
EXACT ALGORITHMS AND HEURISTICS FOR CAPACITATED COVERING SALESMAN PROBLEMS

Lucas Porto Maziero, Fábio Luiz Usberti, Celso Cavellucci
Institute of Computing
Universidade Estadual de Campinas
Campinas
{lucas.maziero, fusberti, celsocv}@ic.unicamp.br

ABSTRACT

This paper introduces the Capacitated Covering Salesman Problem (CCSP), approaching the notion of service by coverage in capacitated vehicle routing problems. In CCSP, locations where vehicles can transit are provided, some of which have customers with demands. The objective is to service customers through a fleet of vehicles based in a depot, minimizing the total distance traversed by the vehicles. CCSP is unique in the sense that customers, to be serviced, do not need to be visited by a vehicle. Instead, they can be serviced if they are within a coverage area of the vehicle. This assumption is motivated by applications in which some customers are unreachable (e.g., forbidden access to vehicles) or visiting every customer is impractical. In this work, optimization methodologies are proposed for the CCSP based on ILP (Integer Linear Programming) and BRKGA (Biased Random-Key Genetic Algorithm) metaheuristic. Computational experiments conducted on a benchmark of instances for the CCSP evaluate the performance of the methodologies with respect to primal bounds. Furthermore, our ILP formulation is extended in order to create a novel MILP (Mixed Integer Linear Programming) for the Multi-Depot Covering Tour Vehicle Routing Problem (MDCTVRP). Computational experiments show that the extended MILP formulation outperformed the previous state-of-the-art exact approach with respect to optimality gaps. In particular, optimal solutions were obtained for several previously unsolved instances.

Keywords Covering routing problems · Integer linear programming · Metaheuristic · Matheuristic

1 Introduction

The Capacitated Vehicle Routing Problem (CVRP), initially proposed by Dantzig and Ramser [1], is one of the most well-known problems in combinatorial optimization. The goal of CVRP is to service the demands of a set of customers through a set of vehicles located in a depot, minimizing the total distance travelled. Each vehicle must depart and return to the depot, and cannot service more than its capacity [2].

The CVRP encompasses many variants with restrictions of time constraints, resources availability, and even customers accessibility, for example, regions of difficult means of entry to vehicles [3, 4]. The latter can be addressed by considering service by covering. A notion by which a customer can be serviced remotely as long as the customer is in the covering range of the vehicle. For example, in Figure 1 customers b and d are within the covering range of customer a . Also, customers a and e can be remotely serviced by vertex c , if there is enough remaining capacity in the corresponding vehicle.

The first problem using the concept of servicing by coverage is the Covering Salesman Problem (CSP), by Current and Schilling [5], stated as follows. Given an undirected graph with cost attributed to the edges, the objective is to determine a minimum cost cycle such that every vertex out of the cycle is covered by at least one vertex in the cycle. The CSP generalizes the Travelling Salesman Problem (TSP) [6] in the case where each vertex only covers itself, from which follows that CSP is NP-hard.




Figure 1: Example of covering ranges.

Generalizations of the CSP were investigated in literature. Golden et al. [7] proposed a generalization of the CSP in which each vertex has a covering demand referring to the number of times it must be covered by the tour. Also, each vertex has a fixed cost that incurs from visiting it. The authors developed a heuristic with local search that explores exchange, removal, and insertion neighborhoods.

Gendreau et al. [8] investigated the Covering Tour Problem (CTP), a problem where the vertices are categorized by those that can be visited V , must be visited $T \subseteq V$, and cannot be visited W . The goal of the CTP is to obtain a minimum cost Hamiltonian cycle over a set of vertices $S \subseteq V$ containing all vertices in T and no vertices in W , and each vertex of W is covered by at least one vertex in S . Exact and heuristic methodologies were proposed to solve the problem.

Hachicha et al. [9] introduced the Multi-Vehicle Covering Routing Problem (m -CTP). It generalizes the CTP in the sense that there are multiple vehicles, and each route cannot exceed predefined length and number of vertices. The m -CTP was used as the basis to formulate a problem of locating distribution centers for humanitarian aid in disaster areas [10]. Methodologies to solve the m -CTP include branch-and-cut [11], column generation [12], branch-and-price [13], constructive heuristics [9], evolutionary metaheuristic [11], variable neighborhood descent [14].

Allahyari et al. [4] proposed the the Multi-Depot Covering Tour Vehicle Routing Problem (MDCTVRP). The MDCTVRP is a combination of the Multi-Depot Vehicle Routing Problem (MDVRP) [15] and CSP. In the MDCTVRP, the demand of each customer can be served either by visiting the customer directly or by covering, i.e, the customer location is within a covering range of at least one visited customer. The authors developed two mixed integer programming formulations and a hybrid metaheuristic, combining Greedy Randomized Adaptive Search Procedure (GRASP), Iterated Local Search (ILS) and Simulated Annealing (SA).

It is worth noticing that the CSP does not have a multi-vehicle variant, as does the CTP. This work fills this gaps by proposing the Capacitated Covering Salesman Problem (CCSP), a NP-hard problem generalizing both the CVRP and the CSP. Vertices with non-negative demands must be covered by a set of capacitated vehicles, based at the depot. The goal is to find a minimum cost set of vehicle routes servicing all the demands. The CCSP represents a straightforward extension of the CSP where the service employed by the vehicles comes at a limited supply. At the same time, the CCSP generalizes the CVRP since covering provides an additional way to service each demand. It is worth pointing out the differences between m -CTP and CCSP:

- CCSP considers demands on the vertices;
- m -CTP forces some vertices to be visited ($T \subseteq V$);
- m -CTP constrains the routes by their lengths and number of vertices, while in CCSP the vehicle is capacitated by the amount of serviced demand.
- CCSP is a natural generalization of the CSP and the m -CTP generalizes the CTP.

Our contributions Two combinatorial optimization problems, the CSP and the VRP, are combined into a general framework to address routing problems with multiple vehicles and limited capacity in the context of service by covering. Mathematical formulations, using integer linear programming, are provided to represent these problems as a CCSP. The complexity of solving these problems optimally asks for heuristic methodologies to tackle large instances that arise from real applications. This work answers this demand by proposing a biased random-keys genetic algorithm to solve the CCSP, and a matheuristic to intensify the search. Furthermore, we extended our ILP to solve the

MDCTVRP and conducted computational experiments on a benchmark of instances, comparing our formulation with the state-of-the-art exact methodology from literature. The proposed formulation outperformed the previous approach with respect to optimality gaps. Moreover, optimal solutions were proven for several previously unsolved instances.

The CCSP and MDCTVRP share common concepts of covering and vehicle capacity. Consequently, both can be modeled in a similar manner concerning serving remotely customers and demands served by the vehicle. Nevertheless, notable distinctions exist between these problems. In CCSP, a vehicle is not obligated to serve a customer during its visit, unlike in MDCTVRP, where the vehicle is required to serve a customer during each visit. Additionally, in CCSP there are customers with no specified demand, providing an opportunity for vehicles to use them to serve other customers remotely which have demand. In contrast, in MDCTVRP every customer is associated with a specific demand.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 formally defines the CCSP and MDCTVRP, presenting ILP formulations for the CCSP and a MILP formulation for the MDCTVRP. Section 3 describes the BRKGA, and the intra-route and inter-route intensification procedures. In Section 4, computational experiments are conducted on a representative set of instances, and results are analyzed and discussed. Section 5 gives the concluding remarks.

2 Mathematical Formulations

2.1 Models for the CCSP

Consider a complete undirected graph $G(V, E)$, where each vertex $v \in V$ has a demand d_v , each edge $e \in E$ has a metric cost c_e , and a depot vertex is denoted by v_0 . Let $V_0 = V \setminus \{v_0\}$ and $V_d = \{v \in V : d_v > 0\}$. There are M homogeneous vehicles with capacity Q that must service all vertices with positive demand.


For each vertex $v \in V$, $C(v)$ is the set of vertices that covers v and $D(v)$ is the set of vertices that are covered by v . It is assumed that $v \in C(v)$ and $v \in D(v), \forall v \in V$.

A route is a nonempty subset $R \subseteq E$ of edges for which the induced subgraph $G[R]$ is a simple cycle containing v_0 . The goal of CCSP is to find M routes of minimum cost with the following constraints:

- each vertex is visited no more than once;
- each demand $d_v : v \in V_d$ is serviced by a route R , which implies in v or some vertex in $C(v)$ being visited by R , and the demand d_v being deducted from the capacity of the vehicle;
- the total demand serviced by any vehicle must not exceed its capacity Q .

Figure 2 shows an optimal solution for a CCSP instance. Routes are depicted with black lines; the blue triangle is v_0 ; red squares are vertices with positive demand; green points are visited vertices with no demand; arrows show which route serviced each demand.

The following ILP formulation $CCSP_1$ is proposed for the CCSP. We denote $\delta(v)$ as the edge cut-set of vertex v , and $\delta(S)$ the edge cut-set of a subset $S \subseteq V$. The formulation includes the following decision variables: $x_e \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ gives the number of times edge $e \in E$ is traversed; $y_v \in \{0, 1\}$ denotes if vertex $v \in V$ is visited (1) or not (0); $z_{uv} \in \{0, 1\}$ shows if vertex $u \in V_d$ is serviced through vertex $v \in C(u)$ (1) or not (0); $K \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is the number of vehicles.


 Figure 2: Optimal solution for the CCSP instance $X-n115-w11-c7$.

 $(CCSP_1)$

$$MIN \sum_{e \in E} c_e x_e, \quad (1)$$

subject to

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(v_0)} x_e = 2K, \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e = 2y_v \quad \forall v \in V_0, \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{v \in C(u)} y_v \geq 1 \quad \forall u \in V_d, \quad (4)$$

$$z_{uv} \leq y_v \quad \forall u \in V_d, \forall v \in C(u), \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_{v \in C(u)} z_{uv} = 1 \quad \forall u \in V_d, \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(S)} x_e \geq \frac{2}{Q} \sum_{u \in V_d} \sum_{v \in (S \cap C(u))} d_u z_{uv} \quad \forall S \subseteq V_0, \quad (7)$$

$$x_e \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall e \notin \delta(v_0), \quad (8)$$

$$x_e \in \{0, 1, 2\} \quad \forall e \in \delta(v_0), \quad (9)$$

$$y_v \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall v \in V_0, \quad (10)$$

$$z_{uv} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall u \in V_d, \forall v \in C(u), \quad (11)$$

$$K \in \mathbb{Z}^+. \quad (12)$$

The objective function (1) minimizes the total cost of the routes. Constraints (2) state that the vertex depot is visited by all K routes. Constraints (3) ensure that the number of edges incident to a vertex $v \in V_0$ is 2 if v is visited or 0 otherwise. Constraints (4) impose that each vertex in V_d must be covered by at least one route. Constraints (5) state that if a vertex $u \in V_d$ is serviced by a vertex $v \in C(u)$, then v is visited. Constraints (6) ensure that every vertex $u \in V_d$ is serviced by a vertex $v \in C(u)$. Constraints (7) impose both the connectivity and the vehicle capacity by forcing into the solution a sufficient number of edges to each subset of vertices.

A second formulation, denominated $CCSP_2$, can be derived by eliminating variables y through variable substitution using constraints (3).

($CCSP_2$)

$$MIN \quad \sum_{e \in E} c_e x_e,$$

subject to

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \geq 2z_{uv} \quad \forall v \in V_0, \forall u \in V_d, \quad (13)$$

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \leq 2 \sum_{u \in V_d} z_{uv} \quad \forall v \in V_0, \quad (14)$$

$$\sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e \leq 2 \quad \forall v \in V_0, \quad (15)$$

(2), (6), (7), (8), (9), (11), (12).

Constraints (13), (14), and (15) impose the correct number of edges incident to a vertex $v \in V_0$ (2 if visited or 0 otherwise).

Preliminary experiments have shown that, even though the $CCSP_2$ has fewer variables than the $CCSP_1$, the overall quality of the upper and lower bounds obtained by $CCSP_1$ is better than $CCSP_2$. Therefore, only the $CCSP_1$ formulation will be considered in the computational experiments.

2.2 Models for a Multi-depot Variant

The Multi-Depot Covering Tour Vehicle Routing Problem (MDCTVRP), proposed by Allahyari et al. [4], is defined next. Given a directed graph $G = (N, A)$, with vertices $N = N_c \cup N_d$, and arcs A . Each customer $i \in N_c = \{1, 2, \dots, n_c\}$ has a positive demand d_i . Set $N_d = \{1, \dots, n_d\}$ contains the depots. Each arc $(i, j) \in A$ has a positive traversing cost c_{ij} . Each customer has to be covered by a route. Set $C(v)$ represents the vertices that covers v . A cost $c'_{ij} > 0$ is attributed for servicing customer i through j . A set of identical vehicles $P = \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ is available, and Q is the vehicle capacity. Each depot $k \in N_d$ has a limited capacity H . Finally, to each depot is attributed a unique set $P_k = \{1, \dots, p_k\}$ of vehicles. The objective of MDCTVRP is to find a minimum cost set of routes, such that all demands are covered, the vehicles and depots capacities are satisfied, and each vehicle starts and ends its route in the same depot.

Borrowing ideas from model $CCSP_1$ and from the flow-based formulation by Allahyari et al. [4], we propose a new MILP formulation for the MDCTVRP. The formulation, henceforth denominated $MDCTVRP_m$, includes the following decision variables: x_{ij} denotes if arc $(i, j) \in A$ is traversed (1) or not (0); y_v represents if vertex $v \in N_c$ is visited (1) or not (0); z_{uv} shows if vertex $u \in N_c$ is serviced by vertex $v \in N_c$ (1) or not (0); f_{ij} gives the vehicle load while traversing arc (i, j) . We represent SP as the set containing all simple paths connecting depots. Specifically, $SP_{(st)} \in SP$ denotes the set of all simple paths between depots s and t .

$$(MDCTVRP_m)$$

$$MIN \quad \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{ij} x_{ij} + \sum_{i \in N_c} \sum_{j \in N_c} c'_{ij} z_{ij}, \quad (16)$$

subject to

$$\sum_{j \in N_c} x_{jk} = \sum_{j \in N_c} x_{kj} \quad \forall k \in N_d, \quad (17)$$

$$\sum_{j \in N_c} x_{kj} \leq |P_k| \quad \forall k \in N_d, \quad (18)$$

$$\sum_{j \in N} x_{jv} = \sum_{j \in N} x_{vj} = y_v \quad \forall v \in N_c, \quad (19)$$

$$\sum_{v \in C(u)} y_v \geq 1 \quad \forall u \in N_c, \quad (20)$$

$$z_{uv} \leq y_v \quad \forall u \in N_c, \forall v \in C(u), \quad (21)$$

$$\sum_{j \in N} x_{vj} \leq z_{vv} \quad \forall v \in N_c, \quad (22)$$

$$\sum_{v \in C(u)} z_{uv} = 1 \quad \forall u \in N_c, \quad (23)$$

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in SP_{(st)}} x_{ij} \leq |SP_{(st)}| - 1 \quad \forall s, t \in N_d, s \neq t, \forall SP_{(st)} \in SP, \quad (24)$$

$$\sum_{j \in N} f_{ji} = \sum_{j \in N_c} d_j z_{ji} + \sum_{j \in N} f_{ij} \quad \forall i \in N_c, \quad (25)$$

$$\sum_{i \in N_c} f_{ik} = 0 \quad \forall k \in N_d, \quad (26)$$

$$f_{ij} \leq (Q - d_i) x_{ij} \quad \forall (i, j) \in A : i \in N, j \in N_c, \quad (27)$$

$$d_j x_{ij} \leq f_{ij} \quad \forall (i, j) \in A : i \in N, j \in N_c, \quad (28)$$

$$\sum_{i \in N_c} f_{ki} \leq H \quad \forall k \in N_d, \quad (29)$$

$$x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall (i, j) \in A, \quad (30)$$

$$y_v \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall v \in N_c, \quad (31)$$

$$z_{uv} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall u \in N_c, \forall v \in C(u), \quad (32)$$

$$f_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^+ \quad \forall (i, j) \in A. \quad (33)$$

The objective function (16) minimizes the total cost of the routes and allocations costs. For each depot $k \in N_d$, constraints (17) impose that the number of vehicles arriving k must be equal to the number of vehicles leaving k . Constraints (18) bound the amount of vehicles arriving each depot. For each customer $v \in N_c$, constraints (19) state that the number of arcs arriving and leaving v is 1 if v is visited, or 0 otherwise. Constraints (20) impose that each vertex in N_c must be covered by at least one route. Constraints (21) state that a vertex $u \in N_c$ can only be serviced through a vertex $v \in C(u)$ if v is visited. Constraints (22) require that if a customer $v \in N_c$ is visited by a vehicle, then its demand is serviced by itself. Constraints (23) ensure that every vertex $u \in N_c$ is serviced by a vertex $v \in C(u)$. Constraints (24) prevent simple paths between depots, forcing each route to start and end in the same depot. Constraints (25) impose the flow conservation on each customer i . Constraints (26) ensure that the vehicle load is zero when returning to the depot. Constraints (27) and constraints (28) bound the vehicle load when traversing arc (i, j) . Constraints (29) impose that the capacity of each depot is at most H .

The number of decision variables used in the new MILP formulation is $O(V^2)$ and the number of decision variables used in the model by Allahyari et al. [4] is $O(V^3)$. An $O(V^2)$ algorithm can separate constraints (24) for integer solutions using a lazy constraint strategy. Given a graph induced by an integer solution, the separation of constraints (24) is performed using Depth-First-Search (DFS) [16]. For every pair (i, j) such that $i, j \in N_d$, a DFS is performed

starting from i . If j is reached, the edges from the path between i and j are retrieved and then a constraint (24) is added to the formulation.

3 BRKGA for Capacitated Covering Salesman Problem

Guided by the Darwinian principle of the survival of the fittest, the Biased Random Key Genetic Algorithm (BRKGA) [17] is an evolutionary metaheuristic in which a population of individuals, representing solutions of a combinatorial optimization problem, evolves towards the optimal.

Each individual is represented by a chromosome encoded as a vector, in which each allele is a random key uniformly drawn over the interval $[0, 1)$. The decoder method is the problem-specific component of the BRKGA which is responsible for mapping a chromosome into a solution.

An initial population of random chromosomes is created and forced into a selective pressure environment in which the best individuals are more likely to survive throughout the generations producing offsprings.

The BRKGA partitions the population into *elite* and *non-elite* sets, with sizes determined by fixed parameters. The elite set is composed by the best individuals; all the remaining individuals form the non-elite set, including the *mutants*, i.e., random chromosomes introduced into the population as a form of diversification.

In each generation, the BRKGA executes the following steps:

1. Decode the chromosomes, evaluating their fitness;
2. Identify the best individuals to form the elite set;
3. Preserve the elite set into the population for the next generation;
4. Introduce the mutants in the next generation;
5. Generate offsprings through the crossover of elite and non-elite chromosomes, inserting them in the next generation.

The BRKGA has demonstrated its efficacy as a robust method for addressing various routing problems [18, 19, 20, 21, 22]. In this sense, the following sections describe how the BRKGA can be employed to solve the CCSP.

3.1 Solution encoding

The solution is encoded as a vector $\mathcal{X} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of size $n = |V_d|$, where x_i is a random number in the interval $[0, 1)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Each element of \mathcal{X} represents a vertex of V_d .

3.2 Decoder function

The decoder function takes as input a vector \mathcal{X} and returns a feasible solution for the CCSP represented by a set of routes \mathcal{R} . Let \mathcal{X}' be the vector resulting by sorting the keys of \mathcal{X} in non-decreasing order.

The proposed decoder for the CCSP has two phases, described in the following sections.

3.2.1 First phase - Best Fit Algorithm

The minimum number of vehicles required to service all demands can be determined by solving a *Bin Packing Problem* (BPP) [23], which is NP-hard. Our decoder assigns vertices from V_d to vehicles by solving the BPP approximately, using the Best Fit Algorithm (BFA). The BFA assigns each vertex to a vehicle with the least residual capacity that can still service the vertex; if no such vehicle exists, a new one is assigned (Figure 3).

Algorithm 1 presents the BFA pseudo-code applied in the decoder, which can be implemented using self-balancing search trees leading to a worst-time complexity of $O(n \lg n)$.

3.2.2 Second phase - route construction

Consider that route R_m of vehicle m is a sequence of vertices represented as $R_m = \{R_m(0), \dots, R_m(r_m + 1)\}$, where $R_m(i)$ and r_m are, respectively, the i -th vertex visited by vehicle m and the number of vertices in V_0 visited by vehicle m . The route starts and ends at the depot, i.e., $R_m(0) = R_m(r_m + 1) = v_0$.




Figure 3: Example of Best Fit Algorithm.

Algorithm 1 Best fit algorithm

Input: a vector \mathcal{X}' .

Output: a set of vehicles $\mathcal{M} = \{1, \dots, M\}$ and their assigned vertices $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_M\}$.

```

1:  $m \leftarrow 0; \mathcal{M} \leftarrow \{\emptyset\}; \mathcal{A} \leftarrow \{\emptyset\};$ 
2: for each  $x'_i \in \mathcal{X}'$  do
3:    $v \leftarrow \text{getVertex}(i)$  – returns the vertex associated to element  $x'_i$ ;
4:   if  $\left( \exists m \in \mathcal{M} : \sum_{u \in A_m} d_u \leq Q - d_v \right)$  then
5:      $m \leftarrow \arg \max_{m' \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ \sum_{u \in A'_{m'}} d_u : \sum_{u \in A'_{m'}} d_u \leq Q - d_v \right\};$ 
6:      $A_m \leftarrow A_m \cup \{v\};$ 
7:   else
8:      $m \leftarrow m + 1;$ 
9:      $\mathcal{M} \leftarrow \mathcal{M} \cup \{m\};$ 
10:     $A_m \leftarrow \{v\};$ 
11:     $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \mathcal{A} \cup \{A_m\}$ 

```

The second phase of the decoder creates a route for each vehicle by using the following insertion cost function,

$$g(v, R_m) = \min_{i \in \{0, \dots, r_m\}} \left\{ c_{(u,v)} + c_{(v,w)} - c_{(u,w)} : u = R_m(i), w = R_m(i+1) \right\},$$

which gives the minimum cost of inserting a vertex v into a route R_m .

For each vehicle $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and each vertex $u \in A_m$, all unvisited vertices $v \in C(u)$ are considered to be included in route R_m by checking the value of $g(v, R_m)$ and taking the vertex resulting in the least cost increment.

Algorithm 2 presents the route construction pseudo-code used in our decoder.

A vertex v is called *redundant* if when removed from a route it does not change the solution feasibility. It occurs when the vertices serviced by v can all be serviced by other vertices in the solution without violating the capacity of any involved vehicle. After applying Algorithm 2, the decoder greedily removes redundancies by considering their cost decrease, until a maximal set of redundancies is removed.

3.3 Intra-Route

Once the BRKGA stopping criteria is triggered, the Lin-Kernighan (LK) heuristic [24] performs the final intra-routes improvements. The LK heuristic is based on k -opt neighborhood, which consists in applying up to k edge exchanges, and it is considered one of the best local searches for the Traveling Salesman Problem.

3.4 Inter-Route Intensification

Following the ideas of Sartori and Buriol [25], this paper proposes a matheuristic for the CCSP using a formulation with covering and packing constraints. Let F be the set of all CCSP feasible routes, a_{if} the covering matrix where for each pair (i, f) , $i \in V_d$ and $f \in F$, $a_{if} = 1$ if and only if vertex i is serviced by route f , and b_{if} the visiting matrix where for each pair (i, f) , $i \in V_0$ and $f \in F$, $b_{if} = 1$ if and only if vertex i is visited by route f . The formulation includes the binary variable λ_f , which denotes whether the feasible route $f \in F$ is used (1) or not (0).

The formulation reads as follows:

Algorithm 2 Construction of Routes

Input: a set of vehicles $\mathcal{M} = \{1, \dots, M\}$ and their assigned vertices $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_M\}$.

Output: a set of routes $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$.

```

1:  $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
2:
3: for each vehicle  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  do
4:    $R_m(0) \leftarrow \{v_0\}$ ;
5:
6:    $r_m \leftarrow 0$ 
7:
8:   for each  $v \in A_m$  do
9:      $S \leftarrow \{u \in C(v) : u \neq R_{m'}(u'), \forall m' \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \forall u' \in \{1, \dots, r_{m'}\}\}$  – set of unvisited candidates to
    service  $v$ 
10:
11:      $u \leftarrow \arg \min_{u' \in S} \{g(u', R_m)\}$  – find best candidate
12:
13:      $insert(u, R_m)$  – insert  $u$  in the best position of route  $R_m$ 
14:
15:      $r_m \leftarrow r_m + 1$ 
16:
17:      $R_m(r_m) \leftarrow \{v_0\}$ ;
18:
19:    $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R} \cup \{R_m\}$ ;
20:
    
```

(*Matheuristic*)

$$MIN \quad \sum_{f \in F} c_f \lambda_f, \quad (34)$$

subject to

$$\sum_{f \in F} a_{if} \lambda_f \geq 1 \quad \forall i \in V_d \quad (35)$$

$$\sum_{f \in F} b_{if} \lambda_f \leq 1 \quad \forall i \in V_0 \quad (36)$$

$$\lambda_f \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall f \in F.$$

The objective function (34) minimizes the costs of the routes. Constraints (35) ensure that each vertex in V_d must be serviced by at least one route, while constraints (36) impose that every vertex in V_0 must be visited by at most one route. Considering that the cardinality of F grows exponentially, in this work we generate a pool of routes F' in the Matheuristic formulation. The pool of routes contains a set of CCSP feasible routes generated as follows. First, an exhaustive search is conducted to find every optimal route that services up to three vertices. All of these routes are included into F' . The remaining routes of F' are filled with the elite individuals from the BRKGA generations, starting from the last generation and continuing until either the size limit of F' is reached or all elite individuals from each BRKGA generation are added to F' .

4 Computational Experiments

4.1 Instances Benchmark

The instances for the CCSP were obtained from the CVRP instances created by Christofides and Eilon [26] and Uchoa et al. [27], containing between 101 and 303 vertices, and named as $E-nA-kB$ and $X-nA-kB$, respectively. The

symbol A gives the number of vertices (with the depot), and B represents the number of vehicles required to service all the demands.

To generate CCSP instances, the following parameters were used:

- $|V_d|$: number of vertices with demand;
- $|D(v)|$: covering size, where $v \in V_0$.

The $|V_d|$ parameter varied in 10%, 20%, and 40% of n . The vertices with demand consist of the first $|V_d|$ vertices, excluding the depot, of the CVRP instance. It is worth mentioning that all demands associated with V_d remain unchanged in relation to CVRP instance. Similarly, the vehicle capacity Q in the CCSP instance remains the same as in the CVRP instance.

For each vertex $v \in V_0$, the set $D(v)$ is defined by the closest vertices from v . The cardinality of $D(v)$ varied in 7, 9, and 11.

For each CVRP instance, all pairings of $|V_d|$ and $|D(v)|$ were considered, resulting in nine combinations and a benchmark of 495 instances. A pre-processing was conducted in the set of instances to remove any vertex $v \in V_0$ such that $D(v) \cap V_d = \emptyset$.

The MDCTVRP instances were created by Allahyari et al. [4], and they are divided in small (120 instances) and large (160 instances). The small instances contain up to 30 vertices, and the large instances have up to 90 vertices. In small instances, the vehicle capacity fluctuates between 140 and 150, while in large instances, the vehicle capacity alternates between 160 and 170. The small instances are divided into three categories, and the large instances are divided into four categories. Each category has eight different groups of instances. The instances are named InputXYZT, where “X”, “Y”, “Z”, and “T” give the category, number of depots, vehicle capacity, and the coverage coefficient (which defines the cost of serving a vertex), respectively. Five instances were generated for each group of instances.

4.2 Computational Settings

The ILP and MILP formulations were implemented and solved using Gurobi 8.1.1 version. The execution time limit were set to a one hour, except for the $MDCTVRP_m$ formulation, which was set to two hours following Allahyari et al. [4]. The experiments were conducted on a PC under Ubuntu 10.12, and CPU Intel Xeon(R) Silver 3114 2.20 GHz, with 32GB of RAM. The BRKGA developed for the CCSP used the C++ framework from Resende and Toso [28]. The parameters used by the BRKGA are listed in Table 1. The implementation of the LK heuristic proposed by Helsgaun [29] was employed. The matheuristic adopted a size limit for the pool F' of 1 million routes.

Table 1: BRKGA parameters.

Parameter	Value
Population size	1000
Fraction of population to be elite individuals	40%
Fraction of population to be replaced by mutants	20%
Crossover probability	70%

4.3 Evaluated Methodologies

Five methodologies were implemented and evaluated in the computational experiments:

- $CCSP_1$: solution of the $CCSP_1$ model, initially ignoring Constraints (7), and later including them in the formulation using a *lazy constraint* strategy;
- BRKGA: implementation of the BRKGA for the CCSP described in Section 3;
- $CCSP_{1,s}$: same as $CCSP_1$, however the solution obtained by the BRKGA is given as warm start for the $CCSP_1$ model;
- *Matheuristic*: solution of the matheuristic described in Subsection 3.4;
- $MDCTVRP_m$: solution of the $MDCTVRP_m$ formulation, initially ignoring Constraints (24), and including them on-demand in the formulation using a *lazy constraint* strategy.

The MDCTVRP_m was compared with the flow-based formulation (F_{flow}) and node-based formulation (F_{node}), both proposed by Allahyari et al. [4], which are the state-of-the-art exact methodologies for the MDCTVRP, to the best of our knowledge.

4.4 Results for the CCSP

Full experimental data, results, instances, and source codes are available on-line¹. The results of the computational experiments show that the CCSP₁ methodology was able to obtain upper bounds for 430 out of 495 instances. In addition, the CCSP₁ methodology proved optimality for 71 instances size up to 101 vertices. Analyzing the results of the BRKGA methodology, we can note that for 407 instances, the obtained solutions were better than the upper bounds obtained by CCSP₁.

With respect to methodologies CCSP_{1s} and *Matheuristic*, the results show that the matheuristic was more effective to improve the solutions obtained from BRKGA. *Matheuristic* methodology improved the BRKGA solutions for 187 out of 495 instances, while CCSP_{1s} improved for 88 instances. The average cost of improvements made by CCSP_{1s} and *Matheuristic* on BRKGA solutions were approximately 1.69% and 2.3%, respectively.

Figure 4 shows, for each methodology, the percentage of solved instances in function of the deviation from the best upper bound ($(\frac{UB - BestUB}{UB}) * 100$). The performance profile clearly shows the BRKGA dominating CCSP₁ with respect to upper bounds. The BRKGA obtained the best solutions for approximately 48% of instances, while the CCSP₁ obtained for approximately 16% of instances. The CCSP_{1s} was able to improve the warm start BRKGA solution for several instances, obtaining the best solutions for approximately 58% of instances. Finally, comparing methodologies *Matheuristic* and CCSP_{1s}, *Matheuristic* was more effective in improving the BRKGA solutions. The *Matheuristic* methodology obtained the best solution for approximately 74% of instances, outperforming CCSP_{1s}.




Figure 4: Performance profiles in terms of deviation (%) from the best upper bound.

¹<http://www.ic.unicamp.br/~fusberti/problems/ccsp>

4.5 Results for the MDCTVRP

Tables 2 and 3 report the results for the small and large instances, respectively. Table 2 reports for each methodology and for each group of small-size instances, the average gap (Avg.gap), the number of optimal solutions (#Opt), and the average running time (Avg.time).

For small instances, the overall optimality gaps were 0.10%, 8.99%, and 30.28% for the MDCTVRP_m, F_{flow} , and F_{node} methodologies, respectively. From 120 small instances, 117, 10, and 4 optimal solutions were obtained by MDCTVRP_m, F_{flow} , and F_{node} , respectively.

Table 3 gives the results from MDCTVRP_m for each group of large-size instances. The column group MDCTVRP_m reports the averages upper bound (Avg.ub), lower bound (Avg.lb), optimality gap (Avg.gap), running time (Avg.time), and number of optimal solutions (#Opt). The column group GRASP x ILS [4] reports the results obtained by the hybrid meta-heuristic proposed by Allahyari et al. [4]. “Avg” gives the average cost obtained over five executions for each instance. Avg.gap_{LP} and Avg.gap_{MDCTVRP_m} give the “Avg” gap from the linear relaxation of F_{flow} formulation, and the average lower bound (Avg.lb) of MDCTVRP_m, respectively.

It should be noticed that, due to the large number of variables, Allahyari et al. [4] have not executed experiments on large instances with F_{flow} . The computational results have shown that MDCTVRP_m achieved good lower bounds for large. Previously, the GRASP x ILS overall gap with respect to the linear programming relaxation of F_{flow} was 20.98%, while with the new lower bounds obtained by MDCTVRP_m the GRASP x ILS overall gap was improved to 7.98%. It is worth noting that even though MDCTVRP_m is an exact methodology, the upper bounds were close to the solutions cost obtained by the GRASP x ILS. More specifically, the solutions cost obtained by GRASP x ILS are, on average, only 1.37% apart from the upper bounds obtained by MDCTVRP_m.

Table 2: Results of computational experiments for the small-size instances.

Category	Group	MDCTVRP _m			F _{Flow}			F _{node}		
		Avg.gap	#Opt	Avg.time	Avg.gap	#Opt	Avg.time	Avg.gap	#Opt	Avg.time
1	Input1000	0.00	5	8.00	6.37	0	7200.00	22.25	0	7200.00
	Input1001	0.00	5	8.80	6.38	0	7200.00	21.29	0	7200.00
	Input1010	0.00	5	6.60	1.74	2	6015.00	17.71	0	7200.00
	Input1011	0.00	5	5.20	2.48	1	7066.00	18.63	0	7200.00
	Input1100	0.00	5	7.00	4.96	2	5621.00	14.19	1	7200.00
	Input1101	0.00	5	6.80	4.87	1	5848.00	12.44	1	7200.00
	Input1110	0.00	5	5.80	3.14	2	5504.00	13.85	1	7200.00
	Input1111	0.00	5	6.20	2.03	2	5220.00	11.57	1	7200.00
	2	Input2000	0.00	5	140.20	10.56	0	7200.00	42.30	0
Input2001		0.00	5	184.60	10.81	0	7200.00	38.64	0	7200.00
Input2010		0.00	5	70.20	10.39	0	7200.00	37.45	0	7200.00
Input2011		0.00	5	115.40	11.14	0	7200.00	33.94	0	7200.00
Input2100		0.00	5	66.60	7.98	0	7200.00	31.33	0	7200.00
Input2101		0.00	5	138.20	7.63	0	7200.00	27.85	0	7200.00
input2110		0.00	5	73.20	9.02	0	7200.00	28.45	0	7200.00
Input2111		0.00	5	44.60	9.55	0	7200.00	27.43	0	7200.00
3		Input3000	1.01	4	2653.20	14.48	0	7200.00	50.29	0
	Input3001	0.71	4	2853.20	14.93	0	7200.00	44.15	0	7200.00
	Input3010	0.00	5	1865.80	15.23	0	7200.00	44.46	0	7200.00
	Input3011	0.58	4	1923.60	14.29	0	7200.00	41.20	0	7200.00
	Input3100	0.00	5	288.20	12.95	0	7200.00	39.75	0	7200.00
	Input3101	0.00	5	246.40	11.83	0	7200.00	35.90	0	7200.00
	Input3110	0.00	5	383.60	12.25	0	7200.00	36.70	0	7200.00
	Input3111	0.00	5	492.20	10.85	0	7200.00	35.00	0	7200.00
Average	0.10		483.07	8.99		6869.75	30.28		7200.00	

Table 3: Results of computational experiments for the large-size instances.

Category	Group	MDCTVRP _m				GRASP x ILS [4]			
		Avg.ub	Avg.lb	Avg.gap	#Opt	Avg.time	Avg	Avg.gap _{LP}	Avg.gap _{MDCTVRP_m}
4	Input4000	799.45	751.98	6.22	0	7200.00	796.21	19.30	5.88
	Input4001	808.23	764.91	5.55	0	7200.00	806.95	18.57	5.50
	Input4010	787.18	729.22	7.86	0	7200.00	775.66	19.68	6.37
	Input4011	792.13	744.53	6.26	0	7200.00	787.64	19.12	5.79
	Input4100	737.27	692.92	6.24	0	7200.00	733.72	21.90	5.89
	Input4101	750.94	701.21	6.98	0	7200.00	745.62	20.91	6.33
	Input4110	721.12	678.30	6.09	1	6650.80	711.94	21.26	4.96
	Input4111	730.01	689.79	5.72	0	7200.00	728.17	21.03	5.56
5	Input5000	899.58	815.45	10.27	0	7200.00	880.01	19.80	7.92
	Input5001	903.58	829.00	8.95	0	7200.00	895.99	18.93	8.08
	Input5010	869.08	784.04	10.82	0	7200.00	857.27	21.41	9.34
	Input5011	886.07	800.62	10.63	0	7200.00	873.99	20.46	9.16
	Input5100	810.75	732.59	10.65	0	7200.00	796.88	22.12	8.78
	Input5101	827.35	748.43	10.52	0	7200.00	813.70	20.85	8.72
	Input5110	785.86	711.22	10.51	0	7200.00	777.99	23.23	9.39
	Input5111	804.80	728.69	10.37	0	7200.00	794.78	21.71	9.07
6	Input6000	1005.58	922.85	8.88	0	7200.00	997.18	20.01	8.05
	Input6001	1037.50	936.43	10.75	0	7200.00	1016.10	19.43	8.51
	Input6010	987.04	898.72	9.63	0	7200.00	968.81	20.59	7.80
	Input6011	998.51	916.29	8.83	0	7200.00	989.60	20.16	8.00
	Input6100	955.65	875.82	9.07	0	7200.00	946.88	20.63	8.11
	Input6101	984.79	893.52	10.09	0	7200.00	967.23	20.11	8.25
	Input6110	936.80	848.97	10.27	0	7200.00	920.24	21.58	8.40
	Input6111	953.62	867.56	9.88	0	7200.00	939.51	20.77	8.29
7	Input7000	1031.77	930.53	10.79	0	7200.00	1013.92	21.35	8.96
	Input7001	1047.06	935.57	11.88	0	7200.00	1019.34	20.89	8.95
	Input7010	1012.71	905.58	11.78	0	7200.00	989.22	21.90	9.24
	Input7011	1018.47	910.80	11.83	0	7200.00	995.08	21.47	9.25
	Input7100	933.58	842.19	10.81	0	7200.00	918.91	22.90	9.11
	Input7101	948.35	849.03	11.65	0	7200.00	924.61	22.39	8.90
	Input7110	917.68	830.41	10.51	0	7200.00	904.92	23.56	8.97
	Input7111	919.48	832.89	10.37	0	7200.00	915.05	23.24	9.86
Average		893.81	815.63	9.40			881.35	20.98	7.98

5 Final Remarks

This work proposes the Capacitated Covering Salesman Problem (CCSP), a problem that approaches the notion of coverage in vehicle routing problems. Two ILP formulations and a BRKGA are proposed to solve the CCSP. From the set of instances for the CVRP [26, 27], a benchmark of instances for CCSP was generated.

Computational experiments conducted on a benchmark of 198 instances for CCSP evaluated the ILP formulation and the BRKGA. The results show the effectiveness of the BRKGA in obtaining upper bounds for all instances. The $CCSP_1$ obtained optimal solutions for 71 instances, with up to 101 vertices.

Furthermore, a new MILP formulation is proposed for the Multi-Depot Covering Tour Vehicle Routing Problem (MD-CTVRP). Computational experiments were conducted on a benchmark of 280 instances from literature. The overall results show unequivocally the new formulation outperforming the best known exact methodology from literature, obtaining 118 new optimal solutions and improving all known lower bounds.

Future works should focus on valid inequalities and a branch-and-cut framework for the solution of CCSP and MD-CTVRP. Another promising field of research is to consider multi-objective vehicle routing problem with covering range being the additional objective function.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by CAPES, CNPq, and Fapesp (grants 140960/2017-1, 314384/2018-9, 435520/2018-0, 2015/11937-9).

References

- [1] George B Dantzig and John H Ramser. The truck dispatching problem. *Management science*, 6(1):80–91, 1959.
- [2] Jean-François Cordeau, Gilbert Laporte, Martin WP Savelsbergh, and Daniele Vigo. Vehicle routing. *Handbooks in operations research and management science*, 14:367–428, 2007.
- [3] Bruce L Golden, Subramanian Raghavan, and Edward A Wasil. *The vehicle routing problem: latest advances and new challenges*, volume 43. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [4] Somayeh Allahyari, Majid Salari, and Daniele Vigo. A hybrid metaheuristic algorithm for the multi-depot covering tour vehicle routing problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 242(3):756–768, 2015.
- [5] John R Current and David A Schilling. The covering salesman problem. *Transportation science*, 23(3):208–213, 1989.
- [6] David L. Applegate, Robert E. Bixby, Vasek Chvatal, and William J. Cook. *The Traveling Salesman Problem: A Computational Study (Princeton Series in Applied Mathematics)*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, USA, 2007.
- [7] Bruce Golden, Zahra Naji-Azimi, S Raghavan, Majid Salari, and Paolo Toth. The generalized covering salesman problem. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 24(4):534–553, 2012.
- [8] Michel Gendreau, Gilbert Laporte, and Frédéric Semet. The covering tour problem. *Operations Research*, 45(4):568–576, 1997.
- [9] Mondher Hachicha, M John Hodgson, Gilbert Laporte, and Frédéric Semet. Heuristics for the multi-vehicle covering tour problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, 27(1):29–42, 2000.
- [10] Zara Naji-Azimi, Jacques Renaud, Angel Ruiz, and Majid Salari. A covering tour approach to the location of satellite distribution centers to supply humanitarian aid. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 222(3):596–605, 2012.
- [11] Minh Hoang Ha, Nathalie Bostel, André Langevin, and Louis-Martin Rousseau. An exact algorithm and a metaheuristic for the multi-vehicle covering tour problem with a constraint on the number of vertices. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 226(2):211–220, 2013.
- [12] Keisuke Murakami. A column generation approach for the multi-vehicle covering tour problem. In *Automation Science and Engineering (CASE), 2014 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 1063–1068. IEEE, 2014.
- [13] Nicolas Jozefowicz. A branch-and-price algorithm for the multivehicle covering tour problem. *Networks*, 64(3):160–168, 2014.

- [14] Manel Kammoun, Houda Derbel, Mostapha Ratli, and Bassem Jarboui. An integration of mixed vnd and vns: the case of the multivehicle covering tour problem. *International Transactions in Operational Research*, 24(3):663–679, 2017.
- [15] Frank A Tillman. The multiple terminal delivery problem with probabilistic demands. *Transportation Science*, 3(3):192–204, 1969.
- [16] Thomas H Cormen, Charles E Leiserson, Ronald L Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to algorithms*. MIT press, 2022.
- [17] José Fernando Gonçalves and Mauricio GC Resende. Biased random-key genetic algorithms for combinatorial optimization. *Journal of Heuristics*, 17(5):487–525, 2011.
- [18] Efrain Ruiz, Valeria Soto-Mendoza, Alvaro Ernesto Ruiz Barbosa, and Ricardo Reyes. Solving the open vehicle routing problem with capacity and distance constraints with a biased random key genetic algorithm. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 133:207–219, 2019.
- [19] Alberto F Kummer N, Luciana S Buriol, and Olinto CB de Araújo. A biased random key genetic algorithm applied to the vrptw with skill requirements and synchronization constraints. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*, pages 717–724, 2020.
- [20] Levi R Abreu, Roberto F Tavares-Neto, and Marcelo S Nagano. A new efficient biased random key genetic algorithm for open shop scheduling with routing by capacitated single vehicle and makespan minimization. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 104:104373, 2021.
- [21] Alberto F Kummer, Olinto CB de Araújo, Luciana S Buriol, and Mauricio GC Resende. A biased random-key genetic algorithm for the home health care problem. *International Transactions in Operational Research*, 2022.
- [22] Saúl Domínguez-Casasola, José Luis González-Velarde, Yasmín Á Ríos-Solís, and Kevin Alain Reyes-Vega. The capacitated family traveling salesperson problem. *International Transactions in Operational Research*, 2023.
- [23] H Kellerer, U Pferschy, and D Pisinger. *Knapsack Problems*, volume 1. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2004.
- [24] Shen Lin and Brian W Kernighan. An effective heuristic algorithm for the traveling-salesman problem. *Operations research*, 21(2):498–516, 1973.
- [25] Carlo S Sartori and Luciana S Buriol. A matheuristic approach to the pickup and delivery problem with time windows. In *International Conference on Computational Logistics*, pages 253–267. Springer, 2018.
- [26] Nicos Christofides and Samuel Eilon. An algorithm for the vehicle-dispatching problem. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 20(3):309–318, 1969.
- [27] Eduardo Uchoa, Diego Pecin, Artur Pessoa, Marcus Poggi, Thibaut Vidal, and Anand Subramanian. New benchmark instances for the capacitated vehicle routing problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 257(3):845–858, 2017.
- [28] Rodrigo F Toso and Mauricio GC Resende. A c++ application programming interface for biased random-key genetic algorithms. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 30(1):81–93, 2015.
- [29] Keld Helsgaun. An effective implementation of the lin–kernighan traveling salesman heuristic. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 126(1):106–130, 2000.