10,58	10,45	
GH + SS(LS)	Paraskevopoulos et al. [38] (2012)	10,54	10,46	
AI(FBI)	Mobini, at al. [33] (2011)	10,55	–	
TS + SS(FBI)	Mobini, at al. [32] (2009)	10,57	–	
GA(FBI)	Wang et al. [44] (2010)	10,57	–	
GA(FBI)	Goncalves [17] (2011)	10,57	10,49	
EA(GA(LS)+DEA(LS))	Elsayed et al. [12] (2017)	10,58	–	
PSO(LS)	Czogalla and Fink [9] (2009)	10,62	–	
GA	Lim et al. [30] (2013)	10,63	10,51	
Parallel(MA(LS))	Chen, at al. [7] (2014)	10,63	–	
PL(LS)	Zheng and Wang [48] (2015)	10,64	–	
GA(FBI)	Zamani [47] (2013)	10,65	–	
SFL(LS)	Fang and Wang [13] (2012)	10,66	–	
GA(FBI)	Ismail and Barghash [24] (2012)	10,66	–	
ACOSS	Wang Chen, at al. [43] (2010)	10,67	–	
GAPS	Mendes, at al. [31] (2009)	10,67	10,67	
GA	Debels, Vanhoucke [11] (2007)	10,68	–	
Specialist(PSO(LS))	Koulinas et al. [29] (2014)	10,68	–	
GA(LS)	Carlier et al. [6] (2009)	10,70	–	
Decomposition	Palpant et al. [34] (2004)	–	–	10,81
Population-based	Valls et al. [41] (2004)	–	–	10,89

Table 3: Average percent deviations from the critical path lower bound for the dataset j90.

Algorithm	Reference	APD, %		
		$\lambda = 50000$	$\lambda = 500000$	<i>unlimited</i>
GA + NS	this paper	<b>9,80</b>	<b>9,53</b>	<b>9,48</b>
GA	Goncharov [19] (2022)	9,92	9,61	
GA	Debels, Vanhoucke [11] (2017)	9,90	–	
Sequential(SS(FBI))	Berthaut et al. [3] (2018)	9,96	9,74	
TS,VNS	Goncharov [20] (2022)	9,98	9,78	
Sequential(SS)	Ranjbar and Kianfar [37] (2009)	10,04	–	
SS(EM + FBI)	Debels, et al. [10] (2006)	10,09	9,80	
PL(LS)	Jedrzejowicz, Ratajczak [25] (2006)	11,60	–	
TS	Ying et al. [46] (2009)	12,15	–	

Table 4: Average percent deviations from the critical path lower bound for the dataset j120.

Algorithm	Reference	APD, %		
		$\lambda = 50000$	$\lambda = 500000$	<i>unlimited</i>
GA + NS	this paper	<b>30,42</b>	<b>29,37</b>	<b>29,19</b>
GA	Goncharov [19] (2022)	30,46	29,63	
Specialist GA	Goncharov, Leonov[18] (2017)	30,50	29,74	
TS,VNS	Goncharov [20] (2022)	30,56	29,88	
GA	Lim et al. [30] (2013)	30,66	29,91	
biased random-key GA	Goncalves [17] (2011)	32,76	30,08	
GANS	Proon, Jin [36] (2011)	30,45	30,78	30,78
ACOSS	Wang Chen, at al. [43] (2010)	30,56	–	
DBGA	Debels, Vanhoucke [11] (2007)	30,69	–	
GH + SS(LS)	Paraskevopoulos et al. [38] (2012)	30,78	30,39	
GA	Debels, Vanhoucke [11] (2007)	30,82	–	
PL(LS)	Zheng and Wang [48] (2015)	31,02	–	
SFL(LS)	Fang and Wang [13] (2012)	31,11	–	
Sequential(SS(FBI))	Berthaut et al. [3] (2018)	31,16	30,39	
EA(GA(LS)+DEA(LS))	Elsayed et al. [12] (2017)	31,22	–	
Specialist(PSO(LS))	Koulinas et al. [29] (2014)	31,23	–	
GA - Hybrid, FBI	Valls, at al. [40] (2008)	31,24	30,95	30,95
GA(FBI)	Wang et al. [44] (2010)	31,28	–	
GA(FBI)	Zamani [47] (2013)	31,30	–	
Enhanced SS	Mobini, at al. [32] (2009)	31,37	–	
GA(LS)	Alcaraz and Maroto [2] (2006)	31,38	–	
GA(LS)	Carlier et al. [6] (2009)	31,40	–	
Scatter search - FBI	Debels, et al. [10] (2006)	31,57	30,48	
GAPS	Mendes, at al. [31] (2009)	31,44	31,20	
GA, FBI	Valls, et al. [39] (2005)	31,58	–	
Decomposition	Palpant et al. [34] (2004)	–	–	31,58

remained unchanged since 2008. The best APD values were achieved for datasets j90 and j120 at every lambda value. We have improved the existing best heuristic solutions for four instances from the dataset j90. Two of these new solutions are not updated in PSPLIB. Improvements have been made to existing best heuristic solutions for over 50 instances within the dataset j120. Four of these new solutions are not updated in PSPLIB (see Table 5). The links to text files containing the achieved makespans for all

Table 5: List of instances with new solutions not uploaded into PSPLIB.

instance			makespan	Date of sending the solution to PSPLIB
dataset	Parameter	Instance		
j90	13	9	122	13 January 2025
j90	29	4	148	28 November 2024
j120	31	1	196	21 January 2025
j120	31	6	190	28 November 2024
j120	31	7	204	26 December 2024
j120	31	9	188	16 January 2025

instances can be found in Table 6.

Average processing time is 16 seconds for  $\lambda = 50000$  and 150 seconds for  $\lambda = 500000$  (for the instances with 120 activities).

Table 6: Hyperlinks to the files with makespans.

dataset	link to file
j60	<a href="http://old.math.nsc.ru/LBRT/k4/j60-hrs-Goncharov.txt">old.math.nsc.ru/LBRT/k4/j60-hrs-Goncharov.txt</a>
j90	<a href="http://old.math.nsc.ru/LBRT/k4/j90-hrs-Goncharov.txt">old.math.nsc.ru/LBRT/k4/j90-hrs-Goncharov.txt</a>
j120	<a href="http://old.math.nsc.ru/LBRT/k4/j120-hrs-Goncharov.txt">old.math.nsc.ru/LBRT/k4/j120-hrs-Goncharov.txt</a>

## 10. Conclusion

Coelho and Vanhoucke [8] encouraged researchers to focus their attention on developing radically new algorithms to solve RCPSP, rather than incrementally improving current algorithms that can solve existing instances of RCPSP only slightly better. Such approaches await their researchers, and this work is without a doubt part of the old conservative school of thought. Nevertheless, we proposed a hybrid GA and NS algorithm for the RCPSP. It incorporates two crossover techniques and two neighborhood variations. We utilize a ranking system based on the importance of each resource. Numerical experiments were carried out using datasets from the PSPLIB online library. Computational experiments reveal that the suggested algorithm is a competitive heuristic, outperforming multiple heuristics documented in the literature. The best heuristic solutions were improved for some instances from the j90 and j120 dataset.

## Acknowledgement

The study was carried out within the framework of the state contract of the Sobolev Institute of Mathematics (project FWNF-2022-0019)

## References

- [1] Abdolshah, M.: A review of resource-constrained project scheduling problems (RCPSP) approaches and solutions, *International Transaction Journal of Engineering, Management, & Applied Sciences & Technologies*, **5**(4), 253–286 (2014).
- [2] Alcaraz, J., Maroto, C.: A hybrid genetic algorithm based on intelligent encoding for project scheduling, In Jyzefowska J., & Weglarz J. (Eds.), *Perspectives in modern project scheduling*, Boston: Springer, 249–274 (2006).
- [3] Berthaut, F., Pellerin, R., Hajji, A., Perrier, N.: A path relinking-based scatter search for the resource-constrained project scheduling problem, *International Journal of Project Organisation and Management*, **10**(1), 1–36 (2018).
- [4] Blażewicz, J., Lenstra, J.K., Rinnoy Kan, A.H.G.: Scheduling Subject to Resource Constraints: Classification and Complexity, *Discrete Applied Math.* **5**(1), 11–24 (1983).
- [5] Brucker, P., Drexler, A., Möhring, R., et al.: Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling: Notation, Classification, Models, and Methods, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **112**(1), 3–41 (1999).
- [6] Carlier, J., Moukrim, A., Xu, H.: A memetic algorithm for the resource constrained project scheduling problem, In *Proc. of the international conference on industrial engineering and systems management, IESM* (2009).
- [7] Chen, D., Liu, S., Qin, S.: Memetic algorithm for the resource-constrained project scheduling problem, In *Proceeding of the 11 th world congress on intelligent control and automation, WCICA*, 4991–4996. IEEE (2014).
- [8] Coelho, J., Vanhoucke, M.: Going to the core of hard resource-constrained project scheduling instances. *Computers & Operations Research*, 121, Article 104976. (2020).
- [9] Czogalla, J., Fink, A.: Particle swarm topologies for resource constrained project scheduling, In Krasnogor N. et al. (Eds.), *Nature inspired cooperative strategies for optimization*, 61–73. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag (2009).

- [10] Debels, D., De Reyck Leus, B.R., Vanhoucke, M.: A Hybrid Scatter Search Electromagnetism Meta-Heuristic for Project Scheduling, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **169**, 638–653 (2006).
- [11] Debels, D., Vanhoucke, M.: Decomposition-based Genetic Algorithm for the Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, *Oper. Res.* **55**, 457–469 (2007).
- [12] Elsayed, S., Sarker, R., Ray, T., Coello, C. C.: Consolidated optimization algorithm for resource-constrained project scheduling problems, *Information Sciences*, 418–419, 346–362 (2017).
- [13] Fang, C., Wang, L.: An effective shuffled frog-leaping algorithm for resource-constrained project scheduling problem, *Computers & Operations Research*, **39**(5), 890–901 (2012).
- [14] Gagnon, M., Boctor, F.F., d’Avignon, G.: A Tabu Search Algorithm for the Resource-constrained Project Scheduling Problem, *ASAC* (2004).
- [15] Gimadi, E.Kh.: On Some Mathematical Models and Methods for Planning Large-Scale Projects. Models and Optimization Methods, in *Proc. AN USSR Sib. Branch, Math. Inst., Novosibirsk. Nauka* **10**, 89–115 (1988).
- [16] Gimadi, E.Kh., Zalyubovskii, V.V., and Sevast’yanov, S.V.: Polynomial Solvability of Scheduling Problems with Storable Resources and Deadlines, *Diskretnyi Analiz i Issledovanie Operazii, Ser. 2*, **7**(1), 9–34 (2000).
- [17] Goncalves, J., Resende, M.G.C, Mendes, J.: A Biased Random Key Genetic Algorithm with Forward-Backward Improvement for Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, *J. Heuristics*. **17**, 467–486 (2011).
- [18] Goncharov, E. N., Leonov, V. V.: Genetic Algorithm for the Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, *Automation and Remote Control* **78**(6) 1101–1114, (2017).
- [19] Goncharov, E. N. : An Improved Genetic Algorithm for the Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem. In: Olenev, N., Evtushenko, Y., Jacimovic, M., Khachay, M., Malkova, V., Pospelov, I. (eds) *Advances in Optimization and Applications. OPTIMA 2022. Communications in Computer and Information Science*, vol 1739. Springer, Cham. (2022). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-22990-9\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-22990-9_3)
- [20] Goncharov, E.N. A Local Search Algorithm for the Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem. *Journal of Applied and Industrial Mathematics*. 16, 672–683 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1134/S1990478922040081>
- [21] Hartmann, S., Briskorn, D.: A Survey of Variants and Extensions of the Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **207**, 1–14 (2010).
- [22] Hartmann, S., Briskorn, D.: An updated survey of variants and extensions of the resource-constrained project scheduling problem. *European Journal of* 297(1), 1–14. (2021).
- [23] Herroelen, W., Demeulemeester, E., De Reyck, B.: A Classification Scheme for Project Scheduling, Weglarz J. (Ed.) *Project Scheduling-Recent Models, Algorithms and Applications*, International Series in Operations Research and Management Science. Kluwer Acad. Publish., Dordrecht: **14**(1), 77–106 (1998).
- [24] Ismail, I. Y., Barghash, M. A.: Diversity guided genetic algorithm to solve the resource constrained project scheduling problem, *International Journal of Planning and Scheduling*, **1**(3), 147–170 (2012).
- [25] Jdrzejowicz, P., Ratajczak, E.: Population learning algorithm for the resource-constrained project scheduling, In Jyzefowska J., & Weglarz J. (Eds.), *Perspectives in modern project scheduling*, 275–296. Boston: Springer (2006).
- [26] Kolisch, R., Hartmann, S.: Experimental Investigation of Heuristics for Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling: An Update, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **174**, 23–37 (2006).
- [27] Kolisch, R., Hartmann, S.: Heuristic Algorithms for Solving the Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem: Classification and Computational Analysis, Weglarz J., (ed). *Project scheduling: Recent models, algorithms and applications*. Kluwer Acad. Publish., 147–178 (1999).
- [28] Kolisch, R., Sprecher, A.: PSPLIB – a Project Scheduling Problem Library, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **96**, 205–216 (1996). (downloadable from <http://www.om-db.wi.tum.de/psplib/>)
- [29] Koulinas, G., Kotsikas, L., Anagnostopoulos, K.: A particle swarm optimization based hyper-heuristic algorithm for the classic resource constrained project scheduling problem, *Information Sciences*, **277** 680–693 (2014).
- [30] Lim, A., Ma, H., Rodrigues, B., Tan, S.T., Xiao, F.: New meta-heuristics for the resource-constrained project scheduling problem, *Flexible Services and Manufacturing Journal*, **25**(1-2), 48–73 (2013).
- [31] Mendes, J.J.M., Goncalves, J.F., Resende, M.G.C.: A Random Key Based Genetic Algorithm for the Resource Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, *Comput. Oper. Res.* **36**, 92–109 (2009).
- [32] Mobini, M.D.M., Rabbani, M., Amalnik, M.S., et al.: Using an Enhanced Scatter Search Algorithm for a Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, *Soft Computing*. **13** 597–610 (2009).

- [33] Mobini, M., Mobini, Z., Rabbani, M.: An artificial immune algorithm for the project scheduling problem under resource constraints, *Applied Soft Computing*, **11**(2), 1975–1982 (2011).
- [34] Palpant, M., Artigues, C., and Michelon, P.: Solving the resource-constrained project scheduling problem with large neighborhood search, *Ann Oper Res* **131** 237–257 (2004).
- [35] Pellerin, R., Perrier, N., Berthaut, F.: LSSPER: A survey of hybrid metaheuristics for the resource-constrained project scheduling problem, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **280**, 2, 395–416 (2020).
- [36] Proon, S., Jin, M.: A Genetic Algorithm with Neighborhood Search for the Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, *Naval Res. Logist.* **58**, 73–82 (2011).
- [37] Ranjbar, M., Kianfar, F.: A hybrid scatter search for the RCPSP, *Scientia Iranica*, **16**(1), 11–18 (2009).
- [38] Paraskevopoulos, D. C., Tarantilis, C. D., Ioannou, G.: Solving project scheduling problems with resource constraints via an event list-based evolutionary algorithm, *Expert Systems with Applications*, **39**(4), 3983–3994 (2012).
- [39] Valls, V., Ballestin, F., Quintanilla, M.S.: Justification and RCPSP: a Technique that Pays, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **165**, 375–386 (2005).
- [40] Valls, V., Ballestin, F., Quintanilla, S.: A Hybrid Genetic Algorithm for the Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **185**(2), 495–508 (2008).
- [41] Valls, V., Ballestin, F., Quintanilla, S.: A Population-based Approach to the Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling Problem, *Annals of Operations Research* **131**, 305–324 (2004).
- [42] Vanhoucke, M.: Resource-constrained project scheduling, In *Project Management with Dynamic Scheduling*, 107–137, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag. (2012)
- [43] Wang Chen, Yan-jun Shi, Hong-fei Teng, et al.: An Efficient Hybrid Algorithm for Resource-Constrained Project Scheduling, *Inf. Sci.* **180**(6), 1031–1039 (2010).
- [44] Wang, H., Li, T., Lin, T.: Efficient genetic algorithm for resource-constrained project scheduling problem, *Transactions of Tianjin University*, **16**(5), 376–382 (2010).
- [45] Weglarz, J.: *Project scheduling. Recent models, algorithms and applications*, Boston: Kluwer Acad. Publ. (1999).
- [46] Ying, K. C., Lin, S. W., Lee, Z. J.: Hybrid-directional planning: improving improvement heuristics for scheduling resource-constrained projects, *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, **41**(3–4), 358–366 (2009).
- [47] Zamani, R.: A competitive magnet-based genetic algorithm for solving the resource-constrained project scheduling problem, *European Journal of Operational Research*, **229**(2), 552–559 (2013).
- [48] Zheng, X., Wang, L.: A multi-agent optimization algorithm for resource constrained project scheduling problem, *Expert Systems with Applications*, **42**(15–16), 6039–6049 (2015).