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Executive Abstract
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1 Introduction

There are significant devastating effects of natural and man-made disasters. For example, the Hurricane Katrina in August 2005 is a well-known disaster, resulting in damage estimates exceeding 200 billion U.S. dollars (Burby, 2006). More recently, two severe earthquakes occurred in Nepal on April 25th and May 12th of 2015, which caused at least 8,000 deaths, 25,000 injuries, and approximately two million homeless people (Binns and Low, 2015). Unfortunately, the scale of natural disasters is becoming larger. Therefore, the importance of effective management of disasters cannot be overemphasized as it is directly relevant to human life, health, and welfare.

Disaster management is typically divided into three phases: preparation, immediate response, and reconstruction (Kovács and Spens, 2007) or four phases: mitigation added after preparation (Pearce, 2003). In this project, we focus on the immediate response phase in the context of disaster relief operations and humanitarian logistics, which takes part in the aftermath of disasters. Specifically, we tackle the relief routing problems to effectively and equitably deliver critical supplies to the affected population.

The vehicle routing problems (VRPs) are one type of important problems considered in disaster relief operations, especially in the immediate response phase, as vehicles are an essential part of the supply chain for delivering supplies. The VRP aims to design optimal delivery or collection routes from one or several depots to a number of geographically scattered customers, subject to some constraints (Laporte, 1992). In disaster relief operations, vehicle routing problems are involved in detailed information collection, medical aid deliver, medical supply deliver, food supply deliver, etc (Luis et al., 2012).

It is not logical to assume that the vehicle capacity is always sufficient to carry all the demand from a customer locations and, therefore, the location may need to be visited multiple times (Yi and Kumar, 2007), which implies split delivery. Özdamar et al. (2004) point out that in emergencies the load to be transported is quite large and a vehicle’s capacity is usually sufficient to carry only a small part of the load. Wang et al. (2014) also state that an affected area can be served more than one time when the demand of the disaster area is greater than the capacity of the vehicle, given the large demand of relief at the affected areas in the post-earthquake. Therefore, the split delivery vehicle routing problem (SDVRP) should play an important role in disaster relief operations to handle large demands.

The SDVRP, which was introduced in Dror and Trudeau (1989), is relatively new compared with the capacitated vehicle routing problem (CVRP). The SDVRP allows a demand node to be visited by more than one vehicle, while the CVRP requires that a demand node be visited exactly once. The SDVRP has attracted researchers’ interest because of the potential cost savings (Dror and Trudeau, 1989; Archetti et al., 2006). The variants of the SDVRP and algorithms to solve the SDVRP and its variants have been extensively studied in recent years. In this project, the SDVRP with uncertain travel times and demands is addressed in the context of disaster relief operations, and is compared with the CVRP counterpart. Uncertainties in travel times and demands are critical factors in planning a vehicle route after a disaster because the optimal deterministic routes could be even infeasible due to a small perturbation in parameters caused by uncertainties. Therefore, it is essential to mitigate the impact of uncertainty in planning a vehicle route. We aim to enhance disaster relief vehicle routing operations by taking into uncertainties explicitly. To do so, robust-optimization based models of the SDVRP with uncertain travel times and demands are proposed to consider different objectives in disaster relief operations. To the best of our knowledge, there are no such robust models of the SDVRP in the context of humanitarian logistics in the literature.

Stochastic programming and robust optimization are two main modeling approaches that can
handle uncertainty. Stochastic programming has some disadvantages in the VRP for disaster relief operations. It requires the known probability distribution function and generally needs heavy computations (Bertsimas et al., 2011; Sim, 2004). However, we may not know the exact information or even the probability distribution of the uncertainties in travel times and demands. When we can only estimate the range of uncertain parameter, we still need to find efficient and effective solution to VRPs for the immediate response operations. In that case, stochastic programming may not perform well. To address this issue, robust optimization can be a good option to formulate the VRP with uncertainty in context of disaster relief operations.

The rest of this report is organized as follows. In Section 2, the literature review of robust optimization in VRP is provided. In Section 3, the deterministic models of CVRP and SDVRP are described as the basis of the robust models, then the robust models of CVRP and SDVRP are presented. The proposed algorithms are illustrated in Section 4. The results are shown in Section 5. Conclusion follows in Section 6.

2 Literature Review

Uncertainty is an important and frequently encountered issue in the VRP for the humanitarian logistics. Among others, the uncertainty in demands and travel times are frequently considered in the literature (Allahviranloo et al., 2014; Braaten et al., 2017). Robust optimization is a modeling methodology of optimization problems in which part of (or all) data are uncertain and only known to belong to some uncertainty sets (Ben-Tal and Nemirovski, 2002). Without the probability distribution information regarding such uncertain data, a solution constructed by robust optimization can be feasible for any realization of the uncertainty in a given set (Bertsimas et al., 2011). Robust optimization has been applied in various areas such as emergency logistics planning (Ben-Tal et al., 2011; Najafi et al., 2013) and value-based performance and risk management in supply chains (Hahn and Kuhn, 2012).

In the CVRP research, Sungur et al. (2008), Erera et al. (2010), Ben-Tal et al. (2011), Gounaris et al. (2013), and Allahviranloo et al. (2014) use robust optimization to address the demand uncertainty. Regarding the uncertain travel times, Braaten et al. (2017) consider a robust version of the CVRP with time windows, in which travel times are uncertain. Han et al. (2013) consider the CVRP with uncertain travel times in which a penalty is incurred for each vehicle that exceeds a given time limit. Agra et al. (2013) address the CVRP with time windows and travel times that belong to an uncertainty polytope. We note that Lee et al. (2012) consider uncertain travel times and demands at the same time in the CVRP, while most other papers focus on only one of the two. Furthermore, Solano-Charris et al. (2014) apply robust optimization for the CVRP with uncertain travel costs. Chen et al. (2016) apply robust optimization for the road network daily maintenance routing problem with uncertain service times. We also note that most papers mentioned above consider the objective of minimizing the total travel time (or travel costs), which may not be relevant to the humanitarian logistics.

In the literature, only limited number of papers, e.g., Bouzaiene-Ayari et al. (1992), Yu et al. (2012), and Lei et al. (2012), that focus on the SDVRP with stochastic demands are found. Bouzaiene-Ayari et al. (1992) propose a heuristic algorithm for the SDVRP with stochastic demands. Yu et al. (2012) address the large scale stochastic inventory routing problem with split delivery and service level constraints. Lei et al. (2012) present a paired vehicle recourse policy for the SDVRP with stochastic demands. An adaptive large neighborhood search heuristic is applied for solving this problem. To the best of our knowledge, there are no robust models of the SDVRP with uncertain travel times and demands for different objective functions in the literature.
In this project, we explicitly consider travel time and demand uncertainty in the CVRP and the SDVRP, and explore several objectives that may better suit the humanitarian logistics such as minimizing the summation of arrival times and the latest arrival time.

3 Models

In this section, the deterministic models for the CVRP and the SDVRP with different objectives are presented as a basis for the robust counterparts. The robust models of the CVRP and the SDVRP are then proposed.

3.1 Deterministic Models of the CVRP

In the deterministic CVRP, let the depot be located at node 0 and the set of nodes except the depot is denoted by \( N = \{1, ..., n\} \). The set of all nodes is then \( N_0 = \{0\} \cup \{1, ..., n\} \). The set of all arcs is denoted by \( A \) such that \( G = G(N_0, A) \) represents the road network. The travel time between nodes \( i \) and \( j \) in \( N_0 \) is denoted by \( t_{ij}, \forall (i, j) \in A \). In our assumption, the travel cost between nodes \( i \) and \( j \) is equivalent to its travel time by setting the travel cost as one for the unit travel distance. The demand from node \( i \) is denoted by \( q_i \), which needs to be served as soon as possible.

The set of available vehicles is denoted by \( K = \{1, ..., |K|\} \), and \( k \) is the index of a vehicle. All vehicles are assumed to be homogeneous, and \( C \) denotes the capacity of a vehicle. The decision variables \( x_{ij}, \forall (i, j) \in A \) are binary variables that indicate whether a vehicle travels from \( i \) to \( j \).

In consistent with the well-known Miller-Tucker-Zemlin (MTZ) formulation of the VRP (Miller et al., 1960), a continuous variable \( c_i, \forall i \in N \) is used, denoting the flow in the vehicle when it leaves the node \( i \), to construct constraints that prevent sub-tours. A continuous variable \( a_i, \forall i \in N \) denotes the arrival time of a vehicle at node \( i \) and an upper bound on the total travel times for each vehicle is denoted by \( T \), which can be relaxed if needed in the problem context by assigning a sufficiently large number on it. We do not consider a time window for delivering critical supplies, as the objectives in the context of humanitarian logistics are on prompt deliveries and we assume that all the demand nodes can accept deliveries any time (e.g., shelters that are open 24 hours). However, time window constraints can be easily added when necessary. The deterministic model that minimizes the total number of vehicles deployed (minV) is formulated as follows:

\[
\text{(CVRP-minV)} \quad \min \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{0i} \tag{1}
\]

\[
\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j \in N_0} x_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall i \in N \tag{2}
\]

\[
\sum_{j \in N_0} x_{ij} - \sum_{j \in N_0} x_{ji} = 0 \quad \forall i \in N_0 \tag{3}
\]

\[
t_{ij} \leq a_j - a_i + T(1 - x_{ij}) \quad \forall i, j \in N \tag{4}
\]

\[
t_{0i}x_{0i} \leq a_i \quad \forall i \in N \tag{5}
\]

\[
q_j \leq c_j - c_i + C(1 - x_{ij}) \quad \forall i, j \in N \tag{6}
\]

\[
q_i \leq c_i \leq C \quad \forall i \in N \tag{7}
\]

\[
x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall (i, j) \in A \tag{8}
\]

The objective (1) is to minimize the number of vehicles deployed. The constraints (2) require that each node should be visited once by exactly one vehicle and equations (3) are flow conservation
constraints. The variables $x_{ij}$ are associated with arrival times in inequalities (4), which also prevent subtours not including the depot. The appropriate minimum arrival time for each node is guaranteed in inequalities (5), and the inequalities (6) work in a similar fashion as inequalities (4). The capacity constraints are imposed in inequalities (7). To solve the CVRP-minV more effectively in the solvers, an additional constraint can be added in the model:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{0i} \geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i}{C}$$

(9)

The inequality (9) provides a tight lower bound of the objective function value, which can reduce the time for solving the model.

The model to minimize the total travel times (minT) is exactly as same as the CVRP-minV except the objective function. That is,

\[
\text{(CVRP-minT)} \quad \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} t_{ij} x_{ij}
\]

s.t. (2)–(8)

To minimize the summation of arrival times (minS), one more constraint to specify the number of vehicles available, $|K|$, needs to be added, because the optimal solution will be a trivial one that utilizes maximum vehicles, e.g., $n$ vehicles, if there is no such constraint. The CVRP-minS can be formulated as:

\[
\text{(CVRP-minS)} \quad \min \sum_{i \in N} a_i
\]

s.t. (2)–(8), (12)

\[
\sum_{i \in N} x_{0i} = |K|
\]

(12)

To minimize the summation of demand-weighted arrival times (minD) can be formulated as:

\[
\text{(CVRP-minD)} \quad \min \sum_{i \in N} q_i a_i
\]

s.t. (2)–(8), (12)

At last, the model to minimize the latest arrival time (minL) is formulated as:

\[
\text{(CVRP-minL)} \quad \min a_l
\]

s.t. (2)–(8), (12)

\[
a_i \leq a_l \quad \forall i \in N
\]

(15)

3.2 Deterministic Models of the SDVRP

The two-index formulation, e.g., $x_{ij}$, is used in the CVRP formulation. We now introduce the three-index formulation for the SDVRP while the notation for parameters remains the same to be consistent. The new decision variables $x_{ijk}, \forall (i, j) \in A, k \in K$ are binary, indicating whether vehicle $k$ travels from $i$ to $j$ ($x_{ijk} = 1$) or not ($x_{ijk} = 0$). The amount of demand served by vehicle $k$ to
node $i$ is denoted by $y_{ik}, \forall i \in N, k \in K$ and a continuous variable $a_{ik}, \forall i \in N, k \in K$ denotes the arrival time of vehicle $k$ at node $i$. The minimum number of vehicles needed, $K_{\text{min}}$, for the SDVRP can be calculated by solving the following equation.

$$K_{\text{min}} = \left\lceil \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i \frac{C}{c} \right\rceil \quad (16)$$

In order to obtain feasible solution, $|K| \geq K_{\text{min}}$. Based on the deterministic model of the SDVRP in Berbotto et al. (2014), the subtour elimination constraints are modified to include $a_{ik}$ in the deterministic models shown in this section. The model to minimize the total travel times of the SDVRP (SDVRP-minT) is formulated as follows.

$$(\text{SDVRP-minT}) \quad \min \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \sum_{k \in K} t_{ij} x_{ijk} \quad (17)$$

s.t. 

$$\sum_{j \in N_0} \sum_{k \in K} x_{ijk} \geq 1 \quad \forall i \in N \quad (18)$$

$$\sum_{j \in N_0} \sum_{k \in K} x_{0jk} \leq |K| \quad (19)$$

$$\sum_{j \in N_0} \sum_{k \in K} x_{0jk} \geq K_{\text{min}} \quad (20)$$

$$\sum_{j \in N_0} x_{ijk} - \sum_{j \in N_0} x_{jik} = 0 \quad \forall i \in N_0, k \in K \quad (21)$$

$$t_{ij} \leq a_{jk} - a_{ik} + T(1 - x_{ijk}) \quad \forall i, j \in N, k \in K \quad (22)$$

$$t_{0i} x_{0ik} \leq a_{ik} \quad \forall i \in N, k \in K \quad (23)$$

$$y_{ik} \leq q_i \sum_{j \in N_0} x_{ijk} \quad \forall i \in N, k \in K \quad (24)$$

$$\sum_{i \in N} y_{ik} \leq C \quad \forall k \in K \quad (25)$$

$$\sum_{k \in K} y_{ik} = q_i \quad \forall i \in N \quad (26)$$

$$x_{ijk} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall (i,j) \in A, k \in K \quad (27)$$

$$y_{ik} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in N, k \in K \quad (28)$$

The constraints (18) require that each node should be visited by at least one vehicle. The inequality (19) ensures that at most $K$ vehicles depart from the depot. The inequality (20) ensures that at least $K_{\text{min}}$ vehicles depart from the depot. The equations (21) are flow conservation constraints. The variables $x_{ijk}$ are associated with arrival times in inequalities (22), which also prevent subtours not including the depot. The appropriate minimum arrival times for each node are guaranteed in inequalities (23). The inequalities (24) ensure that the node can only be served if the vehicle visits it. The inequalities (25) ensure that the maximum load of each vehicle does not exceed capacity $C$. The equations (26) require that the entire demand of each node is satisfied.

To minimize the summation of arrival times, the SDVRP-minS can be formulated as:

$$(\text{SDVRP-minS}) \quad \min \sum_{i \in N} \sum_{k \in K} a_{ik} \quad (29)$$
To minimize the summation of demand-weighted arrival times, the SDVRP-minD can be formulated as:

\[
\text{(SDVRP-minD)} \quad \min \sum_{i \in N} \sum_{k \in K} y_{ik}a_{ik}
\]

\[
\text{s.t. (18)–(28)}
\]

Note that the SDVRP-minD is a mixed integer nonlinear programming (MILP) model, as \(y_{ik}\) and \(a_{ik}\) are variables.

The objective to minimize the latest arrival time, \(a_l\), is formulated as:

\[
\text{(SDVRP-minL)} \quad \min a_l
\]

\[
\text{s.t. (18)–(28)}
\]

\[
a_{ik} \leq a_l \quad \forall i \in N, k \in K
\]

### 3.3 Robust Models of the CVRP

In robust optimization (RO), there are various ways to model uncertainty depending on how to define the sets to which the uncertain parameters belong. We assume that uncertainty sets in this project, which may be obtained by analyzing the historical data, are convex, closed, and bounded. Let us denote an uncertainty set by \(U\), and the travel times and demands are subject to uncertainty. That is, \((t, q) \in U\) where \(t\) and \(q\) are the vectors such that \(t = (t_{ij} : (i, j) \in A)\) and \(q = (q_i : i \in N)\). Taking into account the uncertainty and considering that RO aims to find the best worst-case solutions, the robust CVRP-minV (RCVRP-minV) can be formulated as:

\[
\text{(RCVRP-minV)} \quad \min \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{0i}
\]

\[
\text{s.t. (2)–(3), (8)}
\]

\[
\max_{(t, q) \in U} t_{ij} \leq a_j - a_i + T(1 - x_{ij}) \quad \forall i, j \in N
\]

\[
\max_{(t, q) \in U} t_{0i}x_{0i} \leq a_i \quad \forall i \in N
\]

\[
\max_{(t, q) \in U} q_j \leq c_j - c_i + C(1 - x_{ij}) \quad \forall i, j \in N
\]

\[
\max_{(t, q) \in U} q_i \leq c_i \leq C \quad \forall i \in N
\]

Likewise, the robust CVRP-minT (RCVRP-minT) can be formulated as:

\[
\text{(RCVRP-minT)} \quad \min \max_{x} \sum_{(t, q) \in U} \sum_{(i, j) \in A} t_{ij}x_{ij}
\]

\[
\text{s.t. (2)–(3), (8), (34)–(37)}
\]
The robust counterparts for the CVRP-minS, CVRP-minD, and CVRP-minL can be formulated in a similar fashion as follows:

\[(\text{RCVRP-minS}) \min \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} a_i \]  \quad (39)
\[\text{s.t. } (2)-(3), (8), (12), (34)-(37)\]

\[(\text{RCVRP-minD}) \min \max_{t, q \in U} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} q_i a_i \]  \quad (40)
\[\text{s.t. } (2)-(3), (8), (12), (34)-(37)\]

\[(\text{RCVRP-minL}) \min a_i \]  \quad (41)
\[\text{s.t. } (2)-(3), (8), (12), (15), (34)-(37)\]

Note that the objective functions of the RCVRP-minT and the RCVRP-minD are subject to uncertainty while the ones of other models are not.

Let us assume that there is no correlation between \(t\) and \(q\), then \(U = U_T \times U_Q\) where \(t \in U_T\) and \(q \in U_Q\). Indeed, this assumption can be made without loss of generality in our robust formulations because inequalities (34)-(37), and functions (38) and (40) consider only one type of uncertainty.

In RO, all uncertainty sets are assumed to be bounded. Accordingly, let \(U_T = \{t \mid \bar{t} \leq t \leq \bar{t} + \hat{t}\}\) and \(U_Q = \{q \mid \bar{q} \leq q \leq \bar{q} + \hat{q}\}\) where \(\bar{t}\) and \(\bar{q}\) are the nominal travel time and demand vectors, respectively, and \(\hat{t}\) and \(\hat{q}\) are vectors for the maximum travel delay and increased demand caused by the destabilized infrastructure after a disaster. Such uncertainty sets employed in this report are called box sets and we refer readers interested in a more general notion of uncertainty sets, e.g., ellipsoidal set and convex hull, to Ordóñez (2010) and Ben-Tal and Nemirovski (2002). Because there is only one uncertain factor per constraint, inequalities (34)-(37) can be rewritten as follows:

\[\bar{t}_{ij} + \hat{t}_{ij} x_{ij} \leq a_j - a_i + T(1 - x_{ij}) \quad \forall i, j \in \mathcal{N} \]  \quad (42)
\[\bar{t}_{0i} + \hat{t}_{0i} x_{0i} \leq a_i \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N} \]  \quad (43)
\[\bar{q}_j + \hat{q}_j x_{ij} \leq c_j - c_i + C(1 - x_{ij}) \quad \forall i, j \in \mathcal{N} \]  \quad (44)
\[\bar{q}_i + \hat{q}_i x_{0i} \leq c_i \leq C \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N} \]  \quad (45)

These new constraints are deterministic with given \(\bar{t}_{ij}, \hat{t}_{ij}, \bar{q}_i, \text{ and } \hat{q}_i\).

For the objective function of RCVRP-minT (38), it has uncertain travel times up to the number of arcs in the road network. By employing the concept of the budget of uncertainty (Bertsimas and Sim, 2004), its uncertainty set can be reformulated as:

\[U_T = \left\{ t \mid \bar{t}_{ij} \leq t_{ij} \leq \bar{t}_{ij} + \hat{t}_{ij} x_{ij}, (i, j) \in A, \sum_{(i,j) \in A} x_{ij} \leq \Gamma_T, x_{ij} \in \{0,1\} \right\} \]  \quad (46)

The parameter \(\Gamma_T\) is called the budget of uncertainty and it controls the degree of conservatism or
robustness of the solution. The RCVRP-minT is then:

$$(\text{RCVRP-minT}) \min_{x \in X} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \tilde{t}_{ij} x_{ij} + \max_{t \in U_T} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \tilde{t}_{ij} x'_{ij}$$ (47)

where $X$ is the feasible set for $x$. We may relabel $\hat{t}_{ij}, (i,j) \in A$ in a decreasing order, i.e., $\hat{t}_{e_1} \geq \hat{t}_{e_2} \geq \cdots \geq \hat{t}_{e_m} \geq \hat{t}_{e_{m+1}} = 0$. Therefore, $\hat{t}_{e_i}$ is the $i$th greatest $\hat{t}_{ij}, (i,j) \in A$. For the sake of notational convenience, we also employ $x_{e_i}$ that corresponds $\hat{t}_{e_i}$. The following Theorem 1 shows that the solution of RCVRP-minT can be found by solving multiple deterministic CVRP-minT problems.

**Theorem 1.** The solution of RCVRP-minT (47) can be computed as the minimum of $m + 1$ deterministic VRP problems, for $l = 1, 2, \ldots, m + 1$:

$$Z^l = \Gamma_T \hat{t}_{e_l} + \min_{x \in X} \left( \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \tilde{t}_{ij} x_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^{l} (\hat{t}_{e_k} - \hat{t}_{e_l}) x_{e_k} \right)$$ (48)

where $m$ is the number of arcs in the road network. Let $l^* = \arg \min_l Z^l$, then $Z^* = Z^{l^*}$ and $x^* = x'^{l^*}$ where $x^l$ is the optimal solution of $Z^l$.

**Proof.** See Bertsimas and Sim (2003). □

The objective function of RCVRP-minD (40) can have uncertain demand nodes up to the number of nodes in the road network. A set $S_Q \subseteq U_Q, |S_Q| = \Gamma_Q$ is introduced, where $\Gamma_Q$ is the budget of uncertainty, to the degree which the system is protected deterministically. Then the objective function of RCVRP-minD can be written as follows:

$$(\text{RCVRP-minD}) \min_{\{S_Q \subseteq U_Q, |S_Q| \leq \Gamma_Q\}} \sum_{i \in S_Q} \hat{q}_i a_i$$ (49)

This objective function is protected by:

$$\beta(a, \Gamma_Q) = \max_{\{S_Q \subseteq U_Q, |S_Q| \leq \Gamma_Q\}} \sum_{i \in S_Q} \hat{q}_i a_i$$ (50)

where $a$ is vector of $a_i, \forall i \in N$.

**Proposition 1.** Equation (50) is equivalent to the following linear optimization problem:

$$\beta(a, \Gamma_Q) = \max \sum_{i \in N} \hat{q}_i a_i z'_{i}$$ (51)

s.t. \hspace{1cm} \sum_{i \in N} z'_{i} \leq \Gamma_Q \hspace{1cm} \forall i \in N \hspace{1cm} 0 \leq z'_{i} \leq 1 \hspace{1cm} (52 \text{ and } 53)

**Proof.** It is clear that the optimal solution value of function (51) consists of $|\Gamma_Q|$ variables $z'_{i}$ at 1. This is equivalent to the selection of subset $\{S_Q \mid S_Q \subseteq U_Q, |S_Q| \leq \Gamma_Q\}$ with corresponding function $\sum_{i \in S_Q} \hat{q}_i a_i$. □

**Theorem 2.** The RCVRP-minD has the equivalent formulation as follows.

\[ \text{end} \]
Proof. Consider the dual of function (51):

\[
\min \quad \Gamma Q g' + \sum_{i \in N} p_i'
\]

s.t. \[ g' + p_i' \geq q_i a_i \quad \forall i \in N \] (59)
\[ p_i' \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in N \] (60)
\[ g' \geq 0 \] (61)

By strong duality, since function (51) is feasible and bounded for \( \Gamma Q \in [0, |\mathcal{S}_Q|] \), then the dual problem (58) is also feasible and bounded and their objective values coincide. Using Proposition 1, we have that function (50) is equal to the objective function value of function (58). Substituting (58)–(61), we obtain that function (49) is equivalent to function (54).

### 3.4 Robust Models of the SDVRP

The robust models of the SDVRP use the same fashion of the robust models of the CVRP.

\[
(RSDVRP-minT) \min \quad \max_{(t,d) \in U} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \sum_{k \in K} t_{ij} x_{ijk}
\]

s.t. \[ \sum_{j \in N_0} \sum_{k \in K} x_{0jk} \leq |K| \] (64)
\[ \sum_{j \in N_0} \sum_{k \in K} x_{ijk} = \sum_{j \in N_0} x_{0jk} - \sum_{j \in N} x_{ijk} = 0 \quad \forall i \in N_0, k \in K \] (65)
\[ \max_{(t,d) \in U} t_{ij} \leq a_{jk} - a_{ik} + T(1 - x_{ijk}) \quad \forall i, j \in N, k \in K \] (66)
\[ \max_{(t,d) \in U} t_{0i} x_{0ik} \leq a_{ik} \quad \forall i \in N, k \in K \] (67)
\[ y_{ik} - \max_{(t,d) \in U} q_i \sum_{j \in N_0} x_{ijk} \leq 0 \quad \forall i \in N, k \in K \] (68)
\[ \sum_{i \in N} y_{ik} \leq C \quad k \in K \] (69)
\[ \sum_{k \in K} y_{ik} - \max_{(t,d) \in U} q_i = 0 \quad \forall i \in N \] (70)
\[ x_{ijk} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall (i,j) \in A, k \in K \] (71)
The robust model to minimize the summation of arrival times can be formulated as:

\[
(RSDVRP-minS) \min \sum_{i \in N} \sum_{k \in K} a_{ik} \\
\text{s.t. (63)–(72)}
\]  

The robust model to minimize the summation of demand weighted arrival times can be formulated as:

\[
(RSDVRP-minD) \min \sum_{i \in N} \sum_{k \in K} y_{ik} a_{ik} \\
\text{s.t. (63)–(72)}
\]  

The robust model to minimize the latest arrival time is formulated as:

\[
(RSDVRP-minL) \min a_l \\
\text{s.t. (63)–(72), (32)}
\]  

Inequalities (66) – (68), (70) can be written as:

\[
\tilde{t}_{ij} + \hat{t}_{ij} x_{ijk} \leq a_{jk} - a_{ik} + T(1 - x_{ijk}) \quad \forall i, j \in N, k \in K \quad (76)
\]

\[
(\tilde{t}_{0i} + \hat{t}_{0i}) x_{0ik} \leq a_{ik} \quad \forall i \in N, k \in K \quad (77)
\]

\[
y_{ik} - (\bar{q}_i + \hat{q}_i) \sum_{j \in N_k} x_{ijk} \leq 0 \quad \forall i \in N, k \in K \quad (78)
\]

\[
\sum_{k \in K} y_{ik} - (\bar{q}_i + \hat{q}_i) = 0 \quad \forall i \in N \quad (79)
\]

The main difference between the CVRP models and the SDVRP models is whether an arc \((i, j)\) can be used by multiple vehicles or not. In the CVRP, an arc \((i, j)\) can be used at most once, therefore, each \(t_{ij}\) is related to one variable \(x_{ij}\). In contrast, an arc \((i, j)\) in the SDVRP can be used by multiple vehicles. Therefore, \(t_{ij}\) is related to \(x_{ijk}, k \in K\). A set \(S \subseteq U_T, |S| = \Gamma_T\) is introduced, where \(\Gamma_T\) is the budget of uncertainty. Then the RSDVRP-minT can be written as follows:

\[
(RSDVRP-minT) \min \left( \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \sum_{k \in K} \tilde{t}_{ij} x_{ijk} + \max_{\{S\subseteq U_T,|S| \leq \Gamma_T\}} \sum_{(i,j) \in S} \sum_{k \in K} \hat{t}_{ij} x_{ijk} \right) \\
\text{s.t. (63)–(72)}
\]  

As in the CVRP case, the objective function is protected by:

\[
\beta(x, \Gamma_T) = \max_{\{S\subseteq U_T,|S| \leq \Gamma_T\}} \sum_{(i,j) \in S} \sum_{k \in K} \hat{t}_{ij} x_{ijk}
\]

where \(x\) is vector of decision variables.
Proposition 2. Equation (81) can be written as

$$\beta(x, \Gamma_T) = \max_{\{S \subseteq U_T : |S| \leq \Gamma_T\}} \sum_{(i,j) \in S} \hat{t}_{ij} \sum_{k \in K} x_{ijk} \tag{82}$$

A new type of variable $w_{ij}$ is introduced, which denotes the number of vehicles using arc $(i,j)$. Therefore,

$$\beta(x, \Gamma_T) = \max_{\{S \subseteq U_T : |S| \leq \Gamma_T\}} \sum_{(i,j) \in S} \hat{t}_{ij} w_{ij} \tag{83}$$

subject to

$$w_{ij} = \sum_{k \in K} x_{ijk} \quad \forall (i,j) \in A \tag{84}$$

Equations (83) and (84) are equivalent to the following linear optimization problem:

$$\beta(x, \Gamma_T) = \max \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \hat{t}_{ij} w_{ij} z_{ij} \tag{85}$$

subject to

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in A} z_{ij} \leq \Gamma_T \tag{86}$$

$$0 \leq z_{ij} \leq 1 \quad \forall (i,j) \in A \tag{87}$$

Proof. Clearly the optimal solution value of function (85) consists of $\left\lceil \Gamma_T \right\rceil$ variables $z_{ij}$ at 1. This is equivalent to the selection of subset $\{S \mid S \subseteq U_T, |S| \leq \Gamma_T\}$ with corresponding function $\sum_{(i,j) \in S} \hat{t}_{ij} w_{ij}$. \qed

**Theorem 3.** The RSDVRP-minT has the equivalent formulation as follows.

(RSDVRP-minT) min $\sum_{(i,j) \in A} \sum_{k \in K} \hat{t}_{ij} x_{ijk} + \Gamma_T g + \sum_{(i,j) \in A} p_{ij} \tag{88}$

subject to

$g + p_{ij} \geq \hat{t}_{ij} w_{ij} \quad \forall (i,j) \in A \tag{89}$

$p_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall (i,j) \in A \tag{90}$

$g \geq 0 \tag{91}$

$0 \leq w_{ij} \leq |K| \quad \forall (i,j) \in A \tag{92}$

Proof. Consider the dual of Problem (85):

$$\min \Gamma_T g + \sum_{(i,j) \in A} p_{ij} \tag{93}$$

subject to

$g + p_{ij} \geq \hat{t}_{ij} w_{ij} \quad \forall (i,j) \in A \tag{94}$

$p_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall (i,j) \in A \tag{95}$

$g \geq 0 \tag{96}$

\qed
By strong duality, since function (85) is feasible and bounded for $\Gamma_T \in [0, |S|]$, then the dual function (93) is also feasible and bounded and their objective values coincide. Using Proposition 2, we have that function (81) is equal to the objective function value of function (93). Substituting (93)–(96), we obtain that function (80) is equivalent to function (88).

4 Heuristic Algorithms

For small-sized problems, the problems can be solved by using the solvers such as Gurobi. However, for large-scale problems, it is by no means practical to utilize the solvers, as the VRPs are NP-hard. Considering that the routing decisions need to be made quickly in the immediate response phase of disaster management, it is desirable to obtain the near-optimal solutions within a short time period. In light of this, we propose a heuristic algorithm for which the well-known insertion algorithm is modified and used in conjunction with tabu search method. The overall, high-level main framework is shown in Algorithm 1. In particular, the insertion algorithm is used to find the good feasible solution as an initial solution for tabu search. The maximum CPU time allowed is set by the users. Then, a tabu search method is implemented iteratively until the elapsed CPU time is greater than the maximum CPU time allowed. The best-so-far solution during the whole procedure is returned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Framework for Solving the VRP Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement the insertion algorithm to construct a good feasible solution $s^I$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set $s^I$ as the initial solution for the tabu search;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while elapsed CPU time &lt; Max CPU time do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return best-so-far solution $s^B$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Algorithm 1: Main Framework**

4.1 Extended Insertion Algorithms

We employ the insertion algorithm to find a good initial solution. It has been used for solving various vehicle routing problems, see, e.g., Campbell and Savelsbergh (2004); Campbell et al. (2008a). It constructs a reasonably good feasible solution by repeatedly and greedily inserting an unrouted customer node into a partially constructed feasible solution. The constructed solution from insertion algorithm is not guaranteed to be an optimal solution or a near-optimal solution. Therefore, it is used as the initial solution for a tabu search method in this project.

The insertion algorithm, presented in Campbell and Savelsbergh (2004) and Campbell et al. (2008a), constructs the routes that do not take demands into account. In this project, we extend the insertion algorithms in Campbell and Savelsbergh (2004) to consider the capacity constraints of the CVRP and the SDVRP with different objective functions. For the SDVRP, we further extend the insertion algorithm to consider the split delivery.

The notation used in the extended insertion algorithms proposed are as follows. Let $N'$ denote the set of unassigned nodes, $R'$ denote the set of assigned routes, and $|R'|$ denote the number of assigned routed (not including empty route). The index of a route is denoted by $r \in R$. The flow for route $r$ is denoted by $c^r$, which means the total amount of demands of the nodes in current route $r$. A variable $E$ is used to record the number of vehicles that can not take demand of node $j$ because $C - c^r \leq q_j$. The end of route $r$ is denoted by $L_r$. The objective value of $R'$ is denoted by
The tabu search (TS) approach is a single solution based and deterministic method to search optimal when all nodes have been assigned into routes. When the CVRP-minV is solved, the number of vehicles is fixed and used for the CVRP-minT, CVRP-minS, CVRP-minD, and CVRP-minL. The insertion algorithms for the CVRP-minT, CVRP-minS, CVRP-minD, and CVRP-minL share the same structures, as shown in Algorithm 3. The algorithm starts with \(|K|\) routes that only contain the depot. During the initialization, the algorithm searches \(j^*\) with the smallest \(\delta^*\) if add \(j^*\) at the end of route \(r\) for \(R'\). After \(j^*\) is added into \(R'\), \(j^*\) is removed from \(N'\). When \(N' \neq \emptyset\), the algorithm searches \(i^*, j^*, r^*\) and \(\delta^*\) iteratively. By doing so, the algorithm can insert node \(j^*\) into \(R'\) with the smallest \(\delta^*\) in each iteration. In addition, during searching \(i^*, j^*, r^*\) and \(\delta^*\), the constraint \(C - c^r \geq q_j\) is checked for all \(j\) and \(r\). Therefore, the algorithm can guarantee \(R'\) is feasible for the capacity constraint.

The insertion algorithms for the SDVRP-minT, SDVRP-minS, SDVRP-minD, and SDVRP-minL share the same structures, as shown in Algorithm 5. In Algorithm 5, split delivery is allowed. The procedure to find \(i^*, j^*, r^*\), and \(\delta^*\) is as same as the one in Algorithm 3. The capacity constraint is replaced by \(C - c^r \geq 0\) in Algorithm 5 because a vehicle can serve partial demand of a node. Once \(j^*\) is added into \(R'\), \(y_{j^*r}, q'_{j^*}, \) and \(c^r\) are updated based on the condition \((C - c^r) < q'_{j^*}..\) If the full demand of a node has been served by the routes, then this node is removed from \(N'\).

### 4.2 Tabu Search

The tabu search (TS) approach is a single solution based and deterministic method to search optimal solution. For tutorials, we refer readers to (Glover, 1990). The tabu search algorithm used in this project to solve the VRPs is shown in Algorithm 6.

In TS, the initial solution is given. In this research, the initial solution can be found by implementing the proposed extended insertion algorithm. The current solution during TS is denoted by \(R'\), and the tabu list is denoted by \(\sigma\). The best-so-far solution during TS is denoted by \(R'_{\text{best}}\), and the objective value of \(R'_{\text{best}}\) is denoted by \(f'_{\text{best}}\). In addition, the neighbor solution of \(R'\) is denoted by \(R'_{\text{h}}\), and \(f'_{\text{h}}\) is the objective value of \(R'_{\text{h}}\). The set of \(R'_{\text{h}}\) that satisfies all constraints is denoted by \(M\), and \(R'_{\text{h}}\) are rearranged from the smallest \(f'_{\text{h}}\) to largest \(f'_{\text{h}}\). The maximum CPU time that allows program to run is denoted by \(B_{\text{max}}\) and the elapsed CPU time is denoted by \(B\). While \(B < B_{\text{max}}\), TS is implemented iteratively. At each iteration, all \(R'_{\text{h}}\) of \(R'\) are found according the move operators shown in Algorithms 7–9. In Algorithms 7–9, the nodes are denoted by \(i\) and \(i'\) and the routes are denoted by \(r\) and \(r'\).

Two types of neighbor solutions for the CVRP are defined in this report: exchange-node neighbor solutions and relocate-node neighbor solutions. The exchange-node neighbor solutions can be found by choosing two different nodes in the routes and switching the two nodes. The set of exchange-node neighbor solutions is denoted as \(M_1\) in Algorithm 7. The relocate-node neighbor solutions can be found by removing one node from a route and relocate this node in another route. The set of relocate-node neighbor solutions is denoted as \(M_2\) in Algorithm 8. The move operators for searching exchange-node neighbor solutions and relocate-node neighbor solutions are shown in Algorithms 7 and 8, respectively. For the SDVRP, besides exchange-node neighbor solutions and relocate-node
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Start one route $r \in R'$, each route only contains depot;

while $N' \neq \emptyset$ do
  for $j \in N'$ do
    initialize $E = 0$ ;
    for $r \in R'$ do
      if $C - c^r \geq q_j$ then
        $r^* = r$
      else
        $E = E + 1$
      end
    end
    if $E = |R'|$ then
      add a new route $r'$ in $R'$;  
      add $j$ in $r'$ ;
      $c^{r'} = q_j$;
    else
      add $j$ in $r^*$ ;
      $c^{r^*} = c^{r^*} + q_j$
    end
    Remove $j$ from $N'$;
  end
Return $R'$, $|R'|$.

**Algorithm 2:** Insertion Algorithm Extended for CVRP-minV
Extended Insertion Algorithm for CVRP

start with \( K \) route \( r \in R' \), each route only contains depot, \( f' = 0 \);
\( c^r = 0, \forall r \in R' \);

for \( r \in R' \) do
  \( \delta^* = \infty \);
  for \( j \in N' \) do
    \( R_j = R' \), add \( j \) at the end of route \( r \) for \( R_j \);
    evaluate \( f_j, \delta = f_j - f' \);
    if \( \delta < \delta^* \) then
      \( \delta^* = \delta, j^* = j \)
    end
  end
  add \( j^* \) at the end of route \( r \) for \( R' \), \( c^r = q_j^* \), \( f' = f' + \delta^* \);
  remove \( j^* \) from \( N' \);
end

while \( N' \neq \emptyset \) do
  \( \delta^* = \infty \);
  for \( j \in N' \) do
    for \( r \in R' \) do
      if \( C - c^r \geq q_j \) then
        for \( i \in r \) do
          \( R_{i,j,r} = R' \), insert \( j \) in front of \( i \) in route \( r \) for \( R_{i,j,r} \);
          evaluate \( f_{i,j,r}, \delta = f_{i,j,r} - f' \);
          if \( \delta < \delta^* \) then
            \( \delta^* = \delta, j^* = j, i^* = i, r^* = r \)
          end
        end
      end
      \( R_{i,j,r} = R' \), add \( j \) at the end of route \( r \) for \( R_{i,j,r} \);
      evaluate \( f_{i,j,r}, \delta = f_{i,j,r} - f' \);
      if \( \delta < \delta^* \) then
        \( \delta^* = \delta, j^* = j, i^* = L_r, r^* = r \)
      end
    end
  end
  if \( i^* = L_r, \) then
    add \( j^* \) at the end of route \( r^* \) for \( R' \)
  else
    insert \( j^* \) in front of \( i^* \) in route \( r^* \) for \( R' \)
  end
  \( f' = f' + \delta^* \);
  \( c^{r^*} = c^{r^*} + q_j^* \);
  remove \( j^* \) from \( N' \);
end

return \( R', f' \).

Algorithm 3: Extended Insertion Algorithm for CVRP
neighbor solutions, two more types of neighbor solutions are defined: add-split-node neighbor solutions and delete-split-node neighbor solutions (Berbotto et al., 2014). The add-split-node neighbor solutions can be found by adding node $i$ of route $r$ into route $r'$ if $i \notin r', i \neq i', r \neq r'$. The demand of node $i$ is split and served by route $r$ and route $r'$. The set of add-split-node neighbor solutions is denoted as $M_3$. The delete-split-node neighbor solutions can be found by choosing a node that is served by more than one route, and the node from one of the routes is removed. The set of delete-split-node neighbor solutions is denoted as $M_4$. The move operators for searching add-split-node neighbor solutions and delete-split-node neighbor solutions are shown in Algorithms 9 and 10.

Subsequently, all the neighbor solutions are evaluated and ranked according to their objective values. The best neighbor solution which is not in the tabu list is used as current solution for the next iteration, and added in the tabu list. At the end of each iteration, the tabu list is updated based on frequency. For example, when frequency is 50, a solution is stored in the tabu list for 50 iterations. After 50 iterations, this solution is removed from the tabu list. The best-so-far solution is saved during the whole procedure.

5 Results

5.1 Simple Examples

Two simple examples from Campbell et al. (2008b) are used to illustrate how different objective functions can influence the solutions, and one simple example from Huang et al. (2012) is used to show the difference between the CVRP and the SDVRP. These examples are shown in Figures 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

The main observation from the results, shown Table 2, is that the minS and minL objectives
Extended Insertion Algorithm for the SDVRP

start with $K$ route $r \in R'$, each route only contains depot, $f' = 0$, $q'_j = q_j, \forall j \in N'$;

$y_{jr} = 0, \forall j \in N', \forall r \in R'$;

$c^r = 0, \forall r \in R'$;

for $r \in R'$ do

$\delta^* = \infty$;

for $j \in N'$ do

$R_j = R'$, add $j$ at the end of route $r$ for $R_j$;

evaluate $f_j$, $\delta = f_j - f'$;

if $\delta < \delta^*$ then

$\delta^* = \delta, j^* = j$

end

add $j^*$ at the end of route $r$ for $R'$, $f' = f' + \delta^*$;

if $C < q'_j$, then

$y_{jr^*} = C, q'_{j^*} = q'_j - C, c^r = C$

else

$y_{jr^*} = q'_{j^*}, q'_j = 0, c^r = q_j$

end

if $q'_j = 0$ then

remove $j^*$ from $N'$

end

end

while $N \neq \emptyset$ do

implement Algorithm 4 to find $i^*, j^*, r^*$ and $\delta^*$;

if $i^* = L_{r^*}$ then

add $j^*$ at the end of route $r^*$ for $R'$

else

insert $j^*$ in front of $i^*$ in route $r^*$ for $R'$

end

$f' = f' + \delta^*$;

if $(C - c^r) < q'_j$ then

$y_{jr^*} = y_{jr^*} + (C - c^r), q'_{j^*} = q'_j - (C - c^r), c^r = C$

else

$y_{jr^*} = y_{jr^*} + q'_j, q'_{j^*} = 0, c^r = c^r + q'_j$

end

if $q'_j = 0$ then

remove $j^*$ from $N'$

end

end

Algorithm 5: Extended Insertion Algorithm for the SDVRP
Tabu Search Algorithm
initialize $R'$, $R^{best} = R'$, $\sigma = \emptyset$;
while $B < B_{max}$ do
    $M = \emptyset$;
    find all $R'_h$ of $R'$ according to the move operators, and add them into $M$;
    for $R'_h \in M$ do
        evaluate $f'_h$ of $R'_h$;
    end
    rank $R'_h \in M$ from the smallest $f'_h$ to the largest $f'_h$;
    for $R'_h \in M'$ do
        if $R'_h \notin \sigma$ then
            $R' = R'_h$;
            add $R'_h$ to $\sigma$;
            if $f'_h < f^{best}$ then
                $R^{best} = R'_h$;
                $f^{best} = f'_h$;
            end
        else
            if $f'_h < f^{best}$ then
                $R' = R'_h$;
                add $R'_h$ to $\sigma$;
                $R^{best} = R'_h$;
                $f^{best} = f'_h$;
            end
        end
        break the for-loop when $R'$ is updated;
    end
    update $\sigma$ based on frequency.
end
return $R^{best}$ and $f^{best}$

Algorithm 6: Tabu Search Algorithm
Exchange-nodes Move Operator

for \( r \in R' \) do
  for \( r' \in R' \) do
    for \( i \in r \) do
      for \( i' \in r' \) do
        if \( i \neq i' \) then
          \( R'_h = R' \);
          exchange \( i \) and \( i' \) in \( R'_h \);
          if \( R'_h \) satisfies all constraints then
            add \( R'_h \) in \( M_1 \)
          end
        end
      end
    end
  end
end
return \( M_1 \)

Algorithm 7: Exchange-nodes Move Operator

Relocate-node Move Operator

for \( r \in R' \) do
  for \( r' \in R' \) do
    for \( i \in r \) do
      for \( i' \in r' \) do
        if \( i \neq i' \) and \( r \neq r' \) then
          \( R'_h = R' \);
          take \( i \) out of \( r \) for \( R'_h \), insert \( i \) after \( i' \) in \( r' \) for \( R'_h \);
          if \( R'_h \) satisfies all constraints then
            add \( R'_h \) in \( M_2 \)
          end
        end
      end
    end
end
return \( M_2 \)

Algorithm 8: Relocate-node Move Operator
Add-split-node Move Operator

for \( r \in R' \) do
  for \( r' \in R' \) do
    for \( i \in r \) do
      for \( i' \in r' \) do
        if \( i \notin r', i \neq i' \) and \( r \neq r' \) then
          \( R'_h = R', Y'_h = Y' \);
          randomly generate a number \( \alpha \) in range \([1, y_{ir}]\);
          insert \( i \) after \( i' \) in \( r' \) for \( R'_h \);
          for \( Y'_h, y_{ir} = y_{ir} - \alpha, y_{ir'} = y_{ir'} + \alpha \);
          if \( R'_h \) and \( Y'_h \) satisfy all constraints then
            add \( R'_h \) in \( M_3 \)
          end
        end
      end
  end
end
return \( M_3 \)

Algorithm 9: Add-split-node Move Operator

Delete-split-node Move Operator

for \( r \in R' \) do
  for \( r' \in R' \) do
    for \( i \in r \) do
      if \( i \in r' \) and \( r \neq r' \) then
        \( R'_h = R', Y'_h = Y' \);
        remove \( i \) from \( r \);
        for \( Y'_h, y_{ir'} = y_{ir'} + y_{ir}, y_{ir} = 0 \);
        if \( R'_h \) and \( Y'_h \) satisfy all constraints then
          add \( R'_h \) in \( M_4 \)
        end
      end
    end
  end
end

Algorithm 10: Delete-split-node Move Operator
(a) Network of example 1

(b) Solution for CVRP-minV, SDVRP-minL

(c) Solutions for CVRP-minT, SDVRP-minT

(d) Solutions for CVRP-minS, CVRP-minL, SDVRP-minS

(e) Solutions for CVRP-minD, SDVRP-minD

Figure 1: Network and Solutions of Example 1
Figure 2: Network and Solutions of Example 2
Figure 3: Network and Solutions of Example 3
ensure the better response times for serving the demands of nodes at the possible expense of reduced efficiency (the increase total travel time). In disaster management, this implies that the minS and minL objectives allow delivering the critical supplies to the demand node faster, which is important for the sake of humanitarian logistics. The minD considers the demand-weighted arrival times at the nodes, which ensures the better response times for serving unit demand regardless of the node locations. In example 1, the minimum number of vehicles required is one for the CVRP and the SDVRP. The objective function values provided by the CVRP and the SDVRP are the same corresponding to the minT, minS, and minL.

The main observation, summarized from Table 3, is that the minS and minL objectives may provide different solutions depending on the network. In example 2, we can see that the optimal solution of minimizing the summation of arrival times does not guarantee the minimum latest arrival time. The optimal solution of minimizing the latest arrival time does not guarantee the minimum summation of arrival times either.

From Table 4, we may point out several observations. In this example, the CVRP nominal model requires at least three vehicles to produce feasible solutions, while the SDVRP nominal model requires at least two vehicles. Considering the minV, the SDVRP model allows better utilization of vehicles. In this example, the vehicles have not enough capacity to meet the entire demand of two nodes in the CVRP. Therefore, each vehicle can only serve one node in the CVRP. In the SDVRP, each node is allowed to be served by more than one vehicle. Therefore, vehicles can co-operate with each other to serve the demand. In the SDVRP, the solutions with minimum number of vehicles restrict the solution space. When three vehicles are allowed to be used in the SDVRP, we can see that the optimal solutions vary regarding minT, minS, minL, and minD. To minimize the total travel time, only two vehicles are used to serve the demand in the SDVRP nominal model even though three vehicles are available. To minimize the summation of arrival times, summation of demand-weighted arrival times, and latest arrival time, three vehicles are used to serve the nodes in order to reduce the response times. From these observations, we can see that the SDVRP provides more flexibility.

To test the robust models of the CVRP and the SDVRP, $\hat{t}_{ij}, \forall (i,j) \in A$ for examples 1–3 are generated as shown in Table 1. We use $\hat{q}_i = 1, \forall i \in N$ for examples 1–3. In Table 1, we can see that $\hat{t}_{01}$ and $\hat{t}_{10}$ are relatively very large, which implies that arcs (0, 1) and (1, 0) no longer function in the aftermath of a disaster. From Tables 2 and 3, we can see that arcs (0, 1) and (1, 0) are not selected in the solutions of the RCVRP and the RSDVRP for minT. For minS, minL, and minD, arc (0, 1) is not selected in the solutions, and arc (1, 0) can be selected because arc (1, 0) does not influence the arrival time of the nodes (except depot).

For example 3 where we set $\bar{q}_i + \hat{q}_i = 5$, at least three vehicles are needed. From Table 4, the solutions of SDVRP models can avoid using arc (0, 1) by visiting nodes 2 and 3 more than once. Based on the constraint of CVRP, there is only one feasible solution.

Table 1: Increased Travel Times of Examples 1–3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>$\hat{t}_{ij}$</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the RCVRP-minT and the RSDVRP-minT, we can control the level of uncertainty of travel
Table 2: Results of Example 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minV</td>
<td>0,3,1,2,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minT</td>
<td>0,1,2,3,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minS</td>
<td>0,1,3,2,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minL</td>
<td>0,1,3,2,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minD</td>
<td>0,3,2,1,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minT</td>
<td>0,1,2,3,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minS</td>
<td>0,1,3,2,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minL</td>
<td>0,3,1,2,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minD</td>
<td>0,3,2,1,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minV</td>
<td>0,2,1,3,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minT</td>
<td>0,3,1,2,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minS</td>
<td>0,3,1,2,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minL</td>
<td>0,3,1,2,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minD</td>
<td>0,3,2,1,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minT</td>
<td>0,2,1,3,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minS</td>
<td>0,3,1,2,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minL</td>
<td>0,3,1,2,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minD</td>
<td>0,3,2,1,0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Results from Heuristic Algorithms

For the large-scale examples, heuristic algorithms are used to obtain near-optimal solutions within the time limit. We use examples from http://neo.lcc.uma.es/vrp/vrp-instances/capacitated-vrp-instances/. Examples named $A - n32 - k5$, $A - n44 - k7$, and $E - n101 - k8$ are used. The number of nodes in these examples are 32, 44, and 101, respectively. The capacity of each vehicle in $A - n32 - k5$ and $A - n44 - k7$ is 100. The capacity of each vehicle in $E - n101 - k8$ is 200. For examples $A - n32 - k5$ and $A - n44 - k7$, we set CPU time = 300 seconds for one run of model

...
Table 3: Results of Example 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal Model</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minV</td>
<td>0,2,3,1,0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minT</td>
<td>0,1,2,3,0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minS</td>
<td>0,1,2,3,0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minL</td>
<td>0,3,2,1,0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minD</td>
<td>0,3,2,1,0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minT</td>
<td>0,3,2,1,0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minS</td>
<td>0,1,2,3,0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minL</td>
<td>0,3,2,1,0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minD</td>
<td>0,3,2,1,0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robust Model, Full Uncertainty</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minV</td>
<td>0,2,1,3,0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minT</td>
<td>0,2,1,3,0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minS</td>
<td>0,2,1,3,0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minL</td>
<td>0,3,2,1,0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minD</td>
<td>0,2,1,3,0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minT</td>
<td>0,3,1,2,0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minS</td>
<td>0,2,1,3,0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minL</td>
<td>0,3,2,1,0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minD</td>
<td>0,2,1,3,0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with minV, and CPU time = 3000 seconds for one run of model with other objectives. For example $E - n101 - k8$, we set CPU time = 300 seconds for one run of model with minV, and CPU time = 9000 seconds for one run of model with other objectives.

For testing the robust models, we randomly generate $t_{ij}$ in range $[0, 20]$, and $q_i = 1$. From Tables 7–9, we can see that the performances of CVRP and SDVRP are at similar level in terms of the objective values within the limited CPU time. From Figure 4, we can see that the total travel time increases when $\Gamma_T$ increases, because more $t_{ij}$ in the solution are considered. As the near-optimal solutions are obtained from heuristic algorithms, we can see that the best-so-far solution for the smaller $\Gamma_T$ may not always provide smaller total travel time than the best-so-far solution for the larger $\Gamma_T$.

To test the RCVRP-minD with $\Gamma_Q$, $q_i$ are randomly generated in range $[0, 3]$. From Figure 5, we can see that the summation of demand-weighted arrival times increases when $\Gamma_Q$ increases, because more $q_i$ in the solution are considered. As the near-optimal solutions are obtained from heuristic algorithms, we can see that the best-so-far solution for the smaller $\Gamma_Q$ may not always provide smaller objective value than the best-so-far solution for the larger $\Gamma_Q$.

6 Conclusion

In this project, we explicitly considered the uncertainty in travel times and demands when planning vehicle routes for delivering critical supplies to the affected population in need after a disaster. To consider different scenarios, we proposed robust optimization approaches for the capacitated vehicle routing problems and the split delivery vehicle routing problems under uncertainty, respectively.
Figure 4: Robust Models of minT with $\Gamma_T$

(a) RCVRP, $A - n32 - k5$

(b) RSDVRP, $A - n32 - k5$

(c) RCVRP, $A - n44 - k7$

(d) RSDVRP, $A - n44 - k7$

(e) RCVRP, $E - n101 - k8$

(f) RSDVRP, $E - n101 - k8$
Figure 5: Robust Models of minD with $\Gamma_Q$
Table 4: Results of Example 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minV</td>
<td>[0,1,0], [0,2,0], [0,3,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minT</td>
<td>[0,1,0], [0,2,0], [0,3,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minS</td>
<td>[0,1,0], [0,2,0], [0,3,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minL</td>
<td>[0,1,0], [0,2,0], [0,3,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minD</td>
<td>[0,1,0], [0,2,0], [0,3,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K = 2</td>
<td>SDVRP-minT [0,2,1,0], [0,2,1,3,0]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDVRP-minS [0,1,0], [0,2,0], [0,3,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDVRP-minL [0,2,1,0], [0,3,1,0]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDVRP-minD [0,2,1,0], [0,3,1,0]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K = 3</td>
<td>RCVRP-minV [0,1,0], [0,2,0], [0,3,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCVRP-minT [0,1,0], [0,2,0], [0,3,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCVRP-minS [0,1,0], [0,2,0], [0,3,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCVRP-minL [0,1,0], [0,2,0], [0,3,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCVRP-minD [0,1,0], [0,2,0], [0,3,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Routes</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K = 3</td>
<td>RSDVRP-minT [0,2,0], [0,2,1,3,0], [0,3,1,2,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSDVRP-minS [0,3,0], [0,2,0], [0,2,1,3,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSDVRP-minL [0,2,1,0], [0,3,2,0], [0,2,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSDVRP-minD [0,3,0], [0,2,0], [0,2,1,0]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Results of Robust Models of MinT with $\Gamma_T$, Simple Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Example 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVRP, SDVRP</td>
<td>CVRP, SDVRP</td>
<td>SDVRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_T$</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[0,2,1,3,0]</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[0,3,1,2,0]</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[0,3,1,2,0]</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[0,3,1,2,0]</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Results of Robust CVRP Models of MinD with $\Gamma_Q$, Simple Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Example 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVRP, SDVRP</td>
<td>CVRP, SDVRP</td>
<td>SDVRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_Q$</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[0,3,2,1,0]</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[0,3,2,1,0]</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[0,3,2,1,0]</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Results of Example $A - n32 - k5$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2113</td>
<td>7254</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>87513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>3085</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>35562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>2312</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>29408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>32153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>28463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>3735</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>44024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>2325</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>29622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>2478</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>30895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>2478</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>30895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2522</td>
<td>7743</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>104271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>3969</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>51720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>3237</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>44558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>3468</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>45149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>3623</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>42902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>3707</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>48005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>3210</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>44351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>3679</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>47985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>3544</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>43189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Results of Example $A - n44 \times k7$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2614</td>
<td>9131</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>107424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>3862</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>53915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>2814</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>38074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>3037</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>40376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>2822</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>34198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>3764</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>49064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>2944</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>39282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>2944</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>39282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>2924</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>36959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3065</td>
<td>10144</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>137494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>4968</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>66387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>3793</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>54005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>4184</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>59997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>3944</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>51895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>5571</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>73005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>3934</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>52893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>4783</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>56648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>4112</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>51121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>MAX</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>14751</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>204559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>6604</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>102722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>4436</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>66359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>5333</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>80143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRP-minD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>4436</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>66359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>7294</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>101344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>4970</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>68897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>5843</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>79541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVRP-minD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>5112</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>67931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3278</td>
<td>20644</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>324160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>11090</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>177772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>8378</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>131630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>10296</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>164603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCVRP-minD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>8623</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>128447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>11826</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>181360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>9249</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>132370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>9998</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>144022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDVRP-minD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>9783</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>130069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We presented different robust CVRP and SDVRP models depending on different objectives and the source of uncertain factors (e.g., travel time and demand) to mitigate the impact of the uncertainty and eventually to achieve enhanced resilience in the aftermath of disasters. From the examples presented in this report, we can see that the SDVRP can provide more flexible solutions when the demands from nodes are relatively large. The SDVRP model also avoids the arcs with large uncertain travel time selected in the optimal solution by allowing the visitation of nodes multiple times from different arcs. The small-sized problems can be solved by the solvers such as Gurobi in conjunction with Julia and Jump. For large-scale problems, we presented two-stages heuristic methods combining the insertion algorithm and tabu search to solve the VRP models.
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