

Fast Adaptive Meta-Heuristic for Large-Scale Facility Location Problem

Bahram Alidaee^a and Haibo Wang^{b*}

*^aSchool of Business Administration, University of Mississippi, University, USA; ^bA.R. Sanchez
School of Business, Texas A&M International University, Laredo, USA*

*Corresponding author: Haibo Wang, hwang@tamiu.edu

Fast Adaptive Meta-Heuristic for Large-Scale Facility Location Problem

Abstract

Facility location problems have been a major research area of interest in the last several decades. In particular, uncapacitated location problems (ULP) have enormous applications. Variations of ULP often appear, especially as large-scale subproblems in more complex combinatorial optimization problems. Although many researchers have studied different versions of ULP (e.g., uncapacitated facility location problem (UCFLP) and p -Median problem), most authors have considered small to moderately sized problems. This paper addresses the ULP and provides a fast adaptive meta-heuristic for large-scale problems. The approach is based on critical event memory tabu search. For the diversification component of the algorithm, we have chosen a procedure based on a sequencing problem commonly used for traveling salesman-type problems. The efficacy of this approach is evaluated across a diverse range of benchmark problems sourced from the Internet, with a comprehensive comparison against four prominent algorithms in the literature. The proposed adaptive critical event tabu search (ACETS) demonstrates remarkable effectiveness for large-scale problems. The algorithm successfully solved all problems optimally within a short computing time. Notably, ACETS discovered three best new solutions for benchmark problems, specifically for Asymmetric 500A-1, Asymmetric 750A-1, and Symmetric 750B-4, underscoring its innovative and robust nature.

Keywords: Logistics; Facility location problem; Adaptive meta-heuristic

1. Introduction

Selecting the right facility location is a pivotal strategic decision that influences a company's success. Several crucial factors determine this choice, each playing a vital role in the organization's operational efficiency and competitiveness: customer proximity, business area advantage, infrastructure and transportation, Cost Consideration, and Market Demand and Forecasting. A meticulous evaluation of these factors ensures a well-informed decision, aligning the facility location with the organization's goals and customer-centric approach. Strategic location selection enhances operational efficiency, customer satisfaction, and overall business success.

The facility location problem is a crucial topic in strategic logistics design and a fundamental issue in supply chain planning (Melo et al., 2009). The ULP and its variants have a variety of applications, especially in logistics and transportation (Bolori Arabani & Farahani, 2012; Farahani et al., 2014). The ULP represents a specific instance within broader facility location

problems. These scenarios often occur in extensive real-world applications, where various complex problems can be simplified into two particular cases of the ULP (p -Median or UCFLP), refer to (Galvão & Raggi, 1989; Laporte et al., 2015). Additionally, numerous complex combinatorial problems have large-scale p -Median or UCFLP as subproblems (Caserta & Voß, 2020, 2021). The ULP has found diverse applications in various fields. These applications include locating sensor nodes, which is referred to as the minimum k -storage problem or MSP (D'Angelo et al., 2016), web caching (Sen et al., 2016), distributed database systems (Sen et al., 2016), cell manufacturing (Kusiak, 1987), end-of-life management for complex products (Cruz-Rivera & Ertel, 2009), electric vehicle charging infrastructure (B. Zhang et al., 2023), green logistics (Saldanha-da-Gama, 2022), waste management (Adeleke & Ali, 2021; Shi et al., 2020), and parcel locker analysis (Deutsch & Golany, 2018; Pan et al., 2021).

Mathematically, the ULP may be stated as follows. We are given a set of clients to be served by a set of facilities. Let $I = \{1, \dots, m\}$ be the set of potential facilities and $J = \{1, \dots, n\}$ the set of clients. Let c_{ij} be the cost if client j is served by facility i , f_i fixed cost if facility i is opened, and p is the upper bound for the number of facilities that can be opened. Let x_{ij} be 1 if facility i serves client j , 0 otherwise, and y_i equal 1 if facility i is opened, 0 otherwise. An integer programming formulation of the ULP can be stated as follows (Galvão & Raggi, 1989).

$$\text{Min } Z = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n x_{ij} c_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^m y_i f_i \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m x_{ij} = 1, j=1, \dots, n, \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m y_i \leq p \quad (3)$$

$$x_{ij} \leq y_i, i=1, \dots, m, j=1, \dots, n, \quad (4)$$

$$x_{ij}, y_i \in \{0, 1\}, i=1, \dots, m, j=1, \dots, n \quad (5)$$

In the general ULP, (1)-(5), the value of p is an upper bound for the facilities, and we must find a number of facilities $p^* \leq p$ to open. In this problem, if constraint (3) is missing, we have the UCFLP; however, if p is known, the inequality is replaced by equality, and there is no fixed cost for opening a facility, then we have the p -Median problem. It is known that both p -Median and UCFLP are NP-hard, Garey & Johnson, (1979).

2. Related Literature

Variants of UFL have been discussed in the literature for several decades, refer to the comprehensive book by Laporte et al. (2015). Although there are several variants of the problem, two important variations are UCFLP and p -Median. Literature regarding these two variants is rich in theoretical development and algorithmic perspectives. For a concise review of historical developments regarding p -Median and UCFLP, refer to (Galvão & Raggi, 1989), and for a

comprehensive discussion on exact and meta-heuristic applications for UCFLP and p -Median problems, refer to see (Bolori Arabani & Farahani, 2012; Farahani et al., 2014; Laporte et al., 2015). In a study by (D'Angelo et al., 2016), the authors formulated the MSP as a ULP without fixed costs in equation (1). They provided an algorithm to find the optimal value of k by repeatedly solving a series of k -median problems. One way to solve ULP is by solving several k -median problems included in equation (1).

Researchers have explored various approaches to tackle facility location problems in different contexts. (Yigit et al., 2006) proposed an evolutionary simulated annealing metaheuristic for the Uncapacitated Facility Location (UCFL) problem, applying it to 15 problems from the OR-Library and additional ones generated by the authors. Chen & Ting (2008) developed a hybrid approach combining Lagrangean relaxation and ant colony search for capacitated facility location problems. Fast & Hicks (2017) introduced two branch decomposition heuristics for the p -Median problem and frequently utilized the Greedy Randomized Adaptive Search Procedure (GRASP) in their algorithms. Benyoucef et al. (2013) devised a Lagrangean relaxation-based approach for facility location in supply chain network design problems, incorporating supplier selection and/or supplier reliability into their model. Won & Logendran (2015) introduced a two-phase p -median approach for balanced cells in manufacturing systems, conducting computational experiments with intermediate-sized datasets. Gendron et al. (2016) devised a two-level optimal approach for the Uncapacitated Capacitated Facility Location Problem (UCFLP), while Camacho-Valleho et al. (2014) proposed an evolutionary approach for bi-level UCFLP. Wu et al. (2017) developed a hybrid method integrating Lagrangean relaxation, simulated annealing, and tabu search for a two-echelon capacitated facility location. Almasarwah & Suer (2021) presented a three-phase p -Median model for batch-cycle scheduling. Rahmati et al. (2022) designed a two-stage optimization strategy for an uncapacitated hub location problem with uncertain demand, employing a Benders decomposition algorithm. Zhao et al. (2018) addressed a two-echelon capacitated location and routing problem in urban logistics, proposing a cooperative approximation heuristic and comparing it with three published approaches. Shi et al. (2020) developed three metaheuristics to solve multi-period facility location problems arising from household e-waste collection. Adeleke and Ali (2021) applied a Lagrangian relaxation approach and a linear relaxation heuristic for a set covering facility location problems modeling solid waste collection in urban areas. Caserta & Vos (2020, 2021) introduced a matheuristic algorithm based on the corridor method for capacitated facility location, relaxing the capacity constraint in a Lagrangian fashion to obtain an uncapacitated facility location problem. Pan et al. (2021) proposed a hybrid algorithm integrating a Genetic Algorithm with the Lin-Kernighan heuristic for capacitated facility location problems related to parcel locker networks in the supply chain. Ozsoydan & Golcuk (2023) developed a hybrid method combining linear programming and swarm intelligence algorithms for capacitated facility location problems, successfully applying it

to benchmark problems in the OR-Library. Additionally, Camacho-Vallejo et al. (2014) utilized an Evolutionary Algorithm to address the Bilevel Facility Location Problem Under Preferences. For a comprehensive overview of historical developments related to p -Median and UCFLP, readers can refer to Galvão and Raggi (1989) and Laporte et al. (2015). For an in-depth discussion on exact and metaheuristic applications for UCFLP and p -Median problems, readers are directed to the works of Boloori Arabani & Farahani (2012), Farahani et al. (2014), and Laporte et al. (2015).

As the literature suggests, authors have developed meta-heuristics, including tabu search, for UCFLP and p -Median problems. However, all algorithms, including recent ones published on UCFLP and/or p -Median problems, have ignored testing very large-scale problems. Moreover, the CPU time of these algorithms is often substantial, as seen in recent studies by Halki and Ortacay (2019), Bas and Ulker (2020), Eliguzel et al. (2022), Sonuc and Ozcan (2023), Wang et al. (2023), and Zhang et al. (2023). Variants of ULP typically occur in large-scale situations. Therefore, there is a clear need for developing fast heuristics for large-scale ULP. Several authors recently have also provided heuristics for capacitated facility location and/or p -Median problem, (Caserta and Vos, 2020, 2021, Ozsoydan & Golcuk, 2023, Zhang et al., 2023). However, CPU time for these applications, especially for “super large-size problems”, as the authors call it, is very large. Additionally, there have been no published algorithms for the general ULP, as stated in (1)-(5), except for the optimal procedure designed by Galvão and Raggi (1989), which can handle very small-sized problems. Furthermore, none of the available algorithms mentioned apply the meta-heuristic known as 'adaptive critical event tabu search' (ACETS) to any variants of ULP. Adaptive meta-heuristics improve themselves as the search progresses, as referred to by Sevaux et al. (2018). ACETS has been applied to several very-large-scale combinatorial problems with considerable success in finding optimal or near-optimal solutions in a noticeably short time, as demonstrated in studies by Wang and Alidaee (2019, 2023).

Our primary contribution in this paper is the development of a rapid algorithm based on adaptive critical event tabu search (ACETS) for the uncapacitated location problem (ULP). ACETS for combinatorial problems was pioneered by Glover and Kochenberger (1996) and further refined by Glover et al. (1998). Two fundamentally crucial components of any meta-heuristic, particularly tabu search, include (1) a diversification generator, and (2) a 'simple' improvement procedure. The diversification component aims to explore a diverse solution space. To achieve this, we employ a diversification approach based on the r -Opt strategy, commonly used in sequencing problems such as the traveling salesman problem, similar to the procedure outlined in studies by Alidaee et al. (2017) and Wang & Alidaee (2019). In this approach, we randomly choose r equal to 1, 2, 3, or 4. For the implementation of the simple improvement procedure in all cases, we utilize one of the cases (i)-(iii) explained in the next section.

In the following sections, we outline the algorithm, present computational experiments, and conclude with a summary and remarks.

3. An Adaptive Critical Event Tabu Search with Embedded Sequence

Diversification (ACETS)

In our research, we develop a tabu search (TS) founded on critical event memory, called adaptive critical event tabu search (ACETS). This method incorporates robust diversification components, as discussed earlier. ACETS was first introduced in studies by Glover and Kochenberger (1996) and further elaborated upon by Glover et al. (1998). It has been successfully applied to a wide range of combinatorial problems.

As previously mentioned, two fundamentally important components of any meta-heuristic, especially tabu search, are: (1) a diversification generator, and (2) a 'simple' improvement procedure. We will not delve into the specifics of diversification generators here; interested readers can refer to two papers (Alidaee et al., 2017; Wang & Alidaee, 2019) for details on the r -Opt diversification strategy. To implement the simple improvement procedure, we randomly selected one of the following approaches. Assume in ULP a set of facilities, $V \in J$, is already chosen to serve all clients. We can consider three possible simple improvement 'moves': (i) exchange position of two facilities, one from V and one from the set $J \setminus V$; (ii) move one of the facilities from the set V to the set $J \setminus V$; and (iii) one facility from $J \setminus V$ to the set V , if $|V|+1$ is less than or equal to p . Note that, in the case of p -Median, we only use option (i).

Heuristic 1, outlined below, provides the steps of pseudocode for a simple 2-exchange local improvement search for ULP, which will be utilized within ACETS. Table 1 presents the definitions used to explain Heuristics 1 and 2.

Parameters	Description
J	Set of all clients, $\{1, \dots, n\}$
I	Set of potential facilities, $\{1, \dots, m\}$
V	A subset of I with $ V \leq p$, serving all clients in J
p	Maximum number of facilities that can be chosen to serve all clients J
$H1(g, h)$	Amount of change to the objective function if an element g of V is moved to $I \setminus V$ and an element h of $I \setminus V$ is moved to V
$H2(g)$	Amount of change to the objective function if an element g of V is moved to $I \setminus V$.
$H3(h)$	Amount of change to the objective function if an element h of $I \setminus V$ is moved to V and $ V +1$ is less than or equal to p
H	$\text{Min} \{H1(g, h), H2(g), H3(h)\}$

L	A sequence of numbers in V , where $L(i)$ is the i -th element
K	A sequence of numbers in $I \setminus V$, where $K(i)$ is the i -th element
J	Set of all clients, $\{1, \dots, n\}$

Table 1. Terminologies used in Heuristics 1 and 2

(Heuristic 1) Simple 2-Exchange Local Search with Embedded Sequence Diversification:

Initialize: $I = \{1, \dots, m\}$, $J = \{1, \dots, n\}$, p upper bound for several facilities, V a randomly chosen subset of I with some elements at most equal to p , Z^* value of the objective function when facilities in V serves all clients in J .

```

1  Start
2  Randomly choose a sequence  $L$  of numbers in  $V$ , and a sequence  $K$  of numbers in  $I \setminus V$ 
3  For  $i=1, |V|$ 
4       $g=L(i)$ 
5      For  $j=1, |I \setminus V|$ 
6           $h=K(j)$ 
7          Calculate  $H=Min \{H1(g, h), H2(g), H3(h)\}$ 
           If  $H < 0$  go to 11
8      End For
9  End For
10 Stop (the process is complete)
11 Update:  $V, I \setminus V, Z^*$ 
12 Go to Start

```

Please note that Heuristic 1 is designed for the general Uncapacitated Facility Location (UFL) problem; however, it can be easily modified for variants like Uncapacitated Facility Location Problem (UCFLP) or p -Median. In Step 2, any sequence for L or K is acceptable, and if L and K each include only one sequence, the sequencing diversification is not implemented. It is important to mention that we experimentally demonstrate that dynamically changing sequences significantly impact the heuristic's performance. As mentioned earlier, the sequences we randomly choose are based on the r -Opt strategy, where r is equal to 1, 2, 3, or 4. Another powerful diversification approach based on sequencing involves using Random Keys implementation in genetic algorithms. This diversification method has proven to be highly effective, as recently demonstrated for Quadratic Assignment Problems (QAP) (Wang & Alidaee, 2023). Heuristic 1 serves as an improvement process within the ACETS algorithm. Below, in Heuristic 2, we present a pseudocode for the ACETS algorithm tailored to the ULP.

(Heuristic 2) Adaptive Critical Event Tabu Search with Embedded Sequence Diversification (ACETS):

Initialize: $I = \{1, \dots, m\}$, $J = \{1, \dots, n\}$, p upper bound for number of facilities, V a randomly chosen subset of I with number of elements at most equal to p , Z value of objective function when facilities in V serves all clients in J , $Z^* = Z$, best solution found so far, a vector $Tabu_V(.)$ of $|V|$ elements, and a vector $Tabu_I \setminus V(.)$ of $|I \setminus V|$ elements as tabu status, an integer value for tabu tenure Tab_ten , number of total iterations $MAXCOUNT$, and two positive integers parameters $n2 > n1$.

```

1  For COUNT=1, MAXCOUNT

```

```

2   For  $d=n1, n2$ 
3       Start
4       Randomly choose a sequence  $L$  of numbers in  $V$ , and a sequence  $K$  of numbers in  $J\setminus V$ 
5       For  $i=1, |V|$ 
6            $g=L(i)$ 
7           For  $j=1, |J\setminus V|$ 
8                $h=K(j)$ 
9               Calculate  $H=Min \{H1(g, h), H2(g), H3(h)\}$ 
10              If  $H<0$  Then
11                  Evaluate  $Z$ 
12                  If  $((Tabu\_V(g)=0)$ . and.  $(Tabu\_J\setminus V(h)=0))$ . or.  $(Z<Z^*)$ ) Then
13                      Update:  $V, J\setminus V, Z^*, Tabu\_V, Tabu\_J\setminus V$ 
14                      Go to Start
15                  End If
16              End If
17          End For
18      End For
19      Call RandVarChange(.)
20  End For
21 End For

```

Please note that Steps 3-18 in **Heuristic 2** represent the implementation of **Heuristic 1**, with the inclusion of the tabu structure in Steps 12-13. In this Tabu Search (TS), we utilize short-term memory, often referred to as 'recency,' in Step 12. However, we do not employ long-term memory, known as 'frequency,' which is utilized in some TS procedures. We also use a simple aspiration criterion in the TS, if the objective value of a new solution is strictly better than the best-known solution found so far, Z^* , we override the tabu status, Step 12. When there are no possible improving moves, then in Step 19 we randomly change elements of V and $J\setminus V$ to get into other areas of solution space, a subroutine *RandVarChange(.)* does this. In that, we randomly pick an integer b from $[n1, d]$, (d runs from $n1$ to $n2$), and randomly move b elements from V to $J\setminus V$ and vice versa. This process can potentially move the search process to a more diverse area of the solution space. This step aligns with the original variant of the critical event tabu search (Glover & Kochenberger, 1996; Glover et al., 1998; Wang & Alidaee, 2023). Steps 2-20 constitute one cycle of the ACETS implementation, which is repeated MAXCOUNT times. We note that Heuristics 1 and 2, are extensions of the procedures proposed by Alidaee & Wang (2022). In (Alidaee & Wang, 2022), a hybrid approach combining Genetic Algorithm (GA) and Tabu search, utilizing Random Keys for sequencing diversification in Step 2 of Heuristic 1 and Step 4 of Heuristic 2, was developed. However, we have moved away from the hybrid meta-heuristic approach in this study. Instead, the diversification strategy employed here is based on the r-Opt technique. Additionally, we have applied these heuristics to several new large-scale problem sets and conducted comparisons with two more recent algorithms.

In ULP, an upper bound value of p is given and an optimal number of open facilities, p^* , needs to be found. An alternative way to solve the ULP is to start with maximum p and reduce its

value one at a time to $k=p-1, p-2, p-2, \dots$, and repeatedly solve several k-Median problems, similar to a study (D'Angelo et al., 2016). Indeed, for more challenging problems, our experiments demonstrated that this process was more efficient compared to directly solving the Uncapacitated Location Problem (ULP). We elaborate on this in the next section, where we present our computational experiments.

4. Computational Experiment

To evaluate the effectiveness of our heuristics, we solved various sets of benchmark problems accessible on the Internet. Researchers have widely employed these problems to assess the efficiency of heuristics and/or optimal procedures. We implemented our heuristics using Fortran, compiled with the GNU Fortran compiler v4.7, and executed the code on a supercomputer equipped with parallel processing capabilities. However, we utilized only a single core of the Intel Xeon Quad-core E5420 Harpertown processor, which operates at 2.5 GHz with 8 GB of memory, running the Fortran program sequentially.

4.1. Heuristics chosen for comparison

We selected two leading heuristics, one for p -Median and one for UCFLP, based on the Greedy Randomized Adaptive Search Procedure (GRASP) introduced by (Resende & Werneck, 2006, 2007). GRASP¹ is a widely used heuristic that many researchers employ for comparison purposes. Additionally, we chose two very recent heuristics: one by (F. Zhang et al., 2023), based on Enhanced Group Technology Theory (EGTOA²), and another by (Sonuç & Özcan, 2023), named Adaptive Binary Parallel Evolutionary Algorithm (ABPEA³), both designed explicitly for UCFLP.

The authors of EGOTA conducted experiments comparing their algorithm with seven other algorithms, demonstrating its superiority. Similarly, the authors of ABPEA compared their algorithm with five others, including EGOTA, and showed its superiority. However, it's worth noting that authors in both papers were selective in choosing the problems to solve, often ignoring the most challenging ones in their comparisons. The four heuristics mentioned above are compared with Heuristic 1, both with and without embedded sequence diversification (ESD), and Heuristic 2. We noted that the pseudocode of Heuristics 1 and 2 include upper bounds for the

¹ <http://mauricio.resende.info/src/index.html>

² https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342846629_The_source_code_of_EGTOA_for_solving_UFLP_problem

³ <https://github.com/3mrullah/ABPEA>

optimal value of p ; however, they can be easily adapted for UCFLP or p -Median problems. As an alternative approach to solving ULP, one can solve a series of k -Median problems by starting with an upper bound $k=p$ and gradually reducing k one at a time. This version of Heuristic 2 proved remarkably effective, especially for particularly challenging problems. To illustrate, we solved one of the demanding problems, GAP-C533, starting with $k=20$, and then reducing its value 9 times, each time by 1, solving a series of k -Median problems. The optimal solution was achieved when $p^*=k=13$. The total time to solve all 9 k -Median problems was 8.37, compared to 99.01 when the problem was solved as one ULP.

4.2. Benchmark Problems

p -Median problems: There is a set of 40 problems available in the OR-Library introduced by Beasley⁴; additionally, there are 6 sets of problems, each containing 30 problems, totaling 180 problems available from the Yuri Kochetov benchmark library⁵.

UCFLP: A set of 15 problems is available on the OR-Library, also introduced by Beasley. Furthermore, there are 8 sets of problems, each consisting of 30 problems, totaling 240 problems available in the Yuri Kochetov benchmark library. Additionally, a set of problems known as M^* problems was introduced by Kratica et al. (2001), totaling 22 problems. There is also a set of large-scale problems, totaling 90 problems, introduced by (Ghosh, 2003) (GHOSH). For detailed descriptions of these problems, readers can refer to the paper by Resende and Werneck (2006).

All benchmark problems, including CAP, M^* , GAP A-C, and Pmed problems, were solved using Heuristics 1 (both with and without ESD implementation) and Heuristic 2. CAP, M^* , GAP A-C, and P-med problems were also tackled by the GRASP algorithm. However, the average results of GHOSH problems for GRASP were taken from two papers (Ardjmand et al., 2014; Resende & Werneck, 2006), and the best results from these two papers were used for comparison. We attempted to use the EGTOA and ABPEA heuristics; however, these heuristics were unable to handle large-scale problems due to memory limitations. (F. Zhang et al., 2023) solved only 15 CAP problems from the OR-Library, while (Sonuç & Özcan, 2023) solved these 15 CAP problems and 20 of the M^* problems from (Kratica et al., 2001). It's noteworthy that these authors, as well as authors of several recent articles (Baş & Ülker, 2020; Eligüzel et al., 2022; Hakli & Ortacay, 2019; Sonuç & Özcan, 2023; Wang et al., 2023; F. Zhang et al., 2023), often ignored solving the most challenging problems. The results of the 15 CAP problems for EGOTA and ABPEA are available in papers (Sonuç & Özcan, 2023; F. Zhang et al., 2023). However, even for these problems, solved by EGOTA and ABPEA, the CPU time required was substantial.

⁴ <http://people.brunel.ac.uk/~mastjjb/jeb/orlib/pmedinfo.html>

⁵ http://old.math.nsc.ru/AP/benchmarks/P-median/p-med_eng.html

The results obtained from the simple 2-exchange Heuristic 1, both with and without ESD implementation, provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of implementing sequences as a robust diversification method. Additionally, the results generated by Heuristic 2 offer valuable information regarding the hybrid ACETS' performance strength. It's important to note that some of the problem sets were not challenging enough for our Heuristic 2, leading them to be solved to optimality within zero CPU time. Due to space constraints, we only report results for the more challenging problems. These challenges were identified based on the larger GAP (GAP A-C) values, making these problems particularly difficult. Hence, in this report, we focus on these demanding problems, including those from the OR-Library, the M* set, as well as the GHOSH problems.

Since no benchmark problems were specifically designed for the general Uncapacitated Location Problem (ULP) aimed at finding the optimal value of p^* , we designed an experimental scenario. To create these scenarios for ULP, we tackled challenging Uncapacitated Facility Location Problems (GAP B-C problems). We initiated the process with $p=20$ and reduced its value by one 9 times (i.e., $p=20, 19, \dots, 12$) Each time, we solved a p -Median problem to determine the optimal solution and the corresponding value of p^* .

4.3. Parameter Setting

4.3.1. Parameter Setting for Heuristic 1

In Heuristic 1, a critical parameter is a method used to randomly choose a sequence in Step 2. As previously explained, any process can be employed, but two robust approaches are r -Opt and the Random Keys method of Genetic Algorithms (GA). In this context, we were inspired by the r -Opt strategy commonly used in the traveling salesman problem. Notably, the Random Keys method was initially designed for traveling salesman problems (Bean, 1994). Generally, for larger values of r , CPU time increases. In our approach, we experimented with $r=1,2,3,4$; however, to reduce CPU time, for $r=4$, we implemented a limited version, optimizing the balance between computational efficiency and solution quality.

4.3.2. Parameter Setting for Heuristic 2

In Heuristic 2, crucial parameters include the values of $n1$ and $n2$ used in the subroutine *RandVarChange(.)*, the value of tabu tenure (*Teb_ten*), and stopping criteria for the entire process (*MAXCOUNT*). To determine these parameters, we conducted experiments by setting a time limit of 0.5 seconds to run Heuristic 2. During these experiments, we randomly solved 5 problems from each set of Uncapacitated Facility Location Problems (UCFLP) from the OR-Library, GAP A-C, and M* problems. This approach allowed us to assess the effectiveness of different parameter combinations within the given time constraint.

Values of $n1$ and $n2$: These values determine the number of 0-1 bits to be changed when a local optimum is reached. In our initial experiments, we found that these values had a significant impact

on the results. We tested the value of $n1$ to be equal to 1,3,6,10, and the value of $n2$ to be larger than $n1$ and equal to 3,5,10,15, creating 10 combinations. In all problems solved we realized $[n1, n2] = [1,5]$ performed the best. When $n2$ was chosen to be large, the number of 0-1 bits to be randomly switched in the process of *RandVarChange(.)*, explained earlier, did not do well. Thus, in the final implementation, we used $n1=1, n2=5$.

Value of Tab_ten: We experimented with values of 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30. Smaller values consistently yielded better results. The best values were 5 and 10, with slightly better outcomes for 5. Thus, we set $Tab_ten=5$ in the final implementation.

Value of MAXCOUNT: implementing any heuristic for a longer duration provides more opportunities to explore the solution space. However, in our implementation, we observed that many of the problems were solved optimally within the criteria of a minimum of 0.5 seconds or completing the entire process once (i.e., $MAXCOUNT=1$). Only a few problems resisted reaching optimal solutions. Therefore, we set $MAXCOUNT=3$ in the final implementation to ensure a more thorough exploration of the solution space for challenging instances.

4.4. Analysis of Results

Using the specified parameters, we solved problems from the internet employing Heuristics 1 with and without ESD implementation, and Heuristic 2. We compared the results with GRASP, ABPEA, and EGOTA when possible. Due to space limitations, we present a summary of the results here. However, detailed results, including objective function values and time to reach the best solutions, are available upon request.

Concerning the GHOSH problems, the objective function values (OFV) for three problems were improved. Detailed results are provided in Table 2. The best-known solutions are obtained from Ardjmand et al. (2014). The average objective value for GRASP is derived from the best results for GRASP taken from two papers (Ardjmand et al., 2014; Resende & Werneck, 2006). It is essential to note that results for all problems (p -Median and UCFLP from OR-Library, UCFLP M*, UCFLP GAPA-C) for all algorithms were implemented on the same machine. Hence, a comparison of CPU time is appropriate.

The following conclusions are evidence from our experiments:

1. The embedded sequence diversification (ESD) proves to be highly effective within the algorithms, as evidenced by the results presented in Table 3. When implemented within the simple Heuristic 1, ESD facilitated optimal solutions for 62.5% of the p -Median problem sets, 80% of the UCFLP problems from the OR-Library, and 18.18% of the M* problems. In contrast, these success rates were 35%, 47%, and 9.09%, respectively, when ESD was not implemented. These results highlight the significant impact of ESD on enhancing the algorithm's performance and improving the solutions obtained for various problem sets.

2. The Adaptive Critical Event Tabu Search (ACETS) demonstrates remarkable effectiveness for large-scale problems. The algorithm successfully solved all problems optimally within a short CPU time. Notably, ACETS discovered three best new solutions for GHOSH problems, specifically for Asymmetric 500A-1, Asymmetric 750A-1, and Symmetric 750B-4 (refer to Table 2). These achievements underscore the algorithm's efficiency and its ability to yield superior solutions for challenging instances.

Please Table 2 here

3. The data presented in Table 3 provides straightforward evidence that ACETS outperformed GRASP in terms of speed when solving problem sets such as p -Median, UCFLP M*, and UCFLP GAP A-C. Notably, these problems were solved on the same machine using both algorithms. On average, ACETS took 5.37 seconds to solve these problems, while GRASP required 42.1 seconds. This substantial difference in computational efficiency further emphasizes the effectiveness of ACETS in swiftly finding solutions for these specific problem sets.

Please Table 3 here

4. Table 3 also shows the results of ULP for GAP B-C. Note that, since no benchmark problems are available for ULP, we solved UCFLP B-C by solving 9 repeated p -Median problems, starting with upper bound p equal to 20 and reducing it each time by 1. Total time was reduced drastically. Average and maximum time were reduced to 1.23, and 7.8 seconds for GAP B, while the same values were reduced to 5.97 and 25.85 for GAP C. Also note that optimal values of p^* for these problems turned out to be 13-15. Thus, overall, this suggests if we have a good upper bound for the value of p , solving repeated P -median problems is very time-consuming for solving general ULP.
5. The experiments revealed that EGOTA and ABPEA are not suitable for large-scale problems. EGOTA managed to solve only one of the GHOSH problems to optimality, specifically Asymmetric 250c-1. For these problems, the average percentage gap with optimal solutions was 1.34, the average CPU time was 94.56 seconds, and the maximum was 209.7 seconds. When applying ABPEA with 32, 64, 128, 256, and 512 threads to GHOSH problems, we encountered memory limitations that prevented us from using the algorithm for Symmetric and Asymmetric 500 and 750 problems. However, we obtained some results for the smaller problems, such as the Symmetric and Asymmetric 250 problems. The best performance was with 256 threads, where 5 problems were solved to optimality. The average percentage gap was 0.03, and the average and maximum times were 5.3 and 6 seconds, respectively.

4.5. Managerial implications

Choosing the right location for a service facility is pivotal for business triumph. A strategic location ensures optimal access to customers, workforce, and transportation, fostering commercial success and a competitive edge. The results of this study contribute to this strategic decision. 1). The primary objective is to satisfy and delight customers with products and services at the lowest cost. A well-planned facility unit aligns its strategy with customer needs, ensuring services are readily available and meet expectations. 2). Strategic location optimizes transportation routes, reducing costs and service times. Proximity to highways, ports, and railways streamlines logistics, ensuring efficient supply chain management. 3). Analyzing operational costs helps in selecting cost-effective facility locations. The balance between operational expenses and strategic advantages is crucial for sustained profitability. In summary, the right facility location forms the cornerstone of a successful business strategy.

5. Conclusion and Further Direction

In this paper, we focused on developing a rapid heuristic solution for the large-scale Incapacitated Location Problem. Given that the problem encompasses the p-Median and Incapacitated Facility Location Problems as special cases and is NP-hard in the strong sense, we introduced an adaptive critical event memory tabu search as a solution technique. A sequence diversification process was implemented as a key diversification component of the algorithm. We conducted extensive computational experiments on several large-scale problems available on the Internet and compared our method with four existing algorithms.

As the next step in our research, we plan to apply the diversification procedure within other meta-heuristic algorithms designed for challenging large-scale problems, mainly focusing on Capacitated Facility Location Problems (CFLP), and multi-echelon location problems such as those studied in (Rahmati et al., 2022; Wu et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2018). This ongoing exploration aims to enhance further our understanding and effectiveness in solving large-scale complex optimization challenges.

Acknowledgments: The authors express their gratitude to the researchers who participated in the 10th IFAC Conference on Manufacturing Modelling, Management, and Control, held from June 22-24, 2022, in Nantes, France. The valuable comments and insightful suggestions provided by the attendees significantly contributed to the enhancement of this paper. Their input allowed the authors to expand the preliminary results presented at the conference into a comprehensive and detailed research paper. The authors appreciate the collaborative spirit and intellectual exchange during the conference, enriching the quality of this work.

	OFV, Asymmetric 250			OFV, Symmetric 250			CPU Time (sec.), Asymmetric 250			CPU Time (Sec.), Symmetric 250		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
	257957	276296	334135	257964	276761	332935	0.297	0.277	0.006	0.337	0.02	0.003
	257502	275141	330728	257573	275675	334630	0.127	0.029	0.003	0.433	0.064	0
	257953	276093	333662	257626	275710	333000	0.237	0.013	0.002	0.086	0.068	0.004
	257987	276332	332423	257961	276114	333158	0.07	0.01	0.003	0.86	0.018	0.002
	258190	276404	333538	257896	275916	334635	0.182	0.02	0.001	0.785	0.053	0.006
Avg.	257917.8	276053.2	332897.2	257804.0	276035.2	333671.6	0.183	0.070	0.003	0.500	0.045	0.003
Max.							0.297	0.277	0.006	0.860	0.068	0.006
Avg. GRASP	257922.1	276053.2	332897.2	257806.2	276035.2	333671.6						
	OFV, Asymmetric 500			OFV, Symmetric 500			CPU Time (Sec.), Asymmetric 500			CPU Time (Sec.), Symmetric 500		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
	511383	538060	621360	511187	537931	620041	5.119	0.181	0.015	3.466	2.055	0.01
	511255	537850	621464	511179	537763	620434	2.288	0.346	0.1	1.658	1.247	0.009
	510810	537921	621428	511106	537854	621204	2.102	0.279	0.022	27.147	0.566	0.042
	511008	537925	621754	511137	537742	620437	4.765	2.102	0.022	2.741	1.322	0.018
	511226	537482	621313	511293	538270	623180	44.915	1.031	0.017	1.845	1.736	0.519
Avg.	511136.4	537847.6	621463.8	511180.4	537912	621059.2	11.838	0.788	0.035	7.371	1.385	0.120
Max.							44.915	2.102	0.100	27.147	2.055	0.519
Avg. GRASP	511145.0	537863.4	621463.8	511196.4	537912.0	621059.2						
	OFV, Asymmetric 750			OFV, Symmetric 750			CPU Time (Sec.), Asymmetric 750			CPU Time (Sec.), Symmetric 750		
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
	763520	796454	902026	763671	797026	900363	6.989	3.291	0.104	4.183	7.449	0.593
	763623	795963	899651	763548	796170	897886	52.778	1.229	2.213	22.707	0.524	0.122
	763684	796130	900010	763702	796589	901089	29.054	5.552	0.229	6.307	0.452	0.053
	763941	797013	900044	763887	796709	901239	17.745	0.43	0.054	21.623	0.395	0.052
	763786	796312	899235	763616	796365	900216	105.068	2.819	0.386	138.489	1.915	0.049
Avg.	763710.8	796374.4	900193.2	763684.8	796571.8	900158.6	42.327	2.664	0.597	38.662	2.147	0.174
Max.							105.068	5.552	2.213	138.489	7.449	0.593
Avg. GRASP	763731.2	796393.5	900193.2	763706.6	796593.7	900183.8						

Table 2. Results of GHOSH problems by ACETS

ID	Simple Heuristic 1, w/ESD			Simple Heuristic 1, no/ESD			Heuristic2 (ACETS)			GRASP		
	% Optimal Solution	Avg. Time (sec.)	Max. Time (sec.)	% Optimal Solution	Avg. Time (sec.)	Max. Time (sec.)	% Optimal Solution	Avg. Time (sec.)	Max. Time (sec.)	% Optimal Solution	Avg. Time (sec.)	Max. Time (sec.)
p-Med, OR-Lib.	62.50%	0.234	1.542	35.00%	5.275	35.114	100.00%	1.579	16.540	100.00%	1.536	7.210
UCFLP, OR-Lib.	80%	0.002	0.012	47%	0.005	0.036	100.00%	0.035	0.288	100.00%	0.266	1.563
UCFLP, M*	18.18%	0.277	5.040	9.09%	0.277	4.856	100.00%	0.168	2.320	100.00%	1.734	21.641
UCFLP GAP A							100.00%	1.800	11.300	100.00%	12.620	163.910
UCFLP GAP B							100.00%	16.680	123.180	100.00%	55.960	510.200
UCFLP GAP C							100.00%	12.000	99.010	100.00%	66.180	814.380
UCFLP GHOSH 250asym A							100.00%	0.183	0.297	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 250asym B							100.00%	0.070	0.277	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 250asym C							100.00%	0.003	0.006	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 500asym A							100.00%	11.838	44.915	One problem not optimal		
UCFLP GHOSH 500asym B							100.00%	0.788	2.102	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 500asym C							100.00%	0.035	0.100	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 750asym A							100.00%	42.327	105.068	One problem not optimal		
UCFLP GHOSH 750asym B							100.00%	2.664	5.552	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 750asym C							100.00%	0.597	2.213	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 250sym A							100.00%	0.500	0.860	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 250sym B							100.00%	0.045	0.068	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 250sym C							100.00%	0.003	0.006	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 500sym A							100.00%	7.371	27.147	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 500sym B							100.00%	1.385	2.055	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 500sym C							100.00%	0.120	0.519	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 750sym A							100.00%	38.662	138.489	100.00%		
UCFLP GHOSH 750sym B							100.00%	2.147	7.449	One problem not optimal		
UCFLP GHOSH 750sym C							100.00%	0.174	0.593	100.00%		
ULP GAP B 9-Repeated p-Median							100.00%	1.236	7.980			
ULP GAP C 9-Repeated p-Median							100.00%	5.978	25.85			

Table 3. Summary of problems solved by Simple Heuristic with and without ESD implementation, ACETS, and GRASP. Note: In the first 6 rows, the results are from the same machine. Results of GHOSH problems for GRASP are taken from the best of the results of two papers (Resende & Werneck, 2006) and (Ardjmand et al., 2014). ACETS gave the 3 best new solutions, (highlighted).

References

- Adeleke, O. J., & Ali, M. M. (2021). An efficient model for locating solid waste collection sites in urban residential areas. *International Journal of Production Research*, 59(3), 798-812. 10.1080/00207543.2019.1709670
- Alidaee, B., Sloan, H., & Wang, H. (2017). Simple and fast novel diversification approach for the UBQP based on sequential improvement local search. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 111, 164-175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2017.07.012>
- Alidaee, B., & Wang, H. (2022). Uncapacitated (Facility) Location Problem: A Hybrid Genetic-Tabu Search Approach. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 55(10), 1619-1624. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2022.09.622>
- Ardjmand, E., Park, N., Weckman, G., & Amin-Naseri, M. R. (2014). The discrete Unconscious search and its application to uncapacitated facility location problem. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 73, 32-40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2014.04.010>
- Baş, E., & Ülker, E. (2020). A binary social spider algorithm for uncapacitated facility location problem. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 161, 113618. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2020.113618>
- Bean, J. C. (1994). Genetic Algorithms and Random Keys for Sequencing and Optimization. *ORSA Journal on Computing*, 6(2), 154-160. 10.1287/ijoc.6.2.154
- Boloori Arabani, A., & Farahani, R. Z. (2012). Facility location dynamics: An overview of classifications and applications. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 62(1), 408-420. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2011.09.018>
- Caserta, M., & Voß, S. (2020). A general corridor method-based approach for capacitated facility location. *International Journal of Production Research*, 58(13), 3855-3880. 10.1080/00207543.2019.1636320
- Caserta, M., & Voß, S. (2021). Accelerating mathematical programming techniques with the corridor method. *International Journal of Production Research*, 59(9), 2739-2771. 10.1080/00207543.2020.1740343
- Cruz-Rivera, R., & Ertel, J. (2009). Reverse logistics network design for the collection of End-of-Life Vehicles in Mexico. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 196(3), 930-939. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2008.04.041>
- D'Angelo, G., Diodati, D., Navarra, A., & Pinotti, C. M. (2016). The Minimum \$k\$ - Storage Problem: Complexity, Approximation, and Experimental Analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 15(7), 1797-1811. 10.1109/TMC.2015.2475765
- Deutsch, Y., & Golany, B. (2018). A parcel locker network as a solution to the logistics last mile problem. *International Journal of Production Research*, 56(1-2), 251-261. 10.1080/00207543.2017.1395490
- Eligüzül, N., Çetinkaya, C., & Dereli, T. (2022). A novel approach for text categorization by applying a hybrid genetic bat algorithm through feature extraction and feature selection methods. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 202, 117433. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2022.117433>
- Farahani, R. Z., Hekmatfar, M., Fahimnia, B., & Kazemzadeh, N. (2014). Hierarchical facility location problem: Models, classifications, techniques, and applications. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 68, 104-117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2013.12.005>

- Galvão, R. D., & Raggi, L. A. (1989). A method for solving to optimality uncapacitated location problems. *Annals of Operations Research*, 18(1), 225-244. 10.1007/BF02097805
- Ghosh, D. (2003). Neighborhood search heuristics for the uncapacitated facility location problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 150(1), 150-162. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217\(02\)00504-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217(02)00504-0)
- Glover, F., & Kochenberger, G. A. (1996). Critical Event Tabu Search for Multidimensional Knapsack Problems. In I. H. Osman & J. P. Kelly (Eds.), *Meta-Heuristics: Theory and Applications* (pp. 407-427). Springer US. 10.1007/978-1-4613-1361-8_25
- Glover, F., Kochenberger, G. A., & Alidaee, B. (1998). Adaptive Memory Tabu Search for Binary Quadratic Programs. *Management Science*, 44(3), 336-345. 10.1287/mnsc.44.3.336
- Hakli, H., & Ortacay, Z. (2019). An improved scatter search algorithm for the uncapacitated facility location problem. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 135, 855-867. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2019.06.060>
- Kratica, J., Tošić, D., Filipović, V., & Ljubić, I. (2001). Solving the simple plant location problem by genetic algorithm. *RAIRO - Operations Research*, 35(1), 127-142. 10.1051/ro:2001107
- Kusiak, A. (1987). The generalized group technology concept. *International Journal of Production Research*, 25(4), 561-569. 10.1080/00207548708919861
- Laporte, G., Nickel, S., & da Gama, F. S. (2015). Introduction to Location Science. In G. Laporte, S. Nickel, & F. Saldanha da Gama (Eds.), *Location Science* (pp. 1-18). Springer International Publishing. 10.1007/978-3-319-13111-5_1
- Melo, M. T., Nickel, S., & Saldanha-da-Gama, F. (2009). Facility location and supply chain management – A review. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 196(2), 401-412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2008.05.007>
- Pan, S., Zhang, L., Thompson, R. G., & Ghaderi, H. (2021). A parcel network flow approach for joint delivery networks using parcel lockers. *International Journal of Production Research*, 59(7), 2090-2115. 10.1080/00207543.2020.1856440
- Rahmati, R., Bashiri, M., Nikzad, E., & Siadat, A. (2022). A two-stage robust hub location problem with accelerated Benders decomposition algorithm. *International Journal of Production Research*, 60(17), 5235-5257. 10.1080/00207543.2021.1953179
- Resende, M. G. C., & Werneck, R. F. (2006). A hybrid multistart heuristic for the uncapacitated facility location problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 174(1), 54-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2005.02.046>
- Resende, M. G. C., & Werneck, R. F. (2007). A fast swap-based local search procedure for location problems. *Annals of Operations Research*, 150(1), 205-230. 10.1007/s10479-006-0154-0
- Saldanha-da-Gama, F. (2022). Facility Location in Logistics and Transportation: An enduring relationship. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, 166, 102903. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2022.102903>
- Sen, G., Krishnamoorthy, M., Rangaraj, N., & Narayanan, V. (2016). Facility location models to locate data in information networks: a literature review. *Annals of Operations Research*, 246(1), 313-348. 10.1007/s10479-015-1840-6
- Shi, J., Chen, W., Zhou, Z., & Zhang, G. (2020). A bi-objective multi-period facility location problem for household e-waste collection. *International Journal of Production Research*, 58(2), 526-545. 10.1080/00207543.2019.1598591

- Sonuç, E., & Özcan, E. (2023). An adaptive parallel evolutionary algorithm for solving the uncapacitated facility location problem. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 224, 119956. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2023.119956>
- Wang, C., Han, C., Guo, T., & Ding, M. (2023). Solving uncapacitated P-Median problem with reinforcement learning assisted by graph attention networks. *Applied Intelligence*, 53(2), 2010-2025. 10.1007/s10489-022-03453-z
- Wang, H., & Alidaee, B. (2019). Effective heuristic for large-scale unrelated parallel machines scheduling problems. *Omega*, 83, 261-274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omega.2018.07.005>
- Wang, H., & Alidaee, B. (2023). A new hybrid-heuristic for large-scale combinatorial optimization: A case of quadratic assignment problem. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 179, 109220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2023.109220>
- Wu, T., Chu, F., Yang, Z., Zhou, Z., & Zhou, W. (2017). Lagrangian relaxation and hybrid simulated annealing tabu search procedure for a two-echelon capacitated facility location problem with plant size selection. *International Journal of Production Research*, 55(9), 2540-2555. 10.1080/00207543.2016.1240381
- Yigit, V., Aydin, M. E., & Turkbey, O. (2006). Solving large-scale uncapacitated facility location problems with evolutionary simulated annealing. *International Journal of Production Research*, 44(22), 4773-4791. 10.1080/00207540600621003
- Zhang, B., Zhao, M., & Hu, X. (2023). Location planning of electric vehicle charging station with users' preferences and waiting time: multi-objective bi-level programming model and HNSGA-II algorithm. *International Journal of Production Research*, 61(5), 1394-1423. 10.1080/00207543.2021.2023832
- Zhang, F., He, Y., Ouyang, H., & Li, W. (2023). A fast and efficient discrete evolutionary algorithm for the uncapacitated facility location problem. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 213, 118978. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2022.118978>
- Zhao, Q., Wang, W., & De Souza, R. (2018). A heterogeneous fleet two-echelon capacitated location-routing model for joint delivery arising in city logistics. *International Journal of Production Research*, 56(15), 5062-5080. 10.1080/00207543.2017.1401235