

Experimental results of the IBSH with $f_1(M, \pi)$ and $f_3(M, \pi)$ as the heuristic evaluation function under four control factor levels, i.e., $c_1 \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, are recorded in Table 1 and Table 2, respectively. The best result for each instance under different factor levels are marked in bold.

Table 1 Experimental results of IBSH algorithm with $f_1(M, \pi)$ under different control factor values

Instance	$c_1 = 1$	$c_1 = 2$	$c_1 = 3$	$c_1 = 4$
In01	280	282	283	292
In02	379	380	381	413
In03	469	469	469	545
In04	587	572	591	675
In05	230	231	224	235
In06	327	315	309	320
In07	392	384	380	397
In08	468	455	450	488
In09	172	168	172	181
In10	234	233	234	230
In11	277	276	274	284
In12	329	328	328	330
In13	159	159	154	167
In14	225	221	216	213
In15	263	262	259	266
In16	310	315	306	329

As shown in Table 1, with $f_1(M, \pi)$ as the heuristic evaluation function, IBSH with $c_1 = 1$ (2, 3, and 4) can find best results in 3 (4, 10, and 2) out of 16 instances. Hence, we set $c_1 = 3$ in $f_1(M, \pi)$.

Table 2 Experimental results of IBSH algorithm with $f_3(M, \pi)$ under different control factor values

Instance	$c_1 = 1$	$c_1 = 2$	$c_1 = 3$	$c_1 = 4$
In01	272	277	278	278
In02	375	370	370	370
In03	454	451	453	453
In04	545	530	530	530
In05	221	230	230	230
In06	305	320	320	320
In07	374	381	381	381
In08	449	452	452	452
In09	166	170	170	170
In10	229	235	238	238
In11	274	275	284	284
In12	328	324	326	326
In13	154	165	165	165
In14	217	220	220	220
In15	255	267	267	267
In16	301	304	304	304

As shown in Table 2, with $f_3(M, \pi)$ as the heuristic evaluation function, IBSH with $c_1 = 1$ (2, 3, and 4)

can find best results in 12 (4, 2, and 2) out of 16 instances. Hence, we set $c_1 = 1$ in $f_3(M, \pi)$.