## Appendix: supplementary material

## 7 Detail computational results

Tables 6 - 10 presents a comparison between the proposed LNS and the CMSA on a variety of benchmark instances. The table provide the results for each algorithm in terms of the minimum cost  $f_{\min}$ , average cost  $f_{\text{avg}}$ , and improvement in percentage. The instances are represented by their parameters (n, m, k), which refer to the size and configuration of each benchmark instance. The improvement is calculated based on the difference in performance between the two algorithms.

Tables 11 - 14 compare the proposed LNS against multiple metaheuristics: MA, VNS, and CMSA. These table is based on all other set of benchmark instances. For each algorithm, the table provides the  $f_{\min}$  and average cost  $f_{\text{avg}}$ . Since CMSA is currently the best performing metaheuristic algorithm for MMNPP, we provide the percentage improvement of LNS over CMSA in terms of the objective function value in the last column of the table.

Table 6: Comparison between LNS and CMSA on all benchmark instances (Benchmark set A)  $\,$ 

Ins	(n, m, k)	CMS	SA		our LNS		Improv	ement
1113.	(10, 110, 10)	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{t}(s)$	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$
1	(50,2,5)	294.85	458.54	234.26	338.58	1090.21	20.55%	26.16%
2	(50,5,5)	12974.75	14999.21	9848.17	12471.75	1055.20	24.10%	16.85%
3	(50,10,5)	51399.53	53225.28	42785.16	45894.34	633.62	16.76%	13.77%
4	(50,20,5)	98444.57	103299.49	91302.56	95046.7	704.86	7.25%	7.99%
5	(50,2,10)	3366.89	3996.26	2223.88	2682.48	851.39	33.95%	32.88%
6	(50,5,10)	33289.62	34747.88	25681.99	27118.34	773.66	22.85%	21.96%
7	(50,10,10)	65972.11	70536.97	60469.86	64058.23	1009.41	8.34%	9.18%
8	(50,20,10)	109470.1	114740.04	102855.87	106362.72	1099.75	6.04%	7.30%
9	(50,2,20)	17069.34	17151.06	12343.78	12343.78	368.89	27.68%	28.03%
10	(50,5,20)	61205.94	61820.11	61199.46	62300.31	818.89	0.01%	-0.78%
11	(50,10,20)	92308.56	94080.31	96735.78	98348.11	865.96	-4.80%	-4.54%
12	(50,20,20)			124955.91			2.25%	1.25%
13	(100,2,5)	50.55	78.27	27.62	74.99	1556.19	45.37%	4.18%
14	(100,5,5)	5444.88	8013.43	6791.45	8746.02	1445.37	-24.73%	-9.14%
15	(100,10,5)	37770.65	42169.27	34550.74	39125.26	1238.94	8.52%	7.22%
16	(100,20,5)	92352.47	92957.15	87700.82	89776.19	713.78	5.04%	3.42%
17	(100,2,10)	1616.01	1926.61	531.63	796.19	1370.70	67.10%	58.67%
18	(100,5,10)	24439.21	26225.34	18922.63	20636.5	1466.52	22.57%	21.31%
19	(100,10,10)	63435.93	67685.66	53626.62	59431.65	1294.05	15.46%	12.19%
20	(100,20,10)	117305.31	120362.8	108301.13	112139.33	837.05	7.68%	6.83%
21	(100,2,20)	5117.89	5797.95	2577.08	3303.21	1434.05	49.65%	43.03%
22	(100,5,20)	37700.29	39782.24	30977.84	34027.43	1363.78	17.83%	14.47%
23	(100,10,20)	79934.36	79967.17	73924.25	76321.54	1193.30	7.52%	4.56%
24	(100,20,20)	125657.42	127796.1	118053.59	122705.34	1050.01	6.05%	3.98%
25	(500,2,5)	147.61	183.01	68.34	91.37	1181.77	53.70%	50.07%
26	(500,5,5)	9284.33	9708.58	5908.32	7155.97	1229.68	36.36%	26.29%
27	(500,10,5)	35423.97	35720.59	30778.2	32850.72	850.62	13.11%	8.03%
28	(500,20,5)	86328.01	87447.88	77249.02	80708.49	759.99	10.52%	7.71%
29	(500,2,10)	490.93	564.7	360.16	424.12	1216.01	26.64%	24.90%
30	(500,5,10)	14677.62	15084.17	12530.2	13418.41	706.39	14.63%	11.04%
31	(500,10,10)	49047.65	51929.08	46309.03	48267.42	822.30	5.58%	7.05%
32	(500,20,10)	113147.89	115095.43	104520.96	107958.51	1081.48	7.62%	6.20%
33	(500,2,20)	1261.53	1261.53	1060.56	1116.87	1194.81	15.93%	11.47%
34	(500,5,20)	23087.41	23284.92	18384.31	20654.81	1078.82	20.37%	11.30%
35	(500,10,20)	64953.26	67698.03	61019.37	63660.49	1017.11	6.06%	5.96%
36	(500,20,20)	136291.8	139669.26	125526.86	129674.98	1078.99	7.90%	7.16%
	#Best						34	33

 $Table\ 7:\ Comparison\ between\ LNS\ and\ CMSA\ on\ all\ benchmark\ instances\ (Benchmark\ set\ B)$ 

Ins.	(n, m, k)	CMS	SA		our LNS		Improv	ement
1110.	(10, 110, 10)	$\overline{\overline{f}}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{\overline{f}_{min}}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{t}(s)$	$\overline{\overline{f}}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$
1	(50,2,5)	269.78	426.77	224.85	373.5	913.87	16.66%	12.48%
2	(50,5,5)	12529.99	16590.89	11715.24	14455.8	864.34	6.50%	12.87%
3	(50,10,5)	50035.27	52259.75	42567.06	49320.6	776.35	14.93%	5.62%
4	(50,20,5)	99633.6	102202.35	90165.29	98506.82	412.42	9.50%	3.62%
5	(50,2,10)	3165.56	4728.01	2006.52	2710.39	938.29	36.61%	42.67%
6	(50,5,10)	36285.8	38813.85	27023.58	30291.2	420.26	25.53%	21.96%
7	(50,10,10)	71384.18	74239.12	66004.84	69362.44	423.59	7.54%	6.57%
8	(50,20,10)	114676.85	117931.57	109155.67	113069.99	1090.88	4.81%	4.12%
9	(50,2,20)	17659.29	17746.41	16545.15	16580.43	211.26	6.31%	6.57%
10	(50,5,20)	66794.1	67979.34	62429.31	63384.39	198.37	6.53%	6.76%
11	(50,10,20)	100390.1	101963.47	100749.01	102072.86	836.17	-0.36%	-0.11%
12	(50,20,20)	134024.96	136016.19	133416.51	134531.06	739.19	0.45%	1.09%
13	(100,2,5)	64.93	92.49	81.19	113.37	1172.12	-25.05%	-22.58%
14	(100,5,5)	6157.09	7645.42	6823.14	9290.02	920.06	-10.82%	-21.51%
15	(100,10,5)	39490.32	40189.03	36725.57	39305.89	1124.99	7.00%	2.20%
16	(100,20,5)	91628.39	93946.31	89018.19	92832.36	535.26	2.85%	1.19%
17	(100,2,10)	964.07	1126.72	772.54	1015.56	1266.88	19.87%	9.87%
18	(100,5,10)	23247.75	24614.24	20662.86	22171.56	988.45	11.12%	9.92%
19	(100,10,10)	59052	65073.34	57088.35	61472.02	745.44	-2.48%	5.82%
20	(100,20,10)			108957.81			6.51%	4.74%
21	(100,2,20)	4828.95	5358.54	3470.58	4039.03	1163.53	28.13%	24.62%
22	(100,5,20)	36975.48	38335.13	34499.7	36601.35	1006.88	6.70%	4.52%
23	(100,10,20)	78302.45	81035.58	73684.7	76998.15	1152.30	5.90%	4.98%
24	(100,20,20)	125654.84	128735.7	121892.5	125921.04	847.84	2.99%	2.19%
25	(500,2,5)	97.99	165.24	82.84	114.86	1391.53	15.46%	30.49%
26	(500,5,5)	8454.85	10038.43	6080	7678.56	1132.03	28.09%	23.51%
27	(500,10,5)	35727.47	37903.1	29545.53	33068.9	1051.89	17.30%	12.75%
28	(500,20,5)	85756.42	88754.86	74745.27	79796.19	902.40	12.84%	10.09%
29	(500,2,10)	499.87	577.19	337.91	509.12	1073.50	32.40%	11.79%
30	(500,5,10)	14764.71	15084.17	13120	13418.41	706.39	14.63%	11.04%
31	(500,10,10)	51254.57	52866.13	47953.5	49733.97	1044.56	6.44%	5.92%
32	(500,20,10)			102454.94			6.85%	4.86%
33	(500,2,20)	1375.23	1378.87	1128.7	1299.39	1058.33	17.93%	5.76%
34	(500,5,20)	24137.06	24137.06	20396.66	21773.88	874.24	15.50%	10.94%
35	(500,10,20)	64983.04	66697.85	62317.26	64746.53	961.46	4.10%	2.93%
36	(500,20,20)	134533.41	135346.7	125514.98	130426.04	1320.62	6.70%	3.64%
	#Best						32	33

Table 8: Comparison between LNS and Self-Adaptive CMSA on all benchmark instances (Benchmark set C)

Ins	(n, m, k)	CMS	SA		our LNS		Improv	ement
1113.	(n, m, n)	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{t}(s)$	$\overline{\overline{f}}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$
1	(50,2,5)	315.66	448.7	231.96	342.59	1340.06	26.52%	23.65%
2	(50,5,5)	12987.55	16603.3	11777.38	14264.78	1056.81	9.32%	14.08%
3	(50,10,5)	54698.15	57273.17	45945.59	49285.38	697.39	16.00%	13.95%
4	(50,20,5)	101576.12	107895.51	96529.74	100995.58	916.91	4.97%	6.40%
5	(50,2,10)	3549.69	3986.71	1700.29	2407.37	1236.57	52.10%	39.62%
6	(50,5,10)	30697.83	35889.15	26916.96	29862.22	1123.43	12.32%	16.79%
7	(50,10,10)	74265.87	78127.14	66095.49	69747.96	868.69	11.00%	10.73%
8	(50,20,10)	118317.55	121769.87	109462.61	114780.55	919.84	7.48%	5.74%
9	(50,2,20)	16198.39	16257.72	24539.5	24539.5	295.68	-51.49%	-50.94%
10	(50,5,20)	56333.92	57146.12	57875.99	58240.58	1005.98	-2.74%	-1.92%
11	(50,10,20)	95120.11	98346.07	97730.73	99262.92	1261.60	-2.74%	-0.93%
12	(50,20,20)	132584.06	134749.95	133416.51	134531.06	1111.56	1.05%	1.78%
13	(100,2,5)	39.57	88.43	52.52	98.49	1535.70	-32.74%	-12.37%
14	(100,5,5)	6257.95	7663.89	6894.13	8879.33	1469.38	-21.15%	-15.96%
15	(100,10,5)	33861.81	42659.05	35799.16	40814.19	1371.42	-5.72%	4.32%
16	(100,20,5)	86947.52	90904.51	84473.4	89122.43	1072.59	2.70%	1.24%
17	(100,2,10)	778.48	1208.83	640.61	931.72	1385.15	17.71%	22.92%
18	(100,5,10)	22368.46	24757.82	19418.32	20814.62	1516.61	13.19%	15.93%
19	(100,10,10)	61935.85	65393.86	57088.35	61472.02	1465.55	7.83%	6.00%
20	(100,20,10)	117349.72	122167.3	106648.98	113192.37	1380.51	9.12%	7.35%
21	(100,2,20)	3825.32	4740.6	3196.85	3720.57	1484.86	16.43%	21.52%
22	(100,5,20)	36693.5	39002.51	32126.82	35163.58	1453.24	12.45%	9.84%
23	(100,10,20)	78627.98	82451.89	74850.77	77527.92	1503.29	4.80%	5.97%
24	(100,20,20)	129803.75	130524.01	122058.18	124569.88	1538.40	5.97%	4.56%
25	(500,2,5)	102.93	177.45	53.07	78.92	1308.42	48.44%	55.53%
26	(500,5,5)	8873.65	9885.54	5689.99	6772.99	1476.35	35.88%	31.49%
27	(500,10,5)	35097.66	37132.89	25397.83	31495.5	1145.13	27.64%	15.18%
28	(500,20,5)	83179.91	85095.87	76097.5	79828.13	1351.05	8.51%	6.19%
29	(500,2,10)	496.04	601.41	356.6	425.64	1506.56	28.11%	29.23%
30	(500,5,10)	15763.34	15777.66	13120	14269.83	1115.21	16.77%	9.56%
31	(500,10,10)	52857.27	52857.27	45117.5	48218.91	1365.39	14.64%	8.78%
32	(500,20,10)	105880.18		101081.51	106182.26		7.35%	5.58%
33	(500,2,20)	1278.21	1363.24	1109.04	1223.06	957.97	17.48%	7.97%
34	(500,5,20)	21096.09	23081.48	18973.94	21534.88	1188.59	10.06%	6.70%
35	(500,10,20)	66166.26	67291.51	61727.79	64107.13	1234.50	6.71%	4.73%
36	(500,20,20)	135522.11	138086.2	123033.9	130040.58	1667.35	9.21%	5.83%
	#Best						30	31

Table 9: Comparison between RNS and CMSA on all benchmark instances (Benchmark set D)

Ins.	(n, m, k)	CMSA	A [?]		our RNS		Improvement		
11101	(10, 110, 10)	$\overline{\overline{f}}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{\overline{f}}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{t}(s)$	$\overline{\overline{f}}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	
1	(50,2,5)	259.37	331.74	219.98	319.82	1181.92	15.19%	3.59%	
2	(50,5,5)	13349.36	18165.86	12026.72	14092.34	1109.25	9.91%	22.42%	
3	(50,10,5)	47209.97	55927.33	43521.93	49353.9	1065.22	7.81%	11.75%	
4	(50,20,5)	101646.18	104588.41	96040.09	98826.67	682.40	5.52%	5.51%	
5	(50,2,10)	3248.55	3869.17	2097.06	2801.86	1077.11	35.45%	27.59%	
6	(50,5,10)	33022.08	36431.28	26691.99	29715.36	690.70	19.17%	18.43%	
7	(50,10,10)	77325.11	77958.7	64831.27	69497.35	1265.18	16.16%	10.85%	
8	(50,20,10)	115050.47	119382.14	108277.56	112580.63	1021.68	5.89%	5.70%	
9	(50,2,20)	18559.03	18796.03	16531.67	16531.67	364.34	10.92%	12.05%	
10	(50,5,20)	58028.36	58955.2	59055.74	59258.13	561.80	-1.77%	-0.51%	
11	(50,10,20)	99126.04	100567.9	94405.06	94933.27	995.66	4.76%	5.60%	
12	(50,20,20)	135484.42	137732.2	132755.14	133926.13	917.75	2.01%	2.76%	
13	(100,2,5)	47.35	86.08	76.74	118.11	1538.12	-62.06%	-37.21%	
14	(100,5,5)	6492.37	7556.08	6894.13	8923.66	1415.81	-6.19%	-18.10%	
15	(100,10,5)	40133.88	40531.3	36556.22	40340.33	1410.58	8.91%	0.47%	
16	(100,20,5)	89414.91	92156.78	85753.56	90597.92	918.07	4.09%	1.69%	
17	(100,2,10)	605.48	1240.54	783.7	946.45	1658.95	-29.44%	23.71%	
18	(100,5,10)	22158.33	25676.38	20055.44	21856.18	1255.93	9.49%	14.88%	
19	(100,10,10)	64407.26	65359.88	58453.21	60894.24	1323.89	9.24%	6.83%	
20	(100,20,10)	116703.74	120258.67	102931.11	111229.11	1379.83	11.80%	7.51%	
21	(100,2,20)	4082.92	4379.85	3324.13	4004.06	1463.85	18.58%	8.58%	
22	(100,5,20)	36973.17	38764.72	33748.8	36185.12	1170.79	8.72%	6.65%	
23	(100,10,20)	78115.72	80067.68	71724.76	76837.82	1451.13	8.18%	4.03%	
24	(100,20,20)	124628.6	129232.72	120178.72	122752.29	1618.35	3.57%	5.01%	
25	(500,2,5)	110.87	157.73	48.68	79.29	1333.46	56.10%	49.73%	
26	(500,5,5)	7935.47	9337.33	5607.35	6636.39	1384.87	29.34%	28.93%	
27	(500,10,5)	36523.96	38212.02	31131.92	32659.71	1189.87	14.76%	14.53%	
28	(500,20,5)	79500.16	87618.55	77030.19	80321.34	1262.45	3.11%	8.33%	
29	(500,2,10)	522.48	611.63	370.31	489.02	1379.55	29.12%	20.05%	
30	(500,5,10)	15461.21	16278.27	13324.22	13936.81	1300.72	13.82%	14.38%	
31	(500,10,10)	53670.2	53670.2	47319.92	49459.41	1285.18	11.83%	7.85%	
32	(500,20,10)	107663.95	112277.33	99746.55	105556.61	1270.63	7.35%	5.99%	
33	(500,2,20)	1278.21	1363.24	1109.04	1223.06	1500.29	13.23%	10.28%	
34	(500,5,20)	23535.27	23535.27	19862.11	20960.37	1115.59	15.61%	10.94%	
35	(500,10,20)	64350.14	65616.54	62061.19	63481	1083.14	3.56%	3.25%	
36	(500,20,20)	133688.11	133724.84	126188.1	129403.22	1327.66	5.61%	3.23%	
	#Best						32	33	

Table 10: Comparison between LNS and CMSA on all benchmark instances (Benchmark set E)

Ins.	(n, m, k)	CMS	SA		our LNS		Improv	ement
1110.	(10, 110, 10)	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{\overline{f}_{min}}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{t}(s)$	$\overline{\overline{f}}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$
1	(50,2,5)	250.71	379.08	195.53	292.79	1359.64	22.01%	22.76%
2	(50,5,5)	14812.82	17407.75	10728.54	13346.9	1023.13	27.57%	23.33%
3	(50,10,5)	51673.8	57177.61	44862.36	48805.32	710.31	13.18%	14.64%
4	(50,20,5)	100633.99	107561.19	91911.88	97882.18	982.67	8.67%	9.00%
5	(50,2,10)	2506.37	3701.38	2036.6	2708.5	1410.39	18.74%	26.82%
6	(50,5,10)	36852.3	40561.34	26784.53	28846.86	1247.05	27.32%	28.88%
7	(50,10,10)	73320.65	77355.67	67183.19	69822.9	953.05	8.37%	9.74%
8	(50,20,10)	115034.46	119113.2	108762.88	112686.74	1017.32	5.45%	5.40%
9	(50,2,20)	20258.86	20267.11	21742.08	21742.08	24.48	-7.32%	-7.28%
10	(50,5,20)	58421.24	59433.13	67120.47	67711.34	284.41	-14.89%	-13.93%
11	(50,10,20)	99815.82	101040.36	98692.08	99465.25	233.74	1.13%	1.56%
12	(50,20,20)	135130.26		129602.51	132624.63	1039.55	4.09%	3.09%
13	(100,2,5)	33.56	61.1	57.03	86.45	1516.47	-69.95%	-41.48%
14	(100,5,5)	6964.79	7814.6	6993.37	8879.33	1472.83	-0.41%	-13.62%
15	(100,10,5)	39145.27	41203.8	34251.6	40039.78	1054.09	12.50%	2.83%
16	(100,20,5)	93565.39	95762.98	84473.4	89122.43	1082.73	9.72%	6.93%
17	(100,2,10)	1190.99	1711.93	645.84	897.24	1362.02	45.77%	47.59%
18	(100,5,10)	22188.78	25656.11	19089.06	21253.45	1172.64	13.97%	17.16%
19	(100,10,10)	70979.68	74407.83	57860.6	61807.51	1305.50	18.48%	16.93%
20	(100,20,10)	121402.35	122038.46	106071.24	112440.25	658.80	12.63%	7.86%
21	(100,2,20)	4265.26	5156.54	3031.26	3788.41	1364.80	28.93%	26.53%
22	(100,5,20)	37891.46	40240.04	30694.88	34784.75	1229.53	18.99%	13.56%
23	(100,10,20)	83151.43	84787.8	73503.68	78486.47	1307.65	11.60%	7.43%
24	(100,20,20)	129394.87	131217.02	119643.81	123718.67	1204.80	7.54%	5.71%
25	(500,2,5)	157.17	236.33	51.45	94.09	1372.10	67.26%	60.19%
26	(500,5,5)	7741.14	9111.47	7007.76	7865.28	1322.21	9.47%	13.68%
27	(500,10,5)	37252.97	39166.85	28991.02	33039.89	1348.34	22.18%	15.64%
28	(500,20,5)	88369.21	88883.42	76742.53	80427.37	1071.70	13.16%	9.51%
29	(500,2,10)	506.31	582.26	342.83	463.69	1281.85	32.29%	20.36%
30	(500,5,10)	15374.2	16142.35	13612.91	14345.03	1145.98	11.46%	11.13%
31	(500,10,10)	51909.58	52683.49	43347.42	49070.8	981.69	16.49%	6.86%
32	(500,20,10)	109303.3		100976.26			7.62%	6.60%
33	(500,2,20)	1236.93	1255.96	1020.69	1155.84	957.97	17.48%	7.97%
34	(500,5,20)	21096.09	23081.48	18973.94	21534.88	1188.59	10.06%	6.70%
35	(500,10,20)	66166.26	67291.51	61727.79	64107.13	1234.50	6.71%	4.73%
36	(500,20,20)	135522.11	138086.2	123033.9	130040.58	1667.35	9.21%	5.83%
	#Best						32	32

Table 11: Comparison between LNS and other metaheuristics on benchmark instances (Benchmark set B)

Ins.	(n,k)	M	A	VN	IS	CM	SA	our LNS		Improvement(%)	
	(**,**)	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$								
1	(50, 5)	46423.91	50084.19	46453.83	50329.96	40617.16	42869.94	36168.11	40664.18	10.95%	5.15%
2	(50, 10)	62380.19	65193.65	60120.50	64585.90	56378.10	58928.14	51047.65	53858.50	9.45%	8.60%
3	(50, 20)	81286.98	82822.79	89501.95	95170.04	79717.11	80926.35	78284.99	79142.18	1.80%	2.20%
4	(100, 5)	45430.13	48064.43	42619.04	46259.22	34335.18	35468.31	33162.02	35385.41	3.42%	0.23%
5	(100, 10)	59935.98	69128.34	64275.78	68331.36	49951.31	52651.54	47727.19	49646.60	4.45%	5.71%
6	(100, 20)	75304.68	85937.62	78474.27	85616.91	61440.43	63366.24	58386.87	60889.89	4.97%	3.91%
7	(500, 5)	54341.33	59785.34	53732.82	62440.65	32509.18	34215.41	27613.41	30164.63	15.06%	11.84%
8	(500, 10)	65238.39	72466.53	77988.79	86855.55	44127.28	45419.71	41068.32	42820.91	6.93%	5.72%
9	(500, 20)	83559.44	91409.66	145754.26	5162031.27	756257.18	56890.12	52339.40	54561.46	6.96%	4.09%
	Average	63766.78	69432.51	73213.47	80180.10	50592.55	52303.97	47310.89	49681.53	7.11%	5.27%
	#Best		0		0		3		33		

Table 12: Comparison between LNS and other metaheuristics on benchmark instances (Benchmark set C)

Ins	(n,k)	M	A	VN	IS	CM	SA	our L	LNS	Improve	ment(%)
1110		$\overline{\overline{f}}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{\overline{f}}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{\overline{f}}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$
1	(50, 5)	48570.74	51302.24	46567.85	51222.11	42394.37	45555.17	38621.16	41222.08	8.90%	9.51%
2	(50, 10)	62959.32	65386.46	62736.29	67872.65	56707.74	59943.22	51043.84	54199.53	9.99%	9.58%
3	(50, 20)	79301.2	81694.24	90106.76	96006.63	75059.12	76624.97	77835.36	78599.78	-3.70%	-2.58%
4	(100, 5)	43040.56	46665.28	40195.58	45236.7	31776.71	35328.97	32009.13	34895.25	-0.73%	1.23%
5	(100, 10)	63311.44	69131.97	62783.43	69294.17	50608.13	53381.95	45949.06	49102.68	9.21%	8.02%
6	(100, 20)	72118.43	83022.81	80558.15	86990.71	62237.63	64179.75	58058.15	60245.48	6.72%	6.13%
7	(500, 5)	38325.52	44525.43	41886.59	47489.25	31813.54	33072.94	26809.59	29543.88	15.73%	10.67%
8	(500, 10)	52048.28	55150.33	57309.51	63868.42	43749.21	45424.28	39918.90	42274.16	8.76%	6.93%
9	(500, 20)	58772.68	71862.63	104692.93	3118724.63	354773.14	56652.40	50519.90	53666.64	7.77%	5.27%
	Average	57605.35	63193.49	65204.12	71856.14	49902.18	52240.40	46751.68	49305.50	6.96%	6.08%
	#Best		0		0		5		31		

Table 13: Comparison between LNS and other metaheuristics on benchmark instances (Benchmark set D)

Ins.	(n,k)	M.	A	VN	VNS		SA	our L	LNS	Improvement(%)	
	(**,**)	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$
1 2	(50, 5) (50, 10)	47721.01 62168.49	50317.96 65633.36	46438.22 62007.21	50119.44 65902.01			37952.18 50474.47		6.56% 11.70%	9.17% 9.70%
3	(50, 20)	79230.26	82028.86	87363.97	94905.41	77799.46	79012.83	75686.90	76162.30	2.72%	3.61%
4 5 6	(100, 5) (100, 10) (100, 20)	43746.70 59536.78 71585.53	68816.35	39157.51 61937.35 79754.95	67131.74	50968.70	53133.87	45555.86	48731.49	10.62%	0.25% 8.29% 5.02%
7 8 9	(500, 5) (500, 10) (500, 20)	42167.08 47837.13 57828.51	45964.87 54195.77 65759.57	58264.82	64047.75	44329.46	45709.36	40190.25	29924.18 42360.46 53766.91	9.34%	11.55% 7.33% 4.09%
	Average	56869.05	62225.73	64666.51	71274.37	50286.46	52233.88	46687.06	48909.13	7.38%	6.56%
	#Best		0		0		3		33		

Table 14: Comparison between LNS and other metaheuristics on benchmark instances (Benchmark set E)

Ins	(n,k)	M	A	VN	VNS		SA	our L	NS	Improve	ment(%)
	(**,**)	$\overline{\overline{f}}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$	$\overline{f}_{min}$	$\overline{f}_{avg}$
1	(50, 5)	49364.62	51800.53	46535.47	50524.88	41842.83	45631.41	36924.57	40081.80	11.75%	12.16%
2	(50, 10)	64306.78	66917.61	62542.99	67378.65	56928.44	60182.90	51191.80	53516.25	10.08%	11.08%
3	(50, 20)	83569.63	85775.87	92320.41	98133.12	78406.55	79397.06	79289.28	80385.82	-1.13%	-1.25%
4	(100, 5)	44086.84	47736.32	43136.01	46203.93	34927.25	36210.62	31443.85	34532.00	9.97%	4.64%
5	(100, 10)	63148.40	72326.88	64232.73	68700.42	53940.45	55953.58	45916.68	49099.61	14.88%	12.25%
6	(100, 20)	72441.85	84939.00	80086.91	86557.77	63675.76	65350.35	56718.41	60194.57	10.93%	7.89%
7	(500, 5)	42141.18	45971.13	39112.69	46918.16	33380.12	34349.52	28198.19	30356.66	15.52%	11.62%
8	(500, 10)	50035.10	55385.91	57052.13	64458.62	44273.35	45834.33	39569.85	42572.36	10.62%	7.12%
9	(500, 20)	61653.70	70682.05	106337.22	2120260.40	)56005.35	57428.79	51189.08	54209.61	8.60%	5.61%
	Average	58972.01	64615.03	65706.28	72126.22	51486.68	53370.95	46715.75	49438.74	10.14%	7.90%
	#Best		0		0		4		32		