International Research Journal of Mathematics, Engineering and IT

ISSN: (2349-0322)
Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)
Impact Factor- 7.132 Volume 9, Issue 7, July 2022
Website- www.aarf.asia, **Email** : editoraarf@gmail.com

NEW ROW MAXIMA METHOD TO SOLVE MULTI-OBJECTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM

- **Ahongshangbam Nehru Singh, Research Scholar, Department of Mathematics, School of Science, Glocal University, Saharanpur.**
- **Dr Uma Shanker, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, School of Science, Glocal University, Saharanpur.**

ABSTRACT

In today's world, transportation play an important role in everyone's life. It is not showing its impact only on economic status but also improving the quality of life. Transportation devices provide the way for goods, products, people to be transferred from one location to another with an ease in both cost and time. Only the big cities having contemporary life is suffering from the problems associated with traffic jamming. Thus, transportation is a significant element of our lifestyle and in order to function efficiently, solving transportation problems is necessary as this will lead to productive finance, well managed transport so that all developmental goals related to transportation system can be attained. The government is dealing with the huge tasks to solve mobility issues at different levels. Transportation problems have been reviewed by S. Datta in the emergent nations. Transportation problem belongs to the problem of Linear programming problem, handling the allocation into different areas of need of individual items (finished or raw), in a way which minimises the entire costs of transportation, personal experience is exactly how people, such as drivers, riders, bikers or maybe pedestrians, percept and comprehend road environments, passenger terminals or perhaps IT systems in some elements of transport engineering.

KEYWORDS: Transportation, Mobility, Engineering, Linear Programming

1. INTRODUCTION

The traditional TP is one of some all around organized issues in tasks research and has been broadly concentrated in the writing. It is subcategory of straight programming issues for which straightforward and reasonable computation calculations that exploit the extraordinary design of the issue have been created. As far as the recurrence of event in the application, it is most significant issue in straight programming, as the way toward fostering its answers is

© Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)
A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

straightforward. Deciding a powerful answer for the TP is vital part in tasks research. TP centers on tracking down the best shipped plan for an item from numerous sources to various objections. A stockpile of merchandise can be gotten from various quantities of sources, and there is a particular interest for merchandise at every one of the different objections, and transportation expenses of per unit item between each source to every objective are known. Likewise, when taking care of transportation issues, in actuality, we regularly face vulnerability and dithering because of different uncontrolled elements. To manage vulnerability and dithering, fluffy/intuitionistic fluffy transportation issue has been created. The motivation behind this examination is to propose a successful strategy to track down the underlying fundamental plausible arrangement of the TP.Also a modified Vogel guess technique has been created to get the underlying essential possible arrangement which is exceptionally near ideal arrangement.

In the beginner, the model was formulated so it is called the transportation issue for deciding the ideal shipping pattern. To transport a particular good/product or services of all n origins i = 1, 2, 3,......, n to any of m destinations j = 1, 2,4,....., n is the conventional, extremely common transportation problem. The beginnings are production services with capacity a_1, a_2, a_3, ..., a_n, and end point(destination) is also depositoty (warehouse) with ph levels needed for b_1, b_2, b_3 and...b_n requires. A cost cij is given for the product's transport of the defined item from the resource i to the place j without any loss of generality,

$$c_{ij} \geq 0 \forall i, j$$

Hence, one should identify the amounts xij being moved from sources I = 1, 2, 3, ..., n to endpoints j = 1, 2, 3, ..., m in such a manner that the entire price is lessened.

$$\text{Minimize } Z = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{ij} x_{ij}$$

Conditions

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij} \leq a_i \qquad i = 1,2, \dots, m \qquad \text{(Row restrictions)}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{ij} \leq b_j \qquad j = 1,2, \dots n \qquad \text{(Column restrictions)}$$

$$x_{ij} \geq 0 \qquad \forall_i \text{ and } j$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} a_j \quad \text{((Balanced condition)}$$

Transportationproblem (TP) belongs to linear problems subclass, handling the transportation from a few sources (producing, or gracefully centring) of a solitary homogeneous substance into many sinks (destinations or distribution centers). Although the practitioner tends to a TP, at any point of demand he usually has a certain limit and a given requirement. The aim of TP is to reduce the overalltransportation expense while fulfilling flexibly and demand constraints by the quantities shifted from the origin to the destination.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Purushothkumar et al. (2018) In an industry transporting things from various sources to totally different sinks with probably the least cost is an important part of their minimizing expense of production. Tons of algorithms have been designed to resolve transportation problems with certain parameters. In sensible cases it is hard to find out those parameters in precise.

Vijayalakshmi and Bharathi (2016) Multi-unbiased Transportation problem optimization Using progressive algorithms Right here we presented a multi-objective transportation efficiency application of evolutionary algorithms (MOTSP). The selection of multi-unbiased transmission quality MOTSP (Multi-unbiased transportation quality) is in fact coded and selected as the parent. The works on Evolution have been designed to find a major compromise. In fact, a numerical illustration is shown in this particular program.

Dhodiya as well as patel (2017) Solving multiple interval problems by using the concept of grey scenario choice based on grey figures In addition to impartial abilities like cost, time, etc., an interval transportation issue constructs information on supply in several intervals. The idea of the best limit, left middle, half width and interval limit could be turned into a classical MOTP. Multi-target transportation interval, mass selection, successful solution, impact measurement, gray situation. This particular document presents the impartial transportation dilemma compromise formula, obtained using a grey scenario alternative that produces a principled weight dependent program. The comparison shows the compromise answer is actually better and acceptable for real life scenario when more than one unbiased sold in transporting a device.

3. TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM THEORY

Mathematical formulation of the problem:

May there be m beginnings, i^{th} starting point having a_i units of a specific product, while there will be n destinations (n might possibly be equivalent) with b_j units (as required by destination j).Delivery costs of a thing from every sources let say m to every one of destinations, let's say n are either acknowledged as legitimately or in a roundabout way as far as mileage, dispatching hours and so forth. Let 'x_{ij}' be the sum to be delivered from starting point (i^{th})to the destination (j^{th}) Presently the problem is to decide non-negative values of 'x_{ij}' satisfying both, the accessibility limitation:

$\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij} = a_i$ for i =1, 2, …, m

As well as the requirement constraint:

$\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{ij} = b_i$ for j =1, 2, …, n

Assuming the total availabilities ∑ ai satisfy the entire requirement ∑ bj, we get

$\sum a_i = \sum b_j$ (i=1, 2, …, m and j = 1,2,….,n) (3.1)

Now, the issue here is to decide non-negative (≥0) value of 'xij' satisfying both, the availability constraints:

$\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij} = a_i$ for i =1, 2, …, m.(3.2)

As well as the requirement constraint:

$\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{ij} = b_i$ for j =1, 2, …, n.(3.3)

Minimizing the shipping's complete cost,

$z = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij}\, c_{ij}$ (3.4)

It might be seen here that the imperative conditions (3.2), (3.3) and the objective function (3.4) are for the most part linear in xij, so it might be seen all together the problem of linear programming. The above issue of transportation can likewise be spoken to in an even form:

Data table presentation of transportation problem

Table 3.1

Data table presentation of transportationproblem

Origin

	1	**2**	**n**	**Supply**
1	x11	x12	x1n	a_1
	c11	c12	c1n	
2	x21	x22	x2n	a_2
	c21	c22	c2n	
…	…	…	…	…
m	xm1	xm2	xmn	a_m
	cm1	cm2	cmn	
Demand	b_1	b_2	b_n	

© **Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)**
A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

The transportation table speaks to a matrix inside a matrix. One is the cost matrix which refers to the unit cost of transportation, showing the supply cost a unit startying with the source to the destined place that isj^{th}. The matrix of transportation factors xij superimposed on this matrix shows the amount sent from ith source to j^{th}. The measures of the provisions ai accessible in source I and the amount demanded in bj are shown on the rights and basic side of the transportation table.

FUZZY PRELIMINARIES

- **Definition:**

This approach refers to the functions that are adding restrictions or constraints to the problem, either maximum or minimum (cost, time, etc.) characterized by degree of membership and membership. As the worth of membership is higher, it is closer to being ideal.Here the linear membership function is utilized which is characterized as:

$$\mu_k\left(x_{ij}^k\right) = \begin{Bmatrix} 1 & x_{ij}^k \leq L_k \\ \frac{U_k - x_{ij}^k}{U_k - L_k} & L_k \leq x_{ij}^k \leq U_k \\ 0 & x_{ij}^k \leq L_k \end{Bmatrix} \quad (3.5)$$

Where $L_k \neq U_k$, k=1, 2,....................p. If $L_k = U_k$then for any value of k, the degree of membership or membership value is 1.

NEW ROW MAXIMA METHOD

Step 1 Discover the membership value for every intersection of row and column, called as cell along with for every objective table.

Step 2 Develop another table where every cell will have normal degree of membership of every single objective table.

Step 3 Select the principal row and search the greatest degree of membership, allot that particular cell however much as could reasonably be expected to get edge condition, edge condition either in flexibly or sought after, or in both.

Step 4 If edge condition is in row (for example in gracefully), then proceed to the succeedingrow and rehash step 3. If column has edges condition (for example sought after), then hunt next most extreme degree of membership inaforementioned row and distribute that particular cell however much as could be expected to get edge condition.

Step 5 Rehash step 3 and step 4 until flexibly and request are depleted.

- **Example 1:**

Let's consider the accompanying example to delineate new row maxima method.

A supplier, gracefully a commodity starring withvaried sources to discrete objectives, must decide for the purpose of minimizing costs and transportation time in this transportation issue. The cost and time details shall be as follows:

Table 3.2 Time statistics

Destination → **Sources ↓**	**D1**	**D2**	**D3**	**Supply**
S1	15	20	14	12
S2	24	18	15	15
S3	12	25	6	14
Demand	11	17	16	41

Table 3.3 Cost statistics

Destination → **Sources ↓**	**D1**	**D2**	**D3**	**Supply**
S1	11	16	15	12
S2	15	11	16	15
S3	9	22	9	11
Demand	11	17	16	41

As the first step we measure the membership value, Uk = 28 and Lk = 8 are the following:

Table 3.4 Membership value for time

Destination → **Sources ↓**	**D1**	**D2**	**D3**	**Supply**
S1	0.5	0.35	0.9	12
S2	0.2	0.72	0.35	15
S3	0.6	0.1	1.1	11
Demand	11	17	16	41

The membership value for cost is as follows, Uk = 20, and Lk = 6.

Table 3.5 Membership value for cost

Destination → Sources ↓	D1	D2	D3	Supply
S1	0.75	0.43	0.57	12
S2	0.39	0.71	0.43	15
S3	0.76	0	1	11
Demand	11	17	16	41

Now measure the average benefit of membership

Table 3.6 Average membership value

Destination → Sources ↓	D1	D2	D3	Supply
S1	0.695	0.33	0.775	12
S2	0.295	0.67	0.34	15
S3	0.78	0.1	1.2	14
Demand	11	17	16	41

After applying the new row maxima method, the solution obtained is: X = {X_{11} = 10, X_{13} = 4, X_{22} = 15, X_{23} = 1, X_{33} =12}

The corresponding objective functions values are$f^1(x)$ = 518and$f^2(x)$ = 374

- **Example:** Let us consider another example introduced by numerous analysts having the accompanying characteristics.

Table 3.7 Penalties

Destination → Sources ↓	D1	D2	D3	D4	Supply
S1	0.9	2	7	7	6
S2	0.9	9	3	4	17
S3	7.7	9	4	6	16
Demand	9	5	12	18	45

Table 3.8 Penalties

Destination → **Sources ↓**	**D1**	**D2**	**D3**	**D4**	**Supply**
S1	3.8	3.8	3.3	6	6
S2	4	7	8	7	17
S3	7	3	6.2	3	16
Demand	9	5	12	18	45

The first step is to determine degree of membership for the first objective table where Uk = 9 and Lk = 1

Table 3.9 Membership value for penalties table 3.7

Destination → **Sources ↓**	**D1**	**D2**	**D3**	**D4**	**Supply**
S1	1	0.775	0.35	0.18	6
S2	1	0.3	0.55	0.67	17
S3	0.125	0.3	0.634	0.476	16
Demand	9	5	12	18	45

The second table membership meaning for Uk=10 and Lk=1 is then the following:

Table 3.10 Membership value for penalties table 3.7

Destination → **Sources ↓**	**D1**	**D2**	**D3**	**D4**	**Supply**
S1	0.557	0.557	0.668	0.595	6
S2	0.556	0.323	0.323	0.2	17
S3	0.545	0.989	0.665	2	16
Demand	9	5	12	18	45

Here we calculate average membership value

© **Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)**

Table 3.11 Average membership value

Destination → Sources ↓	D1	D2	D3	D4	Supply
S1	0.92	0.68	0.55	0.67	6
S2	0.67	0.22	0.53	0.52	17
S3	0.37	0.56	0.39	0.91	16
Demand	11	5	12	18	45

On applying the new row maxima method we get the solution as follows: X = {X_{11} = 8, X_{21} = 3, X_{23} = 14, X_{24} = 2, X_{32} = 3, X_{34} =14}

The corresponding values for the objective functions are $f^1(x) = 172$ and $f^2(x) = 213$.

- **Example:** Let us consider one more example of MOTP introduced in having the accompanying characteristics.

Table 3.12 Penalties

Destination → Sources ↓	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	Supply
S1	8.9	11	7.9	7	8.9	6
S2	9	4.5	9	8.2	6	5
S3	7.2	7	11	12	2	3
S4	7	9	14	3	3	8.3
Demand	3	3	7	3	5	22

Table 3.13 Penalties

Destination → Sources ↓	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	Supply
S1	3	8	9	2	3	6
S2	2	8	8	6	3	5
S3	9	2	9	5	6	3
S4	3	9	7	8	9	8.3
Demand	3	3	7	3	5	22

Table 3.14 Penalties

Destination → **Sources ↓**	**D1**	**D2**	**D3**	**D4**	**D5**	**Supply**
S1	3	6	5	3	7	6
S2	5	9	6	7	3	5
S3	6	2	7	5	7	3
S4	7	7	9	5	2	8.3
Demand	3	3	7	3	5	22

In the first step, for the first objective table we calculate the membership value, Uk = 12 and Lk = 2, then the membership value is as follows:

Table 3.15 Membership value for penalties table 3.12

Destination → **Sources ↓**	**D1**	**D2**	**D3**	**D4**	**D5**	**Supply**
S1	0.3	0	0.3	0.6	0.3	6
S2	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.7	5
S3	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.1	0.9	3
S4	0.6	0.4	0.1	1	1	8.3
Demand	3	3	7	3	5	22

The second objective table membership value, here Uk = 9 and Lk = 1, is then the following membership values:

Table 3.16 Membership value for penalties table 3.13

Destination → **Sources ↓**	**D1**	**D2**	**D3**	**D4**	**D5**	**Supply**
S1	0.92	0.1	0.32	2	0.73	6
S2	0.9	0.1	0.1	1	0.9	5
S3	0.9	2	0.22	0.73	0.7	3
S4	0.95	0.22	0.58	0.5	0.22	8.3
Demand	3	3	7	3	5	22

The third target table membership value, here Uk = 9 and Lk = 1 is the following then the membership values:

Table 3.17 Membership value for penalties table 3.14

Destination → Sources ↓	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	Supply
S1	0.92	0.59	0.43	0.9	0.42	6
S2	0.57	0.22	0.71	0.1	0.92	5
S3	0.6	0.81	0.65	0.82	0.4	3
S4	0.52	0.1	0.29	0.82	2	8.3
Demand	3	3	7	3	5	22

Here we calculate average membership value

Table 3.18 Average membership value

Destination → Sources ↓	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	Supply
S1	0.75	0.3	0.3	0.76	0.6	6
S2	0.82	0.29	0.4	0.42	0.79	5
S3	0.55	0.79	0.39	0.56	0.65	3
S4	0.71	0.24	0.3	0.6	0.8	8.3
Demand	3	3	7	3	5	22

On applying the new row maxima method, the solution obtained is: $X = \{X_{11} = 3, X_{14}= 2, X_{25} = 4, X_{32} = 2, X_{41} = 1, X_{42} =2, X_{43} =6\}$

The corresponding objective functions values are $f^1(x) = 157$, $f^2(x) = 72$ and $f^3(x) = 86$

SUMMARIZED RESULTS AND COMMENTS

The consequences of the over three examples are summed up and appeared beneath in Tables 3.19, 3.20, 3.21.

Table 3.19: Comparison between different approaches

Name of the approach	$F^1(x)$	$F^2(x)$
Fuzzy goal programming	517.5	374
New Row Maxima Method	518	374
Ideal Solution	517	374

Table 3.20 Comparison between different approaches

Name of the approach	**$f^1(x)$**	**$f^2(x)$**
Fuzzy goal programming method	160	195
Fuzzy programming to solve bi objective	160.8591	193.926
Trust region algorithm	173	173
New Row Maxima Method	172	213
Ideal Solution	143	167

Table 3.21 Comparison between different approaches

Name of the approach	**$f^1(x)$**	**$f^2(x)$**	**$f^3(x)$**
Interactive algorithms	127	104	76
Fuzzy goal programming method	127	104	76
Fuzzy programming goal programming	126.793	103.1031	77.52
Trust region algorithm	144	104	73
New Row Maxima Method	157	72	86
Ideal Solution	102	72	64

4. CONCLUSION

For the three examples, new row maxima method is applied and arrangement is acquired. The perfect answer for the over three examples is gotten by using TORA software. For first example perfect arrangement and arrangement by new row maxima method are practically equivalent for both the measures. Be that as it may, in second and third example new row maxima method doesn't give arrangement equivalent to the perfect answer for all the punishment standards. Be that as it may, if we contrast this method and the other methods in the writing for a portion of the objectives, it gives better arrangement and for some the objectives it gives same arrangement.

The transport problem aims to fulfill destination requirements entirely at the minimum possible cost within the limitation of production capacity. Whenever products are moved through a number of distribution networks (wholesalers, dealers, distributors, and so on) from the point of view of manufacturers to end users, shipping costs must be minimised so as to improve profit from sales.

5. REFERENCES

1. Kaur, Amarpreet& Kumar, Amit. (2011). A new method for solving fuzzy transportation problems using ranking function. Applied Mathematical Modelling. 12. 10.1016/j.apm.2011.05.012.
2. Zhenning Dong ; Jianhua Ma "A kind of shortest time limit transportation problem with cost constraints, Fifth World Congress on Intelligent Control and Automation, WCICA, 2004, 2963 - 2966 Vol.4.
3. CharalamposPapamanthou, Konstantinos Paparrizos, Nikolaos Samaras, "Computational experience with exterior point algorithms for the transportation problem", Applied Mathematics and Computation, Volume 158, Issue 2, 5 November 2004, pp.459-475.
4. Sreenivas M and Srinivas T, "Probablistic Transportation Problem (PTP)", International Journal of Statistics and Systems, Vol. 3, No. 1 (2008), pp. 83 – 89.
5. Surapati, P. and Roy, T. K. "Multi-objective transportation model with fuzzy parameters: Priority based fuzzy goal programming approach", Journal of transportation Systems Engineering and Information Technology, Vol. 8, pp. 40-48, 2008.
6. Lau, H. C. W., Chan, T. M., Tsui, W. T., Chan, F. T. S., Ho, G. T. S. and Choy, K. L. "A fuzzy guided multi-objective evolutionary algorithm model for solving transportation problem", Expert System with Applications: An International Journal, Vol. 36, pp. 8255-8268, 2009.
7. Amit Kumar, Anila Gupta and Amarpreet Kaur, "Method for Solving Fully Fuzzy Assignment Problems Using Triangular Fuzzy Numbers", International Journal of Computer and Information Engineering, 3 : 4, 2009, pp. 231 – 234
8. Aaron Golub, "Welfare and Equity Impacts of Gasoline Price Changes under Different Public Transportation Service Levels", Journal of Public Transportation, Vol. 13, No. 3 (2010), pp. 1 – 21
9. William J. Cook, Daniel G. Espinoza and Marcos Goycoolea, "Generalized Domino – Parity Inequalities for the Symmetric Traveling Salesman Problem", Mathematics of Operations Research, Vol. 35, No. 2 (2010), pp. 479 – 493.
10. Debashis Dutta and Satyanarayana Murthy A, "Fuzzy transportation problem with additional restrictions", ARPN Journal of Engineering and Applied sciences, Vol. 5, No. 2 (2010), pp. 36-40