

Highlights

Rich Vehicle Routing Problem in Disaster Management enabling Temporally-causal Transhipments across Multi-Modal Transportation Networks

Santanu Banerjee , Goutam Sen, Siddhartha Mukhopadhyay 

- Multi-Trip rich-VRP with multiple Depots, Warehouses, Relief Centres and Nodes
- Ports allow delayed inter-modal resource transfer across Transportation Networks
- Diverse Pickup and Delivery Cargos having Vehicle and Port compatibilities
- MILP and Heuristic developed for Cascaded Makespan Minimization Objective
- Applications in post-disaster Relief-and-Rescue and in pre-disaster Evacuations

Rich Vehicle Routing Problem in Disaster Management enabling Temporally-causal Transhipments across Multi-Modal Transportation Networks

Santanu Banerjee ^{a,*}, Goutam Sen^a, Siddhartha Mukhopadhyay ^a

^a*Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering (ISE), Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Kharagpur, Kharagpur, 721302, West Bengal, India*

Abstract

A rich vehicle routing problem is considered allowing multiple trips of heterogeneous vehicles stationed at geographically distributed vehicle depots having access to different modes of transportation. The problem arises from the real world requirement of optimizing the disaster response time by minimizing the makespan of vehicular routes. Multiple diversely-functional vertices are considered, including Transshipment Ports as inter-modal resource transfer stations. Both simultaneous and split pickup and delivery is considered, for multiple cargo-types, along with Vehicle-Cargo and Transshipment Port-Cargo compatibilities. The superiority of the proposed cascaded minimization approach is demonstrated over the existing makespan minimization approaches through our developed Mixed-Integer Linear Programming formulation. To solve the problem quickly for practical implementation in a Disaster Management-specific Decision Support System, an extensive Heuristic Algorithm is devised which utilizes Decision Tree based structuring of possible routes; the Decision Tree approach helps to inherently capture the compatibility issues, while also explore the solution space through stochastic weights. Preferential generation of small route elements are performed, which are integrated into route clusters; we consider multiple different logical integration approaches, as well as shuffling the logics to simultaneously produce multiple independent solutions. Finally perturbation of the different solutions are done to find better neighbouring solutions. The computational performance of the PSR-GIP Heuristic, on our created novel datasets, indicate that it is able to give good solutions swiftly for practical problems involving large integer instances which the MILP is unable to solve.

Keywords:

Rich multi-trip VRP, Functionally-diverse Vertices, Vehicle-Load Compatibility, Temporally-causal Transhipments, Emergency Response, Multimodal relief-and-rescue, Cascaded Makespan Minimization

1. Introduction

Route planning is an essential part of relief and rescue missions, and optimization of vehicle routes helps in ensuring effective disaster response. One of the major needs in emergency/disaster missions is to fully satisfy all delivery resources requested (say relief kits) from certain geographical locations and pick up stranded individuals (including stray animals, cattle and livestock) stuck at majorly affected places. In many cases, this pickup and delivery must be necessarily performed together, allowing the entire pickup and/or delivery requirement to be satisfied in one go and without load splitting. In other cases, load splitting could be preferred allowing an overall better approach to satisfy the requirements raised at the different geographical locations affected by the disaster. Furthermore, in the case of a preemptive approach towards disaster preparedness and mitigation of associated risks of an incoming disaster, similar pickup and delivery requirements arise from the geographies where some natural disaster is being forecasted.

Often, such emergency missions encompass broad geographies involving multiple modes of transportation. Therefore, transshipment considerations must be taken into account while planning for these missions across transshipment points that are connected to more than one transportation system acting as temporary transfer hubs. These transshipment points are many a time associated with complex compatibilities, allowing only certain resources to pass through, while the transfer of some other type of resource may be restricted.

Furthermore, the locations of resource storage (like water bottles, plastic sheets, medicines, relief kits, *etc.*) vehicles and final locations for Generally the delivery resources in such cases include water bottles, plastic sheets, medicines, relief kits *etc.* which may need to be sourced from different locations once the exact demand is known. Similarly, the rescued individuals may be sent to hospitals or shelters depending on their condition (post disaster) or based on the predicted intensity/severity of an incoming disaster (pre-disaster phase). These necessitate the development and usage of formulations and heuristics which consider different functionalities of vertex (in the graph, generally used as depots/nodes). Conventional vehicle routing problems (VRPs) and their subsequent enhancements have generally considered a single node element to have all the three features of stationing vehicles, storing resources, as well as the final delivery location

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: santanu@kgpian.iitkgp.ac.in (Santanu Banerjee ) , gseu@iem.iitkgp.ac.in (Goutam Sen), sid.mpadhyay@kgpian.iitkgp.ac.in (Siddhartha Mukhopadhyay )

of collected pickups. This may never be the case in real-life disaster-specific VRPs as disasters are generally a one-time occurrence and stationing and maintaining large amounts of resources at one single place only for providing relief during the aftermath of disasters or bringing valuable lives at one safe place during the preparation phase of an incoming disaster may not always be a good approach and may be practically infeasible due to the costs involved. Instead, a decentralized approach with robust and swift transfer capability is required; in this case, existing warehouses (WHs) could reserve some specific amount of different types of resources to be used during emergencies allowing for reduced maintenance costs since the WHs would be able to function normally as well. Similarly, Vehicle Depots (VDs) could reserve a limited number of (rotating) vehicles to be used during emergencies while able to use a wider fleet for other different operations allowing for better maintenance and regular upkeep of working vehicles. In any case, we believe a decentralised distributed network with regular operational points (like vehicle depots, warehouses, relief centres) would help create a wider, deeper and leaner infrastructure network that will be able to leap into action before, during and after a disaster has struck.

Keeping these considerations in mind, we conduct this study, reviewing the literature (section 2), defining the detailed featured of the novel problem identified (section 3), developing a exact Mixed-Integer Linear Program (MILP) formulation (section 4) along with a heuristic algorithm (section 5), and finally perform computational analysis on small and large datasets developed by us (section 6, along with some instances from the literature). We consider a multi-trip multi-modal capacity-and-compatibility constrained VRP with a network consisting of multiple types of vertices each with their own unique function. Our problem is extremely flexible and can be fit in cases where two functionalities need to overlap (like in the traditional sense of multi-depot VRPs), by creating two (or more) separate functionally different vertices in the same geographical location. A list of abbreviations used in this study is available in Appendix A.

2. Previous Works and State of Art

We conduct a survey of existing literature related to our problem; we start with specific keyword searches related to our problem's features and tabulate the other features considered by the authors. To keep this section brief, we present our extensive literature review of individual papers in Table S1 (presenting this single table by breaking its horizontal extensions into A, B, C and D), and mainly discuss the review papers available in the literature in the subsequent text. We also refer the readers to [1] for an interesting overview of associated problems in the rich-VRP domain.

2.1. Related works focusing on Rich VRP

In [2], multiple optimization objectives are discussed multi-objectives and pareto-optimality. They review papers discussing Genetic Algorithms, Adaptive Large Neighbourhood Search, Iterated Local Search. The network features encompassed within their papers include VRPs considering closed and open tours, time windows and multi-modal transportation, while the considered vehicle features of reviewed papers include homogeneous and heterogeneous fleets performing simultaneous and/or split tasks.

The concept of Road Capacity Reduction due to disaster or damaged roads, congestion or traffic, is discussed in [3], [4] and [5]. The authors in [3] discuss about the multi-objective transportation network design proposed in [6], where the authors discuss about the multi-criteria transshipment problem with multiple objectives proposed in [7] for the facility location problem. We don't consider dynamic cases allowing real-time road condition alterations due to ongoing disaster effects; in our case, we consider that the shortest distance (updated with the predictions of available roads throughout the disaster) across nodes will be used to develop the static travel time matrix between geographical points which are used throughout our problem. These shortest distances could be pre-processed with the predictive disaster data and made to avoid disaster-prone areas. Therefore, implementing such a problem as ours within disaster management systems requires this pre-requisite of intelligent pre-processing for the case when our formulation and algorithm is applied in the pre- or in-disaster phase; for post-disaster cases, our study contributions would be more robust without the need for any predictive disaster-impact on the transportation network, however in this case, the transportation network needs to be updated to the post-disaster situation where some transportation links could be broken.

We believe that the optimization sense in the context of VRP plays a crucial role, especially while differentiating between cost, distance, or time minimization, and whether these are being optimized as a minimization problem of their sum or minimization of the highest solution characteristics for among the vehicles. Since among the resources of time, cost and distance, only time is possible to be parallelized, the cascaded minimization of vehicle travel time should be included among the prominent objectives which should be considered or integration within the VRP taxonomy aspects as presented in the Fig. 6 in [3].

The survey papers of [4] and [5] both review papers that have considered constraints on the number of trips of a single vehicle, VRP with Time Windows, VRP with homogenous and heterogeneous fleet with or without limited number of capacitated vehicles, vehicles performing split simultaneous delivery, as well as the single or multiple depot problem. Some extended problem features of constraining the maximum route time, constraining the maximum number of customers per route, and discussions about having separate vehicle (capacitated) compartments for different types of cargo (like for tankers carrying multiple types of fluids at different pickup stages) are also highlighted in [4]; the authors also delve into the optimization sense, discussing about objective functions like cumulative objectives (arc summation till last node), weighted distance with load quantity, as well as priority indexes. Additionally, [5] describes literature which have considered many-to-many transportation, papers allowing the multi-visit of nodes as necessary, and studies on multi-modal networks; many papers in their study include real-world problem features of profitability, service quality, equity, consistency, simplicity, reliability, and externalities.

The authors in [8] perform a survey on the rich VRP literature available. They mention rich-VRPs as emerging from VRPs applied in the real world, and especially now more than ever due to the advent of advanced computing

infrastructure. They discuss and review papers having considered cross-docking, multi-trips, vehicle site dependance, vehicle road dependance, intra route replenishments, and multiple time windows among other features.

Based on these review papers, and the individual studies, we conclude that the problem considered by is novel and has never been considered before. Specifically, as per our knowledge, no one in literature has considered transshipment with time consideration as we are considering, where time causality comes into the picture; therefore this should be the first study considering the development of exact and heuristic algorithms with causality considerations. Furthermore, we are considering multi-modal aspects which further complicate the problem. Another novelty lies in our cascaded makespan minimization approach, which we propose to be superior (more correct, allows deeper optimization not reachable by the single objective function of makespan) than conventional makespan minimization. We next describe the problem in detail, develop the formulation and heuristic algorithm, and prove our claim through computational results.

2.2. Applications of VRP in disaster relief

VRP plays an important role in disaster management; optimized routing of vehicles helps reach victims swifter allowing faster rescues, as well as enable holistic distribution of relief materials during large scale natural disasters. A multi-depot VRP is discussed in [9] for the case of drought relief to solve emergency water trucking; the authors hybridize metaheuristics and demonstrate applications within a case study in Brazil. The authors develop a two-phase multi-period location-routing-inventory model in [10] focusing on resilient distribution of relief during the aftermath of an earthquake developing the model for uncertain conditions using a robust optimization approach; they test two meta-heuristic algorithms for this problem. The study in [11] discuss about the problem of pre-disaster evacuation network design; the authors optimize the total evacuation time, investment cost, and network congestion degree focusing on equilibrium flow.

In [12], the authors develop an uncertain multi-objective MILP for a VRP with trucks and drones for wild-fire detection; the drones being able to use the trucks as launchpads to reach diverse heights and monitor hard-to-reach areas thereby minimizing the maximum regret (this objective may be further improved by using a cascaded minimization of the dynamic maximum regret). They mention coordinated system of trucks and drones will be effective in reducing the makespan (based on their numerical calculations), citing [13] where the authors minimize the makespan of a similar VRP with drones. A latest review paper on this truck-drone routing problem [14] also discusses about the frequently used objective of minimizing *i.e.*, makespan, but fail to find any indication of cascading the same in the literature; their described modes of extended collaboration is highly applicable in disaster situations especially to survey damage and detect (/predict potentially) stranded victims.

The paper [15] discussed how drone monitoring can prevent forest fires by swift detection and mitigation; they introduce the degree of sensitivity of fire-prone areas for the first time and develop matheuristics to provide swift solutions. They refer to [16], where the authors developed ant colony optimization heuristics for multi-depot drone location-routing to detect post-earthquake damage; impacted regions were divided into grids and allocated importance values based on multiple factors including the number of buildings damaged, time of day, *etc.* Unmanned aerial VRP for forest-fire surveillance is also discussed in [17] where the author develops an MILP for the covering VRP and use Bender’s decomposition solution strategy.

In [18], the authors focus on large-scale evacuation planning while conducting a literature review of human behavior modelling and route optimization, revealing agent based simulations are commonly used in such scenarios. The authors in [19] discuss how direct digital payments could be a game-changer as an aid-delivery mechanism during humanitarian crises. The paper [20] discusses about community-volunteers as first responders for cardiac arrest, which can be extended to optimizing volunteer response during localized-emergencies. A multi-criteria decision making model is developed in [21] to select the best facility locations for disaster-responder units, and for task optimization; the authors highlight the importance of strategic positioning in minimizing response times and maximizing operational effectiveness.

3. Problem Description

The real-world disaster management problem (discussed in section 1) broadly considers the transfer of different types of delivery resources (relief materials) and pickups (rescue) to and from disaster-affected geographies or locations where a disaster is predicted to strike. In both cases, the entire operation completion time of the emergency mission is of the essence, and our aim in this study is to minimize this total emergency operation time. This corresponds to the optimization of the vehicle route with the highest route duration. We don’t find any relevant literature that even comes close to considering all the problem features considered by us at once. Our implementation of transshipment ports (TPs) is novel and very appropriate for modelling real-world scenarios involving multi-modal fleet coordination.

To solve this problem at hand, we consider a rich-VRP with specific arcs (Travel Time edge network pre-processed with Traffic information and reduced network due to disaster) allowing multiple heterogeneous vehicles present in various Vehicle Depots to travel on their specific (modal) network layers for performing pickup of relief supply from various capacity constrained Warehouses to be provided to multiple Nodes as a simultaneous delivery-and-pickup allowing rescue of stranded victims/livestock to be sent to strategically located capacity constrained Relief Centers (RCs). Transshipment Ports are provided for temporary holding and cross-docking of cargo during the entire operation. The problem features are highlighted here:

- (I) Travel Time Network across modes considering vehicle-mode compatibility: travel time between same two points could be different among Vehicle Types (VTs) as they might have access to different types of roads/rails *etc.*,
- (II) Multiple Types of Pickup as well as Delivery Loads (both Weight and Volume-constrained) are considered, while also taking into account their respective loading/unloading times specific to each VT

- (III) Functional categorization of the graph vertices (namely: VDs, TPs, WHs, Node Locations, RCs) which are also considered multiple in number, thereby enhancing the model functionality and evolving the fundamental meaning of Depots. We consider multiple capacity-constrained:
 - (a) WHs containing diverse Delivery-Load Types (DCTs) as relief materials,
 - (b) RCs as rescue destinations for diverse Pickup-Load Types (PCTs),
- (IV) Heterogeneous capacity (volume and weight separately) constrained VTs are present in various numbers across respective VDs.
- (V) The vehicles can have multiple trips, i.e. visit vertices multiple times (unless not allowed as for the Simultaneous Pickup-and-Delivery Nodes).
- (VI) VTs are also associated with Open or Closed routes; open routes indicate the final return-journey from a vertex to the vehicle’s respective VD is not considered during trip-time calculation,
- (VII) Allow flexible Hierarchical Transportation across various vehicular networks through introduction of TPs ensuring transshipment happens in a temporally-causal manner.
- (VIII) Compatibility of Cargo-Types with TPs are considered such that incompatible loads may be present in the vehicles at the TPs but cannot be transhipped.
- (IX) Waiting times are considered separately for each vehicle for each of its unique visits to a TP.
- (X) Vehicle to Load preferences are considered such that a VT is allowed to carry only specific CTs. This also ensures the compatibility in cases when certain vehicles are meant to swiftly carry humans and therefore are not allowed to evacuate cattle which must be done by another vehicle,
- (XI) Allow Simultaneous Delivery & Pickup (this ensures no detachment of loads during rescue missions) at Simultaneous Nodes and Split Delivery and Pickup at Split Nodes.
- (XII) The MILP Formulation minimizes the total operation time (and is flexible to allow choosing of other objectives). A multi-step approach for solving our Cascaded Makespan Minimization objective is shown (where the objective function during every step is updated to be include association with only the vehicles which were not having the largest routes during any of the optimization steps performed before).

Some parts of our problem’s features have been considered in different papers in the literature, however we find no single paper coming close to considering all the features of our problem. We understand this could be due to formulation complexity and logical complications during the heuristic development, both of which we have been able to address. Together, the WHs are RCs are termed as the Primary Resource Vertices (PRVs) as they have capacity constrained DCTs and a threshold on the acceptability of PCTs.

3.1. Illustrative Example

An example problem is shown in Figure 1 where four different Single-Mode Transportation Segments (SMTSs) form a Multi-Modal Transportation Network (MMTN). Each SMTS has a Vehicle Depot consisting of vehicles of the specific type which can ply on the respective SMTS. Three Transshipment Ports can be observed with one of them allowing the transshipment of only Delivery type resources. The problem is ideated for the case of an archipelago type system having their individual road networks and connected together by an air transportation segment. The full details of this instance is available in the shared datasets. The bar charts alongside Nodes (Simultaneous or Split Nodes) indicate the request for the Delivery resources (quantity depicted in blue) and the requirement to pickup stranded victims (quantity depicted in orange). The bar-charts alongside Warehouses depict the amount of Delivery resource of each type that is available to be leveraged from the respective Warehouse (and similarly bar-charts alongside each Relief Centre depicts the amount of corresponding Pickup type the specific Relief Centre can accept within itself). For Vehicle Depots, the bar-charts depict the number of vehicles of each type present at the specific depot. For Transshipment Ports, the bar-charts represent the compatibility of resource transfer across that Port (individually for each resource type); 1 indicates the transfer of that specific resource type is allowed, whereas 0 indicates transfer not allowed (the incompatible resource can still be within the vehicle, but cannot leave the vehicle).

4. Mathematical Formulation

To solve the problem having the features discussed in section 3 at hand, a rich vehicle route planning problem (VRP) is considered, having various types of vertices of a graph; these diverse vertex types correspond to different functionalities (Table S2 in Supplementary Material). We initially allow all network linkages, i.e. all possible connection combinations between all vertices clustered within sets mentioned in Table 1 is allowed. It needs to be evident that Nodes (N) are the controlling (*i.e.*, demanding) elements of the formulation and a problem without any Nodes will not require any vehicle to ply. Keeping this in mind we remove linkages connecting Vehicle Depots, linkages connecting Warehouses to Vehicle Depots, as well as linkages connecting Vehicle Depot to Relief Centres; since these would never be used for our considered problem.

We consider multiple types of loads being carried by compatible vehicles. Each vehicle can have multiple trips, which is formulated here using a layered approach such that each vehicle starts and ends at its respective vehicle depot while travelling through other vertices as many times as required and allowed, to perform necessary tasks of relief-and-rescue. The total no. of vehicles allowed to cater to each Simultaneous Node is one. Each individual vehicle (v) may only be accurately identified by its corresponding VD, VT, and a unique number from among the number of vehicles of that specific type available at that depot.




Figure 1: **Illustrative Example** - This MMTN consists of four distinct SMTS, interconnected by 3 TPs having their respective CT-specific transshipment preferences

Table 1: Sets and Parameters

Notation	Description
H	Set of Vehicle Depots (each Vehicle Depot is accessible by all modes of transport which its hosted Vehicles can ply on)
W	Set of Warehouses
N^M	Set of Simultaneous Nodes (allowing only a single vehicle to perform the pickup and delivery operation at one go)
N^P	Set of Split Nodes (allowing any number of vehicles to visit at different times to satisfy portions of the total requirement, which includes pickup or delivery or both types of operations)
N	Set of all Nodes, <i>i.e.</i> , $N^M \cup N^P$
S	Set of Transshipment Ports
R	Set of Relief Centers
V_0	Vertex set consisting of $W \cup N \cup S \cup R$
W_k	Set of all Warehouses that are accessible by (at least one among) the mode(s) of transport on which VT k plies on
N_k^M	Set of all Simultaneous Nodes that are accessible by (at least one among) the mode(s) of transport on which VT k plies on
N_k^P	Set of all Split Nodes that are accessible by (at least one among) the mode(s) of transport on which VT k plies on
N_k	Set of all Nodes that are accessible by (at least one among) the mode(s) of transport on which VT k plies on, <i>i.e.</i> , $N_k^M \cup N_k^P$
S_k	Set of all Transshipment Ports that are accessible by (at least one among) the mode(s) of transport on which VT k plies on
R_k	Set of all Relief Centres that are accessible by (at least one among) the mode(s) of transport on which VT k plies on
V_k	Vertex set consisting of $W_k \cup N_k \cup S_k \cup R_k$
v	Refers to each individual vehicle which is referenced as the combination of a vehicle depot h , a vehicle type k within that vehicle depot, and the vehicle number u among those vehicle types at the concerned depot, where $h \in H, k \in K_h, u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u)$. The Vehicle Depot refers to the originating vertex of the considered vehicle; the Vehicle Type should be among one of the categories of vehicles that are present initially at the concerned vehicle depot, and the Vehicle Number may refer to sequential integers starting from 1 till a maximum value equal to the number of vehicles of the concerned type present at that depot.
L_v	Refers to an array of all the levels l available to vehicle v . The levels are indicated by integer numbers starting from 1 (which is the minimum value, <i>i.e.</i> , l_v^{min}) being the base level, till a maximum value l_v^{max} .
K_i	K_i represents the set of all VTs, which can access any of the modes of transport that connect to the Vertex i , where $i \in V_0$. In other words, it is the set of all Vehicle Types that can access the Node i via the multi-modal transportation network.
K_h	K_h indicates the Vehicle Types present at some specific Vehicle Depot which is referenced through $h, h \subseteq H$. Each H has some specific types of vehicles available for performing tasks.
$G_{h,k}$	G is referenced using the two parameters (h,k) , which indicates the vehicles of type $k \in K_h$ available at a specific vehicle depot h . It is the entire list of numbers starting from 1 to the maximum number of vehicles of type k available at h .
A_c	A_c represents the set of all VTs that are compatible to carry the load type c . If c is a set of load types instead of an individual load type (<i>e.g.</i> as in Eqns. 39, 40, 41, 42 and 67r), then A_c would represent the union of all the vehicle types that are compatible to carry any of the load types represented within c .
O	Set of vehicle types which shall not go back to their starting depots (<i>i.e.</i> , Open Trips)
D	The set of all Delivery cargos
P	The set of all Pickup cargos
C_k	Compatible Cargo: C_k refers to the set of all load types that are allowed to be carried by a vehicle type k
Q_i^c	Represents quantity of Cargo Type c at Pickup and/or Delivery Vertex i (availability of each DCT in W , or, capacity for each PCT at R , or, requirement of each compatible cargo at N)
B_i	Set of delivery and pickup load types that are allowed to be transhipped at transshipment port i , where $i \in S$. In other words, loading or unloading of all load-types within the set B_i is allowed at i . It is assumed that the rest of the incompatible cargo would not be taken out of vehicles during transshipment at the concerned incompatible ports (as the formulation does not allow this).
$U^{k,c}$	Represents the loading/unloading time of cargo type c into/from vehicle type k . ($U^{k,c} \geq 0, \forall k, \forall c$)
$T_{i,j}^k$	$T_{i,j}^k$ Represents the shortest time taken to travel from vertex i to vertex j by vehicle type k (allowing the vehicle to change modes of transport on which it is able to travel, if possible, enabling swift robust transportation)
M	A very large positive real number
E_c	Volume of a unit of load-type c
E^k	Volume of a vehicle of type k
F_c	Weight of a unit of load-type c
F^k	Weight of a vehicle of type k

Table 2: Variable Definitions

Notation	Description
z_x	Continuous variable equal to the largest tour time among all vehicles essentially representing the entire Emergency Operation Time
z_s	Continuous variable equal to the MakeSpan of the Entire Emergency Operation Time, <i>i.e.</i> , the sum of the routes times of all vehicles
z_{sOT}	Intermediate continuous variable used to populate z_s ; this takes the sum of the route-times of all vehicles which need not go back to their respective starting depots essentially performing open trips (like most trains)

Continuation of Table 2 Variable Definitions	
Notation	Description
z_{sCT}	Intermediate continuous variable used to populate z_s ; this takes the sum of the route-times of all vehicles which must go back to their respective starting depots essentially performing closed trips (like most cars and buses in general)
$x_{i,j}^{v,l}$	Binary decision variable referring to a vehicle v travelling from vertex i to vertex j on its level l
$x_i^{v,l,m}$	Binary decision variable referring to a vehicle v at vertex i travelling from level l to level m
$y_{i,j}^{v,l,c}$	Continuous-positive variable referring to the amount of cargo load of category c being taken by vehicle v traveling from vertex i to vertex j both on its level l , the carried cargo being compatible with the vehicle type. Ideally this should be an integer variable since we are considering indivisible units of commodities being carried, however we relax this consideration.
$y_i^{v,l,m,c}$	Continuous-positive variable referring to the amount of cargo load of category c being taken by vehicle v at vertex i traveling from level l to level m , the carried cargo being compatible with the vehicle type
b_i^c	Intermediate continuous variable representing the amount of load transfer of type c at only the lowermost/first level/layer, for all vehicles, at Node i
q_i^c	Intermediate continuous variable representing the amount of load transfer of type c at layers apart from the lowermost, for all vehicles, at Node i
$r_i^{v,l,c}$	Residue refers to the amount of actual transshipment operation of each cargo-type at each TP . It is a Real variable allowed to take negative or positive values depending on whether the compatible cargo-type was deposited or collected by the vehicle during any of its layer-wise visits. In this formulation, we calculate the Residue similar to deposit at TPs , and therefore the variable takes negative values whenever the resources are collected for subsequent transshipment.
$n_i^{v,l,c}$	This is an intermediate binary variable used during calculations of modulus of the Residue. This is constrained to take a value of 1 when the corresponding residue is positive, and 0 when the residue is negative.
$e_i^{v,l,c}$	This continuous-positive variable stores the modulus or absolute value of the Residues.
$a_i^{v,l}$	Continuous-positive variable, refers to the arrival time of vehicle v at vertex i for a specific visit <i>i.e.</i> , at layer l
$d_i^{v,l}$	Continuous-positive variable, refers to the departure time of vehicle v at vertex i after a specific visit <i>i.e.</i> , at layer l
$t_{i,j}^{v,l}$	Continuous-positive variable, refers to the travel time of vehicle v when journeying from vertex i to j on its layer l
$t_i^{v,l,m}$	Continuous-positive variable, refers to the cascaded (or, continually added) travel time of the vehicle v at vertex i when journeying from layer l to layer m
$w_i^{v,l}$	Continuous-positive variable, refers to the non-working or waiting time of the vehicle v at vertex i during a specific visit <i>i.e.</i> , at layer l . The waiting time would be non-zero only during the collection at any S , when the resource to be collected is yet to arrive at that Transshipment Port, <i>i.e.</i> , the cumulative addition of the working-durations (working durations refer to the loading/unloading done by the vehicle v at i during its visit at level l) is less than the required resource arrival time which is still on its way onboard another vehicle.
$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)}$	The residues obtained needs to be populated over load-type and Transshipment Port specific space-time matrices. This continuous variable o represents the cells in each of these matrices. For each $i \in S$ and $c \in B_i$, matrices are created with the space axis varying over (v,l) and the time axis being varied over $(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})$, where l refers to a layer of vehicle v , and \hat{l} refers to a layer of vehicle \hat{v} . Here $\hat{s} \in \{Arr, Dep\}$, where Arr refers to arrival and Dep refers to departure. These space-time matrices are used to ensure that the temporal accumulation of the residues always remain positive.
$g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}$	This intermediate binary variable compares the arrival or departure times of the subscripted vehicle \hat{v} <i>w.r.t.</i> the super-scripted vehicle v during their visits on layers \hat{l} and l respectively, only at the Transshipment Ports <i>i.e.</i> , $i \in S$. Here $s, \hat{s} \in \{Arr, Dep\}$ representing arrival or departure for the vehicle v and \hat{v} respectively. The variable takes value 1 when: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for $s = \hat{s} = Arr$: if $a_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} \leq a_i^{v,l}$, else takes value 0 for $s = Arr$ and $\hat{s} = Dep$: if $d_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} \leq a_i^{v,l}$, else takes value 0 for $s = Dep$ and $\hat{s} = Arr$: if $a_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} \geq d_i^{v,l}$, else takes value 0 for $s = \hat{s} = Dep$: if $d_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} \geq d_i^{v,l}$, else takes value 0

The Min-Max objective in Eq. 1 minimizes the largest route-time among all vehicles (*i.e.*, the Makespan). Makespan is defined as the largest time taken among all simultaneous tasks, or more precisely the time difference between the start and finish of the entire operation (if all functions don't start at the same time), in our case it corresponds to vehicle trip durations. Generally, we have found that researchers have focused on minimizing the makespan for various problems but overlook the subsequent steps for further internal optimization; this is a general problem in the OR research field and is not limited to VRP. No study has focused on the time minimization aspect as done by us; the proposition of cascaded makespan minimization as a replacement to traditional makespan minimization is novel and an improvement over traditional makespan minimization ([22]) which is simply equivalent to performing a single cascade of our optimization process. We combine the cascaded optimization approach with the min-max objective function, to solve this MILP using a multi-step minimization approach; this Cascaded Makespan Minimization is discussed in detail after the formulation description. The variables used in the formulation are described in Table 2.

Objective Function:

$$\text{Minimize } z_x \quad (1)$$

Routing Constraints:

$$\sum_{j \in W_k, N_k, S_k} x_{h,j}^{v,1} \leq 1, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u) \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_{l \in L_v} \sum_{j \in N_k, S_k, R_k} x_{j,h}^{v,l} = \sum_{j \in W_k, N_k, S_k} x_{h,j}^{v,1}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \quad (3)$$

$$x_i^{v,l+1,l} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j \\ \text{if } i \in R \Rightarrow j \neq h}} x_{j,i}^{v,l} = x_i^{v,l,l+1} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j \\ \text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h}} x_{i,j}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \quad \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), l = 1, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (4a)$$

$$x_i^{v,l-1,l} + x_i^{v,l+1,l} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} x_{j,i}^{v,l} = x_i^{v,l,l-1} + x_i^{v,l,l+1} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j \\ \text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h}} x_{i,j}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall i \in V_k, \\ \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \quad (4b)$$

$$x_i^{v,l-1,l} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} x_{j,i}^{v,l} = x_i^{v,l,l-1} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j \\ \text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h}} x_{i,j}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall i \in V_k, \text{if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max}, \quad (4c)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{h \in H \\ k \in K_h \cap K_i \\ u \in G_{h,k} \\ v = (h,k,u)}} \sum_{j \in V_k, h} \sum_{l \in L_v} x_{i,j}^{v,l} \leq 1, \quad \forall i \in N^M, \quad (5)$$

Flow Constraints (at Vehicle Depots):

$$y_{h,j}^{v,1,c} \leq 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall c \in C_k, \forall j \in W_k \cup S_k \cup N_k, \quad (6)$$

$$y_{i,h}^{v,l,c} \leq 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall c \in C_k, \forall i \in S_k \cup N_k \cup R_k, \quad (7)$$

Flow Constraints (at Warehouses):

$$y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \geq y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), l = 1, \forall c \in D \cap C_k, \forall i \in W_k, \quad (8a)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \geq y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \\ \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \forall c \in D \cap C_k, \forall i \in W_k, \quad (8b)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \geq y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max}, \\ \forall c \in D \cap C_k, \forall i \in W_k, \quad (8c)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} = y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), l = 1, \forall c \in P \cap C_k, \forall i \in W_k, \quad (9a)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} = y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \\ \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \forall c \in P \cap C_k, \forall i \in W_k, \quad (9b)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} = y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max}, \\ \forall c \in P \cap C_k, \forall i \in W_k, \quad (9c)$$

Capacity Constraints (for Warehouses):

$$\sum_{\substack{h \in H \\ k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i \\ u \in G_{h,k} \\ v=(h,k,u)}} \sum_{l=1} \left(\sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} \right) = b_i^c, \quad \forall i \in W, \forall c \in D, \quad (10a)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{h \in H \\ k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i \\ u \in G_{h,k} \\ v=(h,k,u)}} \sum_{l \in L_v \setminus \{1\}} \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} (y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} - y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}) = q_i^c, \quad \forall i \in W, \forall c \in D, \quad (10b)$$

$$b_i^c + q_i^c \leq Q_i^c, \quad \forall i \in W, \forall c \in D, \quad (10c)$$

Flow Constraints (at Relief Centres):

$$y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \leq y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), l = 1, \forall c \in P \cap C_k, \forall i \in R_k, \quad (11a)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \leq y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \\ \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \forall c \in P \cap C_k, \forall i \in R_k, \quad (11b)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \leq y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{ if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max}, \\ \forall c \in P \cap C_k, \forall i \in R_k, \quad (11c)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} = y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), l = 1, \forall c \in D \cap C_k, \forall i \in R_k, \quad (12a)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} = y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \\ \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \forall c \in D \cap C_k, \forall i \in R_k, \quad (12b)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} = y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{ if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max}, \\ \forall c \in D \cap C_k, \forall i \in R_k, \quad (12c)$$

Capacity Constraints (for Relief Centers):

$$\sum_{\substack{h \in H \\ k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i \\ u \in G_{h,k} \\ v=(h,k,u)}} \sum_{l \in L_v} \left(\sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \right) \leq Q_i^c, \quad \forall i \in R, \forall c \in P, \quad (13)$$

Flow Constraints (at Nodes):

$$y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \geq y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), l = 1, \forall c \in P \cap C_k, \forall i \in N_k, \quad (14a)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \geq y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u),$$

$$\forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \forall c \in P \cap C_k, \forall i \in N_k, \quad (14b)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \geq y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{ if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max},$$

$$\forall c \in P \cap C_k, \forall i \in N_k, \quad (14c)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \leq y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), l = 1, \forall c \in D \cap C_k, \forall i \in N_k, \quad (15a)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \leq y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u),$$

$$\forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \forall c \in D \cap C_k, \forall i \in N_k, \quad (15b)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \leq y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{ if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max},$$

$$\forall c \in D \cap C_k, \forall i \in N_k, \quad (15c)$$

Resource Constraints (for Nodes):

$$\sum_{\substack{h \in H \\ k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i \\ u \in G_{h,k} \\ v = (h,k,u)}} \sum_{l=1} \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} (y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} - y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}) = b_i^c, \quad \forall i \in N, \forall c \in P, \quad (16a)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{h \in H \\ k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i \\ u \in G_{h,k} \\ v = (h,k,u)}} \sum_{l \in L_v \setminus \{1\}} \left(\sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} \right) = q_i^c, \quad \forall i \in N, \forall c \in P, \quad (16b)$$

$$b_i^c + q_i^c \geq Q_i^c, \quad \forall i \in N, \forall c \in P, \quad (16c)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{h \in H \\ k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i \\ u \in G_{h,k} \\ v = (h,k,u)}} \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} (y_{j,i}^{v,1,c} - y_{i,j}^{v,1,c}) = b_i^c, \quad \forall i \in N, \forall c \in D, \quad (17a)$$

$$\sum_{\substack{h \in H \\ k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i \\ u \in G_{h,k} \\ v = (h,k,u)}} \sum_{l \in L_v \setminus \{1\}} \left(\sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \right) = q_i^c, \quad \forall i \in N, \forall c \in D, \quad (17b)$$

$$b_i^c + q_i^c \geq Q_i^c, \quad \forall i \in N, \forall c \in D, \quad (17c)$$

Flow Constraints (at Transshipment Ports):

$$y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} (y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - y_{i,j}^{v,l,c}) = r_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), l = 1, \forall i \in S_k,$$

$$\forall c \in C_k \cap B_i, \quad (18a)$$

$$y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} = r_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u),$$

$$\forall i \in S_k, \forall c \in C_k \cap B_i, \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \quad (18b)$$

$$y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} = r_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{ if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max},$$

$$\forall i \in S_k, \forall c \in C_k \cap B_i, \quad (18c)$$

$$y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} (y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - y_{i,j}^{v,l,c}) = 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), l = 1, \forall i \in S_k,$$

$$\forall c \in C_k \setminus B_i, \quad (19a)$$

$$y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} = 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u),$$

$$\forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \forall i \in S_k, \forall c \in C_k \setminus B_i, \quad (19b)$$

$$y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} = 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{ if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max},$$

$$\forall i \in S_k, \forall c \in C_k \setminus B_i, \quad (19c)$$

Vehicle Start-Time Constraints:

$$d_h^{v,1} \leq 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \quad (20)$$

Calculating the cascaded travel times (on the same layer):

$$t_{i,j}^{v,1} \leq M \cdot x_{i,j}^{v,1}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall i, j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j, (\text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h),$$

$$(\text{if } i = h \Rightarrow j \notin R), \quad (21a)$$

$$t_{i,j}^{v,l} \leq M \cdot x_{i,j}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1\}, \forall i \in V_k, \forall j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j,$$

$$(\text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h), \quad (21b)$$

$$t_{i,j}^{v,1} \geq -M \cdot (1 - x_{i,j}^{v,1}) + d_i^{v,1} + T_{i,j}^k \cdot x_{i,j}^{v,1}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall i, j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j,$$

$$(\text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h), (\text{if } i = h \Rightarrow j \notin R), \quad (22a)$$

$$t_{i,j}^{v,l} \geq -M \cdot (1 - x_{i,j}^{v,l}) + d_i^{v,l} + T_{i,j}^k \cdot x_{i,j}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1\}, \forall i \in V_k, \forall j \in V_k \cup h,$$

$$i \neq j, (\text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h), \quad (22b)$$

$$t_{i,j}^{v,1} \leq M \cdot (1 - x_{i,j}^{v,1}) + d_i^{v,1} + T_{i,j}^k \cdot x_{i,j}^{v,1}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall i, j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j,$$

$$(\text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h), (\text{if } i = h \Rightarrow j \notin R), \quad (23a)$$

$$t_{i,j}^{v,l} \leq M \cdot (1 - x_{i,j}^{v,l}) + d_i^{v,l} + T_{i,j}^k \cdot x_{i,j}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1\}, \forall i \in V_k, \forall j \in V_k \cup h,$$

$$i \neq j, (\text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h), \quad (23b)$$

Calculating the cascaded travel times (between layers):

$$t_i^{v,l,m} \leq M \cdot x_i^{v,l,m}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l, m \in L_v, |l - m| = 1, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (24)$$

$$t_i^{v,l,m} \geq -M \cdot (1 - x_i^{v,l,m}) + d_i^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \quad \forall l, m \in L_v, |l - m| = 1, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (25)$$

$$t_i^{v,l,m} \leq M \cdot (1 - x_i^{v,l,m}) + d_i^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \quad \forall l, m \in L_v, |l - m| = 1, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (26)$$

Calculating Arrival Times:

$$a_i^{v,l} = t_i^{v,l+1,l} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j \\ \text{if } i \in R \Rightarrow j \neq h \\ \text{if } i = h \Rightarrow j \notin W}} t_{j,i}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), l = 1, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (27a)$$

$$a_i^{v,l} = t_i^{v,l+1,l} + t_i^{v,l-1,l} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j \\ \text{if } i = h \Rightarrow j \notin W}} t_{j,i}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall i \in V_k, \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \quad (27b)$$

$$a_i^{v,l} = t_i^{v,l-1,l} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j \\ \text{if } i = h \Rightarrow j \notin W}} t_{j,i}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max}, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (27c)$$

$$a_h^{v,l} = \sum_{j \in N_k, S_k, R_k} t_{j,h}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \quad (28)$$

Calculating modulus of Residues:

$$r_i^{v,l,c} \geq -M \cdot (1 - n_i^{v,l,c}), \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i \in S_k, \forall c \in B_i \cap C_k, \quad (29)$$

$$r_i^{v,l,c} \leq M \cdot n_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i \in S_k, \forall c \in B_i \cap C_k, \quad (30)$$

$$e_i^{v,l,c} \geq r_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i \in S_k, \forall c \in B_i \cap C_k, \quad (31)$$

$$e_i^{v,l,c} \geq -r_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i \in S_k, \forall c \in B_i \cap C_k, \quad (32)$$

$$e_i^{v,l,c} \leq r_i^{v,l,c} + M \cdot (1 - n_i^{v,l,c}), \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i \in S_k, \forall c \in B_i \cap C_k, \quad (33)$$

$$e_i^{v,l,c} \leq -r_i^{v,l,c} + M \cdot n_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i \in S_k, \forall c \in B_i \cap C_k, \quad (34)$$

Calculating Departure Times (at Transshipment Ports):

$$d_i^{v,l} = a_i^{v,l} + w_i^{v,l} + \sum_{c \in C_k \cap B_i} (e_i^{v,l,c} \cdot U^{k,c}), \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i \in S_k, \quad (35)$$

Calculating Departure Times (at Nodes):

$$d_i^{v,l} = a_i^{v,l} + \sum_{c \in C_k \cap P} \left(U^{k,c} \cdot \left(y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} - y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} (y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} - y_{j,i}^{v,l,c}) \right) \right) + \sum_{c \in C_k \cap D} \left(U^{k,c} \cdot \left(y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} (y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - y_{i,j}^{v,l,c}) \right) \right), \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), l = 1, \forall i \in N_k, \quad (36a)$$

$$d_i^{v,l} = a_i^{v,l} + \sum_{c \in C_k \cap P} \left(U^{k,c} \cdot \left(y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} - y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} \right) \right) + \sum_{c \in C_k \cap D} \left(U^{k,c} \cdot \left(y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} - y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \right) \right), \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u),$$

$$\forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \forall i \in N_k, \quad (36b)$$

$$d_i^{v,l} = a_i^{v,l} + \sum_{c \in C_k \cap P} \left(U^{k,c} \cdot \left(y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} - y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} \right) \right) + \sum_{c \in C_k \cap D} \left(U^{k,c} \cdot \left(y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \right) \right), \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{ if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max}, \forall i \in N_k, \quad (36c)$$

Calculating Departure Times (at Warehouses):

$$d_i^{v,l} = a_i^{v,l} + \sum_{c \in C_k \cap D} \left(U^{k,c} \cdot \left(y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} - y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} \right) \right), \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u),$$

$$l = 1, \forall i \in W_k, \quad (37a)$$

$$d_i^{v,l} = a_i^{v,l} + \sum_{c \in C_k \cap D} \left(U^{k,c} \cdot \left(y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} - y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} \left(y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} - y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} \right) \right) \right), \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h,$$

$$\forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \forall i \in W_k, \quad (37b)$$

$$d_i^{v,l} = a_i^{v,l} + \sum_{c \in C_k \cap D} \left(U^{k,c} \cdot \left(y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} - y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} \left(y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} - y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} \right) \right) \right), \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u),$$

$$\text{if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max}, \forall i \in W_k, \quad (37c)$$

Calculating Departure Times (at Relief Centers):

$$d_i^{v,l} = a_i^{v,l} + \sum_{c \in C_k \cap P} \left(U^{k,c} \cdot \left(y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \right) \right), \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u),$$

$$l = 1, \forall i \in R_k, \quad (38a)$$

$$d_i^{v,l} = a_i^{v,l} + \sum_{c \in C_k \cap P} \left(U^{k,c} \cdot \left(y_i^{v,l+1,l,c} + y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l+1,c} - y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \right) \right), \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h,$$

$$\forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \forall i \in R_k, \quad (38b)$$

$$d_i^{v,l} = a_i^{v,l} + \sum_{c \in C_k \cap P} \left(U^{k,c} \cdot \left(y_i^{v,l-1,l,c} - y_i^{v,l,l-1,c} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} y_{j,i}^{v,l,c} - \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k, h \\ i \neq j}} y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \right) \right), \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u),$$

$$\text{if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max}, \forall i \in R_k, \quad (38c)$$

Comparing Arrival and Departure Times of Vehicles at Transshipment Ports (Temporal Residue Constraints):

$$a_i^{\hat{v},l} - d_i^{v,l} \geq -M \cdot \left(1 - g_{i,(\hat{v},l,\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)} \right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H,$$

$$\forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall s \in \{Dep\}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr\}, \quad (39a)$$

$$d_i^{v,l} - a_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} \geq -M \cdot g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \\ \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall s \in \{Dep\}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr\}, \quad (39b)$$

$$d_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} - d_i^{v,l} \geq -M \cdot \left(1 - g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall s \in \{Dep\}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Dep\}, \quad (40a)$$

$$d_i^{v,l} - d_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} \geq -M \cdot g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \\ \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall s \in \{Dep\}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Dep\}, \quad (40b)$$

$$a_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} - a_i^{v,l} \leq M \cdot \left(1 - g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall s \in \{Arr\}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr\}, \quad (41a)$$

$$a_i^{v,l} - a_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} \leq M \cdot g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \\ \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall s \in \{Arr\}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr\}, \quad (41b)$$

$$d_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} - a_i^{v,l} \leq M \cdot \left(1 - g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall s \in \{Arr\}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Dep\}, \quad (42a)$$

$$a_i^{v,l} - d_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} \leq M \cdot g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \\ \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall s \in \{Arr\}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Dep\}, \quad (42b)$$

Constraining the cell values of Space-Time Matrices when the Vehicles being compared don't overlap in SpaceTime (Temporal Residue Constraints):

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \leq r_i^{v,l,c} + M \cdot \left(1 - g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall s \in \{Dep\}, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr\}, \quad (43a)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \geq r_i^{v,l,c} - M \cdot \left(1 - g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall s \in \{Dep\}, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr\}, \quad (43b)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \leq r_i^{v,l,c} + M \cdot \left(1 - g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall s \in \{Dep\}, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Dep\}, \quad (44a)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \geq r_i^{v,l,c} - M \cdot \left(1 - g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall s \in \{Dep\}, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Dep\}, \quad (44b)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \leq M \cdot \left(1 - g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall s \in \{Arr\}, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr\}, \quad (45a)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \geq -M \cdot \left(1 - g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall s \in \{Arr\}, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr\}, \quad (45b)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \leq M \cdot \left(1 - g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall s \in \{Arr\}, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Dep\}, \quad (46a)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \geq -M \cdot \left(1 - g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall s \in \{Arr\}, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Dep\}, \quad (46b)$$

Constraining the cell values of Space-Time Matrices when the visits of the Vehicles overlap in SpaceTime (Residues being positive):

$$0 \leq o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} + M \cdot \left(1 - n_i^{v,l,c}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr\}, \quad (47)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Arr)}^{c,(v,l)} \leq o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Dep)}^{c,(v,l)} + M \cdot \left(1 - n_i^{v,l,c}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \\ \forall \hat{h} \in H, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \quad (48)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \leq r_i^{v,l,c} + M \cdot \left(1 - n_i^{v,l,c}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Dep\}, \quad (49)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Arr)}^{c,(v,l)} \leq \frac{a_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l})}^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} - a_i^{v,l}}{U^{k,c}} + M \cdot \left(g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Arr)}^{(v,l,Arr)} + g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Arr)}^{(v,l,Dep)}\right) + M \cdot \left(1 - n_i^{v,l,c}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h, \hat{h} \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \\ \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \text{if } U^{k,c} > 0, \quad (50)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Dep)}^{c,(v,l)} \leq \frac{d_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l})}^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} - a_i^{v,l}}{U^{k,c}} + M \cdot \left(g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Dep)}^{(v,l,Arr)} + g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Dep)}^{(v,l,Dep)}\right) + M \cdot \left(1 - n_i^{v,l,c}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h, \hat{h} \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \\ \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \text{if } U^{k,c} > 0, \quad (51)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Arr)}^{c,(v,l)} \geq r_i^{v,l,c} - \frac{d_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l})}^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} - a_i^{v,l}}{U^{k,c}} - M \cdot \left(g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Arr)}^{(v,l,Arr)} + g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Arr)}^{(v,l,Dep)}\right) - M \cdot \left(1 - n_i^{v,l,c}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h, \hat{h} \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \\ \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \text{if } U^{k,c} > 0, \quad (52)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Dep)}^{c,(v,l)} \geq r_i^{v,l,c} - \frac{d_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l})}^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} - a_i^{v,l}}{U^{k,c}} - M \cdot \left(g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Dep)}^{(v,l,Arr)} + g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Dep)}^{(v,l,Dep)}\right) - M \cdot \left(1 - n_i^{v,l,c}\right), \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h, \hat{h} \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \\ \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \text{if } U^{k,c} > 0, \quad (53)$$

Constraining the cell values of Space-Time Matrices when the visits of the vehicles being compared overlap in SpaceTime (Residues being negative):

$$0 \geq o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} - M \cdot n_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr\}, \quad (54)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Arr)}^{c,(v,l)} \geq o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},Dep)}^{c,(v,l)} - M \cdot n_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \quad (55)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \geq r_i^{v,l,c} - M \cdot n_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h,k,u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \\ \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h},\hat{k},\hat{u}), \forall \hat{l} \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Dep\}, \quad (56)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \geq \frac{a_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} - a_i^{v,l}}{-U^{k,c}} - M \cdot \left(g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,Arr)} + g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,Dep)} \right) - M \cdot n_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h, \hat{h} \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \\ \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h,k,u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h},\hat{k},\hat{u}), \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr\}, \text{if } U^{k,c} > 0, \quad (57)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \geq \frac{d_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}} - a_i^{v,l}}{-U^{k,c}} - M \cdot \left(g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,Arr)} + g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,Dep)} \right) - M \cdot n_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h, \hat{h} \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \\ \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h,k,u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h},\hat{k},\hat{u}), \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Dep\}, \text{if } U^{k,c} > 0, \quad (58)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \leq r_i^{v,l,c} + \frac{d_i^{v,l} - a_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}}}{U^{k,c}} + M \cdot \left(g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,Arr)} + g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,Dep)} \right) + M \cdot n_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h, \hat{h} \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \\ \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h,k,u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h},\hat{k},\hat{u}), \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr\}, \text{if } U^{k,c} > 0, \quad (59)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \leq r_i^{v,l,c} + \frac{d_i^{v,l} - d_i^{\hat{v},\hat{l}}}{U^{k,c}} + M \cdot \left(g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,Arr)} + g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,Dep)} \right) + M \cdot n_i^{v,l,c}, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h, \hat{h} \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \\ \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h,k,u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h},\hat{k},\hat{u}), \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Dep\}, \text{if } U^{k,c} > 0, \quad (60)$$

Constraining any collection to occur at Transshipment Ports only when the concerned material is available (i.e. previously deposited by some other vehicle at the same TP):

$$\sum_{\substack{h \in H, \\ k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \\ u \in G_{h,k}, \\ v = (h,k,u)}} o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall \hat{h} \in H, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h},\hat{k},\hat{u}), \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \\ \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr, Dep\}, \quad (61)$$

Constraining final Residues at Transshipment Ports to be null:

$$\sum_{\substack{h \in H, \\ k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \\ u \in G_{h,k}, \\ v = (h,k,u)}} r_i^{v,l,c} \leq 0, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i \cap P, \quad (62)$$

Vehicle Capacity (Volume) Constraints:

$$\sum_{c \in C_k} \left(E_c \cdot y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \right) \leq E^k \cdot x_{i,j}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h,k,u), l = 1, \forall i, j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j, \text{(if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h), \\ \text{(if } i = h \Rightarrow j \notin R), \quad (63a)$$

$$\sum_{c \in C_k} \left(E_c \cdot y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \right) \leq E^k \cdot x_{i,j}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h,k,u), \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1\}, \forall i \in V_k, \forall j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j, \\ \text{(if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h), \quad (63b)$$

$$\sum_{c \in C_k} \left(E_c \cdot y_i^{v,l,m,c} \right) \leq E^k \cdot x_i^{v,l,m}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h,k,u), \forall l, m \in L_v, |l - m| = 1, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (63c)$$

Vehicle Capacity (Weight) Constraints:

$$\sum_{c \in C_k} \left(F_c \cdot y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \right) \leq F^k \cdot x_{i,j}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h,k,u), l = 1, \forall i, j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j, \text{(if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h), \\ \text{(if } i = h \Rightarrow j \notin R), \quad (64a)$$

$$\sum_{c \in C_k} (F_c \cdot y_{i,j}^{v,l,c}) \leq F^k \cdot x_{i,j}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1\}, \forall i \in V_k, \forall j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j, \quad (\text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h), \quad (64b)$$

$$\sum_{c \in C_k} (F_c \cdot y_i^{v,l,m,c}) \leq F^k \cdot x_i^{v,l,m}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l, m \in L_v, |l - m| = 1, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (64c)$$

Populating variables used in the objective function:

$$z_x \geq a_h^{v,l} - \sum_{i \in S_k, N_k, R_k} T_{i,h}^k \cdot x_{i,h}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap O, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \quad (65a)$$

$$z_x \geq a_h^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \setminus O, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \quad (65b)$$

$$z_{s_{OT}} = \sum_{\substack{h \in H, \\ k \in K_h \cap O, \\ u \in G_{h,k}, \\ v = (h,k,u)}} \sum_{l \in L_v} \left(a_h^{v,l} - \sum_{i \in S_k, N_k, R_k} T_{i,h}^k \cdot x_{i,h}^{v,l} \right), \quad (66a)$$

$$z_{s_{CT}} = \sum_{\substack{h \in H, \\ k \in K_h \setminus O, \\ u \in G_{h,k}, \\ v = (h,k,u)}} \sum_{l \in L_v} a_h^{v,l}, \quad (66b) \quad z_s = z_{s_{CT}} + z_{s_{OT}} \quad (66c)$$

Variable Definitions:

$$x_i^{v,l,m} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l, m \in L_v, |l - m| = 1, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (67a)$$

$$x_{i,j}^{v,1} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall i, j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j, \text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h, \text{if } i = h \Rightarrow j \notin R, \quad (67b)$$

$$x_{i,j}^{v,l} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1\}, \forall i \in V_k, \forall j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j, \text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h, \quad (67c)$$

$$y_i^{v,l,m,c} \geq 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l, m \in L_v, |l - m| = 1, \forall c \in C_k, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (67d)$$

$$y_{i,j}^{v,1,c} \geq 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall c \in C_k, \forall i, j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j, \text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h, \text{if } i = h \Rightarrow j \notin R, \quad (67e)$$

$$y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \geq 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1\}, \forall c \in C_k, \forall i \in V_k, \forall j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j, \text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h, \quad (67f)$$

$$r_i^{v,l,c} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i \in S_k, \forall c \in B_i \cap C_k, \quad (67g)$$

$$n_i^{v,l,c} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i \in S_k, \forall c \in B_i \cap C_k, \quad (67h)$$

$$e_i^{v,l,c} \geq 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i \in S_k, \forall c \in B_i \cap C_k, \quad (67i)$$

$$a_i^{v,l} \geq 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i \in V_k \cup h, \quad (67j)$$

$$d_h^{v,1} \geq 0, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \quad (67k)$$

$$d_i^{v,l} \geq 0, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (67l)$$

$$t_i^{v,l,m} \geq 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l, m \in L_v, |l - m| = 1, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (67m)$$

$$t_{i,j}^{v,1} \geq 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall i, j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j, \text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h, \text{if } i = h \Rightarrow j \notin R, \quad (67n)$$

$$t_{i,j}^{v,l} \geq 0, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1\}, \forall i \in V_k, \forall j \in V_k \cup h, i \neq j, \text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h, \quad (67o)$$

$$w_i^{v,l} \geq 0, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i \in S_k, \quad (67p)$$

$$o_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{c,(v,l)} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall c \in B_i, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_c \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_c \cap K_i, \\ \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall \hat{s} \in \{Arr, Dep\}, \quad (67q)$$

$$g_{i,(\hat{v},\hat{l},\hat{s})}^{(v,l,s)} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall i \in S, \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall \hat{h} \in H, \forall \hat{k} \in K_{\hat{h}} \cap A_{B_i} \cap K_i, \\ \forall \hat{u} \in G_{\hat{h},\hat{k}}, \hat{v} = (\hat{h}, \hat{k}, \hat{u}), \forall l \in L_v, \forall \hat{l} \in L_{\hat{v}}, \forall s, \hat{s} \in \{Arr, Dep\}, \quad (67r)$$

$$b_i^c \geq 0, \forall i \in N, \forall c \in D \cup P \quad (67s) \quad z_x \geq 0. \quad (67w)$$

$$b_i^c \geq 0, \forall i \in W, \forall c \in D \quad (67t) \quad z_s \geq 0. \quad (67x)$$

$$q_i^c \geq 0, \forall i \in N, \forall c \in D \cup P \quad (67u) \quad z_{s_{OT}} \geq 0. \quad (67y)$$

$$q_i^c \geq 0, \forall i \in W, \forall c \in D \quad (67v) \quad z_{s_{CT}} \geq 0. \quad (67z)$$

Detailed Explanation of the Constraints used in this MILP Formulation:

Explaining the above constraints in details, Eq. 2 allows at most a single path to start from the respective depot for each vehicle, to any of the allowed elements (which are in the same SMTS) in the sets W, N and S for the base level. Eq. 3 constrains the number of incoming paths/edges into the vehicle's respective depot, across all its levels, to be limited to 1, *i.e.*, only when that vehicle is used. Eq. 4 conserves the route flows for each vertex for all layers constraining the sum of all incoming edges to be equal to the sum of all outgoing edges for that vertex; eq. 4a is specific for the first layer, while eq. 4c is specific for the last layer. Only the first layer has all the vertices in sets W, S and N being connected with edges (decision variables) from the vehicle's depot. All layers have connections from all vertices in the sets S, N and R to the vehicle's depot. For Simultaneous Delivery and Pickup Nodes, only one visit in total is allowed by any of vehicles; which is constrained in Eq. 5.

We use single flow variables for each of the load-types and as per compatibility with the vehicle type; any outflow from the depots is made zero by Eq. 6. All inflows into the depots are made zero by Eq. 7; these nullifications will help us for the remainder of the flow formulations as we may not consider any of the flow variables into or out of any VD . For Warehouses, there will always be an increase from incoming links to outgoing links at each level of vehicle for each compatible delivery load type (Eq. 8). (In case of non-existing variables during the equation framing, *e.g.* when l takes values of 1 or l_v^{max} , the variables must be ignored. Since the constraints differ slightly when ignoring these non-existent variables, constraints dealing with the inter-layer variables are bifurcated into 3 constraints, 1 for the lowest layer, 1 for the in-between layers, and 1 for the top-most layer, similar to the bifurcations in Eq. 4). There would be no change in the amounts of pickup loads at Warehouses (Eq. 9). Each Warehouse capacity is constrained through Eq. 10. For Relief Centres, there will always be a decrease in the outgoing pickup resource flow values *w.r.t.* the incoming pickups as the evacuees (picked-up from Nodes) deboard at each RC (Eq. 11); no change in the delivery values would occur during any

vehicle's visit to the RCs (Eq. 12). Capacity of each RC for each type of the pickup load type is constrained through Eq. 13. During any vehicle's visit at Nodes, the outgoing pickup value for each Node is constrained to be greater than the incoming pickup values through Eq. 14. For the delivery variables, the sum of all incoming values at each level for each Node should be lesser than the sum of the outgoing values for each Cargo Type (CT) individually, during any vehicle's visit to Nodes (Eq. 15). Minimal resource commitment at each Node is ensured by Eqns. 16 and 17. At Transshipment Port, the residues of each type of TP -compatible load during each visit of any vehicle is calculated using Eq. 18. For the loads which are not TP -compatible, no changes in the flow quantity is allowed at the respective TP (Eq. 19).

For developing the Time Constraints, we visualize the following process-flow during the operation at any typical TP during any vehicle visit *i.e.*, at every layer of every vehicular trip.

- i. Vehicle reaches TP at an assumed time T_0
- ii. Loading/Unloading of Vehicle-& TP compatible cargo is done. For each of the compatible load categories, the time considered is the sum of the waiting time T_W loading/unloading time $T_{U/L}$. Here we assume this process to be done without any parallelization approach. As a future research area; or problem variant, this could be edited for task parallelization which could allow the transshipment operations to become organized. As a suggestion, simultaneous cargo-specific queues could also be pondered upon, depending on manpower available at the site and the number of extra vehicle-crew.
- iii. Vehicle departs the TP during this same visit at a time T_z where, $T_z = T_0 + \sum_{Cargos}^{Compatible} (T_W + T_{U/L})$

For a VD all departure times are considered 0 (Eq. 20), assuming that it takes no time to prepare the vehicles (fuelling, maintenance, etc.) or the crew (assigning the route instructions, providing a dry run of the tasks involved during their specific stops, etc.). This constraint may be modified to allow the condition when certain vehicles are available at a later time, allowing other available vehicles to start the relief operation immediately. In this work, we consider this modification only during for the literature instances (modelling vehicular fixed cost as the start time from depot).

Travel time calculation (on the same layer) is done by Eqns. 21, 22 and 23; the travel time calculation between layers is done by Eqns. 24, 25 and 26. Arrival times are calculated using Eqns. 27 and 28. Departure times are calculated in Eqns. 35 (for Transshipment Ports), 36 (for Nodes), 37 (for Warehouses), and 38 (for Relief Centres). The residues need to be arranged *w.r.t.* time so that we may ensure that at any point in time, the sum of residues of a specific load-type at a specific TP is never negative; Eqns. 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34 are used to calculate the modulus of the residues. By comparing Arrival and Departure times of vehicles at Transshipment Ports, Eq. 39 populates the intermediate binary variable g when $s = Dep$ and $\hat{s} = Arr$, Eq. 40 populates variable g when $s = Dep$ and $\hat{s} = Dep$, Eq. 41 populates variable g when $s = Arr$ and $\hat{s} = Arr$ and Eq. 42 populates g for when $s = Arr$ and $\hat{s} = Dep$.

The cell values of the space-time matrices consist of the variables o which store some proportion of the (load-specific) residue r available for transshipment during the arrival and departure times of all vehicles. This uses the comparison of a vehicle's visiting time with another at the same Transshipment Port for all its visiting possibilities individually, *i.e.*, across the various levels. We first consider the case when the visiting durations of the vehicles under comparison don't overlap, *i.e.*, they concerned vehicles don't meet during their corresponding layer-specific visit at the concerned Transshipment Port S . Due to this non-overlapping nature, it is easy to determine the available proportion of residue (*i.e.*, the cell value o) which would either be the entire residue of the vehicle under consideration *v w.r.t.* a reference vehicle \hat{v} if v has already departed the transshipment port with some residue value r during its specific layer-wise visit l ; otherwise its value would be 0 if the concerned vehicle v is yet to arrive in the transshipment port *w.r.t.* the reference vehicle \hat{v} 's visit duration. Constraining the cell values of space-time matrices when the vehicles being compared don't overlap in spacetime is ensured through the Eqns. 43, 44, 45 and 46, which populate the variable o when $g = 1$.

However, when $g = 0$ for both $s = Arr$ and $s = Dep$, *i.e.*, when the vehicles under comparison overlap during their visiting times at the same transshipment port, those constraints become redundant and the new constraints are developed to populate the o variables of the space-time matrix within certain bounds such that the rate of loading/un-loading of the resources is not breached (due to minimization, the o variable should take the upper bound when the residues are positive). When the residues are positive (and the visits of the vehicles being compared overlap in spacetime), we constrain the cell values of the space-time matrices within their limits of 0 to the maximum value being the residue r itself, through Eqns. 47, 48, 49, 50, 51 52 and 53 (the Eqns. 47, 48 and 49 are applicable irrespective of whether the vehicles overlap in spacetime or don't). When the residues are negative (and vehicles being compared overlap in spacetime), we constrain the cell values of the space-time matrices within their limits of 0 to the minimum value being the residue r itself, through Eqns. 54, 55, 56, 57, 58 59 and 60 (the Eqns. 54, 55 and 56 are applicable irrespective of whether the vehicles overlap in spacetime or don't).

The typical space-time matrix may be imagined as a matrix with rows as various space-stamps (*i.e.*, each compatible vehicle's levels) and columns as various time-stamps (refer to Figure S1 and Figure S4 in the Supplementary document). For each vehicle level in the rows, there are two time-stamps namely arrival and departure. Therefore all space-time matrices constructed by us are rectangular in nature with columns being twice that of rows, *i.e.*, the time-stamps correspond to the arrival and departure times of the compatible vehicles' levels. To ensure any resource collection (*i.e.*, loading into vehicles) happens only when there are available resources at transshipment ports, we constrain the sum of the cells across each time axis (each column) for every space-time matrix to be non-negative. This ensures that at every time-stamp the total resource-specific residue at any TP never becomes negative, *i.e.*, no collection of loads takes place before the load was deposited, and only the loading of materials previously deposited by some other vehicles is allowed into the vehicles that arrive later (thereby eliminating pseudo-loading, and ensuring any transfer of pickup or delivery types from the specific TP happens only happen when enough material is available at that TP). Having developed the space-time matrix (*i.e.*, calculated each cell of the matrix, depicted by the variable o), for each load-type at each Transshipment Port S (considering

compatibilities for allowable transshipments) populated by respective o variables, we constrain the cascaded-temporal sum of residues to be non-negative at each time-stamp, for every load-type at every S (Eq. 61).

Since Transshipment Ports are modelled to allow the transfer of (compatible) cargos during the operation period, they should not contain any resource (pickup or delivery load type) finally at the end of the emergency relief-and-rescue operation. Therefore, we need to provide an additional constraint which is set so as to nullify the sum of all residues (of each resource type separately) at each Transshipment Port. Due to the nature of the problem, this is necessary to be constrained for only the PickUp Load Types, since Eq. 61 is enough for the Delivery Load Types. If this constraint is not provided, PickUp quantities after transshipment initiation will remain at the respective Transshipment Ports instead of finally being deposited at Relief Centres. thus, all residues at Transshipment Ports are summed up and equalled to zero (Eq. 62) to constrain the final residues at each Transshipment Ports to be null for each resource type. (In some instances, instead of using $\forall c \in B_i \cap P$ in Eq. 62, we do use $\forall c \in B_i$; this is mainly done to check the formulation run times for different combinations of constraint usages.)

To ensure vehicle capacities are never breached, all flow variables associated with an edge are constrained *w.r.t.* the total available vehicle-volumes (Eq. 63), and *w.r.t.* the total allowable vehicle-weights (Eq. 64). Eq. 65 assigns the MakeSpan objective variable of z_x , such that it can take the maximum among all vehicle's route durations; for the VT s that follow open-tours the last route back towards the depot is subtracted from the total time (Eq. 65a), and for the VT s that follow closed-tours the entire tour length till arrival at the respective depot is considered (Eq. 65b). Similarly, equation 66 is used to populate the variable of z_s such that it is equal to the sum of all vehicle-return-times at VD . For the vehicles which don't need to return back at the starting depot, the time taken to return from the last vertex is subtracted as in Eq. 66a. The z_s variable represents the sum of all route durations and may be used as an alternate objective function. Finally, all variables are defined in the Eqns. 67, with some additional constraints available in Appendix C (these additional constraints are considered during the computational analyses).

4.1. The Study-Example Result using our MILP Formulation

The optimization process, as followed in this paper, minimizes the highest route duration among all vehicles at the first step (cascade) and places this value as a constraint on the route duration of each vehicle. Then the vehicle with the highest route duration is removed from being further compared and the same optimization is done again. This time (in a subsequent cascade) another vehicle is found to be having the highest route duration (this route duration value will always be less than the values found in the previous cascades, given that the previous cascade-steps were run till optimality); this route duration is set as the upper bound of the vehicle route durations of all vehicles which were compared in this cascade-step (*i.e.*, excluding vehicles having the highest route duration in any previous cascade-step), and then the optimization step is re-run (after discarding the vehicle with the highest route duration in the latest cascade, from being compared any further).

The result of the cascaded optimization for the example instance in Figure 1 (and considering all the resource flow variables y to be integers) is shown in Figure 2. The optimal (average optimality gap across all cascades is exactly 0) routes in the order of their cascades are (with the route durations indicated at the end in brackets):

↓ Cascade Numbers	Route Durations ↓
1: Vehicle (VD1, VT4, 1): VD1 → WH1 → NP3 → NM3 → TP1 → VD1	(115.083)
2: Vehicle (VD2, VT5, 1): VD2 → WH2 → TP2 → RC2 → VD2	(99.522)
3: Vehicle (VD3, VT2, 1): VD3 → TP2 → TP3	(99.074)
4: Vehicle (VD3, VT2, 2): VD3 → TP1 → TP3 → TP2	(79.459)
5: Vehicle (VD4, VT3, 1): VD4 → TP3 → NP1 → NM1 → RC1 → VD4	(75.502)
6: Vehicle (VD4, VT3, 2): VD4 → NP1 → TP3 → NP2 → NM2 → RC1 → VD4	(57.39)

Throughout this paper, we round all route durations (or their sums, while reporting the sum of all routes) to 3 decimal places, and all times to 2 decimals. The IntegralityFocus parameter in Gurobi for all instance runs (throughout this study) is always maintained at 1 (to allow rare usage of Gurobi's integer tolerances). For this run, when the Big M value was set at 3E3, and Gurobi's FeasibilityTol (feasibility tolerance for constraints) was set at 1E-5 (reduced from the default value of 1E-6), the total optimization time (for all the cascades) was 21.88 minutes; when the FeasibilityTol was changed to 1E-7 with the Big M value being 8E3, the full cascaded optimization happened in 31.05 minutes.

The sum of all routes after the first cascade was 542.04 while after the last cascade was 526.03 (for the detailed results, *i.e.*, the resource transfer amounts, waiting times *etc.*, please refer to the online repository mentioned after section 7). This showcases the fact that conventional min-max optimization (*i.e.*, the single step Makespan minimization), does not fully solve the problem since this single step is unable to reach into smaller vehicular routes for internal optimizations. To find better solutions, multi-step optimization is necessary; we perform this multi-step minimization terming them cascades and as we progress through each cascade, the internal (smaller) vehicular routes further improve thus strengthening the solution progressively. This improvement through Cascaded Makespan Minimization is further highlighted (as the encoding I) through the computational results in Table 5. The Cascaded Makespan Minimization is a lexicographic/hierarchical optimization approach used for the multi-step optimization problem.

When we allow the resource flow variables to take continuous values, we get a different (fully optimal across all cascades) result where the value of the first cascade changes to 114.363 (this is lower than the integer problem's largest vehicle route duration of 115.083) and the sum of all route durations at the end of all cascades becomes 524.97; however, continuous problems are not realistic and don't have real-world applications as non-integer resources do not have any meaning in reality.




Figure 2: MILP result for the illustrative example (for the Integer flow problem)

5. Heuristic Development based on Preferential Selection of Routes (PSR) from Node-variant-specific Decision Trees (DTs): Route Generation, Integration and Perturbation (GIP)

The main components of the DT-based PSR-GIP Heuristic are briefed below, along with the integration methodology of routes, and utilization of multiple passes of the heuristic's Pipeline (full details is elaborated separately as Heuristic Methods in the supplementary section S3). The flowchart in Figure 3 describes the overview of the Heuristic pipeline.

5.1. Preference Creation and Decision Trees

The preferences of vertices to satisfy a node (or a transshipment port) are stored within decision trees. Each Multi-step Decision Tree consists of Node \rightarrow Vehicle Types \rightarrow Vertices \rightarrow Cargo Types, as Trunk \rightarrow Branches \rightarrow Twigs \rightarrow Leaves, and this is deemed as the Decision Structure (DTS) of the problem. Apart from the exact sequence of routes or multi-trips of vehicles, this Decision Structure is able to capture most of the essential information in the considered problem and especially all the compatibility considerations. Elaborating on the Decision Structure (a sample is provided in Figure 4), from a single Trunk, multiple Branches emerge; from each Branch, multiple Twigs emerge (Twigs from one Vehicle Type-Branch can represent similar Vertices as represented by Twigs from another Vehicle Type-Branch); and ultimately from each Twig, multiple Leaves emerge (Leaves from one Vertex-Twig can represent similar CTs as represented by Leaves from another Vertex-Twig).

Numerical weights are placed at the ends of these trees, which are used to calculate preference scores for route creation in order to satisfy requirements (detailed methodology for calculation of these preferences for nodes is provided in the supplementary sections S3.1.3 and S3.1.4; for TPs the preference scoring methods are provided in section S3.1.5 which leverages a complex recursive function developed for estimating and fathoming deep transshipments). The Figure B.7 in Appendix B further highlights the stages/degrees of transshipment, with deep transshipments indicating higher degrees.

5.2. Smallest Route Element (SRE) development

A Smallest Route Element is an (almost) independent portion within the route of a vehicle. It may be only connected with another SRE due to the causal relationship during transshipments. During any transshipment, the resources which are to be delivered from any TP can happen only after those specific amount (or higher) of each resource reaches that specific Port in S ; this creates a necessary causality constraint for each transshipment. This causal relation comes into effect whenever any resource needs to be transhipped and these relationships are stored within a Causality Dict (CD). There are three segments to an SRE as shown in Figure 5, termed as SETs 1, 2 and 3.

During each Pipeline pass within a Main Iteration, requirements of A set of unsatisfied nodes (Split and/or Simultaneous) is created from among all the unsatisfied nodes (without replacement) during each Pipeline pass, and each of these nodes are satisfied by creating SREs to fulfill their requirements (the full process of developing SREs for each of the node types is explained in the supplementary section S3.2, along with the details for generating SREs during transshipment processes while also logging each transfer into the Causality Dict in section S3.2.1 to maintain temporal causality during each unique transshipment).




Figure 3: Overview of the proposed heuristic




Figure 4: Decision Tree Structure of TP2 from the illustrative example. The Trunk in this case is the TP2; the two Branches are VT2 and VT5 (with their respective set of possible VDs); the 4 Twigs (2 on each Branch) are TP3, TP1, RC2 and WH2; finally, the 8 Leafs of the DTS are all the CTs indicated on the right-most side.




Figure 5: Smallest Route Element. Each SRE is specific to a Vehicle Type and is associated with a list of possible Vehicle Depots; this is used during the assigning of an SRE to any vehicle of that specific Vehicle Type originating from any of the associated VDs.

5.3. Integration of SREs within allocated Vehicle's Route6

During every Pipeline pass (*i.e.*, Pipeline Iteration), we obtain the newly created SREs developed in the current pipeline, these are also stored within a Global SRE Pool (emptied after every Main Iteration), as well as a Pipeline SRE Pool (emptied after each Pipeline Iteration). For the Allocation and Insertion of SREs (from the Pipeline SRE Pool only), we develop each SRE to take a form similar to the structure of a Route, naming this metamorphosed SRE as a Route Portion (RoPr).

5.3.1. Description of the Route6 structure of all vehicular routes

Each vehicle's route is stored within six different arrays:

- List 1:** Stores the vertices orderly as visited by a vehicle. TPs, if any visited by the vehicle, retain their altered new name in this list.
- List 2:** Maintains the count of the number of Perturbations of the vertex at this same position in **List 1**.
- List 3:** Stores the Vehicle Load Code (VLC) for the vertex in the corresponding position in **List 1**.
- List 4:** Stores StatusCodes of the vehicle after each visit to vertices. StatusCodes indicate the current amount of each Cargo Type present within a vehicle.
- List 5:** Stores the TimeTuple for this specific visit. A TimeTuple has the form:
 - (Vertex Entering Time, Loading Unloading Time, Vertex Leaving Time) if it is not a for Transshipment Port
 - If the concerned vertex being visited (at the same position in **List 1**) is a Transshipment Port, an additional information of Waiting Time is necessary and the TimeTuples for Transshipment Port visits are as: (Vertex Entering Time, Loading Unloading Time, Waiting Time, Vertex Leaving Time)
- List 6:** To appropriately implement the entire Heuristic, we need to distinguish between two identical SREs (which may be formed due to the requirement of multiple trips, possibly due to capacity constraints of vehicles). For this we maintain a reference ID of the SRE (during our code implementation, the reference ID was set as the position of the SRE within the Global SRE Pool).

A VLC represents the actual transfer of CTs *w.r.t.* the vehicle (it can be imagined by considering the vehicle as an enclosed Gaussian surface, and any entry of a resource into the surface is attached with a positive number, and vice versa).

Table 3: A. A sample Compacted_Route6 example of a complete VT3 trip from Figure 1

List 1:	VD4	NP1	RC1	TP3_G	NP2	NM2	RC1	NP1	NM1	VD4
List 2:	N/A	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
List 3:	{}	{1P:25}	{1P:-25}	{1D:21, 2D:23}	{1D:-4, 2D:-7}	{1D:-3, 2D:-2, 1P:20}	{1P:-20}	{1D:-5, 2D:-6}	{1D:-9, 2D:-8}	{}
List 4:	{}	{1P:25}	{}	{1D:21, 2D:23}	{1D:17, 2D:16}	{1D:14, 2D:14, 1P:20}	{1D:14, 2D:14}	{1D:9, 2D:8}	{1D:-9, 2D:-8}	{}
List 5:	(, , 0)	(13.98, 3.75, 17.73)	(27.23, 3.75, 30.98)	(38.14, 16.35, ω , 54.49+ ω)	(64.38+ ω , 3.9, 68.28+ ω)	(73.59+ ω , 4.95, 78.54+ ω)	(93.61+ ω , 3, 96.61+ ω)	(106.11+ ω , 4.05, 110.16+ ω)	(115.62+ ω , 6.45, 122.07+ ω)	(132.66+ ω , ,)
List 6:		SRE 30	SRE 30	SRE 23, SRE 54, SRE 89, SRE 17	SRE 23	SRE 54	SRE 54	SRE 89	SRE 17	

Table 3: B. Expansion of the compacted element from Table 3A

Compact Element	Element	Original Elements in expanded form			
TP3_G		TP3_G	TP3_G	TP3_G	TP3_G
0		1	1	1	0
{1D:21, 2D:23}		{1D:9, 2D:8}	{1D:3, 2D:2}	{1D:5, 2D:6}	{1D:4, 2D:7}
{1D:21, 2D:23}		{1D:9, 2D:8}	{1D:12, 2D:10}	{1D:17, 2D:16}	{1D:21, 2D:23}
(38.14, 16.35, ω , 54.49+ ω)		(38.14, 6.45, ω_1 , 44.59+ ω_1)	(44.59+ ω_1 , 1.95, ω_2 , 46.54+ $\omega_1 + \omega_2$)	(46.54+ $\omega_1 + \omega_2$, 4.05, ω_3 , 50.59+ $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3$)	(50.59+ $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3$, 3.9, ω_4 , 54.49+ $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 + \omega_4$)
<i>SRE 23, SRE 54, SRE 89, SRE 17</i>		<i>SRE 17</i>	<i>SRE 54</i>	<i>SRE 89</i>	<i>SRE 23</i>

If multiple same vertices from different SREs occur sequentially in a Route6, we do not combine them together. The combined Route6 as shown in Table 3A may only be developed after the Perturbation step (section 5.4), when the final VDs are assigned at the end of each vehicle’s route (depending on if closed trip is considered); till before that step, we maintain the vertices separately as shown for one such vertex in Table 3B.

Each SRE is moulded into a structural form same as a Route6, termed a RoPr (see supplementary section S3.3.2); depending on the number of permutations possible within each SET of any SRE, multiple RoPr can be formed with are together termed as RoPr-Combos. A complete solution consisting of all vehicle routes is termed as a Route Cluster (RoCu). We develop multiple allocation logics to integrate RoPrs within RoCus; initially each RoCu is labelled with a specific allocation-integration logic and as we introduce dynamic shuffling among these logics, the solution is found to improve. Detailed descriptions of these processes and algorithms can be found in the supplementary section S3.3. While a RoPr is being integrated into a Route6 within a RoCu, similarity of its individual elements are checked with the existing elements of the Route6 allowing to match similar vertices (supplementary section S3.3.6). A novel Waiting Time calculation method based on geometrical logics is devised (supplementary section S3.3.7) which is necessary to maintain temporal causality during every individual transshipment.

5.4. Finding neighbouring route structures through Perturbations of every Route6 within a Route Cluster

This function is used to find the neighbouring solutions of a Route6. It takes a RoCu (termed a `_RoCu` in the pseudocode) and appends the final VDs at the ends of those VTs that have closed trip requirements (thus adding an additional TimeTuple to the routes with a closed trip). Next, iteration over each of its Route6 takes place, to retain successful perturbations as detailed in the below pseudocode. For every Main Iteration, we use a user-defined limit on the number of perturbations allowed to a RoCu (termed `P` in the below function definition); this number is spread across the different Routes6 in that RoCu proportional to their vertex lengths.

Pseudocode of Function to find neighbouring route structures of a Route6

```

1: function NEIGHBOURING_ROUTE_STRUCTURE_GENERATION(a_RoCu, P)
2:   append the return VDs (as applicable) across all routes in a_RoCu
3:   for each Route6 within a_RoCu
4:     for no. of iterations equal to  $P \times \frac{\text{length of this Route6}}{\text{sum of lengths of all Route6 within RoCu}}$ :
5:       randomly selects a vertex to be perturbed (within this Route6)  $\triangleright$  The randomly selected vertex element
        (i.e., the whole column of List 1 to 6 together) will be shifted within that route
6:       upper and lower positional bounds are obtained for a feasible shift
7:       shift the full vertex column element to any position within the identified bound
8:       after the shift, recomputation of the StatusCodes for this Route6 is done
9:       all TimeTuples are updated  $\triangleright$  During the TimeTuple updation, it may be necessary to trigger
        the Waiting Time calculation function multiple times; also other route durations will be affected due to this shift, as
        they may have connected waiting times to this route
10:      if all newly computed StatusCodes are within the vehicle’s weight and volume limitations (i.e., no capacity
        breach detected), and all new Waiting Time computations are successful, and all TimeTuples across that RoCu have
        been updated then
11:        if there is any improvement seen in the overall cascaded vehicle route durations of this RoCu then
12:          we retain this shifted RoCu (as an update to the original RoCu)  $\triangleright$  Subsequent perturbations are
        performed on the updated RoCu
13:          increment the List 2, of the specific vertex which is moved, by 1
14:        else
15:          we revert back to the previous RoCu before this single-vertex shift
16:        end if
17:      end if
18:    end for
19:  end for
20: end function

```

We find the feasible left and right Position bounds (for step 6 in the above pseudocode) till where it may be shifted without hampering the relative position of SET 1, 2 and 3 of its respective SRE (this is done by searching across Route6 and marking the Positions of elements from the same SRE). For every SRE, we need to always ensure that all SET 1 elements are positioned before all SET 2 elements, both of which are positioned before SET 3 elements. If any of the SETs 1 or 3 is empty, then the bound of the SRE 2 vertex will be unlimited in that direction (and limited by the first occurrence of the other SET 3 or 1 element in the opposite direction of Route6’s columns).

As a future area of research, incorporating a threshold during perturbations to allow finding better solutions via worse solutions could be considered; adaptive thresholds [23] could also be integrated within simulated annealing approaches.

5.5. Overall Heuristic Overview

Each Main Iteration of the Heuristic is run as multiple Pipeline passes (depicted in Figure 3). We start by sending each unsatisfied nodes one at a time through this pipeline, generate SREs for the full satisfaction of this node, and integrate RoPr of the SREs into all available Route Clusters; in the next pass we send another unsatisfied node and continue likewise till all nodes have been passed through the pipeline. This creates the final solution across all RoCus which is perturbed. The best cascaded solution among all clusters is deemed the best solution found in this Main Iteration.

When we send all the nodes together in a single pipeline pass, all the SREs pertaining to every node in the problem is developed. All these SREs are then integrated into route clusters and then perturbation takes places (after adding the final return vehicle depot for closed route-vehicle types).

The final best solution from the Heuristic is output as the final best cascaded solution from among the best solutions from each Main Iteration. In our implementation, all Main Iterations are independent; the no. of nodes being passed in any Main Iteration can vary from a single node up to the full problem requirement being considered at once in a single pipeline. We believe this pipelining approach also plays a crucial role in generating diverse quality of solutions.

Our Heuristic does not have any memory-element being passed from one Main Iteration to another (considering this may be in the future research scope), since we already develop multiple diverse solutions through the different clusters with their respective logics labels (shuffled for all route clusters independently after an SRE has been integrated into them).

5.6. Result of the illustrative example problem-instance using our heuristic

A good heuristic result of the cascaded optimization for the example instance in Figure 1 (and considering integral resource transfer) is shown in Figure 6, the routes being:

↓ Cascade Number	Route Durations ↓
1: Vehicle (VD4, VT3, 1): VD4 → TP3 → NP2 → NM2 → RC1 → VD4	(116.87)
2: Vehicle (VD4, VT3, 2): VD4 → TP3 → NP1 → NM1 → NP1 → RC1 → VD4	(114.689)
3: Vehicle (VD2, VT5, 1): VD2 → WH2 → TP2 → RC2 → VD2	(98.219)
4: Vehicle (VD3, VT2, 2): VD3 → TP2 → TP3 → TP1 → TP3 → TP1 → TP2	(78.004)
5: Vehicle (VD1, VT4, 1): VD1 → WH1 → NP3 → NM3 → TP1 → VD1	(74.002)
6: Vehicle (VD3, VT2, 1): VD3 → TP2 → TP3 → TP1 → TP3	(64.398)

The sum of all routes in this solution is 546.183 found in 4.21 minutes. The average of the highest route durations was 168.965 with an S.D. of 21.073; the best solution with the minimum sum of all routes was 511.47 (the average and S.D. of the solution with minimum sum of all routes being 678.94 and 90.303). We don’t develop any separate algorithm for optimization based on the minimum sum of all routes, instead from the same pool of route clusters, we filter encountered solutions based on this criteria maintaining a separate list. These reportings had the average number of Main Iterations as 14.2 (S.D. 0.6) with an average time of 3.6 minutes (S.D. 1.98); for our study-example heuristic runs, we used the following bounds to obtain starting Heuristic input-parameters (from an uniform distribution):

Heuristic Parameter	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
No. of Internal Main Iterations	10	20
Max. No. of Perturbation in each Main Iteration:	1729	8911
Max. No. of Route Generation Logic Allowed from SRE:	100	300

Detailed results are hosted online on GitHub (repository details is available after section 7).

6. Discussion and Computational Study

The details of the supporting Compute Infrastructure are provided in Table S7 in the supplementary, along with the software versions used. We develop novel Instances for benchmarking the Heuristic *w.r.t.* MILP results.




Figure 6: A Heuristic result for our Study-Example Instance (Integer flow problem)

6.1. Small Instances

The results from the small instances (dataset overview in supplementary Table S8) are presented in supplementary Table S11 and Table 5. To effectively convey the comparison of the MILP solution with the Heuristic Algorithm (and to fit the results within a single screen-view), the column headings are encoded as described in Table 4.

We generalize the makespan minimization through cascaded route optimization; we are able to show significant differences in the routes of the final cascade when compared to the first cascade’s routes, as can be observed as S_{FB} in Tables S11 and 5. This happens because there remains a slack even in the optimum solution after minimizing the makespan allowing the smaller routes to be further optimized, a single makespan minimization will never be able to achieve this.

As an alternative to the Cascaded Time Minimization, Makespan minimization followed by minimizing the sum of all the remaining route durations (apart from the highest route which forms the Makespan) could also be thought; the utility of these different optimization approaches must be researched *w.r.t.* application areas as we believe this approach of cascaded time minimization is best suited for our consideration within disaster management scenarios.

The computational results considering the flow variables as Continuous are presented in Table S11 under supplementary section S4.1, and the results when considering the flow variables as Integers are presented in Table 5. The parameters used during these MILP runs (for both the Continuous and Integer problem) along with the (non-default) Gurobi settings are:

Big M (used in Formulation)	3000
Constraint Feasibility Tolerance (FeasibilityTol)	$1E-5$ (default is $1E-6$)
IntegralityFocus	1 (default is 0, setting it to 1 helps allow better satisfaction of integer variables by preventing over-exploitation of integer tolerances)

The Heuristic’s Parameter values used were:

Heuristic User-Inputs	Continuous Problem	Integer Problem
No. of Internal Main Iterations	10	15
Max. No. of Perturbation in each Main Iteration:	1729	4104
Max. No. of Route Generation Logic Allowed from SRE:	100	200

We clearly observe from the column OL_B in Table 5, that the Relative Gap % for the Cascaded Makespan Optimization results as found by our Heuristic (best solution) is within 10% of the solution found by the MILP Formulation (the Average Relative Gap % across all Integer Instances of Table 5 is **3.1%**). Some points to observe for these Integer problems are:

- For the instance (S6), the formulation was infeasible with Levels=1; no solution was found with Levels=2, 3, or 4.
- For the instance (S7), the optimal solution using only 1 level proved to have an incomplete solution space, as the heuristic solution was found to be better. The MILP for this case was also run using levels equal to 2 (the relative gaps of the Heuristic’s best-found solution *w.r.t.* both the MILP runs is reported).
- For the instance (S9) the vehicle with the largest trip length in the first cascade also had the largest trip length in the final cascade (just like in most of the other instances), but this route duration value got decreased in the final cascade (compared to what had been the cascade 1 objective function, and subsequently used for constraining all vehicle trip durations at the end of Cascade 1). The Gap % in this case should therefore be slightly lower, but it has not been adjusted. Further, no solution was found during the second Cascade with Levels=1; (as Gurobi Warm Start did not seem to continue (even after repeated attempts)).

Table 4: Encoded column headings for representing Computational Results of Small Instances from Supplementary Table S8, in the Table S11 for Continuous problems and the Table 5 for the Integer problems

↗ ENCODINGS ↘		
	Explanation of the Encoded Symbols	Encoded Symbol
<p>Cascaded Makespan Minimization using our developed exact MILP Formulation:</p> <p>Here we use Gurobi’s Warm Start to progress towards higher cascades; this happens by default when limited changes in an existing optimization model is performed allowing Gurobi to restart from the previous state (and solution).</p> <p>At the end of every cascade, we add/update constraints limiting the route durations of all vehicles (except those vehicles which had the maximum route duration in any previous cascade, and whose route durations have been removed from constraining the objective function through the Equation 65). This addition of upper limits to vehicle route durations (of unfixed vehicles at the end of every cascade) allows the route duration of any vehicle to flexibly change (<i>i.e.</i>, reduce further) in the subsequent cascades.</p>	The highest Vehicle Route Duration (after completion of all Cascades) (i.e. Makespan)	O
	The sum of all vehicle’s Route Durations (after all Cascades are complete)	S_F
	Total Number of Cascades (equal to the Number of Vehicles)	C
	Time Taken for all Cascades of the specific Level to complete. Each Cascade was allowed to run for:	T
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\frac{180}{C}$ mins for the Continuous problems • $\frac{500}{\frac{C-1}{2}}$ mins for the Integer problems 	
	Gap % as reported by Gurobi after first Cascade	G_O
	Average Gap % across all Cascades	G_A
	Levels used in this solution:	L
	Levels provided to each vehicle were increased from 1 in case the model was found infeasible, or, no feasible solution was found in any of the previous cascades.	
	The sum of all vehicle’s Route Durations, after the 1st Cascade	S_I
Improvement in the Sum of all Vehicle’s Route Durations, w.r.t. final Cascade	I	
Calculated as: $\frac{S_I - S_F}{S_F} * 100$ (%)		
<p>PSR-GIP Heuristic: Cascaded Makespan Minimization sense of Optimization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each Continuous Instance, 250 independent runs of the Heuristic Algorithm were performed (and reported in Table S11) • For each Integer Instance, 175 independent runs of the Heuristic Algorithm were performed (and reported in Table 5) 	The Largest Route Duration among all vehicles of a solution (Best solution among All runs)	L_B
	Average of the Highest Vehicular Route Duration (across All runs)	L_A
	S.D. of the Highest Vehicular Route Duration	L_{SD}
	The Aggregate of all Vehicular Route Durations of the Best solution	S_B
	Average (across All runs) of the Aggregated Vehicular Route Durations	S_A
	S.D. (across All runs) of the Aggregated Vehicular Route Durations	S_{SD}
	No. of Vehicles used in the Best Solution / Out of Total Available Vehicles	V
	Average Heuristic RunTime (minutes)	R_A
	S.D. Of Heuristic RunTimes (minutes)	R_{SD}
<p>Comparative Gap % of Heuristic Best solution w.r.t. MILP Formulation</p>	Gap % w.r.t. the Largest Vehicle’s Route Duration	OL_B
	Calculated as: $\frac{L_B - O}{L_B} * 100$	
	Gap % w.r.t. the Aggregate of all Vehicle’s Route Durations	S_{FB}
	Calculated as: $\frac{S_B - S_F}{S_B} * 100$	

Table 5: Computational Results of Small Instances from Supplementary Table S8 with resource flow variables constrained to being Integers

ID	Cascaded Makespan Minimization using our developed exact MILP Formulation									PSR-GIP Heuristic									Comparative Gap %	
	O	S_F	C	T	G_O	G_A	L	S_I	I	L_B	L_A	L_{SD}	S_B	S_A	S_{SD}	V	R_A	R_{SD}	OL_B	S_{FB}
(S1)	64.516	79.629	2	0.00	0.00	0.00	1	116.307	46.06	64.516	65.456	2.679	79.629	80.721	2.674	2/2	0.61	0.03	0.00	0.00
(S2)	64.278	152.772	4	1.23	0.00	0.00	1	172.665	13.02	64.278	65.159	1.54	157.264	175.42	13.161	4/4	1.35	0.11	0.00	2.86
(S3)	68.122	251.274	4	133.39	0.00	13.45	1	256.254	1.98	68.326	88.089	10.249	194.985	241.438	34.554	4/4	2.34	0.2	0.30	-28.87
(S4)	88.614	195.078	3	750.45	48.82	27.22	3	195.173	0.05	88.614	109.421	7.866	195.108	220.429	17.067	3/3	2.67	0.19	0.00	0.02
(S5)	50.569	262.56	7	992.23	98.33	99.76	2	262.56	0.00	53.828	57.707	2.172	268.134	279.325	7.604	7/7	3.29	0.37	6.05	2.08
(S6)	No Sol.	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	102.277	104.979	3.29	441.597	462.145	29.464	7/7	5.11	0.36	-	-
(S7)	151.937	388.611	5	3.24	0.00	0.00	1	479.326	23.34	141.194	141.861	0.267	450.8	386.727	31.213	5/5	1.54	0.2	-7.61	13.80
	141.809	364.835	5	968.77	26.13	85.23	2	456.791	25.20										-0.44	19.07
(S8)	136.139	421.667	5	968.77	26.99	85.40	2	569.818	35.13	152.2	153.058	0.703	376.127	390.237	19.929	5/5	3.45	0.23	10.55	-12.11
(S9)	101.8	448.559	7	992.28	90.67	98.67	2	680.747	51.76	111.582	125.755	9.022	467.843	517.12	45.458	6/7	5.42	0.56	8.77	4.12
(S10)	104.776	506.891	7	992.23	74.87	87.48	1	620.241	22.36	113.16	129.072	8.011	497.505	546.797	45.472	7/7	8.9	0.71	7.41	-1.89
(S11)	84.667	354.589	6	455.05	0.00	18.29	1	386.301	8.94	84.931	85.467	0.43	368.968	384.883	20.224	6/6	3.06	0.18	0.31	3.90
(S12)	125.107	604.593	7	992.33	30.94	88.49	1	679.992	12.47	136.38	152.257	8.448	610.26	632.575	43.788	7/7	8.23	1.12	8.27	0.93
(M13)	84.418	407.068	6	52.70	0.00	17.15	1	501.11	23.10	84.738	86.012	1.022	392.075	435.048	30.336	6/6	4	0.19	0.38	-3.82
(M14)	87.179	367.202	6	419.69	0.00	26.46	1	470.793	28.21	89.928	98.814	2.127	436.253	464.425	30.888	6/6	5.05	0.27	3.06	15.83
(M15)	68.48	253.605	4	190.39	0.00	45.15	1	261.564	3.14	74.547	109.044	11.183	205.648	310.256	51.143	4/4	3.09	0.36	8.14	-23.32
(M16)	119.277	303.135	4	694.25	0.00	0.00	1	337.684	11.40	119.277	119.277	0	305.026	306.5	5.875	4/4	2.57	0.28	0.00	0.62
(M17)	102.921	395.028	4	937.52	57.81	73.49	1	410.966	4.03	102.921	103.614	0.536	398.577	397.922	6.311	4/4	2.27	0.19	0.00	0.89
(M18)	49.185	142.648	4	183.42	0.00	0.00	1	160.395	12.44	49.185	49.448	0.439	112.618	135.41	16.943	3/4	1.55	0.21	0.00	-26.67
(M19)	88.789	359.811	6	244.79	0.00	16.82	1	397.975	10.61	96.23	103.382	2.641	377.329	398.492	10.852	6/6	7.02	0.53	7.73	4.64
(M20)	136.831	525.789	6	478.88	0.00	3.87	1	556.593	5.86	138.032	147.49	3.028	582.489	584.866	12.852	6/6	5.91	0.57	0.87	9.73
(M21)	41.799	233.326	6	1.90	0.00	0.00	1	221.536	-5.05	42.731	58.902	8.879	172.905	214.22	23.809	5/6	1.69	0.22	2.18	-34.94
(M22)	34.485	159.547	5	968.78	5.79	51.90	1	159.567	0.01	35.196	38.115	1.05	160.112	165.9	4.989	5/5	4.9	0.36	2.02	0.35
(M23)	98.765	461.996	6	219.32	0.00	6.98	1	537.231	16.28	99.609	107.032	4.454	504.868	525.437	29.017	6/6	6.82	0.26	0.85	8.49
(M24)	32.71	147.564	6	839.42	25.92	28.86	1	186.007	26.05	33.739	38.214	1.619	160.435	165.559	6.598	6/6	8.27	0.4	3.05	8.02
(M25)	88.097	383.595	6	241.99	0.00	33.33	1	435.233	13.46	92.666	104.848	4.649	372.48	403.182	18.486	6/6	12.15	1.24	4.93	-2.98

The prefix in the ID is a rough estimation of the problem size for each instance (applicable for all the Tables S8, S9, 5, S11, 6 and S12):

(S) \rightarrow Small (M) \rightarrow Medium (L) \rightarrow Large

6.2. Large Instances

The overview of the dataset details for the large instances we developed can be found in Supplementary Table S9. These Instances are run as Continuous and Integer problems, affecting the variable y in the MILP formulation, and the Heuristic is also tuned to match the same. The computational results of the problems with the resource flow variables as continuous are presented in Supplementary Table S12, while the integer consideration of the same problems is presented in Table 6. During both the computational cases (both Integer and Continuous Problems), the Gurobi (non-default) settings for the MILP runs were:

Big M (used in Formulation)	1E5
MIP Focus	1 (to focus on finding feasible solutions)
Integer Feasibility Tolerance (IntFeasTol)	1E-7 (default is 1E-5)
IntegralityFocus	1 (default is 0, setting it to 1 helps allow better satisfaction of integer variables by preventing over-exploitation of integer tolerances)

and the Heuristic Parameter values used were:

No. of Internal Main Iterations	10
Max. No. of Perturbation in each Main Iteration:	1729
Max. No. of Route Generation Logic Allowed from SRE:	100

We always compare only the fully solved problems for all instances considered across all datasets in section 6, as we don't consider partial satisfaction anywhere in this study. For every Main Iteration within every Instance-runs for the results reported in Tables S11, 5, S13 and 7 there is no Unsatisfiable Portion ever encountered by our Heuristic (showing the strength of our designed algorithm). Only for few of the complex large instances in Tables S12 and 6 do we encounter some of the Instance-runs within which every Main Iteration failed to find any solution.

For the Integer Problems in Table 6:

- i. In the instance (L31): 35 out of 44 Instance runs were successful
- ii. In the instance (L32): 20 out of 30 Instance runs were successful; the remaining 10 runs had no Main Iteration that was able to satisfy all the resource requirements of the problem to their fullest
- iii. In the instance (L34): 25 out of 30 Instance runs were successful

These indicate that for very complex large instances, with multiple intricate compatibility considerations within the problems, the Heuristic is able to generate good solutions at least $\tilde{70}\%$ of the time or more.

Table 6: Computational Results for the Large Instances (instance details in Supplementary Table S9) considering Integer resource flow

ID	MILP Formulation				PSR-GIP Heuristic					Relative Comparative Gap % $\frac{b-a}{b} * 100$
	Objective Value (Cascade 1 only, if any) (a)	Gap % (as reported by Gurobi)	Levels Used (I→Infeasible; N→NFSF; F→Feasible) #	Time (mins)	Best Objective (among at least 30 runs) (b)	Average (of the largest route duration among all Vehicles across successful Heuristic runs)	S.D. (of the vehicle with maximum route duration across successful Heuristic runs)	Average Heuristic RunTime (mins)	S.D. of Heuristic Runtimes (mins)	
(S26)	468.118	0	F:5	0.07	468.118	468.118	0	0.3	0	0.00
(S27)	645.164	0	F:3	53.55	645.164	657.601	30.382	0.53	0.04	0.00
(M28)	1007.834	92.569	N:1,2; F:5	1440	994.522	1121.995	57.748	1.85	0.23	-1.34
(M29)	NFSF	-	N:1	1440	14417.25	16847.385	971.673	31.69	8.83	-
(L30)	NFSF	-	I:5; N:6	OEAM	220.544	384.252	71.529	71.62	10.22	-
(L31)	NFSF	-	N:1	1440	809.61	1222.469	247.362	21.94	8.08	-
(L32)	NFSF	-	N:5,3	1440	994.712	1514.093	243.862	14.09	9.27	-
(L33)	NFSF	-	I:3; N:7,5	1440	470.141	819.59	272.271	11.16	4.19	-
(L34)	NFSF	-	N:5	1440	10550.721	14602.567	2868.328	20.38	10.87	-
(L35)	NFSF	-	N:5,2	1440	1828.904	2749.606	693.81	56.65	41.45	-
(L36)	NFSF	-	N:7,5,4	1440	340.644	518.671	82.805	83.1	13.67	-
(L37)	NFSF	-	I:2; N:3	1370	411.3	771.423	175.041	72.38	15.27	-
(L38)	NFSF	-	I:1; N:2	OEAM	1208.275	1866.051	713.845	98.6	43.08	-

NFSF \implies No Feasible Solution Found

OEAM \implies Optimization Exhausted Available Memory

All Vehicles were provided with the same number of levels, and the result of those instances is briefed. For each of the values mentioned, separate 24 hour MILP runs were performed. The instance results in this table correspond to the last value in the Levels Used column. Further, for levels indicating Infeasibility (due to lack of solution space restricting multi-trips), all lower-Level values were also infeasible (since the solution space is even smaller than with much lesser number of multi-visits possible at any vertex).

6.3. Datasets from Literature: Considering reduced version of our problem

We take instances from the Table 5 of [24]; the Instance Name I_1 corresponds to their case study instance ¹. The overview of the moulded dataset to our problem's specifications can be found in Supplementary Table S10. We use these instances to generate Continuous and Integer Problems, depending on the allowed variable values of the resource flow variables. Continuous variables would mean that fractional pickup and delivery is allowed at any vertex, whereas restricting them to Integers corresponds more towards realistic scenarios (as in real-world, Cargo Type units would not be sub-divided). The table Table 7 corresponds to case where the problems are run using integer variables (for both the MILP and the Heuristic); the MILP computations were performed on the Computer C_1, and the Heuristic Algorithms were run on the Computer C_4. It is observed that here too, the relative gap is significantly low, and is generally lower than the gaps found for the continuous case; this indicates that the Heuristic is suitable for real-world optimization problems.

Table 7: Computational Results of the Instances (instances described in Supplementary Table S10) considering Integer Resource Flows

Instance	Cascaded Makespan Minimization			PSR-GIP Heuristic #						Relative Gap % $\frac{(b-a)*100}{b}$
	Our Exact MILP Formulation*			Cascaded Makespan Minimization Optimization				Runtime		
	Objective Function Value of Cascade 1 (a)	No. of Vehicles used	MILP Gap % (reported by Gurobi)	Best Solution of Largest Route Duration among all Vehicles (b)	No. of Vehicles used in Best Solutions	Average of Best Solutions	S.D. of Best Solutions	Avg. (mins)	S.D. (mins)	
I_1	40.706	9	60.46	45.706	10	73.074	20.267	3.79	0.45	10.94
I_2	38.77	9	58.486	38.77	11	51.104	15.029	3.27	0.41	0.00
I_3	40.706	10	60.46	42.48	10	53.46	13.662	2.95	0.41	4.18
I_4	40.706	9	60.46	40.943	8	48.967	9.138	2.49	0.32	0.58
I_5	38.77	8	58.481	39.135	10	50.309	11.61	2.6	0.39	0.93
I_6	39.793	7	59.554	39.793	11	51.301	11.699	2.97	0.37	0.00
I_7	40.706	7	60.447	40.706	10	49.133	11.256	2.57	0.32	0.00
I_8	40.706	8	60.458	40.713	8	50.167	11.03	2.56	0.28	0.02
I_9	33.787	6	0	34.787	7	40.808	5.341	1.62	0.23	2.87
I_{10}	40.706	8	60.458	40.943	9	54.043	13.705	2.7	0.39	0.58
I_{11}	40.706	11	60.46	42.274	11	59.865	22.614	3.84	0.51	3.71
I_{12}	40.706	9	59.064	40.706	9	46.674	8.355	2.16	0.24	0.00
I_{13}	38.77	9	58.486	38.77	9	44.285	6.551	2.83	0.3	0.00
I_{14}	40.706	9	60.46	40.706	11	52.394	8.634	3.44	0.5	0.00
I_{15}	40.706	10	60.46	41.405	9	50.961	7.086	3.04	0.37	1.69

Gurobi (non-default) settings for the MILP runs:	Big M (used in Formulation)	3000
	Constraint Feasibility Tolerance (FeasibilityTol)	$1E-5$ (default is $1E-6$)

Heuristic Parameters used:	No. of Internal Main Iterations	20
	Max. No. of Perturbation in each Main Iteration:	8911
	Max. No. of Route Generation Logic Allowed from SRE:	300

* All MILPs were run for 24 hours with the Instance I_9 completing in 14.6 hrs (only first Cascades were run)

The Best, Average and S.D. are reported comparing 99 Heuristic runs for each Instance

¹The corrected datasets as sent by the authors of [24] are available along with all other datasets (see after section 7)

7. Conclusion

Disaster Management is an encompassing topic and in this study, we cover one important aspect of optimizing the time for emergency operations. We discuss a rich vehicle routing problem specific to disaster scenarios, defining a novel problem. For the first time, we separate the idea of depots from being packed with the all functionalities (generally depots combine the functionality of our warehouses, relief centres and vehicle depots), and allow the consideration of different functional nodes (multiple in number); we believe this is also an appropriate way of distributing disaster response resources and facilities across geographies, instead of maintaining all of them in a single space which may become critical in the case of man-made emergencies. We consider multiple cargo types having their separate (un)loading times for each vehicle type; vehicle-to-road (or vehicle-to-mode) compatibilities are similarly considered as in [23]. This problem conception focuses on a decentralized scheme where all vehicles, resources and pickups need not to be in the same place. In case it is necessary to combine any of the functional vertices (VDs, WHs or RCs), for the same geographical location, they may be created separately (at the same latitude, longitude) in the same spot.

We propose a complex MILP formulation for the conceived problem and develop an encompassing Heuristic, ensuring it to be robust across diverse instance categories. Our formulation provides the solution space for multiple trips by introducing new levels to the vehicles. Initially, since we do not know how many trips would be required, we provide all vehicles with level 1 (single trip solution space), and try to optimize within this solution space. If the problem is found to be infeasible, we increase this solution space by incrementing the value of levels provided to each vehicle by one. The formulation developed is powerful enough to find optimal solutions to many instances, in spite of having intricate and complex compatibility constraints implemented within it.

To help solve this problem within real-world timeframes, we design a novel heuristic approach. The heuristic starts by creating decision trees to understand the problem feasibility and compatible cargo transfers from a PRV to a Node using heterogeneous vehicles stationed on the same SMTS. These CTs while effectively representing the feasible problem space (inherently capturing vehicle-load, and TP-cargo compatibility) also store preferences which allow preferential SRE generation. The smallest route elements may be connected to each other (causality connections as represented through the CD) if they are part of the same transshipment trail. All generated SREs are allocated to individual vehicles and are inserted (*i.e.*, integrated via matching) within the existing routes; the purpose of matching vertices here is to prevent a vertex from being visited multiple times in the same vehicle's route and try to merge all the tasks that need to be performed at that vertex in a single visit. Feasible perturbations (ensuring vehicles' capacities are not violated) are also considered to allow the finding of better neighbourhood solutions.

We develop novel datasets (small, medium and large instances) and compare the results of our formulation and heuristic; the results obtained are within acceptable relative gaps. The complexity of our novel feature-rich problem arises due to the consideration of transshipment at Ports which take up most of the space both in the formulation and heuristic design. Future research directions for the Heuristic are highlighted at their appropriate contextual places; mentioning some of the most important future research scopes briefly here: the computation of waiting times during every unique transshipment port visit of any vehicle would need an advanced accurate approach which could allow better solutions.

The problem complexity grows due to necessity of minimizing time, while also ensuring transshipments. We firmly believe these aspects both together have never been considered before; considering these aspects together mandates temporal causality to come into the picture (had this been distance/ cost minimization with transshipments, the formulation and heuristic development would have been simpler). Our main contributions lie in the novel problem conception highlighting the importance of the cascaded (multi-step) optimization approach, as well as development of a formulation and heuristics that are able to capture the aspect of causality; as rightly highlighted in [25], the need for such causal modelling arises from the fact that complex and accurate decision-making mandates analyzing the problem through the temporal picture. We further stress on the fact that removing waiting times should not make much complexity difference (as causality still remains), but could be drastic in terms of solution quality; the objective value could degrade dramatically. Waiting time considerations should always be included when solving such problems, allowing a wider optimality search where sometimes waiting (a vehicle staying idle) instead of routing (the vehicle mandatorily moving, if the problem-modelling does not allow it to wait) could prove to be better overall.

We have also developed a GIS plugin, utilizing the open-sourced QGIS software [26], as part of a project to design a spatial decision support system for usage across disasters/emergencies (the details of the plugin and its developmental steps is discussed in an upcoming paper). Our Heuristic Algorithm has been integrated into this QGIS plugin and is being thoroughly tested for robustness across many disaster scenarios.

The developed formulation and heuristic may be also used for slightly modified problems than the one considered by us. For example, this heuristic can also take care of last-mile pickup-delivery problems by considering each specific shipment as a unique cargo type. Furthermore, as suggested in [27], combination of covering and routing can be considered in disaster-specific scenarios.

One major feature addition that may be considered in the context of much more extensive disaster rescue problems could be the introduction of another new vehicle type that can send out smaller vehicles (rescuer craft) and receive them (the rescuer craft with the rescued). This is practically done in the case of flood situations where a land-based vehicle carries uninflated lifeboats, which are then inflated to reach out to stranded individuals. Generally, during this process, the land-vehicle remains immobile, but a future research consideration of allowing the mother-vehicle to remain mobile while the sidekick-vehicles perform their tasks and intercept the mother vehicles at an appropriate location (to tag along/get absorbed). Such problems would also prove to be fruitful when sending out rescue drones from moving vehicles; future research in this direction seems necessary and the call of the hour given the rising tides of both natural and man-made catastrophes.

Online Repository for Datasets and our Study-Example Results

GitHub repository containing all problem instances and our study-example results: <https://github.com/SanTanBan/rich-MultiTrip-MultiModal-VRP>. This repository also contains videos of a few solutions of the MILP for showcasing the layered modelling approach. Elaborate in-depth description of the formulation development steps (splitting the basic equations from the transshipment specific constraints) is available in [28] including details on the PSR-GIP Heuristic and major pseudocodes. For further details, please contact the first/corresponding author.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Santanu Banerjee: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Formal analysis, Validation, Software, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Goutam Sen:** Project administration, Funding acquisition, Supervision, Resources, Writing – review & editing. **Siddhartha Mukhopadhyay:** Software.

Acknowledgments

This research was conducted through the project entitled “Development of SDSS Tools for Addressing Emergency / Disaster Management”, (Code: IIT/SRIC/R/AEM/2021/101), sponsored through the Kalpana Chawla Space Technology Cell (KCSTC) in IIT Kharagpur, funded by the National Remote Sensing Centre (NRSC) under the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO).

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper in any way.

References

- [1] R. Kramer, J.-F. Cordeau, M. Iori, Rich vehicle routing with auxiliary depots and anticipated deliveries: An application to pharmaceutical distribution, *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review* 129 (2019) 162–174. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2019.07.012>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1366554519302637>
- [2] L. Simeonova, N. Wassan, N. Wassan, S. Salhi, *Recent Developments in Real Life Vehicle Routing Problem Applications*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020, pp. 213–228. doi:[10.1007/978-3-030-45312-1_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45312-1_8).
URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45312-1_8
- [3] B. Eksioglu, A. V. Vural, A. Reisman, The vehicle routing problem: A taxonomic review, *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 57 (4) (2009) 1472–1483. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2009.05.009>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360835209001405>
- [4] K. Corona-Gutiérrez, S. Nucamendi-Guillén, E. Lalla-Ruiz, Vehicle routing with cumulative objectives: A state of the art and analysis, *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 169 (2022) 108054. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2022.108054>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360835222001243>
- [5] T. Vidal, G. Laporte, P. Matl, A concise guide to existing and emerging vehicle routing problem variants, *European Journal of Operational Research* 286 (2) (2020) 401–416. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2019.10.010>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221719308422>
- [6] J. Current, M. Marsh, Multiobjective transportation network design and routing problems: Taxonomy and annotation, *European Journal of Operational Research* 65 (1) (1993) 4–19. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217\(93\)90140-I](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217(93)90140-I).
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/037722179390140I>
- [7] W. Ogryczak, K. Studziński, K. Zorychta, A solver for the multi-objective transshipment problem with facility location, *European Journal of Operational Research* 43 (1) (1989) 53–64. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217\(89\)90409-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217(89)90409-8).
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0377221789904098>
- [8] J. Caceres-Cruz, P. Arias, D. Guimarans, D. Riera, A. A. Juan, Rich vehicle routing problem: Survey, *ACM Comput. Surv.* 47 (2) (Dec. 2014). doi:[10.1145/2666003](https://doi.org/10.1145/2666003).
URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2666003>
- [9] Y. E. M. Vieira, R. A. de Mello Bandeira, O. S. da Silva Júnior, Multi-depot vehicle routing problem for large scale disaster relief in drought scenarios: The case of the brazilian northeast region, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 58 (2021) 102193. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2021.102193>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S221242092100159X>
- [10] B. Vahdani, D. Veysmoradi, F. Noori, F. Mansour, Two-stage multi-objective location-routing-inventory model for humanitarian logistics network design under uncertainty, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 27 (2018) 290–306. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2017.10.015>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212420917303059>
- [11] J. Xu, D. Jayakumar Nair, S. Travis Waller, Exploring the pre-disaster evacuation network design problem under five traffic equilibrium models, *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 196 (2024) 110506. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2024.110506>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360835224006272>
- [12] M. Momeni, H. Soleimani, S. Shahparvari, B. Afshar-Nadjafi, A multi-agency coordination resource allocation and routing decision-making problem: A coordinated truck-and-drone dss for improved wildfire detection coverage, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 97 (2023) 104027. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2023.104027>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212420923005071>
- [13] X. Wang, S. Poikonen, B. Golden, The vehicle routing problem with drones: several worst-case results, *Optimization Letters* 11 (4) (2017) 679–697. doi:[10.1007/s11590-016-1035-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11590-016-1035-3).
URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11590-016-1035-3>

- [14] H. Luo, J. Duan, G. Wang, Mathematical models for truck-drone routing problem: Literature review, *Applied Mathematical Modelling* 144 (2025) 116074. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apm.2025.116074>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0307904X25001490>
- [15] İlknur Tükenmez, Ömer Özkan, Matheuristic approaches for multi-visit drone routing problem to prevent forest fires, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 112 (2024) 104776. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2024.104776>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212420924005387>
- [16] N. Aydin, O. Yilmaz, M. Deveci, Z. Lv, Heuristics based optimization for multidepot drone location and routing problem to detect post-earthquake damages, *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 25 (1) (2024) 850–858. doi:10.1109/TITS.2022.3190698.
- [17] İhsan Sadati, An efficient matheuristic integration with benders decomposition for unmanned aerial vehicle routing problem in forest fire surveillance, *Computers & Industrial Engineering* (2025) 111087doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2025.111087>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360835225002335>
- [18] R. Y. Aldahlawi, V. Akbari, G. Lawson, A systematic review of methodologies for human behavior modelling and routing optimization in large-scale evacuation planning, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 110 (2024) 104638. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2024.104638>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S221242092400400X>
- [19] M. Callen, M. Fajardo-Steinhäuser, M. G. Findley, T. Ghani, Can digital aid deliver during humanitarian crises?, *Management Science* 0 (0) (2025). doi:10.1287/mnsc.2024.06469.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2024.06469>
- [20] P. L. van den Berg, S. G. Henderson, C. J. Jagtenberg, H. Li, Modeling the impact of community first responders, *Management Science* 71 (2) (2024) 992–1008. doi:10.1287/mnsc.2022.04024.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2022.04024>
- [21] A. Abdulvahitoglu, D. Vural, İrfan Macit, Selecting facility location of gendarmerie search and rescue (gsr) units; an analysis of efficiency in disaster response, *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 197 (2024) 110639. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2024.110639>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360835224007617>
- [22] K. Venkata Narasimha, E. Kivelevitch, B. Sharma, M. Kumar, An ant colony optimization technique for solving min–max multi-depot vehicle routing problem, *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation* 13 (2013) 63–73. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.swevo.2013.05.005>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2210650213000436>
- [23] S. Banerjee, S. Atta, G. Sen, Single depot heterogeneous capacitated vehicle routing problem with simultaneous delivery and pickup for disaster management systems, in: 2023 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management (IEEM), 2023, pp. 1758–1762. doi:10.1109/IEEM58616.2023.10406762.
- [24] S. Nucamendi-Guillén, A. Gómez Padilla, E. Olivares-Benitez, J. M. Moreno-Vega, The multi-depot open location routing problem with a heterogeneous fixed fleet, *Expert Systems with Applications* 165 (2021) 113846. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2020.113846>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417420306540>
- [25] C. Kern, U. Fischer-Abaigar, J. Schweisthal, D. Frauen, R. Ghani, S. Feuerriegel, M. van der Schaar, F. Kreuter, Algorithms for reliable decision-making need causal reasoning, *Nature Computational Science* 5 (5) (2025) 356–360. doi:10.1038/s43588-025-00814-9.
URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s43588-025-00814-9>
- [26] QGIS Development Team, QGIS Geographic Information System, QGIS Association, version 3.28 “Firenze”, accessed August 2024 (2024).
URL <https://www.qgis.org>
- [27] S. Allahyari, M. Salari, D. Vigo, A hybrid metaheuristic algorithm for the multi-depot covering tour vehicle routing problem, *European Journal of Operational Research* 242 (3) (2015) 756–768. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2014.10.048>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221714008704>
- [28] S. Banerjee, Rich Vehicle Routing Problems in Disaster Management, Master of Science (Research) Thesis, Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, Kharagpur, West Bengal-721302, India (April 2025).

Appendix A. List of Abbreviations

TP	Transshipment Port	PRV	Primary Resource Vertex
VRP	Vehicle Routing Problem	PGF	Preference Generator Function
VD	Vehicle Depot	SRE	Smallest Route Element
MILP	Mixed Integer Linear Programming	CD	Causality Dict
WH	Warehouse	VLC	Vehicle Load Code
N	Node	TRS	Transshipment Trail Stemming
RC	Relief Centre	RoPr	Route Portion
DCT	Delivery Cargo Type	RoPr-Combos	Route Portion Combinations
PCT	PickUp Cargo Type	RoCu	Route Cluster
VT	Vehicle Type	S.D.	Standard Deviation
CT	Cargo Type	CPU	Central Processing Unit
SMTS	Single-Mode Transportation Segment	RAM	Random Access Memory
MMTN	Multi-Modal Transportation Network	OR	Operations Research
PSR	Preferential Selection of Routes	CVRP	Capacitated Vehicle Routing Problem
DT	Decision Tree	NFSF	No Feasible Solution Found
GIP	Generation, Integration and Perturbation	OEAM	Optimization Exhausted Available Memory
DTS	Decision Tree Structure	<i>w.r.t.</i>	with respect to

Appendix B. Visualizing the Transshipment Degree

In our DT-based PSR-GIP Heuristic, transshipments are generally allowed when the combined resources within a potential/degree is insufficient to satisfy the entire requirement.

Figure B.7 depicts stages/degrees of transshipment (which we may imagine as potentials); the resources available directly in the same SMTS (*i.e.*, degree 0) of a requesting Node try to satisfy the demands of that Node as a priority, when the resource availability is insufficient (insufficiency may be due to non availability of Warehouses or Relief Centres in that SMTS, lack of resources available at PRVs which may be unable to satisfy all the demands of all Nodes in that SMTS, or the requirement of a special resource available only at a distant Warehouse which is not in that SMTS) the next higher degrees are searched for the necessary resources to satisfy the Node's requirements. The degrees in this regard may be compared with energy potentials, and a higher energy potential is accessed only when there is dearth of resources in the PRVs available in lesser transshipment degrees.

The Figure B.7 highlights an example scenario of this problem; when a non-zero transshipment code is generated indicating that access to a higher degree is necessary through a TP, the concerned Trunk-TP is referred as the DTS for the next stage of resource availability check in the higher degree(s). Notice that the $W1$ accessible via $VT8$ also shows the cargo-type $2D$ indicating that the $VT9$ is incompatible with this DCT $2D$ (and therefore this CT is not a leaf from the $W1$ twig from the branch $VT9$).




Figure B.7: A hypothetical problem-scenario illustrating the increasing transshipment degrees

Appendix C. Additional Constraints to the MILP

Appendix C.1. Extra Optional Constraints

Eq. C.1 allows a new level to be used only if the level below cannot be used. The usage of these constraints have shown to reduce the computation time of the formulation.

$$\sum_{\substack{z \in V_{k,h} \\ i \neq z \\ \text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow z \neq h}} x_{i,z}^{v,l} + \sum_{\substack{z \in V_{k,h} \\ z \neq j \\ \text{if } j \in R \Rightarrow z \neq h}} x_{z,j}^{v,l} \geq x_{i,j}^{v,l+1}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = 1, \forall i, j \in V_k, \\ i \neq j, \quad (\text{C.1a})$$

$$x_i^{v,l,l-1} + x_j^{v,l-1,l} + \sum_{\substack{z \in V_{k,h} \\ i \neq z \\ \text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow z \neq h}} x_{i,z}^{v,l} + \sum_{\substack{z \in V_k \\ z \neq j}} x_{z,j}^{v,l} \geq x_{i,j}^{v,l+1}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{if } l_v^{max} > 1, \\ \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \forall i, j \in V_k, i \neq j, \quad (\text{C.1b})$$

Eq. C.2 reduces extra level usages for the final connections back to the depots.

$$\sum_{\substack{z \in V_{k,h} \\ i \neq z}} x_{i,z}^{v,l} \geq x_{i,h}^{v,l+1}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = 1, \forall i \in N_k \cup S_k \cup R_k, \quad (\text{C.2a})$$

$$x_i^{v,l,l-1} + \sum_{\substack{z \in V_{k,h} \\ i \neq z}} x_{i,z}^{v,l} \geq x_{i,h}^{v,l+1}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \text{if } l_v^{max} > 1, \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \\ \forall i \in N_k \cup S_k \cup R_k, \quad (\text{C.2b})$$

Eq. C.3 prevents the inter-level connections connecting the same two vertices between two consecutive levels (in opposite directions), to not be used together.

$$x_i^{v,l-1,l} + x_i^{v,l,l-1} \leq 1, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1\}, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Eq. C.4 ensures the sum of incoming edges into any vertex to be at most 1 only if that vehicle is used.

$$x_i^{v,l+1,l} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_{k,h} \\ i \neq j \\ \text{if } i \in R \Rightarrow j \neq h}} x_{j,i}^{v,l} \leq \sum_{j \in W_k, N_k, S_k} x_{h,j}^{v,1}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), l = 1, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (\text{C.4a})$$

$$x_i^{v,l-1,l} + x_i^{v,l+1,l} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} x_{j,i}^{v,l} \leq \sum_{j \in W_k, N_k, S_k} x_{h,j}^{v,1}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall i \in V_k, \\ \forall l \in L_v \setminus \{1, l_v^{max}\}, \quad (\text{C.4b})$$

$$x_i^{v,l-1,l} + \sum_{\substack{j \in V_k \\ i \neq j}} x_{j,i}^{v,l} \leq \sum_{j \in W_k, N_k, S_k} x_{h,j}^{v,1}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall i \in V_k, \text{if } l_v^{max} > 1, l = l_v^{max}, \quad (\text{C.4c})$$

Appendix C.2. Additional Capacity Constraints

The optional Eq. C.5 is only required for specific problem cases, when some Cargo Type needs to have volume and weight as null; which can happen when a dummy load to created to visit a vertex for some activity. An example of such a task would be the clearance of fallen trees which could be modelled as a cargo-associated-task, and the location where this activity needs to take place would be modelled as a Node location, since this is an activity/task there would be no weight/volume utilization of the concerned vehicle; however the loading/unloading time at this node would represent the tree clearance time. In case such a task is modelled as a PCT, then a dummy RC could be created at/near the same dummy Node location to dispose off the fallen trees; otherwise if the task if modelled as a DCT, then a dummy WH would indicate the point of the fallen tree location (basically in the middle of a road) and the disposal location of the cut-and-removed tree trunk would be represented as a dummy Node (very near to the dummy WH).

$$y_{i,j}^{v,l,c} \leq M \cdot x_{i,j}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l \in L_v, \forall i, j \in V_k \cup h, (\text{if } l = 1 \Rightarrow i \neq h), i \neq j, \\ (\text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h), \forall c \in C_k, \quad (\text{C.5a})$$

$$y_i^{v,l,m,c} \leq M \cdot x_i^{v,l,m}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), \forall l, m \in L_v, |l - m| = 1, \forall i \in V_k, \forall c \in C_k, \quad (\text{C.5b})$$

Santanu Banerjee ^{a,*}, Goutam Sen^a, Siddhartha Mukhopadhyay ^a

^a*Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering (ISE), Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Kharagpur, Kharagpur, 721302, West Bengal, India*

Purpose of Supplementary Material

This supplementary material provides additional information and results to complement the main manuscript. It includes detailed explanation of how some important constraints in the formulation were developed, extended Heuristic Description with implementation details of the algorithm, along with the computational results of the continuous instances.

Contents

S1 Literature Review of Individual Papers	2
S2 Additional comments regarding our Exact Formulation	7
S2.1 Considerations while running the MILP	7
S2.1.1 Maximum Vehicle-Level Requirement Estimation	7
S2.2 Explaining the constraint development process through Space-Time matrices used in the development of our MILP formulation	8
S3 Heuristic Methodology and Components	11
S3.1 Preference Generation and storing HyperParameterized Scores within Decision Tree Structures . .	11
S3.1.1 Requirement Code, Compare Code and Score Calculator	11
S3.1.2 Recursive function to enable Transhipment of individual Cargo Types	12
S3.1.3 Preference Generator Function for Split Node	16
S3.1.4 Preference Generator Function for Simultaneous Node	16
S3.1.5 Preference Scoring based on Satisfaction Codes of Transhipment Ports considering Adjusted Transhipment Degrees	17
S3.2 Creating Smallest Route Elements (SREs) while maintaining the Causality Dict (CD)	17
S3.2.1 Explaining the Causality Dict	19
S3.2.2 SRE creation for Split Nodes	22
S3.2.3 SRE creation to satisfy Mandatory Transhipment for some Split Nodes, as necessary . . .	23
S3.2.4 SRE creation for Simultaneous Nodes (with or without transhipments)	24
S3.2.5 SRE creation for Transhipment Ports	25
S3.3 Allocation of Vehicles enabling Integration of SREs within Vehicle routes	27
S3.3.1 Selection Logic for the Allocation of individual SREs to unique vehicles based on the CD .	27
S3.3.2 Moulding an SRE into its Route Portion Combination(s)	27
S3.3.3 Understanding the Integration Logics of Route Clusters	27
S3.3.4 Logics for selection of some RoPr Combos	28
S3.3.5 Allocation Logics of Route Portion within the allocated vehicle’s route, across different Route Clusters	29
S3.3.6 Matching of the same vertices of SREs within the route of a single vehicle, ensuring feasibility during the Insertion of an SRE	30
S3.3.7 Waiting Time computation function for a Route Cluster	31
S4 Detailed Discussions of the Computational Results	35
S4.1 Continuous Results of our Small Instances	35
S4.2 Continuous Results of our Large Instances	39
S4.3 Continuous Instance Runs of the Literature Dataset	40

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: santanu@kgpian.iitkgp.ac.in (Santanu Banerjee ) , ggen@iem.iitkgp.ac.in (Goutam Sen), sid.mpadhyay@kgpian.iitkgp.ac.in (Siddhartha Mukhopadhyay )

S1. Literature Review of Individual Papers

Table S1: A. Discussed Papers and Solution Methodologies used

Reference Paper	Keyword used for search	Problem Details			InterConnections and IntraDependencies	
		Description, Problem Class, and Optimization Approach (of Objective)	Types of Formulations provided and/or discussed	Heuristic used and/or Novelty	Load (PCT or DCT) to Vehicle Type Compatibility	Road to Vehicle Type Compatibility
This study [1]	-	(Open or Closed) VRP cascaded Makespan Minimization	MILP	Time based transshipment at Transshipment Ports; Cascaded Time Minimization	Yes	Yes
[2]	Capacitated VRP	Minimize total distance travelled by all vehicles	MILP	Branch-and-cut algorithm with new Cutting Planes	No	No
[3]	Simultaneous Delivery and Pickup	3L-VRPSDPTW, Minimizes the Total travel Distance	-	Hybrid algorithm of Adaptive Large Neighbourhood Search is used. Authors consider loading from the back side, as well as loading from the long side (in case of 2 compartments) which have not been studied in Literature before	No	No
[4]		VRPSDP, Minimizes the total travel time of the route	MILP	First paper on multiple vehicle routing problem considering simultaneous delivery and pickup; uses three-phase sequential procedure, analogous to "cluster-first route-second"	No	No
[5]		VRPSDP	-	Hybrid Meta-Heuristic Algorithm (ILS-RVND-TA)	No	No
[6]		Symmetric and Assymmetric VRPSDP, Minimize transportation cost of the distances travelled	Two MILP Formulations, one as a Vehicle Flow and another as a Commodity Flow, are proposed.	Authors expect future work to include multiple objective functions. Pre-processing techniques for reducing domain, and effective cutting planes are outlined.	No	No
[7]		Minimize Total Route Cost	MILP requires minimum number of trucks needed as an input; unrestricted return quantity is allowed; minimizes total cost of all routes	Route construction Heuristic	No	No
[8]		HFVRPSDP, Minimization of the sum of all heterogeneous vehicle route used for minimizing fixed plus variable cost of routing	A more compact MILP (than existing previously in the literature) is provided highlighting improvement in solution time	A novel hybrid heuristic is designed enhanced with function-flavours for MachineTuning, and a hyperparameter of JellyFishing	No	Yes

Reference Paper	Keyword used for search	Problem Details			InterConnections and IntraDependencies	
		Description, Problem Class, and Optimization Approach (of Objective)	Types of Formulations provided and/or discussed	Heuristic used and/or Novelty	Load (PCT or DCT) to Vehicle Type Compatibility	Road to Vehicle Type Compatibility
[9]	Multiple Depots	Multi-Depot Covering Tour Vehicle Routing Problem; minimizes total routing cost and allocation cost of customers to nearby nodes	Two MILP formulations developes: Flow and Node based	Hybrid solution developed using GRASP; step-wise clustering and routing; iterated local search and simulated annealing	No	No
[10]		Minimization of Fixed plus Variable cost of all vehicle routes, Multi-Depot Open Location Routing Problem	MILP	Metaheuristic developed performs supplier clustering during construction phase, and has an additional improvement phase	No	No
[11]		Handling cost at depot, Routing transportation cost and Fixed charges of vehicles and Opening depots	Combinatorial optimization problem	Modified tabu search	No	No
[12]		Minimize total routing cost or distance of an Multiple Depot Vehicle Routing Problem	MILP	Bio-inspired meta-heuristic method named Discrete Antlion Optimization algorithm (DALO) followed by the 2-opt algorithm for local searching is used to	No	No
[13]		Minimize the tour-length of the vehicle traveling the longest distance	-	Ant colony optimization; decomposition into different Single Depot VRPs	No	No
[14]	rich-VRP	Periodic Demands; Functional Nodes are considered here; Minimize vehicle type and traveling distance dependant cost as well as the cost to supply the auxiliary depots	No Exact formulation	Multi Start Iterated Local Search	No	Yes (by Customer-Node compatibility)
[15]		Distribution problem with time constraints including ready and due dates for customers already assigned to depots; Minimizes the total distance	MILP	Genetic Algorithms	No	No
[16]		Location-routing problem (involves locating hub facilities as a mandatory transfer point between supply and demand nodes); Objective function selects hub locations and vehicle routes, minimizing overall operational and transportation cost	MILP	Heuristic uses multi-start procedure based on fix+optimize, and a genetic algorithm	No	No

Table S1: B. Network Features in discussed literature

Ref. Paper	Network Features Considered							
	Closed VRP / Open VRP	No. of Trips allowed for each vehicle	Time Windows considered	Maximum Route Duration Du-constrained?	Waiting Time consideration	Loading / Unloading / Service Time considered	Max. No. of Node Visits per route (provided as constraint)	Multi-Modal Transportation Network
Our study	Both	Multiple	No (but can be very easily implemented within the current formulation)	No (can be easily extended)	Yes	Yes	Unconstrained, we consider this answered as time minimization would be better than customer constringing	Yes
[2]	Closed	1	No	No	No	No	No	No
[3]	Closed	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
[4]	Closed	1	No	No	No	No	No	No
[5]	Closed	1	No	No	No	No	No	No
[6]	Closed	1	No	No	No	No	No	No
[7]	Closed	Multiple	No	No	No	No	No	No
[8]	Closed	1	No	No	No	No	No	No
[9]	Closed	1	No	No	No	No	No	No
[10]	Open	1	No	No	No	No	No	No
[11]	Closed	1	No	No	No	No	No	No
[12]	Closed	1	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
[13]	Closed	1	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
[14]	Closed	Multiple (across periods)	Yes (Flexible)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
[15]	Closed	1	Yes (Hard)	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
[16]	Closed	≤ 3	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table S1: C. Vehicle and Cargo features in the discussed literature

Ref. Paper	Vehicle Features Considered				Cargo Features Considered		
	Homogeneous / Heterogeneous Fleet	Weight restricted Vehicle	Volume restricted Vehicle	Common Vehicle Capacity for all types of Load commodity (<i>i.e.</i> , no compartmentalization)	No. of Pickup Types considered (N/A if not allowed)	No. of Delivery Types considered (N/A if not allowed)	Split / Simultaneous resource transfer (Delivery or Pickup)
Our study	Heterogeneous	Yes	Yes	Yes	≥ 1	≥ 1	Simultaneous and/or Split
[2]	Homogeneous	Single Capacity considered		N/A	N/A	1	None
[3]	Homogeneous	Yes	Yes (3D packing considered)	Both considered	Each item is unique in identity and dimensions and multiple such items in the backhaul can be returned by the customer		Simultaneous Delivery and Pickup
[4]	Homogeneous	-	Yes	Yes	1	1	Simultaneous Delivery and Pickup
[5]	Homogeneous	Single Capacity considered		Yes	1	1	Simultaneous Delivery and Pickup
[6]	Homogeneous	Single Capacity considered		Yes	1	1	Simultaneous
[7]	Homogeneous	Single Capacity considered		Yes	1	1	Simultaneous Delivery and Pickup
[8]	Heterogeneous	Single Capacity considered		Yes	1	1	Simultaneous Delivery and Pickup
[9]	Homogeneous	Single Capacity considered		Yes	N/A	1	Single Instance Delivery
[10]	Heterogeneous	Single Capacity considered		Yes	N/A	1	Split Delivery
[11]	Any (flexible model to consider heterogeneous fleet)	Single Capacity considered		Yes	1	1	Simultaneous
[12]	Homogeneous	Single Capacity considered		Yes	N/A	1	Single Instance Delivery
[13]	Homogeneous	Single Capacity considered		Yes	N/A	1	Single Instance Delivery
[14]	Heterogeneous	Single Capacity considered		Yes	N/A	1	Split across multiple-periods
[15]	Heterogeneous	Single Capacity considered		Yes	N/A	1	Single Instance Delivery
[16]	Homogeneous	Single Capacity considered		Yes	≥ 1	≥ 1	Delivery and/or Pickup

Table S1: D. Node Features in discussed literature

Ref. Paper	Node Features Considered							
	Separate Vehicle and Resource parking Locations (N/A if no resource transfer is considered)	Number of Vehicle Depots (or Resource Locations) allowed	Capacity constrained Depot (and/or Limited number of Vehicles)	Capacity constrained Warehouse(s) or equivalent	Relief Points (separate final location to drop all PickUps) considered	Transshipment Ports (or similar features) are available?	Many-to-Many Transport	Multi-visit allowed at Vertices / Nodes
Our study	Yes	>0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
[2]	N/A	1	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	No	No
[3]	No	1	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	No	No
[4]	No	-	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	No	No
[5]	No	1	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	No	No
[6]	No	1	Yes	N/A	No	No	No	No
[7]	No	1	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	No	Yes
[8]	No	1	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	No	No
[9]	No	Multiple	Yes	No	N/A	No	Yes	No
[10]	Yes	Multiple	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Only For the single Split Delivery Node
[11]	No	Multiple	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Yes	No
[12]	No	Multiple	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Yes	No
[13]	No	Multiple	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
[14]	No	Multiple	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
[15]	No	Multiple	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
[16]	No	Multiple	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

S2. Additional comments regarding our Exact Formulation

Table S2: Multi-functionality of Graph Vertices

Types of Vertices based on functionality	
Mathematical View Point	Nomenclature Description
Source / Origin only	Not considered in our Problem or Formulation, applicable only for open VRPs
Sink / Destination only	
Both Source & Sink <i>i.e.</i> , Vertex acts as both Origin & Destination	Vehicle Depot (<i>VD</i>) [these vertices are also the time-origin for corresponding vehicles]
PickUp only	Warehouses (<i>W</i>)
Delivery only	Relief Centers (<i>RC</i>)
PickUp & Delivery (Simultaneous)	Simultaneous Nodes (<i>NM</i>) [for single vehicle relief-rescue]
PickUp & Delivery (Split)	Split Nodes (<i>NP</i>) [allows multiple vehicles to perform pre-defined operations over the entire course of the mission]
Time-Dependent Cargo-Compatible Echelon Points	Transshipment Ports (<i>TP</i>) [also acts as Multimodal Junctions]
Route Split	For deploying Water Boats from a Land Vehicle for urban-flood relief [not considered in current formulation or problem]
Route Capture	For accepting boats with rescued victims back into the Mother Vehicle [not considered in our problem or formulation]
Allows both Route Splitting and Capture	Deploy Points [not considered in current formulation and suggested as a possible future extension]

S2.1. Considerations while running the MILP

The equations 4, C.4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 27, 36, 37, 38 get slightly altered while taking the extreme values of l_v , since when $l = 1$ the incoming variables x or y connecting the bottom-most layer 1 from any below layer is non-existent; and similarly when $l = l_v^{max}$ outgoing variables from the top-most layer l_v^{max} to any other higher layer is non-existent. Further if $l_v^{max} = 1$, then both the above non-existent variables would further reduce such constraints, and these equations respectively reduce to reduced versions of equations 4a, C.4a, 8a, 9a, 11a, 12a, 14a, 15a, 18a, 19a, 27a, 36a, 37a, 38a; the alteration process of one equation (Eq. 4) is shown below into Eq. S1 (which is a reduced form of Eq. 4a without any of the inter-layer variables as they are non-existent variables).

$$\sum_{\substack{j \in V_{k,h} \\ i \neq j \\ \text{if } i \in R \Rightarrow j \neq h}} x_{j,i}^{v,l} = \sum_{\substack{j \in V_{k,h} \\ i \neq j \\ \text{if } i \in W \Rightarrow j \neq h}} x_{i,j}^{v,l}, \quad \forall h \in H, \forall k \in K_h, \forall u \in G_{h,k}, v = (h, k, u), l = 1, \forall i \in V_k, \quad (\text{S1})$$

Increased values of l_v^{max} expand the solution space, and the optimum solution of the problem would depend on these values. Therefore, since it is hard to estimate mathematically the required vehicular levels necessary for each vehicle so that the solution space creation (*i.e.*, variable generation for the exact formulation) is apt for finding the optimal solution, we ideate determining upper bounds on (vehicle type specific) chunks of these variables in section S2.1.1. However, creating the massive solution space based on the upper bound becomes computationally inefficient and we develop an approach to progressively increase these l_v^{max} values (starting all from 1) till no major solution improvement is seen. We may also alternatively assign a good number of levels (*i.e.*, enough vehicle layers) to each individual vehicle to solve the problem once (with any among the minimization approaches of Mi-Max, Makespan reduction, or Cascaded Time Minimization) without going through the process of increasing the layers progressively as highlighted in section S2.1.

S2.1.1. Maximum Vehicle-Level Requirement Estimation

Our proposed exact formulation is dependent on the available levels $l \in L_v$ to each individual vehicle v . A way to calculate the possible upper limit of the vehicle-levels would be to solve the formulation separately many times (with a sufficient number of available levels, to maybe find only the first few feasible solutions) while considering only a single type of vehicle available each time (homogeneous fleet across all depots), and collecting the maximum level usage for each of these vehicle types; these computed values of the levels could then be used in the original bigger problem considering all vehicles in the exact formulation. However, this would be time-taking, cumbersome and infeasible problems could arise, hindering the collection process of this rough upper bound of the levels.

Instead, we solve the original problem considering all vehicles having l_v^{max} as 1 initially. Next, we progress further by a combination of the logics highlighted below:

- i. For vehicles which are unused, we may choose any of the following strategies:
 - (a) Not consider them further, *i.e.*, remove them from the next stages.
 - (b) Progressively change the level value as stages progress, by changing the existing level value by some (preferably negative fraction, say -0.25) number so that the changes seem gradual. The actually assigned number of vehicle layers in the MILP needs to be rounded off values in this case.
- ii. For the used vehicles, we may progressively change the level value as the stages progress, by changing the existing level value by some (preferably positive integer, say 1) number.




Figure S1: **Space-Time Matrices for our study-example instance. The axes are not in any order, indicating that the Time value may not be steadily increasing rightwards, unlike as is generally the case.**

In both cases, the changes may be done on the number of levels assigned in the previous stage, or the number of levels used (in the previous stage).

In our case, we consider that every next stage should have one more level for each vehicle than what was used in the previous stage by that same vehicle (so an unused vehicle will have 1 level to ply on in the subsequent stage). This would progressively decrease the search space by decreasing the number of vehicles, and on the other hand increase the search space by providing additional levels to the used vehicles. A variation of this logic could be using the number of vehicle-specific-levels being one more than what was used by that vehicle in some of the last few stages (by developing a stage-wide memory element).

We consider that through this process, we would be able to progress towards the optimal solution (the optimal solution could have also been found by providing a very large number of levels to each vehicle in the first place, however at the cost of eons of computational time); and consider it over when any additional stage of change in the available vehicles and their levels does not yield any improvement. However, since this approach does not guarantee the exploration of the entire solution space, sub-optimal solutions may be found.

It may be possible that a vehicle, that is being unused at lower values of its available levels, starts getting utilized suddenly from a higher value of the levels available to it (also depending on the availability of other vehicles and their respective available levels). We may try to find even better solutions and refute (or confirm) the above possibility, with all vehicles having the same available levels equal to one more than the maximum of all levels provided to any vehicle in the final stage of the solution above; however, we find this computationally extremely inefficient.

S2.2. Explaining the constraint development process through Space-Time matrices used in the development of our MILP formulation

To ensure temporal-causality during transshipments is maintained, we develop constraints; one important component during the development of these constraints is the space-time matrix, which is elaborately explained in this section.

For each TP, we develop individual space-time matrices for each commodity allowed to be transhipped through that TP. For our study-example instance:

- i. For TP1 and TP2: there will be three separate space-time matrices, each for the commodities 1D, 2D, and 2P
- ii. For TP3: there will be two separate space-time matrices, each for the DCTs 1D and 2D (see Figure 1 for the compatibilities, and the Figure S1 to understand the Space-Time Matrices for our Study-Example instance)

Each such matrix has its Y-axis (the vertical Space Axis) indicating the various vehicles and their levels, which may be used to visit the concerned TP. The X-axis (the horizontal Time Axis) indicates the possible time instances associated with vehicle visits. In case each visit is associated with a single time, then the number of rows and columns in the matrix would have been equal; however in our case, we have two time-stamps associated with any vehicle's visit at any vertex, namely the Arrival Time and the Departure Time, therefore for each row heading, we will have two associated columns (one for the arrival and one for the departure timings), thus these matrices have double the number of columns *w.r.t.* rows. Each cell of the matrix contains the value of the quantity of the resource that was transhipped at that row-level till the time indicated in the column-bottom times (Figure S2); if there has been no transhipment in that row, then the values will be 0. Each cell is essentially the variable o of the MILP.

Vehicle ID	Visit Layer/Level	Residue Value (from Case Study Integer Instance's MILP solution)	Space Axis															TP2; 2D	
VD3,VT2,2	2		s_1																
	1		s_2																
VD3,VT2,1	2		s_3																
	1	-16	s_4					0	-16										
VD2,VT5,1	3		s_5																
	2		s_6																
	1	16	s_7											0	16				
				t_1	t_2	t_3	t_4	t_5	t_6	t_7	t_8	t_9	t_{10}	t_{11}	t_{12}	t_{13}	t_{14}	Time Axis	
				a	d	a	d	a	d	a	d	a	d	a	d	a	d	Arrival/Departure Time	
				2	1	1	2	3	2	1							Visit Level		
				VD3,VT2,2			VD3,VT2,1			VD2,VT5,1						Vehicle ID			

Figure S2: One space-time matrix is elaborated

Column-wise Sum \Rightarrow									0	0	0	0	0	0
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	---	---	---	---

Space Axis															TP2; 2D				
s_1																			
s_2																			
s_3																			
s_4								0	0	-16	-16	-16	-16						
s_5																			
s_6																			
s_7									0	16	16	16	16						
	t_1	t_2	t_7	t_8	t_9	t_{10}	t_{11}	t_{12}	t_5	t_{13}	t_6	t_3	t_4	t_{14}	Time Axis \rightarrow				
This is sorted based on increasing time values, from the MILP solution of the Case-Study Integer Instance																			

Figure S3: The necessary values in the ST Matrix are populated (as per our study-example Integer solution from MILP); all the other unpopulated cells will have null values.

Column-wise Sum \Rightarrow	0	0	5	10	10	4	10	10	10	10	10	2	0	0
-------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	---	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---

<i>Space Axis</i>														
s_{11}	0	0	5	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
s_{12}	0	0	0	0	0	-6	-7	-17	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20
s_{13}	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
s_{14}	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-8	-10	-10
s_{15}	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
s_{16}	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
s_{17}	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	5	5	5	5
	t_9	t_2	t_7	t_4	t_{12}	t_1	t_{13}	t_{11}	t_{10}	t_{14}	t_5	t_8	t_3	t_6
	Time Axis \rightarrow													

Figure S4: A hypothetical Space-Time matrix for some arbitrary TP-CT combination

In Figure S2, the residue values correspond to the variable r in the MILP. Two residue values are shown here which indicate the transfer of this cargo-type 2D from the vehicle (VD2,VT5,1) to the TP2 (positive value), and from the TP2 to the vehicle (VD3,VT2,1) which is indicated with the opposite sign. We see that only the first levels are used in this solution. The residue value is populated along the entire corresponding row only when the times are higher than the departure time. Similarly for all times less than the arrival time, the cells in a row will contain null value; this can be easily understood by the fact that if there has been an amount of the CT transfer at this TP, the transfer details should be maintained subsequently as well allowing other vehicles to take up the CT and further tranship it. The arrival time of the vehicle for which there is a non-zero residue is depicted as green cells in Figure S2, with the departure time-corresponding cells depicted in blue. The intermediate variable g in the MILP allows the comparison between times of any two cells in this matrix, to ultimately allocate the residue value or a null value in the cell. This can be further clearly understood in Figure S3 where for the reader's clarify and ease, the time axis is sorted in increasing rightward value; observe here that (for each row) the cells on the left of the green cells are null, and all the cells on the right of the blue-departure cell will continue to have the full residue values. In the case between the green and blue, *i.e.*, during loading/unloading, the cells are constrained to be able to take up and value less than the full residue amount without breaching the loading-unloading time constraints. Ultimately, to ensure temporal causality is maintained, each time-column must not have any net-negative residue; a net-negative residue would indicate that some pseudo-amount of a CT has been picked up from the TP, which had not been earlier sent to that TP. This is the first time in literature that such kind of temporal causality is implemented directly through an MILP; we use the Eq.61 to implement this.

A hypothetical ST matrix is shown in Figure S4 for better clarity. Notice that all individual column sums are either zero or positive; the first column-sum value (*i.e.* for the lowest time-column) must be zero. The final column-sum value (*i.e.* for the highest value of visit time) should also be zero to ensure that no extra resource is left at the TP after the entire emergency operation is completed, this is done using the constraint in Eq.62.

S3. Heuristic Methodology and Components

Each component of our DT-based PSR-GIP Heuristic is expanded and explained elaborately in details here.

S3.1. Preference Generation and storing HyperParameterized Scores within Decision Tree Structures

We create and maintain a decision tree-like structure of the different levels of possible decisions needed to satisfy any Node. The different stages of the Decision Tree Structure (DTS) are as follows:

- i. Trunk: The first element of the tree is the Trunk which refers to any of the Nodes (for each Simultaneous or Split Node as the Trunk, we develop separate Decision Trees) or Transshipment Ports (which are treated similar to Simultaneous Nodes while considering a resource under transshipment).
- ii. Branch: The next decision stage involves choosing Branches originating from the single Trunk, where each Branch represents a unique Vehicle Type (along with the information about the set of possible Vehicle Depots that are in the same SMTS as the Trunk).
- iii. Twig: Further, Twigs emerging from each Vehicle Type-Branch represent the Vertices accessible by the specific Vehicle Type; these Vertices include those Warehouses, Transshipment Ports and Relief Centres that are located on the same SMTS as the Node-Trunk of the Decision Tree is located upon.
- iv. Leaf: Finally, Leaves emerge from each Vertex-Twig of the Decision Tree, where a Leaf represents a Cargo-Type; the Twigs which represent Warehouses have only Delivery Cargo Types as Leaves whereas the Twigs representing Relief Centres have only PickUp Cargo Types as Leaves; the Leaves (*i.e.*, Delivery or PickUp Cargo Types) emerging from Transshipment Port-Twigs must be compatible to be transhipped at the respective Port. Additionally, all Cargo Type-Leaves must be compatible to be carried by the respective Vehicle Type-Branch from which those Leaves have emerged, through Twigs.

Only those Vehicle Type-Branches are considered within any Decision Tree, for whom there are a non-zero number of vehicles available at any of the corresponding Vehicle Depots (the Vehicle Depots necessarily being present on the same SMTS); all Branches within a Decision Tree represent unique Vehicle Types, in case different Vehicle Depots on the same SMTS have the same Vehicle Types in diverse quantities having a single Branch of that specific Vehicle Type suffices (the information of all Vehicle Depots, on the same SMTS, which contains the particular Vehicle Type is maintained for each respective Vehicle Type-Branch separately) similar to the Vehicle Depot details for each Vehicle Type (as mentioned in Figure 4).

Additionally, when considering the Vehicle Type-Branches for the Decision Trees with Simultaneous Nodes as Trunks, only those Vehicle Types are allowed to form Branches that can satisfy the entire resource demand of the Node-Trunk in one go; this means that the Vehicle Capacity (both Volume and Weight, separately) must be greater than or at least equal to the combined amount of PickUp requested at the Simultaneous Node-Trunk, and the same Vehicle Capacities must also not be less than the combined amount (Volume and Weight) of Delivery requested by the same Simultaneous Node-Trunk. Thus Branches within Decision Trees of different Simultaneous Nodes (even when located in the same SMTS) can be very different depending on the actual combined amount (Volume and Weight) of the PickUp or Delivery Cargo quantities requested. One of the many decision trees for our illustrative example Instance (section 3.1) is depicted in Figure 4 with the Trunk as "TP2", the Vehicle Types compatible to approach the Trunk Nodes as branches ("VT2", and "VT5" in the figure) alongwith their respective depots, the subsequent Twigs indicating the vertices that are connected to the Trunk directly through the respective Branches, and finally the Leaves representing the compatible cargo types that are transferable (across Transshipment Ports) or available to be satisfied (for Warehouses and Relief Centres).

At each Leaf within DTSs, we store HyperParameters which help in the calculation of a preference *Score* for satisfaction of a Node-Trunk by a Vertex-Twig in the same Decision Tree; this is detailed in sections S3.1.3 and S3.1.4.

S3.1.1. Requirement Code, Compare Code and Score Calculator

Nodes indicated as Trunks in the Decision Trees have requirements for some/all of the Cargo types which is stored as a Requirement Code (this has been implemented in code as a Pythonic dictionary with the keys being the Cargo names and the respective values indicating the amount of Delivery and PickUp requirements for each Cargo Type).

A Compare Code is calculated for a Trunk *w.r.t.* any of its Twigs, *i.e.*, a Node's Requirement Code is compared with the available resources (for Delivery Loads) or resource acceptance capability (for PickUp Loads) of a Vertex Twig (this Vertex Twig can be either a Warehouse or a Relief Centre) to generate a Compare Code (in the code implementation, a Python dictionary is generated for each Compare Code calculation, where the keys remain the Cargo names and the values indicate the maximum amount of that specific resource satisfaction possible by that Vertex Twig). For any Cargo Type, the value in the Compare Code is the minimum of: the necessity of that Cargo Type at the Node-Trunk, and the availability of that same Cargo Type at the Vertex Twig.

Having computed the Compare Code for a Node-Trunk—Vertex-Twig pair, a score is developed to signify the amount of resource satisfaction the Vertex Twig can provide to the Node-Trunk, and this score essentially translates to a preference as described subsequently.

For our study-example instance (Figure 1), the Requirement Code for the Split Node "NP3" is {"2P":6, "1D":11, "2D":13} (as the other compatible pickup cargo of "1P" is null for this node; the Cargo Type names ending in "P" indicate a PickUp type and those ending in "D" indicate a Delivery type). When comparing this node with the Warehouse "WH1", the Compare Code is {"2P":0, "1D":11, "2D":13}. If the Requirement Code had been {"2P":6, "1D":41, "2D":33}, then the Compare Code *w.r.t.* the same Warehouse would have been {"2P":0, "1D":20, "2D":20} as the resource limits of the concerned Warehouse would have been reached. Similarly, for the Requirement Code of the Simultaneous Node "NM2"

being {"1P":20, "1D":3, "2D":2}, its Compare Code *w.r.t.* the Relief Centre "RC1" is {"1P":20, "1D":0, "2D":0}; had the Requirement Code been {"1P":100, "2P":100, "2D":13}, the Compare Code would have been {"1P":50, "2P":0, "2D":0} as "RC1" has a maximum of 50 units of capacity availability to accept the Pickup type "1P".

Before describing the preference score generation, it would be apt to mention that any symbol used in section S3.1.1 is only for demonstration purposes for the score calculation and does not carry any relation/significance with previously defined symbols in Table 1 or Table 2 unless specifically mentioned. For each Cargo Type in the Compare Code, we develop a fraction f indicating the ratio of its value in the Compare Code *w.r.t.* the Requirement Code (only if there is a non-zero value in the Requirement Code); if this fraction f is 0, it would mean that the Twig Vertex was unable to satisfy any amount of the specific Cargo Type for this demand, while f equal to 1 indicates that the entire amount of this requirement was satisfied for the specific Cargo Type. For a Requirement Code of {"1P":100, "2P":100, "2D":13} and a Compare Code being {"1P":50, "2P":0, "2D":0}, we have the Fractions as $\{f_{1P} : 0.5, f_{2P} : 0, f_{2D} : 0\}$.

For effective representation, each fraction f is subscripted by its respective Cargo Type of its Leaf. Each individual Leaf is associated with two HyperParameters one to act as a Multiplier (designated as m in the Eqns. S2, S3 and S4) and another to act as an Exponent (designated as p in Eqns. S2 and S4) to the fraction f for the preference score generation. These HyperParameters are random values stored in each of the Cargo-Leaves. All HyperParameter values remain constant during every Main Iteration and are changed before the next Main iteration. The HyperParameter values are taken from Normal distribution (μ and σ chosen randomly between 0 and 1) or Uniform distribution (upper and lower bounds chosen randomly between 0 and 1), allowing different HyperParameters to be derived from different distributions (or be equal to unity as a rare probability). During the score calculation, a *Numerator* and a *Denominator* are computed separately for each Twig of the Decision Tree using the Compare Codes generated by comparing the Requirement Code of the Trunk-Node and the resource satisfiability at the Twig.

For the *Numerator* calculation, each Cargo Type specific satisfiability fraction is raised to the power of a unique Exponent-HyperParameter value (indicated in p in Eq. S2) and then multiplied by a unique Multiplier-HyperParameter (indicated in m in Eq. S2). Each of these HyperParameters are Leaf specific and are represented with the appropriate subscripts of the specific Cargo Type represented by the Leaf. Assuming a sample Requirement Code to be $\{C_1 : 100, C_2 : 0, C_3 : 125, C_4 : 10, C_5 : 15, C_6 : 0, C_7 : 5\}$, a sample Compare Code could be $\{C_1 : 80, C_2 : 0, C_3 : 125, C_4 : 0\}$ or $\{C_5 : 15, C_6 : 0, C_7 : 0\}$, when comparing the Node requirements with a Warehouse or a Relief Centre Respectively. Here we assume that the first 3 cargo types are Delivery with C_4 and C_5 being Pickup load types; thus the Compare Codes are different when calculated with Vertex Twigs which are Warehouses (the first sample Compare Code above), versus when the Vertex Twigs are Relief Centres (the second sample Compare Code above). The Compare Codes contain possible satisfaction values for all Cargo types for which the Vertex Twig has Leaves. The final score is calculated as the ratio of the *Numerator* and the *Denominator*, as shown for the first sample Compare Code in Eqns. S2 and S3 respectively.

$$Numerator = m_{C_1} * (f_{C_1})^{p_{C_1}} + m_{C_3} * (f_{C_3})^{p_{C_3}} + m_{C_4} * (f_{C_4})^{p_{C_4}} \quad (S2)$$

$$Denominator = m_{C_1} + m_{C_2} + m_{C_3} + m_{C_4} \quad (S3)$$

It can be observed that the calculation of the *Numerator* may have some fraction f values missing (due to 0 value in the Requirement Code), for which the corresponding Multiplier-HyperParameter values are still added up in the *Denominator*, this is done so that the scores for the same Node-Trunk across different Vertex Twigs (of a similar kind, *i.e.*, Warehouses or Relief Centres) may be comparable. A sample *Score* calculation is also shown for the second sample Compare Code in Eq. S4.

$$Score = \frac{Numerator}{Denominator} = \frac{m_{C_5} * (f_{C_5})^{p_{C_5}} + m_{C_7} * (f_{C_7})^{p_{C_7}}}{m_{C_5} + m_{C_6} + m_{C_7}} \quad (S4)$$

A Requirement Code is compared with each Vertex Twig in its DTS to generate such Compare Codes and Scores. Two other HyperParameters (these are single Hyperparameters for the entire problem) toggle the method of forming the *Score*:

- Time consideration during Scoring: If this HyperParameter is ON/True, the Travel Time from the Node-Trunk to the Vertex-Twig is multiplied to the whole Denominator.
- Denominator consideration during scoring: If this HyperParameter is OFF/False, then the entire Denominator during all *Score* calculations is made equal to unity.

S3.1.2. Recursive function to enable Transshipment of individual Cargo Types

Here we develop degrees of transshipment according to the depth of the transshipment; the degrees can be imagined as potentials with possible transshipments in lower degrees (lower potentials) happening first before moving to higher potentials (deeper degrees).

This recursive function accepts the following six arguments:

- (I) Already considered Warehouses and Relief Centres
- (II) Vehicle Type which sent this requirement
- (III) Cargo Type name and the minimum quantity that needs to be transhipped
- (IV) Name of the Transshipment Port which is being considered for this transshipment requirement
- (V) Degree of Transshipment (set to the default value of 1)

- (VI) A Tabu List of Vehicle Type and Transshipment Port paired combination which have already been considered to satisfy this specific transshipment requirement (the initial default value is set to an empty list)
- (VII) A List of SMTS which have been previously considered for Transshipment

When this function is initially called from other functions, only the first four arguments are passed, the last three arguments are used only during recursive calls of this same function from within itself. This current SMTS can be inferred from the Branch-Twig information in item (II) and (IV) (since one Vehicle Type is allowed to ply on a unique SMTS in our considered problem), for updating the list in item (VI) during recursions.

The primary objective of this function is to generate preference scores for satisfying a Transshipment Port similar to that of a Split Node (the case of satisfying all the requirements of any single Transshipment Port together, similar to a Simultaneous Node, is not dealt with in our problem and could be a future research direction); for this, the DTSs with each individual Transshipment Ports as Trunks are considered.

To generate the preference score (similar to as described in section S3.1.1, we need to have the Compare Code first, however since Transshipment Ports inherently don't contain static resources, we use this function to find out how much of a specific resource can be obtained (for Delivery types, from subsequent Transshipment Ports or Warehouses) or distributed (for Pickup types, from subsequent Transshipment Ports or Relief Centres), alongwith the depth of Transshipment necessary for the same. This depth of Transshipment, which we have termed as degree, may not necessarily be a single number which can be directly inferred. For example, in the study-example instance described in Figure 1, there are no Warehouses in the SMTS "Road_A" and therefore, all Deliveries must be resourced using the Transshipment Port "TP3". In this case, when this function is called using the first four argument values as below:

- (1) "RC1",
- (2) "VT3",
- (3) "1D": 5 (assuming that the request to this function was sent from "NP1" as the Trunk),
- (4) "TP3" (as one of the Twigs in the DTS with Trunk as "NP1"),

there would be two types of function returns, the first Component contains only the vertices containing Static resources that may be able to (fully or partially) satisfy the requirement of the Trunk Node specifically for the requested type of Cargo ("1D" in this case) alongwith the information of their depth/degree and the quantity of the resource that they have, and the second Component containing the same information clubbed together such that only vertices that are approachable directly via a single new journey (i.e. upto one higher degree) is mentioned (with a combined degree for Transshipment ports requiring multiple subsequent transshipments) alongwith quantity of resources (available at downstream degrees for Transshipment Ports, or present in the vertices containing static resources like Warehouses or Relief Centres).

Whenever this function is queried, the Decision Tree with the Trunk being the Transshipment Port in item (IV) above is considered; with its Branches being the Vehicle Types that have access to this Trunk through different SMTSs; the Twigs representing the different Warehouses, Transshipment Ports and Relief Centres which are accessible by the respective Vehicle Type-Branch; and the final Leaves representing those Cargo Types which are compatible to be carried on the respective Vehicle Type-Branch as well as allowed to be transhipped through the Transshipment Port-Trunk. Since this function takes care of only one resource type at a time, all leaves of only this Cargo Type is considered during a specific query and throughout during recursions of that same query.

The functional approach is described in pseudocode:

Recursive function to satisfy transshipment requirement of a single CT

```

1: function TRANSHIPMENT_OF_A_CT_FROM_A_TP(considered_PRVs, previous_VT, (CT_name,Q), TP_name,
   transshipment_Degree=1, Tabu_List, used_SMTS=[ ])
   CT_Satisfaction_Counter = 0
2:   for each VT-Branch in the DTS with TP_name as Trunk (except when the VT-Branch is same as previous_VT):
3:     for each Twig emerging from the outer iterator:
4:       if the iterator Twig is a TP, or the iterator Twig is among considered_PRVs then
5:         continue                                ▷ iterate over to the next Twig, till a suitable PRV is encountered
6:       end if
7:       for each CT-Leaf associated with the iterator Twig, and if the Leaf represents CT_name:
8:         Satisfiable_Leaf_Amount = min(available quantity of CT_name at iterated Twig, Q)
9:         if the iterator Twig is not within considered_PRVs then                                ▷ Updates are done only once for each
   unique vertex, since a single PRV can be encountered in multiple Twigs on different Branches in this single Decision
   Tree and considering them multiple times would be a faulty approach
10:          Satisfiable_Leaf_Amount is stored in Temp_DS and associated with its PRV (i.e., iterator Twig)
11:          CT_Satisfaction_Counter ← CT_Satisfaction_Counter + Satisfiable_Leaf_Amount
12:        end if
13:      end for
14:    end for
15:  end for
16:  considered_PRVs is extended with the information from Temp_DS
17:  if CT_Satisfaction_Counter ≥ Q then
18:    This indicates all requested resources can be transhipped from PRVs that are just one degree away
19:    if Global_Transshipment_Fathom is False then

```

```

20:         return considered_PRVs, considered_PRVs      ▷ Since there is no deep transshipment yet, both return
Components are same
21:     end if
22: end if
23:     used_SMTS is updated with the information of this current network-segment, i.e., from the previous_VT and
TP_name information
24:     marge_C1 = []
25:     marge_C2 = []
26:     for a_VT_Branch among all Branches in the DTS with TP_name as Trunk, except when a_VT_Branch repre-
sents previous_VT:
27:         for a_TP_Twig among all Twigs associated with a_VT_Branch:
28:             if the Branch-Twig combination pair (a_VT_Branch, a_TP_Twig) is present in Tabu_List then
29:                 continue      ▷ We skip for the combinations already considered and thus present in the Tabu_List
30:             end if
31:             Dynamic_Tabu_List is generated by updating Tabu_List with this new Branch-Twig (i.e., (a_VT_Branch,
a_TP_Twig)) combination pair
32:             for each CT-Leaf associated with the iterator TP-Twig, and if the Leaf represents CT_name:      ▷ Some
CT-Leaves could be missing due to incompatibility issues with VT-Branch or TP-Trunk
33:                 new_Q = 0      ▷ new_Q is the subsequent transshipment request amount
34:                 if FullFathom is True then
35:                     new_Q = Q
36:                 else
37:                     new_Q = Q - CT_Satisfaction_Counter
38:                 end if
39:                 rC1,rC2 = TRANSHIPMENT_OF_A_CT_FROM_A_TP(considered_PRVs, a_VT_Branch, (CT_name,new_Q), a_TP_Twig, transshipment_Degree+1, Dynamic_Tabu_List, used_SMTS)      ▷ The amount of resources
transhipable at a_TP_Twig is found through this recursive functional return data of return Components rC
40:                 rC2 is stored in the respective CT-Leaf in the DTS with the Trunk being a_TP_Twig      ▷
The value of relative degree is best assumed 0 during this storage as the same function-calculation can also happen
independent of previous-degrees; therefore the value of transshipment_Degree is subtracted from each of the internal
degree reportings while storing
41:                 marge_C1 is enhanced with rC1 data
42:                 marge_C2 is enhanced with rC1 data, in the format of Component_2
43:             end for
44:         end for
45:     end for
46:     return marge_C1, marge_C2
47: end function

```

Elaborating on the first set of return from step 20 above, for each PRV in Component_1 *i.e.*, in considered_PRVs, there are three values associated: the first value indicates the Degree of Transshipment, the second value indicates the respective Satisfiable_Leaf_Amount for when the specific PRV-Twig was being considered for the satisfaction of the Trunk's requirements, and the third value indicates the maximum amount of CT_name present at the concerned PRV-Twig.

A unique SMTS can be directly identified with the information of a VT and a TP. Expanding on the step 28, deeper recursions happening from different Branches/Twigs can only consider combination-pairs not encountered previously, but parallel recursions may consider the same combination-pairs. Similarly, PRVs already used in a Potential/Degree cannot be encountered in any other Potential/Degree within the same recursion (such pseudo transshipments are rejected through the usage of the Tabu_List, they may however be encountered in the separate parallel recursions).

Higher Degrees of Transshipments indicate complex problems needing multiple stages of resource transshipment for proper allocation and transfer; these Degrees could be compared with Potentials where a lower Potential for Transshipment is preferred and the algorithm moves to an higher potential for new transshipment search only when all possibilities within a lower Potential value are unable to satisfy the resource transshipment requirement completely.

Each Dynamic_Tabu_List is an update over the function's original Tabu_List passed in its argument. To be more clear, Tabu Lists increase through progressively deeper recursive function calls, but change across recursive function calls made during other iteration-scans while traversing the DTS. Detailing on the recursive functional *return* component pair rC from step 39:

- (A) **Component_1** consists of only those PRVs which can satisfy the concerned transshipment amount; since the PRVs can be on different SMTSs, there will be intermediate transshipments necessary. Each PRV information in Component_1 is associated with the maximum quantity of the CT that is available and satisfiable at the PRV, and the degree of transshipment. If the transshipment degrees of some of the PRVs are higher than the rest, it would mean that access to that PRV is possible only through more subsequent transshipments across different SMTSs.
- (B) **Component_2** represents the satisfaction of the concerned transshipment amount through usage of Vertices (could be WHs, RCs, and TPs) in the just next transshipment degree, *i.e.*, on the same SMTS as that of a_TP_Twig. Thus, the Component_2 can be derived from the Component_1. The PRVs used through subsequent deep-transshipments are compacted within Component_2's TP data; this is represented as the Downstream_Information where the PRVs that are accessed through subsequent transshipment are associated within their specific TP-vertex inside

Component_2 along with their full Transshipment Degree values. This in addition to the information types of Component_1, *i.e.*, the transshipment degree, and amount of CT satisfiable by a vertex, each TP-vertex in Component_2 also has the additional Downstream_Information of the subsequent PRVs which can be encountered through that TP-vertex. The satisfiable/available resource quantities (*i.e.*, the second element here) are used during the Compare Coding of TPs.

We now elaborately explain the processing of the Component Pairs received from recursive function calls, *i.e.*, the steps 41 and 42. The different Component_Pairs captured (during the iteration-scan) at each Leaf are aggregated and moulded into a final *return* component pair in step 46:

- i. To obtain the aggregated Component_1, all the first components caught from the different recursive function calls are merged into marge_C_1 (step 41).
- ii. marge_C_2 : To obtain the aggregated Component_2 (step 42), all the first components from different recursions are used to infer a single degree representation. This Adjusted Degree of Transshipment is calculated for each encountered TP, and is a value between the maximum and minimum of all deeper Transshipment Degrees encountered (depending on the value of a HyperParameter Transshipment_Degree_Slider, which is toggled per Main Iteration). The Adjusted Degree of a TP may best be weighted with the resource satisfiability, across all PRV degrees under its TP; this Adjusted Degree closely represents the depth of transshipments necessary. The calculation of the weighted average-Adjusted Degrees is shown through an independent example (not related to our study-example).

Assume the following Component Pairs as the functional *returns* (in step 39) caught during different recursions (*i.e.*, these component pairs are stored in rC_1 and rC_2 across parallel recursions):

Eg. 1: Component_1: “WH1”: (1, 20, 20), “WH2”: (2, 15, 25), We use weighted sum to calculate the inferred degree for a TP in Component 2 as $\frac{1 \cdot 20 + 2 \cdot 15}{20 + 15} = \frac{10}{7}$, with the weights being the satisfiable resource quantities as mentioned in the second tuple elements.

Component_2: “TP1”: ($\frac{10}{7}$, 35, {1:{"WH1":20}, 2:{"WH2":15}})

This is done assuming that the “TP1” is used for a deeper transshipment to access “WH1” and “WH2”.

Eg. 2: Component_1: “WH3”: (1, 15, 15), “WH4”: (2, 10, 10), “WH5”: (3, 10, 10)

Inferred degree: $\frac{1 \cdot 15 + 2 \cdot 10 + 3 \cdot 10}{15 + 10 + 10} = \frac{13}{7}$

Component_2: “TP2”: ($\frac{13}{7}$, 35, {1:{"WH3":15}, 2:{"WH4":10}, 3:{"WH5":10}})

Eg. 3: Component_1: “WH5”: (2, 10, 10), “WH2”: (3, 25, 25), “WH4”: (3, 10, 10)

Inferred degree: $\frac{2 \cdot 10 + 3 \cdot 25 + 3 \cdot 10}{10 + 15 + 10} = \frac{25}{7}$

Component_2: “TP3”: ($\frac{25}{7}$, 35, {2:{"WH5":10}, 3:{"WH2":25, “WH4”:10}})

Now, for aggregating the above assumed recursion results, we will develop the Component Pair:

- (a) Aggregated Component_1 (step 41): Here we group all the first components from the above three results to obtain: “WH1”: (1, 20, 20), “WH2”: (2, 25, 25), “WH3”: (1, 15, 15), “WH4”: (2, 10, 10), “WH5”: (2, 10, 10).

This indicates the maximum amount of resources that can be leveraged from unique vertices and through the lowest potential degree. Observe that all the vertices in the third result are already available in either of the previous two results, thus we always include the lower degrees for vertices with multiple occurrences and consider the higher of the resource satisfiable quantity (*i.e.*, the second elements of their tuples).

- (b) Aggregated Component_2 (step 42): If all the three Component_2s had been for the same TP (in the examples **1**, **2** and **3** above), say “TP1”, then we needed to obtain a common degree; we could then calculate a weighted degree from the Aggregated Component_1 as well by $\frac{1 \cdot 20 + 2 \cdot 25 + 1 \cdot 15 + 2 \cdot 10 + 2 \cdot 10}{20 + 25 + 15 + 10 + 10} = \frac{125}{80}$. For the other elements like resource satisfiability, we take the best values; and take union of the downstream information set also with the respective best values and degrees (similar to as is done in the Aggregated Component_1).

However, all the Component_2s have unique TPs (the same TPs will be encountered if there are more than one VTs plying on a SMTS) in our example, and therefore we can directly group them up: “TP1”: ($\frac{10}{7}$, 35, {1:{"WH1":20}, 2:{"WH2":15}}), “TP2”: ($\frac{13}{7}$, 35, {1:{"WH3":15}, 2:{"WH4":10}, 3:{"WH5":10}}), “TP3”: ($\frac{25}{7}$, 35, {2:{"WH5":10}, 3:{"WH2":25, “WH4”:10}}).

The HyperParameters Global_Transshipment_Fathom, and FullFathom, toggle between True and False values every Main Iteration; for the above example they may just be assumed False.

Continuing our study-example discussions:

When this function is queried with the inputs item (1)-(4), since there is no PRV in any of the higher degree SMTS (in this case there is only a single SMTS of degree one, which is SMTS “Air_A”). Thus the first functional *return* (of step 20) is not executed and the CT_Satisfaction_Counter remains 0. Thus the next portion of scanning the TP-Twigs in the DTS starts (on the single available Branch of “VT2”, hosted at “VD3”). Now there are two ports encountered during the iteration across the Twigs, namely “TP1” and “TP2” for which this same function is called independently (as two separate parallel recursion calls).

For the first recursion call, the functional arguments passed are:

- (1) “RC1”, (this is the list of all PRVs encountered in the previous SMTS “Road_A”, and in the querying SMTS “Air_A”)
- (2) “VT2”,
- (3) “1D”: 5, (as there was no reduction)

- (4) “TP1”,
- (5) degree = 2
- (6) (“VT3”, “TP3”),
- (7) “Road_A” (this was inferred using the Branch-Twig information, and the current SMTS being used will be inferred at the beginning of the next recursive function summon).

The functional *return* obtained being “WH1”: (2, 5, 20) both for the components 1 and 2; the first degree refers to the relative degree depth where the search was done, the next value of 5 is essentially the minimum among the resource requested and the resource available, and the next 20 represents the maximum resource availability at “WH1”.

For the second recursion call, the functional arguments passed are same as above with the only difference being in the fourth argument being “TP2”; the functional *return* obtained is “WH2”: (2, 5, 20) both for the components 1 and 2. The original function instance that receives these recursion returns in step 39, combines them depending on the component:

- (A) For Component_1: The final aggregation is obtained as {“WH1”: (2, 5, 20), “WH2”:(2, 5, 20)}
- (B) For Component_2: The information is represented as {“TP1”: (2, 5, {2: {“WH1”:20}}), “TP2”: (2, 5, {2: {“WH2”:20}})}. Here the first value of 2 for each TP represents the inferred (aggregated) degree from within the downstream information; the downstream information is the third element representing the currently available resources and the respective relative degree of that vertex *w.r.t.* the PRV-Twigs, arranged as per degree-wise dictionary-keys).

S3.1.3. Preference Generator Function for Split Node

This function develops preferences for satisfying the Split Node passed to it as an argument. The DTS with the unsatisfied Split Node as its Trunk is already available before these Preference Generator Functions (PGFs) are called. The task of PGFs (both the Split and Simultaneous PGFs) is to assign preferences to the Twigs of the specific Decision Tree such that higher values indicate more affinity of the Node-Trunk to be satisfied by a Twig.

The passed Split Node-Trunk has its own Requirement Code and the function discussed in section S3.1.1 is used to generate the Compare Codes along with the preference *Scores* initially only for all Warehouse and Relief Centre Twigs in the Decision Tree. It is then checked if the Warehouse and the Relief Centres directly accessible by the Split Node (them being on the same SMTS) are able to fully satisfy the requirements of the Split Node. This is done by adding all the generated Compare Codes (Cargo type-wise separately) and comparing if each cargo amount obtained from this addition is at least equal to or exceeds the Requirement Code amounts.

If the satisfaction requirements cannot be fulfilled by the $W's$ or $R's$ on the same SMTS, a Transshipment Code is generated which contains only the extra amounts for each Cargo Type, these extra amounts being the difference of the specific Cargo Type in the Requirement Code *w.r.t.* the summed up Compare Codes; the Transshipment Code is populated with those corresponding Cargo Types whose excess amounts are positive, (as after the difference, negative values indicate that they may be satisfied through the $W's$ and $R's$). During the actual satisfaction and route element generation, this consideration will not hold every time as the resources in the $W's$ and $R's$ will continually decrease and new Transshipment requirements would need to be catered to then.

Transshipment Codes can also takeup the entire initial value of the Requirement Code, depending on whether the single HyperParameter of Full_Demand_Passed_for_Enhanced_Variability is set as On/True; this allows the function to try and find Transshipment possibilities for the entire amount and is essentially a stress testing of the Heuristic, since in reality, this sort of a situation would be the absolute worst scenario.

After the Transshipment Code is finalized (*i.e.*, with amounts within the Transshipment Code being greater than zero), the maximum transshipment possible for each Cargo Type within the Transshipment Code is found using the function described in section S3.1.2; the Recursive function for Transshipment calculation is called for each Transshipment Port-Twig in the DTS, with the Trunk being the Split Node. The function *returns* the information of maximum possible resource satisfaction (similar to a Compare Code, and termed as the Satisfaction Code) for each Cargo Type within the Transshipment Code.

The maximum and minimum Transshipment Degree, which is encountered while satisfying each Cargo type, is also inferred from this functional *return*. A Transshipment_Degree_Slider_for_ N^P HyperParameter (common for the entire problem) is used to find a value between these maximum and minimum Transshipment Degree bounds; this Adjusted Transshipment Degree is used to find the preference *Score* for the Transshipment Port using the function described in section S3.1.5.

It should be mentioned that DTS of the TPs are populated with the necessary Component Pairs which are generated during the function-usages of sections S3.1.3 and S3.1.4 (the internal recursions of the Transshipment function in S3.1.2 help in populating the possible transshipment resource quantities along with their respective degree estimates).

The Split Nodes which require transshipment to be satisfied are identified and stored within a Mandatory_ N^P _Transshipment_Requirement dictionary along with the Cargo Type and the respective quantity which is necessary to be transhipped (since the specific Split Node can be partially satisfied without transshipments).

S3.1.4. Preference Generator Function for Simultaneous Node

This function is necessarily slightly different from the PGF for Split Nodes, since the PGF for Split Nodes considers partial satisfaction, therefore utilizing Leaves across different Branches is allowed there. However, in this case, to satisfy Simultaneous Nodes, all the Leaves utilized within any Decision Tree must be from one single Vehicle Type-Branch (this simple solution of developing routes from the same branch for a Simultaneous Node has been another major advantage of using the DTS; other advantages include inherent filtering of incompatibilities to create the necessary feasible solution

space). During the actual route generation, multiple trips of that specific Vehicle (of the same type as the Branch) may be required.

A parameter within this function is the `Consideration_with_Transshipment`, which remains set at a default False state initially. If the HyperParameter of `Full_Demand_Passed_for_Enhanced_Variability` is set as On/True, then the functional parameter of `Consideration_with_Transshipment` is changed to True at this function start. Here too, similar to the PGF for Split Nodes, we develop a Requirement Code for the passed Simultaneous Node.

We iterate across Vehicle Type-Branches, and across the Warehouse- and Relief Centre-Twigs within each Branch to generate Compare Codes and corresponding *Scores* for each Twig using the function described in section S3.1.1. During the iteration, only those Vehicle Type-Twigs are considered which are able to carry the full resource requirement of the Simultaneous Node (both in terms of Volume and Weight). The Requirement Code of the Simultaneous Node-Trunk is compared with the aggregate of all the Compare Codes *w.r.t.* all Vertex-Twigs in the same Vehicle Type-Branch and any remaining resource satisfaction requirement is checked. If all resources are able to be satisfied, then we proceed to check the next Vehicle Type-Branch, otherwise, depending on if the `Consideration_with_Transshipment` HyperParameter is True, we further check the same Vehicle Type-Branch with the Vertex-Twigs now being the Transshipment Ports. The recursive function for Transshipment estimation (S3.1.2) is used to find the estimated resource quantity for the specific resources which were not satisfiable previously without transshipment. After all the Transshipment Ports accessible by the Vehicle Type-Branch is iterated, it is now checked if this Branch (along with all its Twigs of Warehouses, Relief Centres, and Transshipment Ports) is able to satisfy the Requirement Code completely. If the Branch is able to fully satisfy the entire Requirement Code, then an additional *Score_Sum* is stored for each Branch; otherwise this Branch is rejected. The *Score_Sum* for a Branch is the sum of *Scores* of all Twigs originating from that Branch.

Here too, all Simultaneous Nodes which were found to contain all the Branches with Transshipment requirements are stored within a Mandatory N^M Transshipment Requirement, and the function calls to the recursive Transshipment estimation function (S3.1.2) helps in populating the resource leverage estimates for each Transshipment Port.

S3.1.5. Preference Scoring based on Satisfaction Codes of Transshipment Ports considering Adjusted Transshipment Degrees

This function uses its inputs of the Satisfaction Code, Transshipment Code, and an additional Degree Code (which contains Cargo Type specific Adjusted Transshipment Degrees), to *return* a score. This score is meant to be a preference for the transshipment of resources through a specific Transshipment Port-Twig to satisfy a Node-Trunk via a specific Vehicle Type-Branch; this function is similar to the function for generating Compare Codes (S3.1.1) with the primary difference being that the function in S3.1.1 is specifically meant to generate preference scores for those Twigs which represent Warehouse and Relief Centres; for scoring the Transshipment Ports represented as the Twigs, we use this function (S3.1.5).

Information of the Trunk, Branch and Twig is also passed to this function so that it is able to develop the score using the appropriate HyperParameters at each Cargo Type-Leaf similar to as described in the Eqns. S2-S4. In this case, the fraction f , as is calculated for each Cargo Type separately, is the ratio of amounts of the same Cargo Type in the Satisfaction Code *w.r.t.* the Transshipment Code.

Apart from the two HyperParameters affecting the *Denominator* during scoring (Travel Time multiplication in the *Denominator*, or making the *Denominator* unity), we also consider the following two additional HyperParameters in this function to utilize the Adjusted Degree:

- `Degree_affects_Multiplier`: If this HyperParameter is ON/True, the Multiplier-HyperParameters are divided by the Adjusted Degree obtained for the specific Cargo-type in the Degree Code.
- `Degree_affects_Exponent`: If this HyperParameter is ON/True, the Exponent-HyperParameters are multiplied by the Adjusted Degree found in the Degree Code for the specific Cargo-type.


These are two separate Hyperparameters for the entire Problem, which focus on toggling the scoring mechanisms during different Main Iterations. The logic behind using the Adjusted Degree to alter the preference (through alterations in the Exponent- and/or Multiplier-HyperParameters) is based on the natural sense that if some Cargo is able to be obtained using lesser number of Transshipments, then we should actually prefer that, instead of going for higher number of Transshipments to obtain that Cargo Type (in full or in part). For very complex problems with reduced feasible regions, this may not always be the case and could allow overlooking the optimal solution which may only be obtained using some counter-intuitive logic; however, for practical real scenarios, we firmly believe that lesser number of Transshipments would be better, and thus our Heuristic moves to a higher Potential/Degree for the Transshipment only when no more Cargo Load may be satisfied in the lower Potentials (keeping the relative Transshipment Degree low); therefore no Transshipment (*i.e.*, Degree 0) is the most preferred.

S3.2. Creating Smallest Route Elements (SREs) while maintaining the Causality Dict (CD)


The term Vehicle Load Code (VLC) in Figure 5 refers to the amount of cargo (of each type) that was transferred from a vertex into the vehicle, in case some quantity has been transferred from inside the vehicle to the vertex (as is applicable at Relief Centres, or during some transshipments) the quantity would be negative. In simple terms, the Vehicle outline is imagined to have a Gaussian surface (closed smooth topology) with any resource quantity entering inside the Gaussian volume to be positive and negative values indicating exit of some resources. It may be observed, from the examples in Figure S5, that at no instant in time will any Cargo Quantity be present as a negative number within the vehicle, since that would indicate an exit of some non-existent resources from within the Gaussian enclosure.

The SRE is prepared for a specific Vehicle Type respecting the constraint of not exceeding that Vehicle Type's capacity. All SREs are subsequently allocated to a specific Vehicle (a Vehicle Depot and the unique vehicle type number in that Depot) in section S3.3. A Split Node (or a Transshipment Port) can have multiple SREs to satisfy whereas a Simultaneous


Five sample SREs from the Case Study Instance are shown:
(these may not be a part of the Optimal set of SREs)




If there would have been a Relief Centre with unlimited resources in SMTS Road_B, the following SRE (SRE 6) would have been valid:




However, since there is no "RC0", the Transshipment Port needs to be used:



The subsequent transshipments in this shipment trail (from SRE 7) could look like SREs 8 and 9:



The following SRE from the Case Study is valid, but such SREs containing multiple Cargo Types in its SET 2 are never generated by our Algorithm (as the Recursive Transshipment estimation function can handle only a single Cargo Type search)



Instead, the same is broken into three separate SRE for each of the Cargo Types 1D, 2D and 2P (the above SRE 10 essentially being a superposition of them all)

Figure S5: Sample SREs (numbered examples) pertaining to our study-example instance in subsection 3.1

Node (as per the definition of Simultaneous Nodes, they must be satisfied fully using a single vehicular trip) can have only a single SRE. This can be seen in the example with the dummy Relief Centre "RC0" in Figure S5 (and the next corrected example with "TP1" in place of the "RC0"). In other words the SET 2 here (and for any Simultaneous Node for that matter) contains the full requirement code of the specific node ("NM3" in our example in the SRE 6) but in the form of the sign-corrected VLC.

The SET 2 in Figure 5 will contain only a single element (i.e. the prime vertex which is the focus of the route element) along with its VLC. The SET 1 and SET 3 may contain multiple elements; either of SET 1 or SET 3 may be empty but not both. The addition of all VLCs (i.e. separately adding the amount of transfers for each load type across all the vertices across an SRE's SETs) within an SRE must be 0, indicating that the load transferred from some vertex was delivered to another (in the direction of the arrow in Figure 5). To be more clear: SET 1 transfers only Delivery load types to SET 2; and SET 2 transfers only Pickup load types to SET 3.

In the subsequent sections, we discuss how to create SREs for the different Types of Nodes and TPs. The SETs 1 and 3 of an SRE can contain multiple vertex elements, whose relative positioning is perturbed using methods described in section 5.4, while maintaining causality constraints (developed during transhipments). Perturbations allow deeper exploration of neighboring solutions, and are made to respect the Causality constraints through the CD, and also the vehicle capacity constraints.

S3.2.1. Explaining the Causality Dict

All causality constraints are stored in the Causality Dict; whenever a TP is used within any of the SETs of an SRE, the details of this allocation is recorded in the CD. For example, if we assume all the (ten) numbered SREs from Figure S5 are actually being generated sequentially one after another in some way during the program execution, the CD will be updated right after the SREs 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 (since the other SREs numbered 1 and 6 do not contain any TP anywhere within any SET) are generated.

The CD is structured as a Table with mainly two columns (apart from the first indexing column), the left one for representing superior causal events (i.e., events which should take place before in time), and the right one for representing inferior causal events (i.e., events which should take place after all the respective superior causal events have taken place). It is depicted having the following three column headings:

A unique ID corresponding to the TP-in-concern at which the Causal events are being reported	LEFT Column: Superior Causal Events	RIGHT Column: Inferior Causal Events
--	--	---

Two types of SREs may be observed in Figure S5, SREs not containing any TP in their SET 2, and SREs that contain a TP in their SET 2. Whenever SREs get generated, the TPs concerned within any of the SETs in that SRE is searched, and the TPs found in the SETs 1 and 3 are put in separate rows of the CD as per the superior or inferior causal logic. All TPs encountered in the SET 1 are causally inferior, since to satisfy these allocations, further transhipments of Delivery resources will be necessary. However, if any TP is encountered in the SET 3, it is deemed to be causally superior as subsequent pickups from within the resources in the respective VLC associated with the encountered TP will be able to take place only afterwards (after the resources get deposited in the TP in the first place). We only look at the SETs 1 and 3 when any new SRE is generated as the SET 2 is developed internally (using the logic mentioned in section S3.2.5) to continue a transhipment trail.

The usage of the CD with examples from Figure S5 is explained step-by-step:

- When the SRE 2 from Figure S5 gets generated (using the function described in section S3.2.2), all TPs concerned within any of the SETs in that SRE are searched for, in this case a single TP is present in its SET 1, which is observed to be causally inferior. Therefore, after the generation of SRE 2, the CD is updated as below (along with the respective SRE source information):

TP Name with a Unique ID	LEFT Column: Superior Causal Events	RIGHT Column: Inferior Causal Events
TP3_A		SRE 2

If in SET 1 of the SRE 2, an additional TP would have been present (with its VLC) as say TP0: {3D:3, 4D:1}, this would have been assigned another fresh row in the CD as:

TP Name with a Unique ID	LEFT Column: Superior Causal Events	RIGHT Column: Inferior Causal Events
TP3_A		SRE 2
TP0_B		SRE 2

- After every new inferior causal event addition (as unique rows) in the CD, its superior causal events are generated using the function described in section S3.2.5, and inserted in the LEFT column of the corresponding row. For the SRE 2, the next continuation in the transhipment trail is shown as SRE 3 with the CD now being:

TP Name with a Unique ID	LEFT Column: Superior Causal Events	RIGHT Column: Inferior Causal Events
TP3_A	SRE 3	SRE 2

The meaning that may be inferred from this row of the CD is that at the TP3 (as seen from the TP Name in the index), the SREs 2 and 3 are causally linked such that the superior causal event of SRE3 should end before (in time) the inferior causal event of SRE 2.

- Right after the generation of SRE 3, similar search to detect the presence of any TPs in its SET 1 and 2 is conducted; the usage of TP2 is observed in its SET 1. The CD therefore gets updated to:

TP Name with a Unique ID	LEFT Column: Superior Causal Events	RIGHT Column: Inferior Causal Events
TP3_A	SRE 3	SRE 2
TP2_C		SRE 3

- The function in section S3.2.5 gets triggered to satisfy the further superior causal elements in this transshipment trail. This results in the generation of the *SRE 4*, and further updating the CD as below:

TP Name with a Unique ID	LEFT Column: Superior Causal Events	RIGHT Column: Inferior Causal Events
TP3_A	SRE 3	SRE 2
TP2_C	SRE 4	SRE 3

- This ends this transshipment trail, since *SRE 4* contains only the PRVs in its SET 1 and 3. The final meaning of this CD can be fathomed by subtly imagining the relative causal relations obtained between the *SREs 4, 3* and 2; the causal superiority diminishes across them as they transport the same resources from a PRV (in *SRE 4*) to a node (in *SRE 2*). These SREs may (and will) be assigned to different vehicles (also of different types, in this case), and keeping these records using the novel devised method of Causality Dict ensures that the temporal causality is maintained during all transshipments. The CD is also used to calculate the waiting time (if any) of vehicles at TPs (separately during each of their unique visits, incase the same TP is visited by a vehicle multiple times), since it may be better for a vehicle to wait for a short amount of time to pickup an incoming resource.

In a very similar fashion, when TPs are encountered in the SET 3 of an SRE, the SRE is added to the RIGHT causally superior column in the CD, and the same function described in section S3.2.5 is used to develop the subsequent SREs extending the transshipment trail till the resources reach a PRV. The evolution of the CD in this case can be seen by taking the example of *SRE 7* from Figure S5:

- After the *SRE 7* is generated (using functional methods from section S3.2.4), it is scanned to search for the existence of any TP in its SETs 1 and 3; after the TP1 is found in SET 3, the CD is updated to (only the rows relevant to this transshipment trail are shown):

TP Name with a Unique ID	LEFT Column: Superior Causal Events	RIGHT Column: Inferior Causal Events
TP1_D	SRE 7	

- Next, using the function from section S3.2.5, the subsequent SRE is generated to resolve the resource commitments done to the TP1 in *SRE 7*. This is shown as the *SRE 8*; the CD now gets updated to:

TP Name with a Unique ID	LEFT Column: Superior Causal Events	RIGHT Column: Inferior Causal Events
TP1_D	SRE 7	SRE 8

- The newly generated SRE is scanned and here too, a TP is encountered in the SET 3; this results in the CD to get updated to:

TP Name with a Unique ID	LEFT Column: Superior Causal Events	RIGHT Column: Inferior Causal Events
TP1_D	SRE 7	SRE 8
TP2_E	SRE 8	

Observe that the index of the second row above contains the same TP which is encountered in the SET 3 (with an additional alphabet-tag to keep all row IDs unique).

- The creation of a new row in the CD triggers the function in section S3.2.5 to resolve the latest resource commitments. It generates *SRE 9*, updating the CD to:

TP Name with a Unique ID	LEFT Column: Superior Causal Events	RIGHT Column: Inferior Causal Events
TP1_D	SRE 7	SRE 8
TP2_E	SRE 8	SRE 9

This marks the end of this transshipment trail, as all vertices in the SETs 1 and 3 of latest SRE generated (*i.e.*, *SRE 9*) are PRVs. This CD helps imagine the resource flow from the relatively temporally-supreme causal SRE of *SRE 7* downstream along the transshipment trail, through the relatively causally-poorer SRE of *SRE 8*, to final resource destination (a PRV).

In all the above examples, each individual cell contains a single SRE, however, it may so happen during the SRE generation process that the SETs 1 or 3 (or both) may contain multiple TPs (interestingly the same TP could also be in both SETs, and so we uniquely number-tag all TPs used during SRE creations to enable the concrete creation of corresponding rows in the CD). To handle all these cases, the following sequence of steps is followed:

Pseudocode to fathom each Transshipment Trail

- 1: **Search** for any TP across the SETs 1 and 3 in every newly created SRE:
- 2: **for** each TP usage in these SETs:
- 3: A unique row is created in the CD (if the same TP is in SET 1 and 3, two different CD rows are created having different Unique ID tags). Each row is named starting with the concerned TP found.
- 4: **for** each generated CD row:
- 5: The SRE ID is placed in the appropriate CD column (RIGHT or LEFT depending on the temporal causality, as discussed previously).

- 6: The function in section S3.2.5 is triggered to continue the respective transshipment trail. This function generates new SREs to satisfy assigned resource commitments to TPs, which may be multiple in number. Each newly created SRE is placed in the opposite column (of the respective row) from which its generation was triggered.
- For each of these newly created SRE, this pseudo-code is recursively called from Step 1 (**Search**).
- 7: **end for**
- 8: **end for**
- 9: **end Search**

Elaborating on Step 6 above, all cells in the CD either have none or a single SRE ID assigned till before the first time Step 6 is executed. Through the Step 6, multiple SREs may be generated during multi-trips as well as normally when different vehicles are used to satisfy one segment of the transshipment trail. This can be imagined similar to the route structure of a tree (or in the delta of rivers), where single elements converge (or diverge). A Transshipment Trail dealing in Pickup Cargo Types start from the Node similar to the main river element, and stem out via different SREs (river outlets) distributing this pickup to PRVs or TPs, the pickups from TPs in this transshipment trail are further sent via further (increasingly causally inferior) SREs which may be compared to the final river-branchings, before it reaches the sea (*i.e.*, any of the PRVs, some outlets may reach oceans faster which other may branch multiple times more and reach different oceans). Similarly, the aggregation of delivery resources from PRVs (nutrients from the soil) occurs through the formation of different SREs (smallest roots), which transport these to some TPs after which they may be transported further upstream together (roots joining to form tertiary, secondary and primary structures) until the delivery reaches the nodes (stems of plants). We term this phenomenon as the Transshipment Trail Stemming (TRS). We observe that each unique transshipment trail generated by our algorithm may be either comparable to the pickup distribution (river delta stemming outwards always) or delivery aggregation (plant root network stemming inwards always), but not both. This is because of the way the Transshipment Satisfaction function has been designed to handle one Cargo Type at a time. The only place where the TRSs of different delivery and pickup types of transshipment trails may meet are at the Nodes. The TP aggregation points in the Delivery TRSs, and the TP distribution points in the Pickup TRSs may be handling multiple types of resources, but of the same Delivery or Pickup type. At the end of Step 6, after the placement of the newly generated SREs in the opposite columns (of the respective rows) some cells in the CD may contain multiple elements, as in the hypothetical case mentioned in Table S3.

Table S3: A few rows of a hypothetical Causality Dict

TP Name with a Unique ID	LEFT Column: Superior Causal Events	RIGHT Column: Inferior Causal Events
TP19_ZA	<i>SRE 45, SRE 51, SRE 31</i>	<i>SRE 74</i>
TP25_ZB	<i>SRE 94</i>	<i>SRE 62, SRE 88, SRE 18</i>

where some assumed details of each SRE could be:

SRE ID	Vehicle Type	Possible set of Vehicle Depots to be allocated from
<i>SRE 45</i>	VT7	VD16, VD18
<i>SRE 51</i>	VT8	VD15
<i>SRE 31</i>	VT8	VD15
<i>SRE 74</i>	VT9	VD17, VD19
<i>SRE 94</i>	VT9	VD17, VD19
<i>SRE 62</i>	VT8	VD15
<i>SRE 88</i>	VT7	VD16, VD18
<i>SRE 18</i>	VT8	VD15

As described previously through the TRS, our algorithm design prevents any row in the CD to have more than one SRE in both columns simultaneously, as this would mean aggregation and branching happening in the same transshipment trail. If such a requirement is necessary, separate transshipment requests are generated forming different trails. For example, consider a hypothetical case where two nodes NP8 and NP9 have delivery demands of water bottle packs in the respective quantities of 18 and 19, and there is no PRV present in their SMTS named SMTS_X; only a single transshipment port named TP72 is situated in their SMTS. This TP72 also has access to another SMTS named SMTS_Y containing only two warehouses, W6 and W8, both containing 20 units of water. The considered MMTN consists only of two SMTS having different modes of transport, and each SMTS has 2 vehicles of the same type stationed at a single Vehicle Depot in both the SMTSs.

Two vehicles are available in SMTS_Y, and so it would (generally) be pertinent to send each one from the single depot and fetch resources from either of the Warehouses to dump them at the TP72. Meanwhile, the two vehicles in SMTS_Y would be journeying to TP72 and wait until the resources arrive, only to leave (one after the other) for either of the Nodes to complete the final delivery. In this case, if we focus on the happenings at TP72, we find that resources aggregated from two warehouses get distributed to the nodes; however in our implementation, each request from an individual node will constitute as a separate independant transshipment request initiating a transshipment trail. So our algorithm is able to completely handle all such cases, and much more complex ones (as may be seen in the datasets); by imagining the superposition of the individual TRSs will one be able to picture the aggregation and the distribution together. Further, incase the nodes had requests of other types of delivery, these would constitute as other independant transshipment trails for subsequent SRE generations.

S3.2.2. SRE creation for Split Nodes

This function accepts a subset of unsatisfied Split Nodes, and generated SREs to satisfy them (to the fullest extent possible). In case for some nodes, transshipment is deemed necessary, the function described in section S3.2.3 is triggered. The Algorithm proceeds through the following steps:

Pseudocode to generate SREs for Split Nodes

```

1: if any remaining Unsatisfied Split Nodes, within the set of Nodes passed to the function, are left to be satisfied: then
2:    $send\_all\_remaining\_for\_Mandatory\_Transshipment \leftarrow True$ 
3:   for each of the Twigs in every DTS, with the Split Nodes as Trunks, iterate in the decreasing order of preference
      scores, irrespective of the Trunk the Twigs belong to (scores already generated using section S3.1.3):  $\triangleright$  This means
      that the first iteration could be pointing to a Twig in some DTS and the other to another DTS originating from a
      different source Split Node as the Trunk, and potentially visiting newer Twigs from previously iterated DTSs.
4:     if the encountered Twig's original Trunk is within the current set of Unsatisfied Split Nodes, and if the Twig
      itself refers to a PRV (i.e., is a Warehouse or a Relief Centre): then
5:        $Trips \leftarrow 0$   $\triangleright$  Zero ensures atleast 1 trip with the encountered Twig
6:       while  $e^{-Trips \times Multi-Tripping\ HyperParameter\ value\ from\ this\ Twig} > rand_0^1$   $\triangleright$  All Twigs of
      DTSs is associated with a Multi-Trip-HyperParameter varying between 0 and 1;  $rand_a^b$  gives a random number from
      a uniform distribution ranging from  $a$  to  $b$ 
7:         The actual SRE generation process starts  $\triangleright$  Detailed below
8:         Current resource availability at the PRV visited in the SRE is adjusted (decremented)
9:          $send\_all\_remaining\_for\_Mandatory\_Transshipment \leftarrow False$   $\triangleright$  Since there has been an SRE
      creation in this iteration across the Unsatisfied Split Nodes
10:        if the Twig still has resources left to be leveraged, and the respective Trunk (being already in the list of
      Unsatisfied Split Nodes) still has unsatisfied requirements, that may be satisfied by the PRV Twig through subsequent
      transfers: then
11:           $Trips \leftarrow Trips + 1$ 
12:          continue  $\triangleright$  starts next iteration after checking the condition in step 6
13:        else if if the Node is fully satisfied then
14:          remove it from the list of Unsatisfied Nodes
15:        break  $\triangleright$  Exit this loop to proceed with the iteration of Step 3
16:        end if
17:      end while
18:    end if
19:    if  $send\_all\_remaining\_for\_Mandatory\_Transshipment = True$  then
20:      all the leftover (partial or full) unsatisfied requirements are set to be satisfied using the functional methods
      described in section S3.2.3 through transshipments
21:    else
22:      Execution starts from step 1  $\triangleright$  Process flow goes back to step 1
23:    end if
24:  end for
25: else if no remaining Split Nodes are left to be satisfied then
26:   return the execution flow ending this function
27: end if

```

Detailing the SRE generation process from Step 7:

The details of the resources available at the PRV Twig is matched with the resources requested by the Split Node (Unsatisfied Trunk). The Vehicle Type to be considered for this SRE creation is the same as the DTS Branch connecting the Trunk (Unsatisfied Node) with the Twig (PRV). Respecting both the Vehicle Volume and Weight constraints, as much possible of the requested requirement is tried to be satisfied. This already accounts for the Vehicle-Cargo compatibility, since any incompatible combinations would not contain the subsequent Leaves of that Cargo Type in this DTS.

The resource allocation will therefore halt, only if:

- There is no more requirement left to be satisfied at the Node, or,
- Any leftover requirement needs to be allocated to another Cargo-compatible VT, or,
- Some of the requested CTs are unavailable/partially available at the PRV, or,
- The vehicle capacity has been reached.

In any case, provided that some resources were allocated for a trip, the actual SRE set creation would be done as follows:

- i. An empty SRE with three SETs is created
- ii. VLC creation: The allocated Cargo Types along with their respective quantities with the appropriate signage (indicating inflow or outflow from the Vehicular Gaussian Surface) is prepared.
- iii. The (Unsatisfied) Split Node (*i.e.*, the Trunk of this DTS) is assigned to the VLC and stored in the SET 2.
- iv. Similarly, the VLC for the Twig is prepared. It may be noted that since a PRV may contain either Delivery Load Types, or have space to accommodate Pickup Load Types, only one among the SETs 1 or 3 will be populated with the VLC. Appropriate signage in the VLC is ensured (essentially opposite to that used in SET 2 creation).

- v. If the PRV Twig is a Warehouse, the PRV and VLC combo is assigned within the SET 1; if the PRV Twig is a Relief Centre, the PRV and VLC combo is assigned within the SET 3.
- vi. Any SRE is incomplete without its associated VT and VD information. In this case, the Vehicle Type information, along with the possible set of VDs, is inferred from the DTS Branch connecting the Twig and the Trunk. These respective information is tagged along with every SRE.
- vii. The SRE is provided with a Unique ID, and appended into the list of all SREs.

S3.2.3. SRE creation to satisfy Mandatory Transshipment for some Split Nodes, as necessary

This function satisfies the Mandatory Transshipment for some of the Split Nodes which were already identified during preference generation, as well as other Split Nodes which may have been later identified to require transshipment (through the processes in section S3.2.2). Whenever this function is triggered, it tries to fulfill all mandatory transshipments necessary, to or from Split Nodes; the algorithm is designed as follows:

Pseudocode to generate SREs for Split Nodes requiring transshipment

Ensure: HyperParameter of Transshipment_Trip_Setting takes the True value with an 80% probability before every Main Iteration gets initiated

- 1: **for** each request present within the list of all currently generated Mandatory Transshipment requirements for Split Nodes:
- 2: Transshipment requests of different CTs to/from the same Node is spread separately within the Mandatory Transshipment requirement List. A single request consists of three different information:
 - i. the Split Node which requires transshipment,
 - ii. a single Cargo Type which is to be transhipped, and
 - iii. the Quantity of that Cargo Type requested.

From the DTS containing the Split Node at the Trunk, all non-PRV Twigs (*i.e.*, Twigs which correspond to TPs) are sorted in the decreasing order of their scores; this is termed as Filtered DTS-TP

- 3: **while** the current remaining amount of resources requested is non-zero
- 4: **for** each TP within Filtered DTS-TP
- 5: **if** the requested Cargo is obtainable via the concerned TP **then** ▷ computation described below
- 6: **if** Current_Estimate = 0 **then**
- 7: **continue** ▷ proceeds to check the next lower-scored candidate within the Filtered DTS-TP
- 8: **else**
- 9: $Trips \leftarrow 0$
- 10: **while** $e^{-Trips \times Multi-Tripping\ HyperParameter\ value\ of\ Twig} \geq rand_0^1$
- 11: The maximum amount of resource transfer possible is calculated by finding the minimum among:
 - Current_Estimate,
 - Maximum amount of the Cargo Type (from step 2.ii.) that can be loaded into the Vehicle Type (that connects the Twig with the Trunk), respecting the Volume and Weight capacities of the vehicle
 - Quantity of the resource requested (for transshipment, in step 2.iii.)

and is dubbed Amt_Sat (the amount satisfiable through this SRE).

- 12: An empty SRE is created; the VD information associated with the SRE is taken from the same VT-Branch connecting the Trunk and the Twig.
- 13: An appropriate signage-adjusted VLC is generated (using the Amt_Sat value) to indicate the resource transfer at the Split Node. This is stored in the SET 2 of the fresh SRE.
- 14: A similar VLC (opposite in its signage *w.r.t.* the previous) is developed and assigned to the TP-Twig (*i.e.*, the current iterator of Iteration 4); this is stored appropriately in either the SETs 1 or 3 (depending on if the Cargo Type is of Delivery or Pickup respectively).
- 15: Update (decrease) the resource requirements at the Split Node for the concerned CT by the Amt_Sat value, as some (or all, depending on the Amt_Sat) of it is now shifted to the TP through this SRE creation.
- 16: A new row in the CD is generated with this SRE ID placed in the appropriate column (RIGHT in case the CT from Step 2.ii. is of Delivery Type, and LEFT in case it is a PCT).
- 17: To satisfy the resources diverted to/from the TP-Twig, the function SRE creation for TPs (section S3.2.5 is triggered; this automatically takes care of all subsequent transshipment requirements generated from this transshipment trail. ▷ This function is automatically triggered whenever a new row in the CD is added
- 18: Decrease both the transshipment requirement amount from step 2.iii., and the Current_Estimate by value of Amt_Sat, and find their minimum (say this minimum value is m)
- 19: **if** $m \geq 0$ **and** Transshipment_Trip_Setting_HyperParameter=True **then**
- 20: $Trips \leftarrow Trips + 1$
- 21: **continue** ▷ rechecks the **while** condition in step 10
- 22: **else if** $m = 0$ **then**
- 23: **break** ▷ starts the next iteration of step 4
- 24: **end if**
- 25: **end while**

```

26:         end if
27:         else if the concerned TP is unable to leverage any amount of the resource type (or if it is found incompatible
to transfer the cargo type) then
28:             continue           ▷ proceeds to check the next lower-scored candidate within the Filtered DTS-TP
29:         end if
30:     end for
31:     if no SRE was created in the latest full run of the for loop in step 4 then
32:         this transshipment requirement is deemed unsatisfiable: the details are stored within Unsatisfiable_Portion,
and the next Main Iteration is initiated
33:     end if
34:     if Transshipment_Trip_Setting HyperParameter=False then
35:         break                   ▷ flow continues with iterations of the for loop from step 1
36:     end if
37: end while
38: end for

```

To ensure a TP can satisfy some amount of the requested CT (elaborating the step 5 above) the Estimated Compare Code of the iterated TP-Twig in its DTS found during the preference generation of Split Nodes in section S3.1.3 is looked into. If this Estimated Compare Code contains the requested CT in some non-zero quantity, it would indicate that if this TP-Twig is committed with some amount of that resource, it will be able to leverage the resource upto the quantity in the Estimated Compare Code.

As the Heuristic progresses and transshipment requests are generated, a lot of the Estimated Compare Codes describing the resource leveraging capability gets redundant. This happens because some of the resources (for delivery, or their accepting capability for pickup) in some PRV may have decreased, as they may have been sent away (for delivery), or accepted (for pickups, thus decreasing the accepting capacity of the RC) by the PRV. We don't create fresh scores for the Twig after every such allocations (as this would be more computationally intensive) because then all scores across all DTSs involving that specific PRV directly or indirectly (through TPs) would need to be updated. Instead we focus on getting a new, accurate and current estimate of the resource leveraging capability; for PRVs this is directly inferred from the current amount of resource they have, but for the TPs, this is made possible by referring to the Component_2 (developed earlier using the function in section S3.1.2) stored in the DTS; this Component_2 contains the details of the PRVs from/to which resources may be leveraged, and so we just find the current available quantity of resource (of the Cargo Type under consideration from Iteration 1) at those PRVs and sum them together creating a Current_Estimate.

Expanding on the step 32 above, this scenario never arises unless the problem itself is infeasible, essentially requiring transshipment when no TP is available in that SMTS. Complex cases containing disconnected SMTSs forming multiple independent MMTNs are deemed to be separate problems, and may also be solved together using our Heuristic or MILP Formulation as a single problem.

S3.2.4. SRE creation for Simultaneous Nodes (with or without transshipments)

This function accepts a set of Simultaneous Nodes that are yet to be satisfied, and follows the following logical steps:

Pseudocode to generate SREs for Simultaneous Nodes

```

1: function SRE_CREATION_FOR_SIMULTANEOUS_NODES(Unsatisfied_NM)
2:   for each DTS-Trunk, where the Simultaneous Node-Trunk is present within Unsatisfied_NM:
3:     for each VT-Branch (of the DTS considered in the outer loop)
4:       compare the Requirement Code of the Simultaneous Node-Trunk, with the aggregate of all the resources
available across all PRV-Twigs connected to this VT-Branch           ▷ This is done by considering only the CTs
within their respective Leaves since the DTS preserves the compatibilities (thus ensuring we are not considering any
resource transfer onboard an incompatible vehicle)
5:       if it is found that all the combined PRV-Twigs are unable to satisfy the requirement fully then
6:         TP-Twigs are also considered to satisfy the requested requirement           ▷ Elaborated below
7:       if it is found that this Branch will be able to satisfy the Simultaneous Node fully, either using only
PRV-Twigs or also using TP-Twigs then
8:         Create an empty SRE
9:         Modify the Requirement Code to develop a VLC with the appropriate signage to be assigned to the
Simultaneous Node; this Simultaneous Node-VLC combo is stored in the SET 2 of the SRE
10:        Relieve resource requirements across all CTs           ▷ Detailed below
11:      else
12:        this portion of the requested requirement is deemed unsatisfiable (details are placed in Unsatisfiable_-
Portion): As per our algorithm design, this could mean infeasibility in the problem; in rare cases it could also indicate
bad HyperParameter combination of the current Main Iteration, which are revised while starting the next Main
Iteration immediately.
13:      end if
14:    end if
15:  end for
16: end function
17: end function

```

Elaborating the step 6 above, for each TP-Twig, we have the details of the PRVs that it can leverage resources to/from through its stored Component_2 (developed earlier using section S3.1.2). We aggregate all the Component_2s (from the existing CT Leaves for a TP-Twig), across all the TP-Twigs connected with the iterator 2's VT-Branch; then we sum up the resources available to be leveraged (for each CT individually) from within each Component_2's PRV set, across the aggregated Component_2s. During this process we cautiously ensure that no PRV-resource of the same CT gets summed up multiple times (as the same CT-Leaves from different Twigs can share some of the same PRVs within their Component_2). This gives us the CT-specific leveraging potential of the entire VT-Branch and allows us to compare the Requirement Code to check if it can be fully satisfied.

To maximally relieve resource requirements across all the CTs (detailing the step 10 above), we iterate through the PRV-Twigs of the VT-Branch from Iteration 2 in descending preferential order (section S3.1.4). We don't need to consider the VT capacity issues in this case as they have already been considered when this VT-Branch was deemed viable to satisfy this full requirement simultaneously. All these assignments are separately encoded to develop appropriately signed VLCs and stored in the appropriate SETs (SET 1 or 3 of the SRE) associated with their concerned PRV. If it was earlier found (in step 5) that the requirement satisfaction would necessitate transshipment(s) as well, we iterate through the TP-Twigs (in the decreasing preferential order). For each TP-Twig:

- We calculate the maximum amount of all resources that may be leveraged utilizing the Component_2 PRV information from across each CT-Leaf associated with this specific TP-Twig.
- We develop separate VLC's for the PickUp and Delivery CTs (this was automatically ensured when iterating through the PRV-Twigs as each PRV is specific to either PCTs or DTCs, but for TPs, we need to maintain them separately).
- The VLC(s) developed are assigned (with appropriate signs representing load transfer into/out of a vehicle) to the appropriate SETs (SET 1 for VLC with only DCTs, and SET 3 for the VLC with only PCTs) bearing association to the TP-Twig. This is the only place in our entire algorithm design where both the SETs 1 and 3 may be filled up (tweaking this aspect is another broad area with future research scope).
- Once the SRE development leveraging a TP-Twig to satisfy some/all of the requirement is completed, the SRE is assigned a unique ID, associated with the VD information obtained from the corresponding VT-Branch.
- A new row in the CD is created, containing the TP-Twig name (tagged with a unique combination of alphabets) as the row ID; the generated SRE ID is placed in an appropriate column in that row.
- The function to generate SREs, from TPs as DTS-Trunks (section S3.2.5), gets triggered with the information of the newly generated CD-row, to satisfy the subsequent transshipments from the TRS originating from this new CD-row.

A future investigation area could be the utilization of Branch scores (developed as an aggregation of the preferences of the connecting Twigs) for choosing the VT. Our design considers the first VT-Branch that can fully satisfy the Simultaneous Node-Trunk as the Branch scoring approach could be computationally intensive, requiring one pass of this entire function to calculate the current leveraging potential for each Branch, score then, and then perform the exact task done by this function (section S3.2.4) in a second pass.

S3.2.5. SRE creation for Transshipment Ports

This recursive function is designed to be triggered anytime during a Main Iteration to satisfy any transshipment requirement generated through the addition of a new row in the CD.

This function accepts the relevant details of the TP name (from the passed row-Unique ID of the newly generated CD-row), the CT requested, and its amount (depicted as Q in the pseudo-code below). The row-Unique ID helps to query the SRE directly and get its vehicle information; this helps in reducing the subsequent computational search by removing the SMTS (*i.e.*, all VTs can ply on it) onto which the SRE-Vehicle Type plys on. Thus we get a Tabu List of VTs. The function proceeds accordingly:

Pseudocode of Function to generate SREs for Transshipment Ports

```

1: function SRE_CREATION_FOR_TRANSshipment_PORTS(TP_Name,CT,Q)
2:   DeepTransshipment ← False
3:   Unrestricted_Amt_of_DeepTransshipment ← False
4:   while Q>0
5:     Initialize ScoreList ← [ ] ▷ Empty list to store scores
6:     for each Vehicle Type-Branch in the DTS with Trunk as TP_Name; the Vehicle Type not being in the Tabu List
7:       for each Twig connected to a Branch of the outer iterator
8:         if DeepTransshipment = False then
9:           if the iterated Twig is a TP then
10:            continue ▷ we leave the TPs for later and try to satisfy the current resource requirements only with PRVs (i.e., without deeper transshipments right away)
11:          end if
12:        end if
13:       for the specific Cargo Type-Leaf connected to the outer-iteration Twig which is the same as the CT in the function definition ▷ relevant compatibilities (Cargo Type -vs- TP) are taken care of by the DTS, allowing the algorithm to always search within the feasible region
14:         Amt_Sat is calculated

```

```

15:          $f = Amt\_Sat/Q$  ▷ fraction of the amount satisfiable
16:          $score = mf^p$  ▷ Exponent  $p$  and Multiplier  $m$  are HyperParameters of the concerned Cargo
Type-Leaf (discussed in section S3.1.1)
17:         if HyperParameter of Time consideration during Scoring is ON then
18:              $score = score/T$  ▷ Here  $T$  is the time taken to travel from the Trunk to the Twig (or vice versa)
using the Branch-VT
19:         end if
20:         if the outer iterator Twig is a TP then
21:              $score = score - Adjusted\_Degree \times DegreeScoreReduction$ 
22:         end if
23:         append  $score$  to  $ScoreList$ 
24:         end for
25:     end for
26: end for
27: if if no positive  $Amt\_Sat$  was generated within any of the iterations within step 6 then
28:     if  $DeepTransshipment = False$  then
29:          $DeepTransshipment \leftarrow True$ 
30:         continue execution initiates from step 4
31:     else if  $DeepTransshipment = True$  then
32:         if  $Unrestricted\_Amt\_of\_DeepTransshipment = False$  then
33:              $Unrestricted\_Amt\_of\_DeepTransshipment \leftarrow True$ 
34:         else
35:             remaining transshipment amount yet to be satisfied is deemed to be an Unsatisfiable Portion within
the entire problem: ▷ We get Unsatisfiable Portions extremely rarely for very complex large instances, and
that too only in very few of the Main Iterations (as this depends on the overall HyperParameter value combinations).
Any addition in the Unsatisfiable Portion of the Problem indicates a need to shift to the next Main Iteration, as the
current HyperParameter combinations are deemed unsuitable.
36:         end if
37:     end if
38:     end if ▷ At this stage, we should have some positive  $Amt\_Sats$ 
39:     take the element with the highest score from the  $ScoreList$  and create a new SRE with it
40:     update the CD-row with this newly generated SRE appended in the opposite column
41:     update the requirement  $Q$ 
42: end while
43: end function

```

Expanding on the calculation of the Amt_Sat from step 14, for PRV-Twigs, the Amt_Sat takes the minimum value from the following:

- requested amount of resource Q
- maximum quantity of that Cargo Type which can fit within the Vehicle's Volume, and Weight limitations,
- current amount of the resource available of specific Cargo Type in the PRV

For TP-Twigs, the Amt_Sat takes the minimum value from among the following:

- requested transshipment amount Q
- maximum quantity of resource that can fit within the Vehicle Types, weight and volume restrictions
- current estimate of resource quantity possible to be leveraged by the TP-Twig (we consider this only if $Unrestricted_Amt_of_DeepTransshipment$ is set as False): We calculate this by summing the appropriate available resources at the PRVs associated from the $Component_2$ stored in the DTS-Leaf.

As previously mentioned, we consider the degrees as potentials which are incorporated in this scoring (if the Twig is a TP). The previously calculated Adjusted Degree (which is a cumulative measure of the degrees for the specific TP-Twig) is taken into consideration here and multiplied by a HyperParameter $DegreeScoreReduction$; this product is subtracted from the Score (see step 21 above). The HyperParameter of $DegreeScoreReduction$ is varied after every Main Iteration and takes values between -2 and 8 from within a varying distribution (we allow negative values allowing the Heuristic to experiment with reversed potentials, *i.e.*, deeper transshipments then will be better than no or single-degree transshipment).

Elaborating on the SRE creation from step 39, the SET 2 of this SRE contains the VLC with the appropriate signage with the vertex assigned as the TP which was passed into the function definition along with its requirement. The VLC contains the maximum quantity of resource satisfiable which is the Amt_Sat associated with the highest Score. We create another VLC with the appropriate signage (opposite to the one assigned in SET 2) and assign this to the Vertex-Twig that had the highest score; this Vertex may be a PRV or a TP. This Vertex-VLC association is sent to either the SET 1 or 3 depending on the logical sequence of transshipment; as a short explanation/trick, whenever the Cargo is of Delivery Type, it is assigned to SET 1, otherwise it is assigned to SET 3.

The appropriate signage (as previously elaborated) always ensures resources exit from the vehicle only after they enter it at a previously visited vertex. So, the sign associated within the VLC in SET 2 is:

- i. POSITIVE when Cargo is Pickup Type
- ii. NEGATIVE when the Cargo is of Delivery Type

and likewise opposite for the other VLC placed in either SET 1 or 3. The VT information about this SRE, and its possible choices of VDs is inferred from the VT-Branch step 6.

Elaborating on the step 41:

- If the Vertex-Twig is a PRV:

We decrease (update) the resource availability of that PRV, since some of that reserve was used up as is represented in value by the Amt_Sat of the highest Score (this may not necessarily be the highest among all Amt_Sat due to the scoring process followed, an area of interest ripe with future research potential).
- If the Vertex-Twig is a TP:

We introduce a new row in the CD (*i.e.*, place the newly created SRE in the appropriate column of a new CD-row, with its row ID being the Vertex-TP tagged along with unique alphabet combination). We immediately call this same function of SRE creation for TPs (section S3.2.5) starting a recursion chain to satisfy the TRS; as per our design, the TRS is satisfied similar to depth-first approach as it stems deeper. The details for the recursion function start are derived from the newly generated CD-row (our implementation of this function does not have any functional *return*).

After step 41, in case when re-initiation of the first iteration happens, more than one SRE ID would be put in the same cell as shown in Table S3. It may be kept in mind that as per our algorithm design, multiple SRE insertions within the same cell in the CD can happen only through this function.

S3.3. Allocation of Vehicles enabling Integration of SREs within Vehicle routes

Each SRE, as created and stored within the Global SRE Pool, also contains information on its vehicle type and additionally, the possible Vehicle Depots whose Vehicles of the concerned type can allow the allocation of this SRE (in its Route Portion form) within their routes. The additional information about the Vehicle Depots is necessary to ensure routes developed within an SMTS are not allocated to another SMTS.

S3.3.1. Selection Logic for the Allocation of individual SREs to unique vehicles based on the CD

Once we have generated SREs for this PASS within the Main Iteration (PASS indicates the Node Set sent for creation of SREs), we integrate them to vehicles of the same type as contained in the SRE information, and to a vehicle starting from any of the depots in the VD set of the SRE. However we do not send the SREs to be integrated in any sequence. This is because, SREs without any TP vertices within their SETs are essentially independent entities but those SREs containing some TP-Vertex within any of their SETs are in a way connected to the SRE with superior or inferior causality, this connection stems down as per the TRS structure. We therefore ensure that while selecting SREs for integration, we start with the absolute causally-superior SREs. The relative superiority is directly inferred from each row of the CD; to respect the absolute superiority while sending SREs for integration, we ensure that:

- Step 1:** If the SRE to be integrated is in the RIGHT Column of the CD (in any row), all its causally-superior SREs (on the corresponding rows LEFT Column) must have been already sent for integration.
- Step 2:** If the SRE to be integrated is in the LEFT Column of the CD, we check if it is anywhere else on the CD in the RIGHT Column. If it is found anywhere else on the RIGHT Column, we restart from **Step 1** above, otherwise we send it for integration.

After sending out all the SREs from the CD for integration within vehicles, we send the remaining SREs at random since they don't contain any TP vertex within any of their SETs and therefore random integration will do no harm.

In case this is not followed, some Route Clusters could become infeasible later on due to complexity (impossibility) of Waiting Time calculation at TPs.

S3.3.2. Moulding an SRE into its Route Portion Combination(s)

An SRE in its own form cannot be directly integrated into a Route6. We create Route Portions from SREs as the first step towards integration into vehicle route, after each SRE is chosen for integration.

A possible RoPr of an SRE is the sequence of vertices of the SRE such that independent permutations of its SET 1 and SET 3 is allowed, while maintaining the relative sequence of vertices in the order SET 1 → SET 2 → SET 3. Alongwith the vertex list (as the List 1 in the RoPr), all the other lists similar to those in a Route6 are created (with some default values, like 0 for all List 2 elements, only populating the Loading+Unloading Time within all TimeTuples), and not initiating any StatusCode entries in the List 4 for now).

An example of such an RoPr is provided in Table S4; for any SRE, the number of such combinations will be the value $\min(1, |\text{SET}_1| \cdot |\text{SET}_3|)$. Reiterating the main points, all the SET 1 and SET 3 elements are allowed to be in any relative ordering in the RoPr, however, all SET 2 vertices must be placed after all SET 1 vertices, all of which must be placed before SET 3 vertices in the List 1 of any RoPr-Combo.

S3.3.3. Understanding the Integration Logics of Route Clusters

An entire solution of the whole problem is stored as a Route Cluster (RoCu); a RoCu contains Route6 for all vehicles. We develop different logical steps during the process of Integration of an SRE into a Vehicle's Route6. These progress through:

- i. The selection of an SRE (section S3.3.1) initiating an Integration step
- ii. Development of the RoPr-Combos from the SRE, such that each RoPr is similar in structure to a typical Route6 section (S3.3.2)

Table S4: All RoPr-Combos of *SRE 5* from the Figure S5

RoPr Combo 1				RoPr Combo 2			
List 1:	TP1	TP2	TP3	List 1:	TP2	TP1	TP3
List 2:	0	0	0	List 2:	0	0	0
List 3:	{1D:2}	{1D:7}	{1D:-9}	List 3:	{1D:7}	{1D:2}	{1D:-9}
List 4:	{}	{}	{}	List 4:	{}	{}	{}
List 5:	(, 0.22,)	(, 0.77,)	(, 0.99,)	List 5:	(, 0.77,)	(, 0.22,)	(, 0.99,)
List 6:	<i>SRE 5</i>	<i>SRE 5</i>	<i>SRE 5</i>	List 6:	<i>SRE 5</i>	<i>SRE 5</i>	<i>SRE 5</i>

- iii. Selection of some of the Integration Logics, based on the combinations of RoPr-Combo, Allocation and Matching Logics (section S3.3.4, S3.3.5, and S3.3.6). In addition to these, we also consider comparing results with Waiting Time computation and without it (as indicated in the last column of Table S5). In total we can have a total of 554 (slightly above $4*7*9*2$, as found by multiplying all the total no. of logical cases as shown in Table S5 along with the inclusion of all the True rows for which Waiting Time consideration as False is available) unique Integration Logics.
- iv. Using a user input, we take an upper bound on the no. of unique logics we will be considering for a Heuristic run, (with a lower bound set at half the user-input value). Some Integration Logics are considered and put into a set NonTabuLogic; the number of such logics lie between the bounds.
- v. We generate empty Route Clusters equal to the no. of initial elements in the NonTabuLogic set.
- vi. We assign each RoCu with a unique logic label from the NonTabuLogic set.
- vii. Whenever an SRE is chosen for Integration, it is integrated into each of the Route Clusters; the integration is performed as per the current logic label of the respective RoCu. Thus each Route Cluster keeps its own unique copy of the developing problem solution; each solution possibly being drastically different from the others.

Even within each individual Integration Logic, there are multiple combinations possible between the selected Route Portions, and the selected Vehicles. Such a case can be seen for the currently assigned Route Cluster 3's Logic Label in the Table S5, where multiple Route Portions will be returned (also happens for the Route Cluster 4), as well as all the vehicles possible to be allocated to will be considered. During such cases, we create temporary twins of the RoCu and try out all these combinations; we retain the best RoCu-twin that has the minimum cascaded time of the route cluster, among all cluster-twins.

The cascaded vehicle route duration comparison, between two clusters, is done by:

- i. Updating all the TimeTuples of each Route6. This is done along with the Waiting Time computations if the corresponding logic of Waiting Time computation Consideration Logic is True, otherwise, all waiting times are considered 0
- ii. Arranging the route durations in descending order, for each RoCu separately
- iii. Compare the highest route duration between the clusters. If found the same we compare the next highest vehicle route, until we get a deterministic comparison.
- iv. If we have compared all the vehicular routes across the Route Clusters in descending order and all are found to be the same in value, then we deem both solutions to be equally good (and possibly the same).

During the algorithm development, shuffling of the logic labels proved extremely successful. We develop a HyperParameter to decide if such shufflings should be carried out; this HyperParameter `To_Shuffle_or_Not_to_Shuffle` takes a True value 80% of the time before every Main Iteration (but we recommend setting it to full, as the improvement has been found to be dramatic). If `To_Shuffle_or_Not_to_Shuffle` is found to be True, the logic labels of the Route Clusters get shuffled after every SRE Integration. In some cases, when all the waiting times within every Route6 of a RoCu cannot be computed (discussed in section S3.3.7), we ditch that RoCu along with the current logic label associated with it (thus this ditched logic label is not considered during future Integration-Logic-Label shufflings within the same Main Iteration). A lot of scope remains in generating new Integration Logics, and comparing our shuffling approach with the concept of Crossover used in Genetic Algorithms.

S3.3.4. Logics for selection of some RoPr Combos

As previously mentioned, each Route Cluster is associated with a specific Integration_Logic. The first component of a typical Integration_Logic determines the selection logics for RoPrs from among the RoPr-Combos. We used four following different RoPr Selection Logics:

- **Random:** Randomly selects one single RoPr from among the RoPr-Combos
- **MinTime:** Selects the RoPr with the minimum duration compared to the other RoPrs in the RoPr-Combo. This calculation assumes the arrival time of the vehicle at first vertex in any RoPr to be 0, for all the RoPrs within the RoPr-Combos; waiting times are also considered to be 0, in case any TP is encountered. The final Vertex leaving time (*i.e.*, the last element in the TimeTuple, of the last Vertex) is compared for comparing the minimum durations.
- **Min2Time:** Similar to MinTime, but selects two RoPrs, one with the lowest duration, and the other with the second lowest duration.
- **All:** Selects the entire RoPr-Combo set for the subsequent processes.

Table S5: Some sample Integration Logics assigned to respective Route Clusters (four example Logic-Labels are provided)

Total no. of logical cases →:	4	7	9	2
	RoPr selection Logic	Allocation Logic	Matching Logic (Breach Consideration, Left-Over Mobility, TP Matching)	Waiting Time computation Consideration Logic #
Route Cluster 1:	MinTime	VertexSimilarity_1	OFF	True
Route Cluster 2:	Random	VertexSimilarity_3	(True, False, True)	False
Route Cluster 3:	All	All	(False, True, True)	False
Route Cluster 4:	Min2Time	Random	(True, True, False)	True

For every False row, its corresponding True row is always considered as a separate available logic, and assigned to some other Route Cluster not mentioned here

S3.3.5. Allocation Logics of Route Portion within the allocated vehicle's route, across different Route Clusters

This function *returns* a set of suitable vehicles which can be used for integrating a RoPr. The SRE information, along with any one among the below allocation logics, are passed to this function. The exact Vehicle information is obtained from the VT and VD set associated with the original SRE from which the RoPr was generated; all the vehicles matching both the VT and VD description are considered while choosing. An additional input of the Vertices present in the SRE, is used in some of the logics. The allocation logics used by us are:

- **Random:** A random vehicle from among the suitable set of vehicles is selected.
- **VertexSimilarity_1:** In this case the vertices in the SRE are iterated, within which the current vertices in the concerned vehicle's Route6 is also iterated upon; their number of matches are counted. The vehicle with the maximum value of these matches is selected.
- **VertexSimilarity_2 and 3:** Here we take a more practical approach by counting only the feasible (feasibility in this case is not *w.r.t.* the vehicle capacity constraints but *w.r.t.* the necessity of keeping all vertices of the SRE's SET 1 before its SET 2 which must be entirely before its SET 3) number of insertions possible. We do this by (setting a counter at zero, and) starting with the first vertex in the RoPr; then we proceed by:

Step 1: Calculating the number of Vertex-matchings (*i.e.*, the same vertex currently being considered from the SRE being present in the RoPr), from after each individual Vertex-matching of the previous SRE-element as separate cases. The logic behind considering the matchings only from after the previous matchings (if any) lies in the fact that when actually integrating the RoPr into a Route6, the relative positioning of the RoPr elements within the Route6 will remain intact, even though its individual vertices can be spaced out to accommodate other (any number of) vertices between them.

Step 2: We add this number of feasible matching to a counter.

Step 3: If matchings are found for this RoPr vertex, we proceed to the next vertex and start from **Step 1**; otherwise we proceed to **Step 4**.

Step 4: We check if the program flow converges here due to no matching, or due to all RoPr vertices having been considered. In case of all the RoPr vertices were considered, it would mean that the final vertex in the RoPr found a match in the Route6 and all the other vertices were also able to be inserted in the same relative order; in this case the function *returns* the counter as the value. If however, the process flow converged due to the case of no match found after some (or no) matchings, the function *returns* a modified value of the counter, which:

- For **VertexSimilarity_2** is kept at: $counter + 10000 * (i + 1)$
- For **VertexSimilarity_3** is used as: $counter * (i + 1)$

where i denotes the number of elements of the RoPr which were possible to be matched, before the next ($i + 1^{th}$) vertex couldn't find any feasible match.

The vehicle with the maximum value of these values is chosen.

- **MinTime:** For all the vehicles, we consider their time of leaving last vertex in their respective routes (*i.e.*, we compare the last element of the last TimeTuple, for every suitable vehicle for which this value exists) in case it had been already computed during its last RoPr insertion. We choose the vehicle which has this value as the lowest; in case none of the values exist we assign one at random.
- **Min2Time:** This is similar to the MinTime logic, but in this case we select both the minimum and the second minimum options. We assign one vehicle at random if the values don't exist yet, which will also happen when the vehicle routes are empty.
- **All:** The full set of suitable vehicles is returned.

S3.3.6. Matching of the same vertices of SREs within the route of a single vehicle, ensuring feasibility during the Insertion of an SRE

When we integrate a RoPr into a Route6, we are able to decide whether the integration will consider Matching during this Integration. In the case of Matching having being turned ON, it is done so by toggling the below mentioned MatchMaking Parameters, each of which can take True/False values independently. Thus this Matching function has 9 possible logical scenarios, the 2^3 toggled combinations of the MatchMaking Parameters and the case without Matching.

The MatchMaking Parameters used in this function are:

- i. **Breach Consideration:** This considers the Breach Point as LeftOver insertion upper bound
- ii. **LeftOver Mobility:** Allows some insertion mobility to the leftover (or all) RoPr-Elements, leftover elements being those without any confirmed match.
- iii. **TP Matching:** Keeping this True (recommended) allows the TP vertices to also be considering during the Matching process described in section S3.3.6.

Additionally a functional variable representing the LeftOver-insertion-UpperBound is initially set to a Position value after the final vertex of Route6.

The main idea here is to try and place elements from the RoPr (starting from the first element, and always ensuring the relative position of all the elements from the RoPr are undisturbed during/after the insertion). The steps followed are shown:

Step 1: Iteration 1 initiation across the RoPr elements ((we start considering each of the RoPr elements from its extreme left)

Step 2: Logical Flow within Iteration 1:

We try to find a match (*i.e.*, same vertex) of the RoPr-Element (under consideration from **Step 1** or **3**) with any of the Route6 elements. For comparing with the Route6 elements, the search starts from after the vertex position where any previous RoPr-Element was inserted; as for the first RoPr-Element matching since will be no such position available, we start the matching search from the starting vertex (after the VD) of the Route6.

If a match is found, we check if inserting the RoPr-Element just after this match Position results in any (weight or volume) capacity breach across any of the subsequent StatusCodes in a temporarily modified Route6; this is done by updating the StatusCodes starting from the inserted RoPr-Element (as a continuation of the StatusCode from the match position). Any StatusCode is calculated as the sum of the previous Element's StatusCode with the current Element's VLC; it represents the resource amount contained within the vehicle, and is therefore never negative for any CT. If no capacity breach is found, we confirm this Match and go to **Step 3**. Otherwise, when a Breach is reported:

- If Breach consideration is True, the LeftOver-insertion-UpperBound is set as the position available just before the Breach Position. If it is False, the LeftOver-insertion-UpperBound is unchanged.
- We go to **Step 4** reporting a capacity breach.

Step 3: We insert the RoPr-Element just next (rightwards in positioning) to the matched Route6-Element; practically this indicates that the vertex instead of being visited multiple times may be visited a single time. After this we start the Matching consideration for the next RoPr-Element from a position in the Route6 after this Match Position (*i.e.*, go to **Step 1**).

Step 4: The RoPr elements which were not inserted yet (*i.e.*, starting from the last unmatched element position, and taking all the subsequent elements always in the same sequence) are termed LeftOver. We try to place the LeftOver RoPr elements together in a suitable Position of the Route6. This suitable position is searched:

- From within a range starting after the latest RoPr-Element insertion Position upto the LeftOver-insertion-UpperBound, if LeftOver Mobility is set as True.
- If it is False, the insertion happens at the LeftOver-insertion-UpperBound.

A possible matching from the example in Table S6 could be: VD1 → WH1 → WH1 → NP3 → NP3 → NP3 → TP1_GA → TP1_GP

When Matching is turned OFF, then the full RoPr is integrated at the very end of the Route6, as shown for the same example: VD1 → WH1 → NP3 → NP3 → TP1_GA → WH1 → NP3 → TP1_GP

Table S6: A. **Sample Route6 from our Illustrative Example in section 3.1 of a VT4 on SMTS Road_B indicating the possible insertion positions for accomodating (none or multiple) elements of new incoming RoPrs.**

	Position 1	Position 2	Position 3	Position 4	Position 5
List 1:	VD1	WH1	NP3	NP3	TP1_GA
List 2:	N/A	0	0	0	0
List 3:	{}	{1D:11, 2D:13}	{1D:-11, 2D:-13}	{2P:6}	{2P:-6}
List 4:	{}	{1D:11, 2D:13}	{}	{2P:6}	{}
List 5:	(, , 0)	(12.88, 5.15, 18.03)	(22.54, 5.15, 27.69)	(27.69, 1.2, 28.89)	(41.3, 1.2, 0* 42.5)
List 6:		SRE 59	SRE 59	SRE 72	SRE 72

Table S6: B. RoPr of the *SRE 7* from Figure S5; the *SRE 7* has only this possible combination within its RoPr-Compos set. Each individual column element is also indicated.

	Element 1	Element 2	Element 3
List 1:	WH1	NP3	TP1_GP
List 2:	0	0	0
List 3:	{1D:-5, 2D:-4}	{1D:-5, 2D:-4, 2P:-8}	{2P:-8}
List 4:			
List 5:	(, 2.15,)	(, 3.75,)	(, 1.6, 0*,)
List 6:	<i>SRE 7</i>	<i>SRE 7</i>	<i>SRE 7</i>

* Due to superior causality, they naturally has zero waiting times

S3.3.7. Waiting Time computation function for a Route Cluster

This function accepts a RoCu and updates it with the computed Waiting Times in the appropriate List of each vertex within all Route6s in the RoCu. It starts by taking a random vehicle's Route6 from the RoCu and proceeding as below:

Function to update all TimeTuples of a RoCu, and Compute Waiting times


```

1: function GEOMETRICALLY-COMPUTING_WAITING_TIME(passed_RoCu)
2:   while TimeTuple computation of some position in any Route6 is yet to be done
3:     for each Route6 in the passed_RoCu
4:       for each vertex in the chosen Route6 from the outer iteration    ▷ The vertices are taken either from the
       beginning, or from a TP-vertex whose waiting Time computation was not possible earlier (refer to step 9 below)
5:         calculate TimeTuple in its List 5; if we encounter a TP-Vertex, we estimate the best waiting time (for
       that specific visit) as below:
6:         if the encountered TP represents an Inferior Causal event then
7:           if corresponding Superior Causal event(s) have already been encountered in this function previously
then
8:             compute waiting time using geometrical approach
9:           else
10:            stop this Route6's TimeTuple computation at this TP-vertex (to resume TimeTuple calculations
       from this vertex-position later)
11:            break                                ▷ start the next Route6's TimeTuple computations
12:            end if
13:            else
14:              waiting time is 0                    ▷ Superior Causal events have no waiting time
15:            end if
16:          end for
17:        end for
18:      end while
19: end function

```

In step 5 above, the TimeTuple calculations from the beginning Vertex are started by putting the value of the first vertex-leaving-time as 0, that vertex being its VD (while comparing with the Literature Instances in Table S10, we had to give a VT-specific starting time delay, due to requirement of converting the literature problems' vehicle fixed cost into our problem specifications) and just adding up the subsequent travel time to the next vertex, adding the loading/unloading time at this next vertex, and keep doing so repeatedly till we encounter a TP.

At a TP, we need to estimate the best waiting time accurately; this not a static calculation. Each unique TP usage associates its TP Name with a unique alphabet tag. Using this unique TP name (of the encountered TP from step 5), we find the corresponding row of the CD, and check if the SRE ID is in the Superior or Inferior Causality column. If it is found to be of superior causality, we don't need to calculate the Waiting Time of this vehicle at this Vertex-TP as it will be 0; this may be easily understood by considering the superior causal events (*i.e.*, the unloading events depicted in blue) in the Figures S6 and S7, as these unloading events shouldn't require any waiting time. In case the SRE ID is found to be of inferior causality (step 6), then we check if its corresponding superior causal event(s) have already been encountered in this function previously (step 7). If the time computation is not possible (through step 8) due to some superior causal event(s) not having been encountered previously in this function, we leave this Route6's TimeTuple computation here since we are unable to proceed with the calculation of the TimeTuples across this vertex and further vertices for this Route6. We move on to another Route6 and (re)start the process of TimeTuple computation (from where it was last left, if at all) re-initiating from step 3.



Multiple unloadings at TP19_ZA with a single upload (all loading/unloadings are indicative of a single Cargo Type, assumed with a name CT_X)






Figure S6: Visual representation of the Waiting Time calculation, for the first CD-row of Table S3 (the loading or unloading is represented by colour and not by signage in this figure). Here two cases are considered to deepen the understanding of the approach used by us.



Single unloading at TP25_ZB with multiple uploads (all loading/unloadings are indicative of a single Cargo Type, assumed with a name CT_Y)





Figure S7: Visual representation of the Waiting Time calculation, for the second CD-row of Table S3. Some of the infeasible regions (yellow regions near dashed lines) and Critical Arrival Times (calculated at the base of each dotted line) for each of the vehicles arriving at the TP with inferior causality (SREs depicted as orange loadings) are mentioned with arrows.

However, if all superior causal events are encountered, their current TimeTuples in their respective List 5 will be known and fully populated, and we can now proceed to compute waiting times using a geometrical approach (step 8). We use all these TimeTuples to construct the Waiting Time computation problem geometry (as shown in the first four small input figures in both the Figures S6 and S7); the respective VLCs from each of their List 3 determines the heights of the individual triangular loading/unloading sections, and the full loading/unloading time (across all the CTs present in the respective VLC, and transferred in this specific TP-visit) determines the base of the right triangular region. We first place all the unloading (blue) triangles over each others' baseline, stacked from the 0 resource level in the order of their arrival times (refer to the stacking of the orange unloading triangles in Figure S6); their hypotenuses start from exactly their arrival times, since these superior causal events don't have any waiting time. Next we place all the inferior causal triangle geometries on top of their respective baselines starting from the zero resource level, stacked from the bottom up in the order of their arrival times (refer to the stacking of the blue loading triangle in Figure S7); for explanation purposes, we initially place them at an imaginary infinite time at the very far right. Finally we try to push all the loading triangles towards the left, always keeping in mind that:

- The hypotenuse of the loading triangles (orange triangles in figures Figure S6 and Figure S7 do not cross the hypotenuse of any of the unloading triangles within their respective resource height
- The hypotenuse of the loading triangle does not intersect with its own arrival time

In Figure S6 the resource height of the loading triangle ranges from level 0 to q_4 . In the case 1, if the actual arrival time of the loading triangle a_4 would have been less than or equal to the Critical Arrival Time (calculated at base of the loading hypotenuse pushed left-wards till it reaches the edge of feasibility, and depicted as dotted lines in figures S6 and S7) A_c , the loading triangle could have then be pushed further left to reduce any waiting time. However, the (big, orange) loading triangle in case 2 cannot be shifted any further left as it then goes to the infeasible region (yellow region, depicted with an arrow in the figure); in this case the infeasible region corresponds to the loading vehicle having better loading speed (steeper hypotenuse) due to which it has been able to take up all resources delivered to the TP by the SRE 45 and SRE 31 quickly even though it started its loading process at the Critical Arrival Time.

Finally, as per our design, we compute the waiting time (calculated for each loading triangle individually) as the difference between the actual arrival time of a loading triangle, and the time from where its hypotenuse starts from its triangle-base. However this is the waiting time estimated considering only the specific Cargo Type for which the resource levels were constructed. If the VLC has other cargo types which are being transferred, similar geometrical approach is taken to find the waiting times for them too; in terms of the triangle geometries, only their heights will change depending on the new resource levels of the other CT, but their base lengths will remain the same as we consider the entire loading/unloading time across all CTs (*i.e.*, for the full VLC). The final waiting time is the maximum among all these waiting times calculated for each CT-specific geometrical approach.

This waiting time minimization can be vividly imagined by sliding the loading triangles leftwards from infinity, on their respective baselines, and stopping only if any part of their hypotenuse hits any part of the hypotenuses of any unloading triangle (within its resource levels on which it was slid); we also stop beforehand if the loading triangle's arrival time gets intersected by its hypotenuse. The intersection with the arrival times is prevented in the case of the SRE 18 triangle hitting a_3 in Case 1 of Figure S7, and also for the SRE 88's triangle geometry hitting a_2 in the Case 2; both of these triangles have their Critical Arrival Times shown as the base of their dotted hypotenuse pushed further leftwards, and as conveyed previously, they will have 0 waiting times.

This is the exact logic we implement in code, and envision lot of future potential in utilizing and improving this idea of waiting time minimization. As an example, different stacking orders, and breaking triangle hypotenuse into multiple slide-able parts could be looked into. A caveat in our approach is that we consider the base width for each triangle to be the entire loading-unloading time for a VLC for simplifying our approach, which allows some sub-optimality in the waiting time minimization approach. (We are yet to devise a better strategy for the same!)

Resource Quantity (loading or unloading is represented by colour and not by signage in this figure). If it has not been made clear yet, the rate of loading and unloading activities get represented through the hypotenuse, across the total time during which all loading/unloading (for all cargo type) happens (this time being represented by a triangle's base-length).

Multiple passes of this process will allow all Waiting Times to be computed and fully update all the Time Tuples. In case, it so happens that no progress in the time calculation is observed across all the Route6 even after trying all of the Route6s once again (*i.e.*, every Route6 time computation is left at the same place, even after retrying from the stopped-Vertex calculation position of each respective Route6), we abandon this RoCu concluding the current Integration-Logic of the RoCu to be a TabuLogic, complications during Matchings section S3.3.6, or due to not following the sequential SRE Allocation process of section S3.3.1.

S4. Detailed Discussions of the Computational Results

The specifications of the different computers used during the compilation of the computational results is provided in Table S7 (All computations were run on any of these computers).

Table S7: **Computer Infrastructure Details**

	C 1	C 2	C 3	C 4
Gurobi Optimizer Version	11.0.0 build v11.0.0rc2 (win64 - Windows 11+.0 (22631.2))	11.0.1 build v11.0.1rc0 (win64 - Windows 11.0 (22621.2))	11.0.0 build v11.0.0rc2 (linux64 - "CentOS Linux 7 (Core)")	12.0.0 build v12.0.0rc1 (win64 - Windows 11.0 (22631.2))
Python Version	3.11.5 packaged by Anaconda, Inc. (main, Sep 11 2023) [MSC v.1916 64 bit (AMD64)]	3.11.7 packaged by Anaconda, Inc. (main, Dec 15 2023) [MSC v.1916 64 bit (AMD64)]	3.9.19 (main, May 6 2024)	3.12.7 packaged by Anaconda, Inc. (main, Oct 4 2024) [MSC v.1929 64 bit (AMD64)]
CPU Model	Intel(R) Xeon(R) W-2223 CPU @ 3.60GHz	Intel(R) Xeon(R) W-2133 CPU @ 3.60GHz	Intel(R) Xeon(R) Silver 4110 CPU @ 2.10GHz	13th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-13700
Thread Count	4 physical cores, 8 logical processors, using up to 8 threads	6 physical cores, 12 logical processors, using up to 12 threads	16 physical cores, 32 logical processors, using up to 32 threads	16 physical cores, 24 logical processors, using up to 24 threads
Installed RAM	16.0 GB (15.7 GB usable)	16.0 GB (15.7 GB usable)	62 GB	16.0 GB (15.8 GB usable)

We develop novel Instances for benchmarking the Heuristic *w.r.t.* MILP results. Overview of dataset details for the small and large instances developed by us can be found in Table S8 and S9 respectively, with similar details of the literature instance provided in Table S10.

S4.1. Continuous Results of our Small Instances

Here we discuss about the small instances modelled as continuous problems. Some points to observe for the Continuous problems are:

- i. For the instance (S4), the problem was found to be Infeasible with Levels 1 and 2. The Cascade 1 with Levels=3 gave a lower objective function value of 88.613 as the largest route duration among all vehicles, with a lower MILP Gap of 48.75%, but its Cascade 2 could not find a feasible solution (Gurobi warm start failed to load).
- ii. For the instance (S7), the optimal solution using only 1 level proved to have incomplete solution space, as the heuristic solution was found to be better. Thus, the MILP for this case was also run using levels equal to 2 (the relative gaps of the Heuristic's best-found solution *w.r.t.* both the MILP runs is reported).
- iii. For the instance (S8), the Vehicle with the highest trip duration in the first Cascade was not the same Vehicle with the highest trip duration in the final Cascade.
- iv. For the instance of (S11), no solution was found during the fourth Cascade with Levels=1; Levels=2 bettered the solution.

Table S8: Details of the Small Instances developed for our computational study

ID	No. of Vehicle Types	No. of PickUp Cargo Types	Delivery Cargo Types	Vehicle Depots	Ware Houses	Simultaneous Nodes	Split Nodes	Trans-shipment Ports	Relief Centres	No. of Modal Segments	No. of Incompatibilities	
	$ K $	$ P $	$ D $	$ H $	$ W $	$ N^M $	$ N^P $	$ S $	$ R $	$ SMTS $	Vehicles -vs- Cargos	Cargos -vs- TPs
(S1)	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	0	0
(S2)	2	1	1	2	1	3	3	1	1	2	0	0
(S3)	2	1	1	2	1	4	4	1	1	2	0	0
(S4)	3	0	2	2	1	0	6	1	0	3	0	0
(S5)	5	0	1	5	2	0	3	5	0	5	0	0
(S6)	5	0	1	5	2	0	3	5	0	5	0	0
(S7)	5	0	1	5	2	0	2	8	0	5	0	0
(S8)	5	0	1	5	2	1	1	8	0	5	0	0
(S9)	5	0	1	5	2	2	2	8	0	5	0	0
(S10)	5	0	1	5	2	2	2	8	0	5	0	0
(S11)	3	1	1	2	1	4	5	2	1	3	0	0
(S12)	5	0	1	5	2	2	2	10	0	5	0	0
(M13)	3	1	1	2	1	5	5	2	1	3	0	0
(M14)	3	1	1	2	1	5	6	2	1	3	0	0
(M15)	2	1	1	2	1	5	5	1	1	2	0	0
(M16)	3	1	2	4	2	3	1	3	1	3	2	3
(M17)	3	1	2	4	2	1	3	3	1	3	2	3
(M18)	3	1	2	4	2	2	2	3	1	3	2	3
(M19)	4	1	2	4	2	1	2	2	1	4	3	3
(M20)	4	1	2	4	2	2	1	2	1	4	3	3
(M21)	6	2	0	3	0	3	3	2	2	3	4	0
(M22)	3	1	2	4	2	3	3	3	1	3	2	3
(M23)	3	1	2	2	1	5	5	2	1	3	0	0
(M24)	3	1	2	2	1	6	4	2	1	3	0	0
(M25)	4	1	2	4	2	2	2	2	1	4	3	3

The prefix in the ID indicates approximate (simplified) instance sizes (for all the Tables S8, S9, 5, S11, 6 and S12):

(S) \rightarrow Small (M) \rightarrow Medium (L) \rightarrow Large

Table S9: Details of the Large Instances developed in this study for computational analysis

ID	K	P	D	H	W	N ^M	N ^P	S	R	SMTS	No. of Incompatibilities		Computer Used #	
											Cargos -vs- Vehicles	TPs -vs- Cargos	Continuous	Integer
(S26)	3	0	1	2	1	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	C_1	C_1
(S27)	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	C_3	C_3
(M28)	5	0	1	5	2	2	2	5	0	5	0	0	C_1	C_3
(M29)	3	3	5	4	2	7	9	3	2	3	2	3	C_2	C_1
(L30)	8	2	4	4	3	20	20	6	3	4	8	1	C_1	C_2
(L31)	10	2	3	7	4	10	10	12	4	6	2	26	C_1	C_3
(L32)	11	2	3	7	4	10	10	7	4	7	3	11	C_3	C_1
(L33)	11	2	3	7	4	8	8	12	4	7	3	26	C_2	C_1
(L34)	11	2	4	7	4	8	8	6	4	7	9	0	C_1	C_3
(L35)	10	3	3	7	4	10	10	12	4	6	6	16	C_2	C_1
(L36)	11	2	3	7	4	30	30	10	4	6	8	1	C_3	C_3
(L37)	11	2	4	7	6	40	50	10	5	6	9	1	C_2	C_3
(L38)	11	2	4	7	7	60	50	10	5	6	9	1	C_3	C_2

For both MILP runs using Gurobi, and Heuristic Algorithm implemented in Python

Table S10: Dataset details of the Literature Instances discussed in the Table 5 in [17]

ID	K	P	D	H	W	N ^M	N ^P	S	R	SMTS	No. of Incompatibilities	
											Cargos -vs- Vehicles	TPs -vs- Cargos
<i>I</i> ₁	8	1	0	13	0	13	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₂	8	1	0	13	0	12	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₃	8	1	0	13	0	11	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₄	8	1	0	13	0	10	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₅	8	1	0	13	0	10	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₆	8	1	0	13	0	11	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₇	8	1	0	13	0	10	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₈	8	1	0	13	0	10	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₉	8	1	0	13	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₁₀	8	1	0	13	0	10	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₁₁	8	1	0	13	0	13	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₁₂	8	1	0	13	0	9	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₁₃	8	1	0	13	0	11	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₁₄	8	1	0	13	0	12	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>I</i> ₁₅	8	1	0	13	0	11	0	0	1	1	0	0

Table S11: Computational Results of Small Instances from Table S8 with resource flow variables as Continuous

ID	Cascaded Makespan Minimization using our developed exact MILP Formulation									PSR-GIP Heuristic									Comparative Gap %	
	O	S_F	C	T	G_O	G_A	L	S_I	I	L_B	L_A	L_{SD}	S_B	S_A	S_{SD}	V	R_A	R_{SD}	OL_B	S_{FB}
(S1)	64.516	79.629	2	0.00	0.00	0.00	1	116.307	46.06	64.516	68.924	5.584	79.629	84.257	5.568	2/2	0.27	0.02	0.00	0.00
(S2)	64.278	152.772	4	1.83	0.00	0.00	1	176.506	15.54	64.278	66.953	3.263	161.304	180.419	15.128	4/4	0.5	0.05	0.00	5.29
(S3)	68.119	252.419	4	36.98	0.00	0.00	1	254.323	0.75	68.203	96.729	10.905	214.709	263.323	43.68	4/4	0.79	0.1	0.12	-17.56
(S4)	88.614	195.078	3	270.13	56.21	32.95	4	195.078	0.00	88.964	115.921	7.279	195.458	237.882	23.354	3/3	0.89	0.06	0.39	0.19
(S5)	52.875	275.042	7	466.72	98.40	99.77	2	302.602	10.02	54.152	59.225	2.82	268.003	281.271	9.298	7/7	0.97	0.14	2.36	-2.63
(S6)	79.731	408.275	7	466.72	98.09	99.73	3	455.476	11.56	101.729	105.508	4.124	427.559	457.523	36.281	7/7	1.01	0.09	21.62	4.51
(S7)	151.936	411.598	5	93.39	0.00	2.19	1	529.535	28.65	141.194	142.114	0.793	397.215	391.223	30.235	5/5	0.55	0.07	-7.61	-3.62
	141.756	371.003	5	411.00	24.13	84.83	2	517.192	39.40									-0.40	6.60	
(S8)	135.093	462.105	5	411.00	23.98	54.39	2	637.363	37.93	152.2	153.34	1.097	376.127	390.819	20.245	5/5	1.06	0.11	11.24	-22.86
(S9)	98.533	437.76	7	466.72	38.85	91.26	1	462.496	5.65	112.822	135.627	11.678	471.193	544.078	49.568	6/7	1.68	0.27	12.67	7.10
(S10)	103.237	506.316	7	466.73	38.95	90.54	1	556.42	9.90	112.219	135.915	11.201	488.548	563.132	54.179	7/7	2.52	0.37	8.00	-3.64
(S11)	69.263	342.179	6	441.00	11.60	67.27	2	390.568	14.14	84.931	85.962	0.697	370.338	386.504	24.154	6/6	0.99	0.09	18.45	7.60
(S12)	128.183	588.457	7	466.73	39.31	91.32	1	622.294	5.75	134.628	162.127	13.757	602.437	654.272	52.118	7/7	2.2	0.45	4.79	2.32
(M13)	84.412	366.032	6	158.28	0.00	12.21	1	428.96	17.19	84.738	87.592	3.199	398.048	438.734	30.055	6/6	1.22	0.1	0.38	8.04
(M14)	87.179	371.954	6	182.38	0.00	31.27	1	508.285	36.65	89.631	101.862	4.489	486.238	469.631	32.32	6/6	1.5	0.14	2.74	23.50
(M15)	68.467	254.914	4	61.46	0.00	25.27	1	257.391	0.97	69.116	121.11	13.901	200.21	330.504	52.413	4/4	1.13	0.19	0.94	-27.32
(M16)	119.277	303.159	4	317.37	20.80	13.24	1	319.311	5.33	119.277	119.277	0	305.026	306.346	14.089	4/4	0.82	0.09	0.00	0.61
(M17)	102.921	394.692	4	375.00	57.50	71.63	1	408.241	3.43	102.921	104.122	0.839	398.577	396.229	17.357	4/4	0.76	0.08	0.00	0.97
(M18)	49.185	142.649	4	65.65	0.00	0.00	1	169.159	18.58	49.185	49.617	0.615	112.618	138.221	17.8	3/4	0.54	0.05	0.00	-26.67
(M19)	88.749	357.989	6	96.74	0.00	0.00	1	362.771	1.34	96.711	105.443	3.777	379.025	402.532	15.582	6/6	1.96	0.2	8.23	5.55
(M20)	136.408	548.69	6	365.45	0.01	17.06	1	549.547	0.16	136.459	150.172	4.194	555.35	588.425	17.661	6/6	1.65	0.18	0.04	1.20
(M21)	40.954	234.258	6	2.49	0.00	0.00	1	234.258	0.00	44.579	64.411	9.103	185.333	227.243	23.471	6/6	0.6	0.07	8.13	-26.40
(M22)	34.477	159.567	5	411.01	5.48	27.38	1	159.567	0.00	36.005	39.097	1.938	159.061	166.792	9.22	5/5	1.51	0.18	4.24	-0.32
(M23)	98.71	428.758	6	265.37	0.00	34.83	1	428.758	0.00	100.327	110.737	6.608	521.344	537.761	35.245	6/6	2.08	0.18	1.61	17.76
(M24)	32.71	145.474	6	267.36	0.00	29.46	1	184.859	27.07	34.47	39.575	1.744	158.88	168.197	6.51	6/6	2.35	0.19	5.11	8.44
(M25)	88.017	357.433	6	264.32	0.00	33.33	1	359.41	0.55	93.039	108.06	6.502	378.379	410.372	19.501	6/6	3.2	0.27	5.40	5.54

The prefix in the ID indicates approximate (simplified) instance sizes (for all the Tables S8, S9, 5, S11, 6 and S12):

(S) \rightarrow Small (M) \rightarrow Medium (L) \rightarrow Large

S4.2. Continuous Results of our Large Instances

Our developed large instances (overview of the same as may be found in Table S9) were run both as continuous and integer problems. We discuss all integer results in the main paper, and the continuous problems in this supplementary paper.

For the Continuous Problems in Table S12:

- i. In the instance (L32): 20 out of 30 Instance runs were successful
- ii. In the instance (L34): 25 out of 30 Instance runs were successful
- iii. In the instance (L38): 30 out of 44 Instance runs were successful. By unsuccessful, we mean that the remaining 14 runs had every Main Iteration unable to satisfy the full resource requirement of the problem.

Table S12: **Computational Results for the Large Instances in Table S9 considering Continuous resource flow**

ID	MILP Formulation				PSR-GIP Heuristic					Relative Comparative Gap % $\frac{b-a}{b} * 100$
	Objective Value (Cascade 1 only, if any) (a)	Gap % (as reported by Gurobi)	Levels Used (I→Infeasible; N→NFSF; F→Feasible) #	Time (mins)	Best Objective (among at least 30 runs) (b)	Average (of the largest route duration among all Vehicles across successful Heuristic runs)	S.D. (of the vehicle with maximum route duration across successful Heuristic runs)	Average Heuristic RunTime (mins)	S.D. of Heuristic Runtimes (mins)	
(S26)	468.118	0	F:3	0.04	468.118	468.118	0	0.31	0.01	0.00
(S27)	645.164	0	F:3	63.06	645.164	657.154	29.116	0.49	0.05	0.00
(M28)	NFSF	-	N:3,1	1440	993.032	1115.094	49.908	1.9	0.25	-
(M29)	NFSF	-	N:1	1440	13985.943	16619.888	882.518	34.71	9.98	-
(L30)	NFSF	-	I:6; N:8,7	1300	280.111	386.006	57.648	67.62	10.89	-
(L31)	NFSF	-	N:1	1440	841.112	1250.869	294.932	21.51	9.61	-
(L32)	NFSF	-	I:4; N:8,5	1440	989.239	1495.502	278.36	9.28	4.65	-
(L33)	NFSF	-	I:4; N:5,10	1440	459.966	687.87	211.605	12.86	5.23	-
(L34)	NFSF	-	I:4; N:5	1440	11814.237	16146.259	3345.709	12.29	5.39	-
(L35)	NFSF	-	N:5,1	1440	1809.793	2952.262	1199.431	58.24	25.42	-
(L36)	NFSF	-	I:3; N:4,5	1440	314.822	531.669	101.719	81.41	16.08	-
(L37)	NFSF	-	I:1; N:2	OEAM	380.421	788.941	213.558	70.65	12.79	-
(L38)	NFSF	-	I:2; N:3	OEAM	1203.092	1507.298	187.736	112.2	54.6	-

NFSF \implies No Feasible Solution Found

OEAM \implies Optimization Exhausted Available Memory

All Vehicles were provided with the same number of levels, and the result of those instances is briefed. For each of the values mentioned, separate 24 hour MILP runs were performed. The instance results in this table correspond to the last value in the Levels Used column. Further, for levels indicating Infeasibility (due to lack of solution space restricting multi-trips), all lower-Level values were also infeasible (since the solution space is even smaller then with much lesser number of multi-visits possible at any vertex).

S4.3. Continuous Instance Runs of the Literature Dataset

This section contains the continuous problem results of instances from [17]. For both the cases of Continuous and Integer runs of this literature dataset (and essentially for all for MILP runs in our study), the Gurobi parameter of IntegralityFocus are always set to 1. The table Table S13 corresponds to case when the problems are run using continuous variables (for both the MILP and the Heuristic); all the Computations (for both the Exact Formulation and Heuristic Algorithm) were performed on the Computer C_1. It is observed that here too, the relative gap is significantly low, and is generally lower than the gaps found for the continuous case; this indicates that the Heuristic is suitable for real-world optimization problems.

Table S13: Computational Results of the Instances in Table S10 considering Continuous Resource Flows

Instance	Cascaded Makespan Minimization			PSR-GIP Heuristic #						Relative Gap % $\frac{(b-a)*100}{b}$
	Our Exact MILP Formulation*			Cascaded Makespan Minimization Optimization				Runtime		
	Objective Function Value of Cascade 1 (a)	No. of Vehicles used	MILP Gap % (reported by Gurobi)	Best Solution of Largest Route Duration among all Vehicles (b)	No. of Vehicles used in Best Solutions	Average of Best Solutions	S.D. of Best Solutions	Avg. (mins)	S.D. (mins)	
I_1	40.706	9	60.46	44.2	11	54.159	9.087	1.03	0.13	7.90
I_2	38.77	10	58.49	38.773	11	48.297	5.678	0.92	0.1	0.01
I_3	40.706	11	60.46	42.482	10	54.114	11.085	0.83	0.08	4.18
I_4	40.706	10	60.46	40.713	8	53.959	10.428	0.73	0.06	0.02
I_5	38.77	7	58.49	38.77	10	50.633	9.028	0.75	0.07	0.00
I_6	39.793	9	59.55	42.48	11	53.718	11.445	0.81	0.08	6.33
I_7	40.706	9	60.46	40.706	9	50.734	9.059	0.74	0.08	0.00
I_8	40.706	7	60.46	41.235	10	55.669	10.712	0.77	0.08	1.28
I_9	33.787	6	43.73	35.573	7	38.93	1.98	0.59	0.05	5.02
I_{10}	40.706	7	60.46	40.934	9	51.604	7.046	0.78	0.06	0.56
I_{11}	40.706	9	60.46	42.706	12	57.201	14.265	1	0.09	4.68
I_{12}	40.706	6	60.46	40.706	9	49.679	6.883	0.72	0.06	0.00
I_{13}	38.77	9	58.49	38.77	11	51.427	12.488	0.89	0.1	0.00
I_{14}	40.706	8	60.46	40.713	10	56.295	13.578	0.96	0.09	0.02
I_{15}	40.706	6	60.46	43.027	6	53.827	10.484	0.92	0.24	5.39

Gurobi (non-default) settings for the MILP runs:

M	1000 (Big M as used in Formulation)
MIPFocus	set at 2 (to focus more on proving optimality)

Heuristic Parameters used:

No. of Internal Main Iterations	10
Max. No. of Perturbation in each Main Iteration:	1729
Max. No. of Route Generation Logic Allowed from SRE:	100

* All MILP runs were provided with a runtime of 9999 seconds (only the first Cascades were run)

The Best, Average and S.D. are reported comparing 99 Heuristic runs for each Instance

References

- [1] S. Banerjee, Rich Vehicle Routing Problems in Disaster Management, Master of Science (Research) Thesis, Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, Kharagpur, West Bengal-721302, India (April 2025).
- [2] N. R. Achuthan, L. Caccetta, S. P. Hill, An improved branch-and-cut algorithm for the capacitated vehicle routing problem, *Transportation Science* 37 (2) (2003) 153–169. arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1287/trsc.37.2.153.15243>, doi:[10.1287/trsc.37.2.153.15243](https://doi.org/10.1287/trsc.37.2.153.15243).
URL <https://doi.org/10.1287/trsc.37.2.153.15243>
- [3] H. Koch, A. Bortfeldt, G. Wäscher, A hybrid algorithm for the vehicle routing problem with backhauls, time windows and three-dimensional loading constraints, *OR Spectrum* 40 (4) (2018) 1029–1075. doi:[10.1007/s00291-018-0506-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00291-018-0506-6).
URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00291-018-0506-6>
- [4] H. Min, The multiple vehicle routing problem with simultaneous delivery and pick-up points, *Transportation Research Part A: General* 23 (5) (1989) 377–386. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-2607\(89\)90085-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-2607(89)90085-X).
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/019126078990085X>
- [5] T. Öztaş, A. Tuş, A hybrid metaheuristic algorithm based on iterated local search for vehicle routing problem with simultaneous pickup and delivery, *Expert Systems with Applications* 202 (2022) 117401. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2022.117401>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S095741742200745X>
- [6] J. Rieck, J. Zimmermann, Exact solutions to the symmetric and asymmetric vehicle routing problem with simultaneous delivery and pick-up, *Business Research* 6 (1) (2013) 77–92. doi:[10.1007/BF03342743](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03342743).
URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03342743>
- [7] S. MITRA, An algorithm for the generalized vehicle routing problem with backhauling, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Operational Research* 22 (02) (2005) 153–169. arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217595905000522>, doi:[10.1142/S0217595905000522](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217595905000522).
URL <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217595905000522>
- [8] S. Banerjee, S. Atta, G. Sen, Single depot heterogeneous capacitated vehicle routing problem with simultaneous delivery and pickup for disaster management systems, in: 2023 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management (IEEM), 2023, pp. 1758–1762. doi:[10.1109/IEEM58616.2023.10406762](https://doi.org/10.1109/IEEM58616.2023.10406762).
- [9] S. Allahyari, M. Salari, D. Vigo, A hybrid metaheuristic algorithm for the multi-depot covering tour vehicle routing problem, *European Journal of Operational Research* 242 (3) (2015) 756–768. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2014.10.048>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221714008704>
- [10] S. Nucamendi-Guillén, A. Gómez Padilla, E. Olivares-Benitez, J. M. Moreno-Vega, The multi-depot open location routing problem with a heterogeneous fixed fleet, *Expert Systems with Applications* 165 (2021) 113846. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2020.113846>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417420306540>
- [11] Y. SHIMIZU, T. SAKAGUCHI, J.-K. YOO, A hybrid method for solving multi-depot vrp with simultaneous pickup and delivery incorporated with weber basis saving heuristic, *Journal of Advanced Mechanical Design, Systems, and Manufacturing* 10 (1) (2016) JAMDSM0004–JAMDSM0004. doi:[10.1299/jamdsm.2016jamdsm0004](https://doi.org/10.1299/jamdsm.2016jamdsm0004).
- [12] P. S. Barma, J. Dutta, A. Mukherjee, A 2-opt guided discrete antlion optimization algorithm for multi-depot vehicle routing problem, *Decision Making: Applications in Management and Engineering* 2 (2) (2019) 112–125. doi:[10.31181/dmame1902089b](https://doi.org/10.31181/dmame1902089b).
URL <https://dmame-journal.org/index.php/dmame/article/view/42>
- [13] K. Venkata Narasimha, E. Kivelevitch, B. Sharma, M. Kumar, An ant colony optimization technique for solving min–max multi-depot vehicle routing problem, *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation* 13 (2013) 63–73. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.swevo.2013.05.005>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2210650213000436>
- [14] R. Kramer, J.-F. Cordeau, M. Iori, Rich vehicle routing with auxiliary depots and anticipated deliveries: An application to pharmaceutical distribution, *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review* 129 (2019) 162–174. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2019.07.012>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1366554519302637>
- [15] B. Rabbouch, F. Saâdaoui, R. Mraïhi, Efficient implementation of the genetic algorithm to solve rich vehicle routing problems, *Operational Research* 21 (3) (2021) 1763–1791. doi:[10.1007/s12351-019-00521-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12351-019-00521-0).
URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12351-019-00521-0>

- [16] J. Rieck, C. Ehrenberg, J. Zimmermann, Many-to-many location-routing with inter-hub transport and multi-commodity pickup-and-delivery, *European Journal of Operational Research* 236 (3) (2014) 863–878, *vehicle Routing and Distribution Logistics*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2013.12.021>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221713010059>
- [17] S. Nucamendi-Guillén, A. Gómez Padilla, E. Olivares-Benitez, J. M. Moreno-Vega, The multi-depot open location routing problem with a heterogeneous fixed fleet, *Expert Systems with Applications* 165 (2021) 113846. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2020.113846>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417420306540>