A Probabilistic Tree-Based Representation for Non-convex Minimum Cost Flow Problems

Ghasemishabankareh, Behrooz; Ozlen, Melih; Neumann, Frank; Li, Xiaodong

https://researchrepository.rmit.edu.au/esploro/outputs/9921863538201341/filesAndLinks?institution=61RMIT_INST&index=null

Ghasemishabankareh, B., Ozlen, M., Neumann, F., & Li, X. (2018). A Probabilistic Tree-Based Representation for Non-convex Minimum Cost Flow Problems. Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature (PPSN'2018), 69–81.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-99253-2_6

Document Version: Accepted Manuscript

Published Version: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-99253-2_6

Repository homepage: <https://researchrepository.rmit.edu.au>

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2018

Downloaded On 2023/04/26 18:55:47 +1000

Thank you for downloading this document from the RMIT Research Repository.

The RMIT Research Repository is an open access database showcasing the research outputs of RMIT University researchers.

RMIT Research Repository: <http://researchbank.rmit.edu.au/>

Citation:

Ghasemishabankareh, B, Ozlen, M, Neumann, F and Li, X 2018, 'A probabilistic tree-based representation for non-convex minimum cost flow problems', in Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature (PPSN'2018), Coimbra, Portugal, 8 - 12 September 2018, pp. 69-81.

See this record in the RMIT Research Repository at:

<https://researchbank.rmit.edu.au/view/rmit:52635>

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Copyright Statement:

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2018

Link to Published Version:

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-99253-2_6

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE THIS PAGE

A Probabilistic Tree-Based Representation for Non-convex Minimum Cost Flow Problems

Behrooz Ghasemishabankareh^{*1}, Melih Ozlen¹, Frank Neumann², and Xiaodong Li¹

¹ School of Science, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia

{behrooz.ghasemishabankareh,melih.ozlen,xiaodong.li}@rmit.edu.au

² School of Computer Science, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia
frank.neumann@adelaide.edu.au

Abstract. Network flow optimisation has many real-world applications. The minimum cost flow problem (MCFP) is one of the most common network flow problems. Mathematical programming methods often assume the linearity and convexity of the underlying cost function, which is not realistic in many real-world situations. Solving large-sized MCFPs with nonlinear non-convex cost functions poses a much harder problem. In this paper, we propose a new representation scheme for solving non-convex MCFPs using genetic algorithms (GAs). The most common representation scheme for solving the MCFP in the literature using a GA is priority-based encoding, but it has some serious limitations including restricting the search space to a small part of the feasible set. We introduce a probabilistic tree-based representation scheme (PTbR) that is far superior compared to the priority-based encoding. Our extensive experimental investigations show the advantage of our encoding compared to previous methods for a variety of cost functions.

Keywords: Representation scheme · genetic algorithm · minimum cost flow problem · mixed integer nonlinear programming.

1 Introduction

Network flow problems have numerous applications in electrical and power networks, telecommunication, road and rail networks, and airline services [2]. Different types of network flow problems exist, e.g., the shortest path problem, the maximum flow problem, the assignment problem, the transportation problem, and the minimum cost flow problem (MCFP), among which MCFP is one of the most general cases with applications such as distribution problems, optimal loading of a Hopping aeroplane and the racial balancing of schools [2].

MCFPs can be formulated and solved by Linear Programming (LP) techniques, when the underlying cost function is linear or can be approximated by a linear function [18]. However, many real-world MCFPs are nonlinear and require formulation using a nonlinear cost function, instead of a linear approximation.

^{*} Corresponding author.

For example, in a transportation problem, the nonlinearity of a cost function is due to the economy of scale phenomenon, which occurs when cost per unit of the transportation flow decreases with an increasing amount of the total flow [7]. Many studies suggest the appropriateness of employing nonlinear cost functions in the network design problems [4, 16].

Some attempts have been made in using genetic algorithms (GAs) to solve the network flow problems [1, 7, 14]. Among these works, the *representation scheme* plays a critical role in their success. Several representation schemes exist for the network flow problems such as variable-length encoding [20], fixed-length encoding [3], and priority-based representation (PbR) [17]. The most common representation scheme for solving MCFPs is PbR [8]. PbR scheme has been used to solve the shortest path problems, the transportation problems, as well as the network design problems [8, 14, 17]. Although PbR is widely used for solving network flow problems, it has some serious drawbacks (when dealing with MCFP), most noticeably its restriction on any search algorithm from reaching some parts of the feasible search space (see Section 2 for details).

To counteract the above limitations, in this paper we propose a probabilistic tree-based representation (PTbR) for solving nonlinear non-convex MCFP instances using the GA. The PTbR allows all possible feasible solutions to be generated, instead of being restricted to a small part of the feasible region (e.g., PbR scheme). This paper first examines the capabilities of PTbR and compare it with that of the PbR scheme. Then a comparative study is carried out on the performance of the GA employing these two different representation schemes on a set of 35 benchmark instances. This paper has the following contributions: 1) proposing a novel representation scheme (PTbR) to deal with MCFP; 2) providing a close examination between PTbR and PbR to find out which one is more effective for handling MCFPs; 3) conducting extensive experiments to compare the performance of the PTbR-based GA (PtGA) variants with the PbR-based GA (PrGA) for solving non-convex MCFP instances. We also compare our results with those of the mathematical solver packages.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 gives the preliminaries and Section 3 describes our proposed probabilistic tree-based representation and the GA employing PTbR scheme for solving MCFPs. The experimental studies are presented in Section 4 and Section 5 provides the conclusion.

2 Preliminaries

This section describes the problem definition, the PbR, and finally discusses the drawbacks of PbR. Let $G(N, A)$ be a network consisting of a set N of n nodes and a set A of m directed arcs. The maximum and minimum amount of flow on each arc (i, j) are equal to u_{ij} and 0, respectively. $b(i)$ denotes the amount of supply or demand for source or sink node. $b(i) > 0$ denotes that node i is a supply node and $b(i) < 0$ shows that node i is a demand node with a demand of $-b(i)$ and $b(i) = 0$ denotes the transshipment node i . Fig. 1 shows an example of the MCFP with $n=5$ nodes and $m=7$ arcs, which has one supplier node ($b(1) = 10$)

Fig. 1: An example of the MCFP ($n=5$, $m=7$).

and one demand node ($b(5) = -10$). In this example, we aim to satisfy the demand by sending all supplies through the network while minimising the total cost. The integer flow on an arc (i,j) is represented by x_{ij} and the associated cost for the flow (x_{ij}) is denoted by $f_{ij}(x_{ij})$. The formulation of the MCFP is as follows [2]:

$$\text{Minimise : } z(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in A} f_{ij}(x_{ij}), \quad (1)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{\{j:(i,j) \in A\}} x_{ij} - \sum_{\{j:(j,i) \in A\}} x_{ji} = b(i) \quad \forall \quad i \in N, \quad (2)$$

$$0 \leq x_{ij} \leq u_{ij} \quad \forall \quad (i,j) \in A, \quad (3)$$

$$x_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \forall \quad (i,j) \in A, \quad (4)$$

where Eq.1 minimises the total cost through the network. Eq. 2 is a flow balance constraint which states the difference between the total outflow (first term) and the total inflow (second term). The flow on each arc should be between an upper bound and zero (Eq. 3), and finally all the flow values are integer numbers (Eq. 4). In this paper we consider the following assumptions for the MCFP: 1) the network is directed; 2) there are no two or more arcs with the same tail and head in the network; 3) the single-source single-sink MCFP is considered; 4) the total demands and supplies in the network are equal, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^n b(i) = 0$.

2.1 Priority-based representation

Priority-based representation (PbR) is the most commonly-used representation method for MCFPs [8]. In order to represent a candidate solution for an MCFP, PbR lets the number of genes to be equal to n and the value of each gene is generated randomly between 1 and n , which represents the priority of each node for constructing a path among all possible nodes [8]. Fig. 2a illustrates the PbR chromosome for the network presented in Fig. 1. In order to obtain a feasible solution, a two-phase decoding procedure is followed. In phase I, a path is generated based on the priorities and the maximum possible flow is sent through the generated path in phase II. After sending the flow on the network, the upper

Fig. 2: The PbR chromosome and its corresponding solution.

Fig. 3: A feasible solution that PbR fails to represent (for the network in Fig. 1).

bound (u_{ij}), supply and demand should be updated. If the supply/demand is not equal to 0, the next path should be generated. The above procedure repeats until all demands are satisfied. Fig. 2b presents a feasible solution for the given chromosome in Fig. 2a.

Although PbR has been commonly used in the network flow problems, it has some limitations in representing the full extent of the feasible space for MCFP. Fig. 3 shows an example (for the network presented in Fig. 1) that PbR is unable to represent. Here the first path is generated as follows: $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5$. Since in Path₁ after node 1, node 2 is selected, it shows that node 2 has a higher priority than node 3. Hence, if arc (1,2) is not saturated, PbR will not allow any flow to be sent through arc (1,3), essentially blocking this possibility completely (Fig. 3, Path₂). This means that PbR is unable to represent a potential feasible solution such that the flow would go through arc (1,3) (as shown in Fig. 3). Another limitation for PbR is that each time a path is generated, we are supposed to send the maximum possible amount on the generated path. These limitations would restrict a search algorithm from reaching the full extent of the feasible space.

3 Proposed method

Representation plays a critical role before applying an optimisation algorithm, and this applies to GA too. In this section we first propose a probabilistic tree-based representation (PTbR) scheme for solving MCFPs, which alleviates the deficiency of using PbR. Then we describe the GA employing PTbR for solving MCFP instances.

3.1 Probabilistic tree-based representation

To counteract the above-mentioned limitations of the PbR, we propose the PTbR scheme, where a probability tree is adopted to represent a potential MCFP

Fig. 4: Probability tree and its corresponding PTbR for the network in Fig. 1.

solution. Unlike the PbR scheme which is restricted to a small part of the feasible space, the PTbR is able to represent all possible feasible solutions. Fig.4a shows an example of the probability tree for the network presented in Fig. 1. Here, the probability of each successor node to be selected is defined on each branch.

The tree structure can be converted to a chromosome with several sub-chromosomes. Fig. 4b shows the PTbR chromosome converted from the probability tree presented in Fig 4a. The PTbR chromosome has $n-1$ sub-chromosomes (Sub.Ch) and the value of each gene is a random number between 0 and 1 which is then accumulated to 1 in each sub-chromosome. In order to obtain a feasible solution from PTbR, in phase I, a path is first constructed, and then a feasible flow is sent through the constructed path in phase II. For example, to obtain a feasible solution for the chromosome in Fig. 4b, we generate the first path from node $i=1$ (Sub.Ch _{$i=1$}). A random number is generated in $[0,1]$ ($rand=0.2$), and since $0 \leq rand = 0.2 \leq 0.6$, we move through arc (1,2) and node 2 is selected. From node 2 (Sub.Ch _{$i=2$}) another random number is generated ($0.09 \leq rand = 0.85 \leq 1$) and the selected successor node is 4. From node 4 the only available node is 5. Hence, the following path is generated: $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5$.

In Phase II, we attempt to send a feasible flow through the generated path. First the capacity of the generated path is defined ($U = \min\{u_{12} = 10, u_{24} = 7, u_{45} = 8\} = 7$). Then, there are three possible approaches to send a feasible flow on the generated path: 1) send a random flow between 1 and U (random(**R**)); 2) send a flow 1-by-1 (one-by-one (**O**)); 3) send the maximum possible amount of the flow on the generated path (maximum(**M**)), which is the same as PbR. In the above example, we follow the first approach (random(**R**)) and after calculating $U=7$, we send a random flow in $[1,7]$ (e.g., flow=6) and the network, supply and demand are updated. Since the demand has not been fully met (i.e., not equal to 0 yet), the above procedure is repeated.

Fig. 5 shows a feasible solution for the chromosome presented in Fig. 4b. Note that in Fig. 5, after generating Path₁, although arc (1,2) is not saturated, the second path picks node 3 as the successor of node 1, unlike the PbR. This

Fig. 5: A feasible solution generated based on the PTbR chromosome in Fig. 4b.

example illustrates that PTbR allows all potential solutions to be generated probabilistically, instead of being restricted by using PbR.

3.2 Genetic algorithm with PTbR

This section describes the GA employing the new representation scheme PTbR for solving MCFPs, i.e., PtGA. The key distinction between the PtGA and the PbR-based GA (PrGA) is that PrGA employs the PbR [8]. This PtGA can be described by the following procedure:

Initialisation: First a population with *pop_size* individuals (chromosomes) is randomly generated. The process of creating a chromosome based on the PTbR is explained in Subsection 3.1.

Crossover and mutation: In order to explore the feasible region, crossover and mutation operators are applied to create the new offspring at each generation. For PtGA, a two-point crossover operation is applied, where two blocks (sub-chromosomes) of the selected chromosome (parents) are first randomly selected. Then, two parents swapping the selected sub-chromosomes to generate new offspring. To perform mutation for PtGA, first a random parent is selected and the randomly chosen sub-chromosome is regenerated to create a new offspring.

Fitness evaluation and selection: For each chromosome in the population, after finding a feasible solution ($\mathbf{x}$) by applying the decoding procedure for PTbR, the value of cost function is evaluated using the following equation: $Minimize : z(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n f(x_{ij})$. After calculating the fitness values for all individuals in the population, the tournament selection procedure is applied to select individuals for the next generation.

Termination criteria: The termination criteria for the PtGA are as follows: 1) no further fitness value improvement in the best individual of the population for β successive iterations; 2) the maximum number of function evaluations (NFEs) reached. If any of the above conditions is satisfied first, the algorithm stops and the best solution ($\mathbf{x}^*$) and its corresponding cost function value are reported.

Note that for PrGA, it is common to employ a weight mapping crossover (WMX) and inversion mutation [12, 8]. The termination criteria can be the same for both PrGA and PtGA.

4 Experimental Studies

This section first describes the MCFP instances and cost functions that have been adopted, followed by some discussion about the mathematical solver pack-

Fig. 6: Shapes of different cost functions.

ages used in our experiments. We then describe the parameter settings, experimental comparisons and result analysis on the performances of PrGA, PtGA, and mathematical solvers in solving these MCFP instances.

Since our focus is to solve nonlinear non-convex MCFP, we adopt a set of nonlinear non-convex cost functions which are commonly-used in the literature [9, 10, 15]. Michalewicz et al. [15] categorised the nonlinear cost functions as 1) piece-wise linear cost functions; 2) multimodal (nonlinear non-convex) cost functions; 3) smooth cost functions which are mostly used for Operations Research (OR) problems. In this paper we chose the nonlinear non-convex and arc-tangent approximation of the piece-wise linear cost functions from [15, 9, 10] to evaluate the performances of PrGA and PtGA. The formulation of these functions are as follows [15, 9, 10]:

$$F_1 : f(x_{ij}) = c_{ij} (\arctan(P_A(x_{ij} - S))/\pi + 0.5 + \arctan(P_A(x_{ij} - 2S))/\pi + 0.5 + \arctan(P_A(x_{ij} - 3S))/\pi + 0.5 + \arctan(P_A(x_{ij} - 4S))/\pi + 0.5 + \arctan(P_A(x_{ij} - 5S))/\pi + 0.5). \quad (5)$$

$$F_2 : f(x_{ij}) = c_{ij} ((x_{ij}/S)(\arctan(P_B x_{ij})/\pi + 0.5) + (1 - x_{ij}/S)(\arctan(P_B(x_{ij} - S))/\pi + 0.5) + (x_{ij}/S - 2)(\arctan(P_B(x_{ij} - 2S))/\pi + 0.5)). \quad (6)$$

$$F_3 : f(x_{ij}) = 100 \times c_{ij} (x_{ij} (\sin(\frac{5\pi x_{ij}}{4S}) + 1.3)). \quad (7)$$

Note that c_{ij} is non-negative coefficient, P_A and P_B are set to 1000 and S is set to 2 for F_1 , and 5 for F_2 and F_3 , respectively [10]. All cost functions F_1 , F_2 and F_3 are illustrated in Fig. 6. A set of 35 single-source single-sink MCFP instances is randomly generated with different number of nodes ($n = \{5, 10, 20, 40, 80, 120, 160\}$) and presented in Table 1 ($No.$ denotes the instance number, and each instance has n nodes and m arcs). Note that, for each node size (n), five different networks are randomly generated. The number of supply/demand for nodes $1/n$ are set to $q=20/-20$ in the test instances up to 20 nodes and for all other test problems supply/demand are set to $q=30/-30$.

This paper focuses on solving nonlinear non-convex MCFPs, which could be considered as mixed integer nonlinear programming (MINLP) problems. However, only very few mathematical solver packages exist for solving MINLP problems, such as CPLEX, Couennn, Baron, LINDOGlobal and AlphaECP [5, 13, 19]. Some of these solvers have serious limitations. For instance, CPLEX is only capable of solving quadratic optimisation problems, BARON cannot handle the

Table 1: A set of 35 randomly generated single-source single-sink MCFP instances.

No.	n	m	No.	n	m	No.	n	m	No.	n	m	No.	n	m	No.	n	m	No.	n	m
1	8	6	24	11	114	16	369	21	1484	26	3419	31	4882							
2	8	7	34	12	98	17	385	22	1406	27	3166	32	4718							
3	5	8	8	10	32	13	20	105	18	40	373	23	80	1560	28	120	3326	33	160	4986
4		9	9	27	14	99	19	406	24	1353	29	3212	34	4835						
5		8	10	29	15	101	20	406	25	1526	30	2911	35	5130						

trigonometric functions $\sin(x)$, $\cos(x)$, while Couenne is not able to handle the *arctangent* function [5]. Among these solvers, AlphaECP and LINDOGlobal are able to handle general MINLPs [13, 19]. As a result, we choose to compare our PtGA and PrGA results with those of LINDOGlobal and AlphaECP.

4.1 Parameter settings

Both PrGA and PtGA are implemented in MATLAB on a PC with Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-6500U 2.50 GHz processor with 8 GB RAM and run 30 times for each problem instance. In order to solve MCFP instances using mathematical solvers, AlphaECP is applied through a high level mathematical language general algebraic modelling system (GAMS) [11] and LINDOGlobal [13] is applied directly on all problem instances.

The parameter settings for the PrGA are as follows: maximum number of iterations ($It_{max}=200$), population size ($pop_size = \min\{n \times 10, 300\}$), crossover rate ($P_c=0.95$), mutation rate ($P_m=0.3$) and maximum number of function evaluations ($NFEs=100,000$). The parameter settings for the PtGA are $It_{max}=200$, $pop_size = \min\{n \times 5, 300\}$, $P_c=0.95$, $P_m=0.3$ and $NFEs=100,000$. The pop_size value depends on the number of nodes (n) and increases for the larger networks and the $P_m = 0.3$ value decreases linearly in each iteration. If the results are not improved in $\beta = 30$ successive iterations for PrGA or PtGA, the algorithm is terminated. The run time limit for LINDOGlobal and AlphaECP is set to 3600 seconds (s). Other parameters for AlphaECP and LINDOGlobal are set as default settings.

4.2 Results and analysis

As mentioned in the procedure of PTbR, after finding a path, there are three possible ways to send the flow over the generated path, i.e., send possible flow 1) randomly (**R**), 2) one-by-one (**O**), or 3) by a maximum possible amount (**M**). This creates three different variants of the PTbR-based GA, namely PtGA-R, PtGA-O, and PtGA-M respectively.

To compare the effectiveness of these representation methods, we evaluate these variants, as well as PrGA using a set of 35 MCFP instances. Tables 2-4 present the results of PtGA-R, PtGA-O, PtGA-M, PrGA, LINDOGlobal, and AlphaECP on a total of 35 test problems using cost functions F_1 , F_2 , F_3 . The

Table 2: Results for cost function F_1 .

No.	n	m	PtGA-R			PtGA-O			PTGA-M			PrGA			LINDOGlobal	AlphaECP	h
			<i>t</i>	<i>mean</i>	<i>std</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>mean</i>	<i>std</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>mean</i>	<i>std</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>mean</i>	<i>std</i>	<i>t'</i>	<i>OBJ</i>	
1	5	8	5	30.1752	7.29E-15	12	30.1752	7.29E-15	3	30.1752	7.29E-15	7	30.1752	7.29E-15	1	30.1752	0
2		8	5	32.2126	0.00E+00	13	32.2126	0.00E+00	3	32.2126	0.00E+00	7	32.2126	0.00E+00	2	32.2126	0
3		8	5	33.0507	7.29E-15	15	33.0507	7.29E-15	4	33.0507	7.29E-15	6	33.0507	7.29E-15	1	33.0507	0
4		9	5	33.1016	7.29E-15	13	33.1016	7.29E-15	4	33.1016	7.29E-15	7	33.1016	7.29E-15	1	33.1016	0
5		8	6	40.3756	2.19E-14	15	40.3756	2.19E-14	3	40.3756	2.19E-14	6	40.3756	2.19E-14	1	40.3756	0
6	10	24	45	26.2974	2.08E-01	76	29.1682	8.03E-02	42	29.2961	9.99E-02	32	30.0343	3.16E-05	3600	29.135	268
7		34	57	19.8109	2.03E-01	88	20.1956	3.09E-01	45	20.7775	2.94E-01	42	24.1056	6.01E-01	3600	19.5957	3600
8		32	48	23.4834	1.16E-01	85	23.6681	1.46E-01	37	24.0765	2.34E-01	28	25.3353	1.39E-01	3600	23.3061	350
9		27	48	26.1797	2.31E-01	69	26.2407	1.52E-01	34	26.4196	7.96E-02	29	28.3965	2.01E-01	3600	25.9165	525
10		29	49	19.8438	9.12E-02	68	20.2202	2.30E-01	34	21.4404	1.55E-01	32	23.3819	2.95E-01	3600	19.6325	740
11	20	114	160	8.8767	4.60E-01	172	10.9784	4.74E-01	178	13.0274	7.23E-01	153	15.8245	2.03E-01	3600	8.3929	3600
12		98	141	11.7898	2.18E-01	167	12.4354	3.02E-01	156	13.2006	4.27E-01	160	15.4705	2.40E-01	3600	11.5964	3600
13		105	213	8.2120	4.40E-01	239	9.619	5.36E-01	191	10.7931	4.36E-01	133	11.7116	4.25E-01	3600	7.0803	3600
14		99	187	10.1773	3.85E-01	227	11.3854	7.18E-01	202	12.881	6.11E-01	175	15.1102	9.30E-01	3600	10.5551	3600
15		101	132	14.9139	3.17E-01	191	15.5517	5.14E-01	104	16.5822	7.43E-01	154	18.4694	5.16E-01	3600	13.8717	3600
16	40	369	340	1.6119	3.08E-01	437	3.1972	4.35E-01	362	4.1695	5.34E-01	411	6.6595	7.00E-01	3600	0.4433	3600
17		385	316	3.5652	4.57E-01	376	4.853	4.95E-01	285	6.0036	3.92E-01	407	10.1381	8.84E-01	3600	4.9674	3600
18		373	393	0.5091	3.26E-01	523	1.9296	4.46E-01	406	3.0951	7.99E-01	432	5.1361	1.09E+00	3600	0.1937	3600
19		406	330	0.8437	3.93E-01	370	3.22	6.36E-01	279	6.5308	4.73E-01	342	10.684	6.18E-01	3600	0.2118	3600
20		406	359	3.5742	4.14E-01	435	6.177	6.60E-01	320	9.1481	6.27E-01	360	12.2394	7.58E-01	3600	8.7013	3600
21	80	1484	336	0.7333	2.71E-04	401	0.8181	1.67E-01	375	2.3523	7.75E-01	459	3.2517	1.32E+00	3600	NF	3600
22		1406	326	0.6737	4.90E-04	336	0.806	1.56E-01	369	2.2178	4.64E-01	506	5.4074	1.03E+00	3600	NF	3600
23		1560	279	0.8085	3.36E-04	361	1.6541	4.84E-01	278	4.128	8.63E-01	429	5.6396	9.22E-01	3600	NF	3600
24		1353	342	0.6585	3.50E-04	464	1.793	5.88E-01	354	4.3911	7.70E-01	779	8.1006	1.32E+00	3600	NF	3600
25		1526	322	0.7628	3.39E-04	394	1.0477	3.20E-01	302	2.7758	5.56E-01	583	5.0059	1.11E+00	3600	NF	3600
26	120	3419	725	1.0924	5.37E-04	725	2.8201	3.69E-01	711	5.525	4.39E-01	877	8.5144	1.17E+00	3600	NF	3600
27		3166	728	1.0818	9.44E-04	805	2.4484	3.89E-01	624	4.9784	6.08E-01	754	7.6565	1.16E+00	3600	NF	3600
28		3326	892	1.0152	6.75E-04	893	2.3935	3.03E-01	636	5.0317	6.01E-01	906	7.5819	7.76E-01	3600	NF	3600
29		3212	748	1.0532	7.88E-04	877	2.5385	5.05E-01	673	5.2673	6.27E-01	777	10.2727	1.74E+00	3600	NF	3600
30		2911	731	0.9446	4.06E-04	828	2.0144	4.28E-01	697	4.2781	6.21E-01	817	7.5293	1.82E-01	3600	NF	3600
31	160	4882	837	12.2598	2.35E+00	914	14.5003	4.81E-01	950	15.6057	5.54E-01	922	13.8152	2.74E-01	3600	NF	3600
32		4718	961	6.1413	1.42E+00	919	15.6089	9.73E-01	952	17.0593	7.89E-01	927	14.6681	9.81E-01	3600	NF	3600
33		4986	902	8.5483	1.21E+00	912	16.2194	6.18E-01	947	17.2818	8.47E-01	1345	15.1022	7.50E-01	3600	NF	3600
34		4835	853	6.3798	1.01E+00	1064	11.199	4.81E-01	1067	12.1144	6.70E-01	942	10.3464	4.48E-01	3600	NF	3600
35		5130	994	10.6176	1.22E+00	1068	19.7703	7.79E-01	1081	20.5212	8.59E-01	896	18.9247	5.97E-01	3600	NF	3600

Table 3: Results for cost function F_2 .

No.	n	PiGA-R			PiGA-O			PiGA-M			PiGA			LINDOGlobal	AlphaECP	h	
		t	mean	std	t	mean	std	t	mean	std	t	mean	std	t	OBJ		t
1	5	8	4	7.525	1.82E-15	8	7.525	1.82E-15	2	7.525	1.82E-15	5	7.525	2.92E-15	1	7.525	0
2		8	5	8.65	0.00E+00	12	8.7085	1.56E-01	3	8.65	0.00E+00	5	8.65	0.00E+00	1	8.65	0
3		8	4	8.225	3.65E-15	8	8.225	3.65E-15	2	8.225	3.65E-15	5	8.225	3.65E-15	1	8.225	0
4		9	6	9.925	1.82E-15	14	9.925	1.82E-15	3	9.925	1.82E-15	5	9.925	1.82E-15	1	9.925	0
5		8	5	11.375	5.47E-15	10	11.375	5.47E-15	2	11.375	5.47E-15	6	11.375	5.47E-15	1	11.375	0
6	10	24	34	11.0999	1.82E-15	41	12.3986	5.47E-15	33	11.5073	5.26E-01	22	12.2462	2.76E-01	90	11.05	230
7		34	28	11.185	1.10E-01	37	11.2515	9.10E-02	17	11.0976	8.46E-02	25	11.3236	3.65E-15	360	11.014	310
8		32	40	10.8903	1.09E-01	54	11.1688	1.09E-01	25	11.0155	5.40E-02	21	11.2944	3.65E-15	580	10.725	431
9		27	26	11.3939	3.65E-15	36	11.3939	3.65E-15	20	11.3990	1.55E-02	26	11.8862	9.16E-02	610	11.3939	581
10		29	42	9.8438	1.03E-01	56	10.4882	7.34E-02	22	10.0002	1.30E-01	23	9.9807	1.57E-01	840	9.7293	743
11	20	114	127	9.8945	3.65E-15	171	10.7446	1.05E-02	90	10.6551	8.82E-02	159	10.5488	1.18E-01	3600	9.8945	3600
12		98	134	11.4485	0.00E+00	190	11.5245	2.89E-02	101	11.5641	4.27E-02	157	11.595	4.56E-02	3600	11.4485	3600
13		105	99	10.8133	3.65E-15	113	10.8133	3.65E-15	87	10.8133	2.32E-05	161	11.1547	4.77E-02	3600	10.8133	3600
14		99	119	10.3787	0.00E+00	115	10.3787	0.00E+00	91	10.3787	0.00E+00	168	10.7202	1.88E-01	3600	10.3787	3600
15		101	115	10.7386	3.65E-15	123	10.7386	3.65E-15	94	10.7386	3.65E-15	172	10.759	6.63E-03	3600	10.7386	3600
16	40	369	348	9.7242	3.65E-15	395	13.8021	2.75E-01	281	10.9094	2.19E-02	372	10.9402	1.35E-02	3600	9.7242	3600
17		385	368	10.4645	2.27E-01	427	12.0613	3.25E-01	232	10.5797	9.81E-02	373	10.8525	1.16E-01	3600	11.1484	3600
18		373	490	9.4592	1.82E-15	537	13.9817	2.84E-01	348	11.0849	4.99E-02	381	11.1263	1.69E-02	3600	9.4592	3600
19		406	299	9.5696	1.82E-15	348	14.144	1.01E-01	230	10.8622	1.34E-01	379	11.1395	7.01E-02	3600	9.5696	3600
20		406	314	10.0842	1.82E-15	424	13.2452	3.54E-01	221	10.908	1.29E-01	372	11.0853	1.38E-01	3600	10.0842	3600
21	80	1484	323	10.4395	1.88E-01	364	14.4468	2.41E-01	243	10.6247	1.77E-02	325	10.7098	4.24E-02	3600	13.6678	3600
22		1406	326	11.4700	1.43E-01	396	14.4949	4.10E-02	250	11.5366	1.76E-02	369	11.5842	2.24E-02	3600	13.6122	3600
23		1560	249	9.3868	1.01E-02	360	14.4684	8.50E-02	209	10.6202	1.55E-02	395	10.6933	3.05E-02	3600	9.5945	3600
24		1353	364	10.9509	2.92E-01	510	14.8901	5.86E-02	286	11.0069	2.04E-02	343	11.135	5.69E-02	3600	12.2486	3600
25		1526	332	9.8808	6.44E-04	340	14.7078	1.23E-01	256	10.6271	4.95E-02	360	10.7367	5.29E-02	3600	9.9196	3600
26	120	3169	545	11.5658	2.21E-01	699	14.8154	7.21E-02	603	11.9241	2.23E-02	670	12.0306	3.47E-02	3600	NF	10.568
27		3466	555	11.8297	8.19E-01	617	15.1518	1.32E-01	402	12.9766	5.31E-02	595	12.1168	5.61E-02	3600	NF	10.861
28		3326	601	11.6167	1.16E-01	679	14.6177	7.13E-02	412	12.9766	5.31E-02	603	12.1168	5.61E-02	3600	NF	10.861
29		3212	745	11.8559	4.17E-03	864	15.3256	7.73E-02	396	12.1214	4.13E-02	670	12.2555	6.60E-02	3600	11.8478	3600
30		2911	731	12.5460	1.59E-01	699	15.3006	7.35E-02	478	12.7238	4.79E-02	877	12.7510	6.14E-02	3600	14.2069	3600
31	160	4782	981	11.4402	3.48E-01	1040	26.5183	5.87E-01	914	16.903	5.39E-01	908	18.3406	7.00E-01	3600	NF	10.345
32		4488	146	12.0254	2.00E-01	1040	26.0915	5.50E-01	912	16.903	5.39E-01	912	18.3406	7.00E-01	3600	NF	11.435
33		4984	84	12.0254	2.00E-01	928	28.4872	1.01E-01	912	18.947	9.97E-01	912	18.947	9.97E-01	3600	NF	11.435
34		4835	916	11.6837	1.78E-01	1029	25.521	4.70E-01	1005	16.7851	7.29E-01	994	18.3083	7.24E-01	3600	NF	11.881
35		5130	995	12.1966	9.78E-01	1122	30.2795	6.41E-01	1082	19.7566	6.03E-01	951	21.2144	7.46E-01	3600	NF	12.994

Table 4: Results for cost function F_3 .

No.	n	PtGA-R			PtGA-O			PtGA-M			PrGA			LINDOGlobal	AlphaECP		h		
		t	mean	std	t	mean	std	t	mean	std	t	mean	std	t	OBJ	t		OBJ	
1	5	8	5	114.3819	7.29E-14	11	114.3819	7.29E-14	3	114.3819	7.29E-14	9	114.3819	7.29E-14	1	114.3819	1	114.3819	0
2		8	6	111.8675	0.00E+00	14	111.8675	0.00E+00	4	111.8675	0.00E+00	9	111.8675	0.00E+00	1	111.8675	1	111.8675	0
3		8	7	138.2576	0.00E+00	16	138.2576	0.00E+00	3	138.285	0.00E+00	6	138.285	0.00E+00	1	138.2576	1	138.2576	0
4		9	7	107.3083	0.00E+00	14	107.3083	0.00E+00	3	120.0322	5.83E-14	6	123.3197	2.92E-14	1	107.3083	1	123.32	0
5		8	6	150.9943	2.92E-14	15	150.9943	2.92E-14	3	150.9943	2.92E-14	7	150.9943	2.92E-14	1	150.9943	1	150.9943	0
6	10	24	66	106.7312	1.44E+00	108	107.7509	2.18E+00	43	118.2249	5.35E-01	41	135.3015	1.87E+00	3600	104.5113	332	141.64	-1
7		34	36	81.7436	3.64E-01	69	85.7071	3.81E+00	39	89.5549	7.08E+00	32	117.8976	1.06E+01	3600	80.97226	431	108.13	-1
8		32	49	89.4711	1.47E+00	65	88.569	6.40E+01	36	90.3497	2.08E+00	33	131.963	6.02E-01	3600	86.41261	491	135.434	-1
9		27	45	112.2958	1.31E+00	74	115.9811	4.28E+00	37	114.265	1.58E+00	27	152.5404	1.28E+00	3600	110.3257	288	133.92	-1
10		29	49	90.1242	8.41E-01	78	90.2275	8.48E-01	39	90.4574	1.21E+00	35	104.8298	8.38E+00	3600	88.05281	333	135.81	-1
11	20	114	90	69.7972	1.25E+00	163	105.9186	8.93E-01	81	103.9751	3.76E+00	86	103.4472	4.32E+00	3600	66.6795	3600	102.375	-1
12		98	111	79.5198	3.91E-01	194	116.2849	4.75E-01	79	116.3386	5.97E+00	78	122.6103	3.04E+00	3600	79.3041	3600	92.146	0
13		105	137	96.3334	2.15E+00	234	123.3836	2.84E+00	137	120.5739	1.11E+00	93	116.6993	5.49E+00	3600	90.1959	3600	137.339	-1
14		99	92	79.4689	0.00E+00	213	103.5296	1.40E+00	86	99.9841	3.27E+00	80	115.5684	1.98E+00	3600	79.4689	3600	115.578	0
15		101	145	82.9519	1.56E+00	199	108.6625	1.11E+00	99	111.233	2.93E+00	75	115.2218	2.27E+00	3600	78.4144	3600	116.503	-1
16	40	369	299	75.7446	6.09E-01	384	119.4979	4.80E+00	323	105.1299	2.87E+00	223	108.7354	3.66E+00	3600	77.1499	3600	145.164	1
17		385	253	89.9066	3.16E-01	396	108.3421	1.07E+00	241	111.1345	2.21E+00	294	119.3059	3.82E+00	3600	90.1749	3600	148.655	1
18		373	203	83.1843	3.78E+00	582	133.7859	3.33E+00	433	106.883	4.90E+00	215	93.0859	3.19E+00	3600	79.8989	3600	90.777	-1
19		406	282	72.447	5.14E-01	355	119.7419	4.45E+00	231	99.0947	3.44E+00	285	103.488	2.99E+00	3600	73.0978	3600	92.443	1
20		406	288	65.1725	4.73E-01	359	127.004	3.93E+00	277	102.8105	6.24E+00	201	109.9314	3.55E+00	3600	65.0667	3600	117.312	0
21	80	1484	325	83.9645	1.85E+00	404	138.502	5.27E+00	296	109.589	1.40E+00	336	107.3701	2.04E+00	3600	90.1854	3600	124.549	1
22		1406	238	93.3544	1.13E+00	332	128.5883	6.91E+00	246	109.0366	1.42E+00	347	108.2733	2.49E+00	3600	93.4224	3600	129.357	0
23		1560	296	106.1091	3.03E+00	304	143.037	2.91E+00	243	112.9184	1.57E+00	272	111.1676	1.20E+00	3600	148.6104	3600	107.493	0
24		1353	261	63.7182	4.32E-01	464	134.5088	7.03E+00	331	108.1399	2.83E+00	314	94.7708	5.95E+00	3600	65.3662	3600	132.307	1
25		1526	365	59.5713	2.19E-14	293	134.002	6.85E+00	241	101.3695	7.98E+00	335	106.9928	5.50E+00	3600	59.5713	3600	125.508	0
26	120	3419	544	86.2999	1.93E+00	595	130.1538	2.76E+00	491	84.2045	2.36E+00	686	89.0996	3.92E+00	3600	NF	3600	91.267	1
27		3166	464	55.0274	1.79E+00	475	129.6023	2.81E+00	437	83.2053	3.92E+00	544	87.5812	5.25E+00	3600	66.009	3600	92.576	1
28		3326	530	80.7884	8.00E+00	693	131.3889	3.27E+00	535	88.2298	5.87E-01	685	88.4319	5.24E-01	3600	NF	80.755	0	
29		3212	486	84.6939	5.19E+00	566	133.1519	2.59E+00	528	90.2997	5.19E-01	535	89.1701	4.72E-01	3600	NF	3600	136.381	1
30		2911	481	89.7215	1.09E+00	525	136.358	4.51E+00	455	90.4635	1.55E+00	582	95.9605	6.85E+00	3600	NF	3600	102.4492	1
31	160	4882	885	80.6756	5.27E+00	994	257.169	5.66E+00	631	145.3273	6.83E+00	907	158.2989	1.14E+01	3600	145.654	3600	98.5290	1
32		4718	835	82.8948	9.12E+00	944	270.361	8.50E+00	651	156.9115	8.70E+00	895	174.8577	9.43E+00	3600	144.216	3600	123.975	1
33		4986	910	80.4273	5.40E+00	1006	266.059	6.02E+00	694	159.3669	5.94E+00	800	170.5026	1.20E+01	3600	NF	3600	117.75	1
34		4835	992	82.432	3.75E+00	946	247.8246	4.70E+00	740	143.5167	7.49E+00	949	158.1368	9.00E+00	3600	NF	3600	102.685	1
35		5130	988	88.063	4.01E+00	1040	272.3081	5.92E+00	856	162.7781	7.43E+00	917	181.6462	9.77E+00	3600	173.679	3600	117.999	1

Table 5: The Friedman test's results for PtGA-R, PtGA-O, PtGA-M and PrGA.

	p-value	mean column ranks			
		PtGA-R	PtGA-O	PtGA-M	PrGA
F_1	0.000E+00	16.49	34.13	50.94	60.43
F_2	0.000E+00	18.99	59.27	32.69	51.05
F_3	0.000E+00	16.28	54.94	41.05	49.72

mean ranks of the algorithms (PtGA-R, PtGA-O, PtGA-M and PrGA). The mean column rank values of the PtGA-R is less than those of the PtGA-O, PtGA-M and PrGA (Table 5) which indicates that PtGA-R's performance is better than those of the other GA variants. It is clearly evident that the superior performance of the PrGA-R comes from utilising PTbR in its procedure and sending a random possible flow.

We also compare the performance of PtGA-R with LINDOGlobal and AlphaECP by applying a one-sample t -test with the significance level set to 0.05. After performing the one-sample t -test, if PtGA-R has statistically better or worse performance than that of the mathematical solvers, the parameter h is set to 1 and -1 respectively, otherwise h is set to 0. The last column of Tables 2-4 presents the value of h for all instances.

For cost function F_1 , Table 2 shows that PtGA-R has better performance on all instances with $n=\{80,120,160\}$ compared with that of PtGA-O, PtGA-M, PrGA, LINDOGlobal and AlphaECP. Furthermore, LINDOGlobal fails to find any feasible solutions when the problem size is increased ($n=\{80,120,160\}$). For F_2 , Table 3 shows that on 28 out of 35 instances (80%), the PtGA-R has equal or better performance than the two mathematical solvers.

With regard to cost function F_3 , Table 4 shows that even on instances 3 and 4 (small-sized instances), PrGA failed to find the optimal solutions due to the limitations of PbR in searching the feasible region, which is consistent with our analysis in Subsection 2.1. In all large-sized instances ($n=\{80,120,160\}$), the PtGA-R has similar or better performance than that of the mathematical solvers.

Fig. 7: Convergence graphs for PtGA, PrGA, LINDOGlobal and AlphaECP.

Fig. 7 shows the convergence graphs of PtGA-R, PtGA-O, PtGA-M, PrGA and the mathematical solvers for large-sized instances on F_2 and F_3 . Since LINDOGlobal is not able to find any feasible solution for all large-sized problems on F_1 , we are not able to provide the convergence graph for that cost function. As shown in Fig. 7, PtGA-R converges to a good solution faster than other GA variants as well as LINDOGlobal and AlphaECP. Based on Fig. 7, LINDOGlobal cannot find any feasible solution after about 1000s. Once a solution is found, mathematical solvers (specially LINDOGlobal) are not able to improve it.

5 Conclusion

This paper has proposed a new encoding scheme called probabilistic tree-based representation (PTbR) for more effective handling of MCFPs. We examine the commonly-used priority-based representation (PbR), and compare it with PTbR to demonstrate that PTbR is superior to PbR for solving MCFPs. To validate our analysis on these representation schemes, the PTbR-based GA (i.e., PtGA) and PbR-based GA (i.e., PrGA) are evaluated over a set of 35 single-source single-sink network instances with up to five thousand variables. The experimental results demonstrate that PtGA with a random flow (i.e., PtGA-R) has better performance than PrGA on all problem instances. In addition, PtGA-R has also been shown to produce better solutions and have better efficiency than mathematical solvers such as LINDOGlobal and AlphaECP when considering the large-sized instances. For future research, one can focus on solving large-sized real-world MCFP using the proposed representation method.

References

1. Abdelaziz, M.: Distribution network reconfiguration using a genetic algorithm with varying population size. *Electric Power Systems Research* **142**, 9–11 (2017)
2. Ahuja, R.K., Magnanti, T.L., Orlin, J.B.: *Network flows: theory, algorithms, and applications*. Prentice hall, pp.4–6 (1993)

3. Aiello, G., La Scalia, G., Enea, M.: A multi objective genetic algorithm for the facility layout problem based upon slicing structure encoding. *Expert Systems with Applications* **39**(12), 10352–10358 (2012)
4. Amiri, A.S., Torabi, S.A., Ghodsi, R.: An iterative approach for a bi-level competitive supply chain network design problem under foresight competition and variable coverage. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review* **109**, 99–114 (2018)
5. Burer, S., Letchford, A.N.: Non-convex mixed-integer nonlinear programming: a survey. *Surveys in Operations Research and Management Science* **17**(2), 97–106 (2012)
6. Derrac, J., García, S., Molina, D., Herrera, F.: A practical tutorial on the use of nonparametric statistical tests as a methodology for comparing evolutionary and swarm intelligence algorithms. *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation* **1**(1), 3–18 (2011)
7. Fontes, D.B., Gonçalves, J.F.: Heuristic solutions for general concave minimum cost network flow problems. *Networks* **50**(1), 67–76 (2007)
8. Gen, M., Cheng, R., Lin, L.: *Network models and optimization: Multiobjective genetic algorithm approach*. Springer Science & Business Media (2008)
9. Klanšek, U.: Solving the nonlinear discrete transportation problem by minlp optimization. *Transport* **29**(1), 1–11 (2014)
10. Klanšek, U., Pšunder, M.: Solving the nonlinear transportation problem by global optimization. *Transport* **25**(3), 314–324 (2010)
11. Lastusilta, T., et al.: Gams minlp solver comparisons and some improvements to the alphaecp algorithm. *Process Design and Systems Engineering Laboratory, Department of Chemical Engineering Division for Natural Sciences and Technology, Abo Akademi University, Abo, Finland* (2011)
12. Lin, L., Gen, M.: Bicriteria network design problem using interactive adaptive-weight ga and priority-based encoding method. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* (2007)
13. Lin, Y., Schrage, L.: The global solver in the lindo api. *Optimization Methods & Software* **24**(4-5), 657–668 (2009)
14. Lotfi, M., Tavakkoli-Moghaddam, R.: A genetic algorithm using priority-based encoding with new operators for fixed charge transportation problems. *Applied Soft Computing* **13**(5), 2711–2726 (2013)
15. Michalewicz, Z., Vignaux, G.A., Hobbs, M.: A nonstandard genetic algorithm for the nonlinear transportation problem. *ORSA Journal on Computing* **3**(4), 307–316 (1991)
16. Reca, J., Martínez, J., López-Luque, R.: A new efficient bounding strategy applied to the heuristic optimization of the water distribution networks design. In: *Congress on Numerical Methods in Engineering CMN* (2017)
17. Tari, F.G., Hashemi, Z.: A priority based genetic algorithm for nonlinear transportation costs problems. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* **96**, 86–95 (2016)
18. Vegh, L.A.: A strongly polynomial algorithm for a class of minimum-cost flow problems with separable convex objectives. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **45**(5), 1729–1761 (2016)
19. Westerlund, T., Pörn, R.: Solving pseudo-convex mixed integer optimization problems by cutting plane techniques. *Optimization and Engineering* **3**(3), 253–280 (2002)
20. Zhang, Y.H., Gong, Y.J., Gu, T.L., Li, Y., Zhang, J.: Flexible genetic algorithm: A simple and generic approach to node placement problems. *Applied Soft Computing* **52**, 457–470 (2017)