

Randomised Variable Neighbourhood Search for Multi Objective Optimisation

Martin Josef Geiger

School of Computer Science & IT, University of Nottingham, mjpg@cs.nott.ac.uk

Abstract

Various local search approaches have recently been applied to machine scheduling problems under multiple objectives. Their foremost consideration is the identification of the set of Pareto optimal alternatives. An important aspect of successfully solving these problems lies in the definition of an appropriate neighbourhood structure. Unclear in this context remains, how interdependencies within the fitness landscape affect the resolution of the problem.

The paper presents a study of neighbourhood search operators for multiple objective flow shop scheduling. Experiments have been carried out with twelve different combinations of criteria. To derive exact conclusions, small problem instances, for which the optimal solutions are known, have been chosen. Statistical tests show that no single neighbourhood operator is able to equally identify all Pareto optimal alternatives. Significant improvements however have been obtained by hybridising the solution algorithm using a randomised variable neighbourhood search technique.

Keywords: Hybrid Local Search, Multi Objective Optimisation, Flow Shop Scheduling.

1 Introduction

Machine scheduling considers in general the assignment of a set of resources (machines) $\mathcal{M} = \{M_1, \dots, M_m\}$ to a set of jobs $\mathcal{J} = \{J_1, \dots, J_n\}$, each of which consists of a set of operations $J_j = \{O_{j1}, \dots, O_{jo_j}\}$ [5]. The operations O_{jk} typically may be processed on a single machine $M_i \in \mathcal{M}$ involving a nonnegative processing time t_{jk} . Usually, precedence constraints are defined among the operations of a job, reflecting its technical nature. In the specific case of the here considered *permutation flow shop scheduling problem*, the machine sequences are identical for all jobs [21]. Furthermore, the sequence of the jobs on the machines is assumed to be the same, therefore leading to a single job permutation as a possible schedule representation. A solution of the problem, a *schedule*, defines starting times for the tasks respecting the chosen job sequence and the defined constraints of the problem.

Optimality of schedules can be judged with respect to a single or multiple objective functions, expressing the quality of the solution in a quantitative way. While the multi criteria nature of scheduling in manufacturing environments has been mentioned quite early [24], the problem is treated only recently as a multi objective optimisation problem [30]. Here, the goal is to identify all efficient alternatives, the *set of Pareto optimal solutions* P [31]. Most important optimality criteria are based on the completion times C_j of the jobs J_j in the schedule:

- The minimisation of the maximum completion time (makespan) $C_{max} = \max\{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$.
- The minimisation of the sum of the completion times $C_{sum} = \sum_{j=1}^n C_j$

In the case of existing due dates d_j for each job J_j , it is possible to compute due date violations in the form of tardiness values $T_j = \max\{C_j - d_j, 0\}$. Possible optimality criteria are:

- The minimisation of the maximum tardiness $T_{max} = \max\{T_1, \dots, T_j\}$.
- The minimisation of the total tardiness $T_{sum} = \sum_{j=1}^n T_j$.

- The minimisation of the number of tardy jobs $U = \sum_{j=1}^n U_j$ where $U_j = \begin{cases} 1 & : T_j > 0 \\ 0 & : T_j = 0 \end{cases}$

In terms of machine efficiency, idle times I_i of the machines M_i may be considered up to the completion of the last job. Optimality criteria are therefore:

- The minimisation of the maximum machine idleness $I_{max} = \max\{I_1, \dots, I_m\}$.
- The minimisation of the total machine idleness $I_{sum} = \sum_{i=1}^m I_i$.

An important factor for the resolution of the permutation flow shop scheduling problem is the circumstance that the functions are *regular* [6]. It is therefore possible to map a given sequence of jobs $\pi = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n\}$ into an active schedule, one of which is optimal [8]. Consequently, many existing local search approaches are based on this idea of a schedule representation, and neighbourhood definitions manipulate the job permutations π by changing the positions of jobs [23]:

- Exchange neighbourhood (EX), exchanging the position of two jobs π_j and π_k , $j \neq k$.
- Forward shift neighbourhood (FSH), removing a job π_j and reinserting it at position π_k with $k > j$.
- Backward shift neighbourhood (BSH), removing a job π_j and reinserting it at position π_k with $k < j$.
- Inversion neighbourhood (INV), inverting the positions of a chosen subset of π .

Important applications of local search algorithms for the permutation flow shop scheduling problem comprise local search descent [11, 23, 32], simulated annealing [10, 11, 13, 19, 20, 25], tabu search [22, 27, 33], and evolutionary algorithms [1–4, 14, 15, 17, 18, 26]. The majority of the previously conducted studies consider the problem as a single objective optimisation problem with respect to the makespan objective C_{max} . Here, shift neighbourhood operators lead in most cases to superior results [27]. A generalisation of the conclusions with respect to multi objective problem settings seems however questionable, and corresponding studies have not been conducted yet.

2 An investigation of neighbourhood operators

2.1 Local search framework and experimental setup

The effectiveness of local search operators for multi objective flow shop scheduling problems has been investigated using the framework described in algorithm 2.1 [29].

Algorithm 2.1 Multi Objective Local Search Descent

- 1: Generate initial solution x
 - 2: $P^{approx} = \{x\}$
 - 3: **repeat**
 - 4: Select $x \in P^{approx}$ for which $nh(x)$ has not been investigated yet
 - 5: Generate $nh(x)$
 - 6: Update P^{approx} with all $x' \in nh(x)$
 - 7: **if** $x \in P^{approx}$ **then**
 - 8: Mark $nh(x)$ as 'investigated'
 - 9: **end if**
 - 10: **until** $\nexists x \in P^{approx}$ with $nh(x)$ still to be investigated
-

Starting from a random initial solution, neighbouring solutions are generated until no further improvement is possible. With respect to the goal of approximating a Pareto set P of alternatives, an approximation set P^{approx} is maintained during search. The update of P^{approx} is done according to the Pareto dominance relation, given in definition 2.1 for the chosen objective vector $G(x) = (g_1(x), \dots, g_k(x))$. P^{approx} therefore only contains nondominated alternatives. Solutions $x' \in nh(x)$ that dominate x lead to the removal of x from P^{approx} , making step 7 after the update of P^{approx} necessary.

Definition 2.1 (Pareto dominance): A vector of objective functions $G(x)$ is said to dominate an vector $G(x')$ if and only if $\forall i \ g_i(x) \leq g_i(x') \wedge \exists i \ | \ g_i(x) < g_i(x')$.

The neighbourhood operators applied within the framework have been k -FSH, k -BSH, and k -EX. A control parameter k determines the number of succeeding jobs in the sequence being involved in the shift or exchange operation, resulting in a block shift or block exchange neighbourhood for $k > 1$. Settings of $k = 1$, $k = 2$, and $k = 3$ have been tested. 100 Test instances have been generated with $n = m = 10$ following the proposal of TAILLARD [28], and the due dates of the jobs were generated adopting the methodology of DEMIRKOL ET AL. [9]. The size of the instances allows the determination of the true Pareto set by enumerating all possible alternatives within reasonable time.

Tab. 1: Investigated combinations of optimality criteria.

Abbreviation	No objectives	Classification	α β γ [12]
γ_1	2	F	$prmu, d_j$ C_{max}, T_{max}
γ_2	2	F	$prmu, d_j$ C_{max}, C_{sum}
γ_3	2	F	$prmu, d_j$ C_{max}, T_{sum}
γ_4	2	F	$prmu, d_j$ T_{max}, T_{sum}
γ_5	2	F	$prmu, d_j$ C_{sum}, T_{max}
γ_6	2	F	$prmu, d_j$ C_{sum}, T_{sum}
γ_7	3	F	$prmu, d_j$ $C_{max}, T_{max}, T_{sum}$
γ_8	3	F	$prmu, d_j$ $C_{max}, C_{sum}, T_{max}$
γ_9	3	F	$prmu, d_j$ $C_{max}, C_{sum}, T_{sum}$
γ_{10}	3	F	$prmu, d_j$ $C_{sum}, T_{max}, T_{sum}$
γ_{11}	4	F	$prmu, d_j$ $C_{max}, C_{sum}, T_{max}, T_{sum}$
γ_{12}	6	F	$prmu, d_j$ $C_{max}, C_{sum}, T_{max}, T_{sum}, I_{sum}, U$

Each neighbourhood operator has been tested on each problem instance in 100 test runs regarding twelve different combinations of optimality criteria as given in table 1, leading to a total of 1,080,000 local search runs. The approximation quality of the obtained set P^{approx} to the Pareto set P has been measured using the D_1 (average deviation of P^{approx} to P) and D_2 (maximum deviation of P^{approx} to P) metrics of CZYŻAK and JASZKIEWICZ [7].

2.2 Results

The average results obtained by the local search operators have been investigated for statistical significance using a t-test at a given level of significance of 0.01. Table 2 and 3 give the number of test instances, in which a neighbourhood definition led to a significantly best approximation for D_1 and D_2 .

It is possible to observe that neighbourhoods with a control parameter of $k > 1$ are only superior for very few problem instances. Comparing 1-FSH, 1-BSH and 1-EX, no operator turns out to be the most appropriate in all cases. While forward shift tends to lead more frequently to significantly best results, there are still numerous instances for which other operators are more favourable. It can also be noticed that this result is not primarily depending on the optimality criteria involved.

On a more detailed level it is possible to observe that the identification probability of a single Pareto optimal alternative depends on the choice of the neighbourhood operator. To illustrate this circumstance, figure 1 plots for each $x \in P$ of a problem instance, involving the optimality criteria combination γ_{11} , the frequency of its identification. No correlation between the identification frequencies can be seen, and the analysis reveals the existence of Pareto optimal alternatives which may be identified rather easily using e.g. 1-FSH while not being found by the 1-EX neighbourhood and vice versa.

Tab. 2: Significance test results for D_1 over all 100 test instances.

γ	1-BSH	2-BSH	3-BSH	1-FSH	2-FSH	3-FSH	1-EX	2-EX	3-EX
γ_1	0	0	0	37	0	0	15	0	0
γ_2	20	0	0	9	0	0	10	0	0
γ_3	11	0	0	9	0	0	16	0	0
γ_4	2	0	0	30	0	0	13	0	0
γ_5	1	0	0	39	0	0	15	0	0
γ_6	32	0	0	1	0	0	15	0	0
γ_7	2	0	0	44	0	0	19	0	0
γ_8	3	0	0	48	0	0	18	0	0
γ_9	20	0	0	17	0	0	17	0	0
γ_{10}	6	0	0	29	0	0	15	0	0
γ_{11}	8	0	0	47	0	0	18	0	0
γ_{12}	5	0	0	42	0	0	37	0	0

Tab. 3: Significance test results for D_2 over all 100 test instances.

γ	1-BSH	2-BSH	3-BSH	1-FSH	2-FSH	3-FSH	1-EX	2-EX	3-EX
γ_1	0	0	0	53	1	0	23	0	0
γ_2	22	0	0	14	0	0	12	0	0
γ_3	13	0	0	15	0	0	24	0	0
γ_4	3	0	0	41	0	0	20	0	0
γ_5	4	0	0	49	1	0	24	0	0
γ_6	30	0	0	2	0	0	19	0	0
γ_7	2	0	0	49	2	0	24	0	0
γ_8	5	1	0	56	0	0	19	0	0
γ_9	20	0	0	23	0	0	23	0	0
γ_{10}	14	1	0	34	0	0	27	0	0
γ_{11}	10	2	0	51	1	0	21	0	0
γ_{12}	10	1	0	32	0	0	53	0	0

3 Multi Objective Variable Neighbourhood Search

3.1 Description of the approach

Based on the investigation presented in section 2, an improved local search approach has been proposed, described in algorithm 3.1. Its main idea is the randomised application of a set of neighbourhood operators to increase the overall identification probability of every Pareto optimal alternative. Compared with existing concepts of variable neighbourhood search [16], the applied operator is randomly chosen at every step of the algorithm from a predefined set of neighbourhoods. Also, only a single neighbourhood is generated, even if it is not possible to achieve further improvements with the selected operator. The computational complexity of this approach is therefore identical with the multi objective local search framework in section 2.

The MOVNS heuristic has been applied to the 100 test instances regarding the twelve optimality criteria definitions in 100 test runs each. Two different configurations have been considered:

1. MOVNS/3, applying a neighbourhood from the set {1-BSH, 1-FSH, 1-EX}.
2. MOVNS/9, selecting in each step from all nine neighbourhood definitions as given in section 2.




Fig. 1: Frequency of identification of Pareto optimal alternatives depending on the neighbourhood operator.

Algorithm 3.1 Multi Objective Variable Neighbourhood Search (MOVNS)

- 1: Generate initial solution x
 - 2: $P^{approx} = \{x\}$
 - 3: **repeat**
 - 4: Select $x \in P^{approx}$ for which $nh(x)$ has not been investigated yet
 - 5: Select a neighbourhood nh
 - 6: Generate $nh(x)$
 - 7: Update P^{approx} with all $x' \in nh(x)$
 - 8: **if** $x \in P^{approx}$ **then**
 - 9: Mark $nh(x)$ as 'investigated'
 - 10: **end if**
 - 11: **until** $\nexists x \in P^{approx}$ with $nh(x)$ still to be investigated
-

3.2 Results

Statistical tests of significance show that MOVNS/3 is able to outperform the multi objective local search approach involving a single operator in most test instances. Table 4 and 5 give the number of problem instances in which the approach led to significantly best results for D_1 and D_2 . This behaviour does not seem to depend on the defined optimality criteria. For a few problem instances however, and especially for the maximum deviation D_2 , no improvements are possible.

The configuration of MOVNS with all presented neighbourhood definitions MOVNS/9 does not lead to satisfying results. Integrating relatively weaker neighbourhood operators can consequently not be regarded as a promising concept of hybridising local search heuristics.

The running times for the different algorithms are almost identical as the approaches differ only in terms of the additional choice of the neighbourhood in MOVNS. On a Intel Pentium 4 PC running at 1.8 GHz and 256 MB RAM, neighbouring solutions may be computed within 0.0003 milliseconds, while the evaluation of a solution takes 0.0402 milliseconds. The comparison of the resolution behaviour of different neighbourhood operators shows no significant difference in terms of running time.

4 Conclusions

A study of local search neighbourhoods for multi objective flow shop scheduling has been presented. First experiments involving twelve different combinations of optimality criteria revealed that no single operator is superior for

Tab. 4: Significance test results for D_1 over all 100 test instances.

γ	1-BSH	1-FSH	1-EX	MOVNS/3	MOVNS/9
γ_1	0	1	1	53	0
γ_2	3	3	0	47	0
γ_3	0	2	0	53	0
γ_4	0	4	0	35	0
γ_5	0	8	0	46	0
γ_6	3	0	1	30	0
γ_7	0	7	0	63	0
γ_8	0	8	0	65	0
γ_9	0	8	0	65	0
γ_{10}	1	6	0	54	0
γ_{11}	0	19	0	64	0
γ_{12}	0	9	3	79	0

Tab. 5: Significance test results for D_2 over all 100 test instances.

γ	1-BSH	1-FSH	1-EX	MOVNS/3	MOVNS/9
γ_1	0	10	2	58	0
γ_2	5	5	0	58	0
γ_3	1	6	0	64	0
γ_4	1	12	1	46	0
γ_5	0	14	0	48	0
γ_6	5	0	2	42	0
γ_7	0	18	1	66	1
γ_8	0	20	0	64	1
γ_9	4	9	1	66	0
γ_{10}	2	10	2	68	0
γ_{11}	1	21	1	67	1
γ_{12}	3	15	17	60	1

all considered problem instance. Furthermore, it has been possible to show that the identification probability of a specific Pareto optimal alternative depends on the choice of the neighbourhood in the local search procedure.

Improvements have been obtained in a significantly large number of test cases by applying a concept of randomised variable neighbourhood search. While the in average superior behaviour of the MOVNS approach is independent from the choice of the optimality criteria, a restriction to favourable neighbourhood definitions is necessary as weaker operators do not contribute to the quality of the obtained results.

The study demonstrates the advantages of hybridising traditional local search techniques with multi neighbourhood strategies. This is especially of importance as in the proposed setting of alternatively selecting operators the computational complexity of the approach is not increased while superior results are obtained.

Acknowledgements

The author wants to thank two anonymous referees for their helpful comments.

References

- [1] Tapan P. Bagchi. *Multiobjective scheduling by genetic algorithms*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, Dordrecht, London, 1999.
- [2] Tapan P. Bagchi. Pareto-optimal solutions for multi-objective production scheduling problems. In Zitzler et al. [34], pages 458–471.
- [3] Matthieu Basseur, Franck Seynhaeve, and El-ghazali Talbi. Design of multi-objective evolutionary algorithms: Application to the flow-shop scheduling problem. In *Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC'2002)*, volume 2, pages 1151–1156, Piscataway, NJ, May 2002. IEEE Service Center.
- [4] Christian Bierwirth. *Flowshop Scheduling mit parallelen Genetischen Algorithmen: Eine problemorientierte Analyse genetischer Suchstrategien*. Deutscher Universitäts Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1993.
- [5] J. Błażewicz, K. H. Ecker, E. Pesch, G. Schmidt, and J. Weglarz. *Scheduling Computer and Manufacturing Processes*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 2. edition, 2001.
- [6] R. W. Conway, W. L. Maxwell, and L. W. Miller. *Theory of Scheduling*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1967.
- [7] Piotr Czyżak and Andrzej Jaskiewicz. Pareto simulated annealing - a metaheuristic technique for multiple-objective combinatorial optimization. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis*, 7:34–47, 1998.
- [8] Richard L. Daniels and Joseph B. Mazzola. A tabu-search heuristic for the flexible-resource flow shop scheduling problem. *Annals of Operations Research*, 41:207–230, 1993.
- [9] Ebru Demirkol, Sanjay Mehta, and Reha Uzsoy. Benchmarks for shop scheduling problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 109(1):137–141, August 1998.
- [10] Rajesh Gangadharan and Chandrasekharan Rajendran. A simulated annealing heuristic for scheduling in a flowshop with bicriteria. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 27(1–4):473–476, 1994.
- [11] Celia A. Glass and Chris N. Potts. A comparison of local search methods for flow shop scheduling. *Annals of Operations Research*, 63:489–509, 1996.
- [12] R. L. Graham, E. L. Lawler, J. K. Lenstra, and A. H. G. Rinnooy Kan. Optimization and approximation in deterministic sequencing and scheduling: a survey. *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, 5:287–326, 1979.
- [13] Hisao Ishibuchi, Shinta Misaki, and Hideo Tanaka. Modified simulated annealing algorithms for the flow shop sequencing problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 81:388–398, 1995.
- [14] Hisao Ishibuchi and Tadahiko Murata. A multi-objective genetic local search algorithm and its application to flowshop scheduling. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 28(3):392–403, August 1998.
- [15] Hisao Ishibuchi, Tadashi Yoshida, and Tadahiko Murata. Balance between genetic search and local search in memetic algorithms for multiobjective permutation flowshop scheduling. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 7(2):204–223, 2003.
- [16] N. Mladenović and P. Hansen. Variable neighborhood search. *Computers and Operations Research*, 24(11):1097–1100, 1997.
- [17] Tadahiko Murata, Hisao Ishibuchi, and Hideo Tanaka. Multi-objective genetic algorithm and its application to flowshop scheduling. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 30(4):957–968, 1996.
- [18] Amit Nagar, Sunderesh S. Heragu, and Jorge Haddock. A combined branch-and-bound and genetic algorithm based approach for a flowshop scheduling problem. *Annals of Operations Research*, 63:397–414, 1996.
- [19] F. A. Ogbu and D. K. Smith. The application of the simulated annealing algorithm to the solution of the $n/m/c_{max}$ flowshop problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, 17(3):243–253, 1990.

-
- [20] I.H. Osman and C.N. Potts. Simulated annealing for permutation flow-shop scheduling. *OMEGA International Journal of Management Science*, 17(6):551–557, 1989.
- [21] Michael Pinedo. *Scheduling: Theory, Algorithms, and Systems*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2. edition, 2002.
- [22] Colin R. Reeves. Improving the efficiency of tabu search for machine sequencing problems. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 44(4):375–382, 1993.
- [23] Colin R. Reeves. Landscapes, operators and heuristic search. *Annals of Operations Research*, 86:473–490, 1999.
- [24] A. H. G. Rinnooy Kan. *Machine Scheduling Problems; Classification, complexity and computations*. Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, 1976.
- [25] Yuri N. Sotskov, Thomas Tautenhahn, and Frank Werner. Heuristics for permutation flow shop scheduling with batch setup times. *OR Spektrum*, 18:67–80, 1996.
- [26] S. Stöppler and C. Bierwirth. The application of a parallel genetic algorithm to the $n/m/p/c_{max}$ flowshop problem. In G. Fandel, T. Gullledge, and A Jones, editors, *New Directions for Operations Research in Manufacturing*, pages 161–175. Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1992.
- [27] E. Taillard. Some efficient heuristic methods for the flow shop sequencing problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 47:65–74, 1990.
- [28] Eric Taillard. Benchmarks for basic scheduling problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 64:278–285, 1993.
- [29] El-Ghazali Talbi, Malek Rahoual, Mohamed Hakim Mabed, and Clarisse Dhaenens. A hybrid evolutionary approach for multicriteria optimization problems: Application to the flow shop. In Zitzler et al. [34], pages 416–428.
- [30] Vincent T’kindt and Jean-Charles Billaut. *Multicriteria Scheduling: Theory, Models and Algorithms*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 2002.
- [31] David A. Van Veldhuizen and Gary B. Lamont. Multiobjective evolutionary algorithms: Analyzing the state-of-the-art. *Evolutionary Computation*, 8(2):125–147, 2000.
- [32] Frank Werner. On the heuristic solution of the permutation flow shop problem by path algorithms. *Computers & Operations Research*, 20(7):707–722, September 1993.
- [33] Marino Widmer and Alain Hertz. A new heuristic method for the flow shop sequencing problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 41:186–193, 1989.
- [34] Eckart Zitzler, Kalyanmoy Deb, Lothar Thiele, Carlos A. Coello Coello, and David Corne, editors. *Evolutionary Multi-Criterion Optimization: Proceedings of the First International Conference EMO 2001*, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 2001. Springer Verlag.