

3.6 Aspiration Criteria

The most common interpretation of the aspiration criteria, as described in the introduction of the TS framework, must use the cost function f to decide, whether an improvement of the best solution obtained so far in a given TS iteration is achievable. Since in our application, for a given intermediate result \mathcal{B} of a TS iteration, this would imply calculating $f(m(\mathcal{B}))$ for all $m \in M(\mathcal{B})$, that is, coloring the induced ensemble graphs for all $m(\mathcal{B})$, this is not a manageable way in our case. Instead, and to keep things simple, we reformulate the aspiration criteria, ignoring a tabu on any move $m = (v, u, z, s) \in M(\mathcal{B})$ if $z \neq |\mathcal{B}_v| + 1$ and if $d(m) > 0$ (implying $b_1(m) > 0$). In addition, to prevent the emergence of loops, we must demand that the service s of the move m has not previously been removed from \mathcal{B}_z , for then it would return to its origin, ignoring the tabu set to prevent situations of this kind.

3.7 Algorithmic Description

The following program code describes the adaption of TS to the EPP:

```

Choose  $\mathcal{B}_0 \in \mathbb{B}$ ;           // Choose initial value.
 $\bar{f} := f(\mathcal{B}_0)$ ;           // Remember best result so far.
 $i := 0$ ;                   // Counter for the TS iteration steps.
 $TL := \emptyset$ ;          // Initialize tabu list.
WHILE (termination condition not fulfilled) DO
BEGIN
  // Be aware that all tabued moves of  $K_1(\mathcal{B}_i)$  fulfill the aspiration criteria,
  // so we do not remove any tabued moves.
   $K_1(\mathcal{B}_i) := \{m = (v, u, z, s) \in M(\mathcal{B}_i) \mid (m \notin TL \vee z \neq |\mathcal{B}_v| + 1) \wedge d(m) > 0\}$ ;
   $K_2(\mathcal{B}_i) := \{m \in M(\mathcal{B}_i) \mid b_2(m) > 0\} \setminus TL$ ;
   $K_3(\mathcal{B}_i) := \{m \in M(\mathcal{B}_i) \mid b_3(m) > 0\} \setminus TL$ ;
   $K_4(\mathcal{B}_i) := M(\mathcal{B}_i) \setminus TL$ ;
  IF ( $K_j(\mathcal{B}_i) = \emptyset \ \forall j \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ ) THEN error handling;
  Choose smallest  $j_0 \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$  such that  $K_{j_0}(\mathcal{B}_i) \neq \emptyset$ ;
  Choose  $m_0 \in K_{j_0}(\mathcal{B}_i)$  such that for all  $m \in K_{j_0}(\mathcal{B}_i)$  :  $m \triangleleft m_0 \vee m \equiv m_0$ ;
   $\mathcal{B}_{i+1} := m_0(\mathcal{B}_i)$ ;
  IF ( $f(\mathcal{B}_{i+1}) < \bar{f}$ ) THEN  $\bar{f} := f(\mathcal{B}_{i+1})$ ;
   $i := i + 1$ ;
  Actualize tabu list  $TL$ ;
END; // of WHILE

```

Remarks:

1. $K_j(\mathcal{B})$, $j = 1, \dots, 4$, is a system of so called candidate lists. In our algorithmic context, we have a priority level set on the candidate lists such that the candidate list $K_j(\mathcal{B})$ is of higher priority than all the candidate lists $K_{j+1}(\mathcal{B}), \dots, K_4(\mathcal{B})$, $j = 1, \dots, 3$. Each candidate list $K_j(\mathcal{B})$, $j = 1, \dots, 4$, consists of the moves $m \in M(\mathcal{B})$ relevant for the priority level it represents.