
A RIDE TIME-ORIENTED SCHEDULING ALGORITHM FOR DIAL-A-RIDE PROBLEMS

Claudia Bongiovanni
HEC Montréal and GERAD
claudia.bongiovanni@hec.ca

Nikolas Geroliminis
École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne
nikolas.geroliminis@epfl.ch

Mor Kaspi
Tel-Aviv University
morkaspi@tauex.tau.ac.il

ABSTRACT

This paper offers a new algorithm to efficiently optimize scheduling decisions for dial-a-ride problems (DARPs), including problem variants considering electric and autonomous vehicles (e-ADARPs). The scheduling algorithm, based on linear programming theory, aims at finding minimal user ride time schedules in polynomial time. The algorithm can either return optimal feasible routes or it can return incorrect infeasibility declarations, on which feasibility can be recovered through a specifically-designed heuristic. The algorithm is furthermore supplemented by a battery management algorithm that can be used to determine charging decisions for electric and autonomous vehicle fleets. Timing solutions from the proposed scheduling algorithm are obtained on millions of routes extracted from DARP and e-ADARP benchmark instances. They are compared to those obtained from a linear program, as well as to popular scheduling procedures from the DARP literature. Results show that the proposed procedure outperforms state-of-the-art scheduling algorithms, both in terms of compute-efficiency and solution quality.

Keywords vehicle routing · dial-a-ride · scheduling · routing · battery management · large neighborhood search

1 Introduction

Many real-world urban mobility and supply chain problems involve time-dependent allocation and sequencing decisions that must be frequently re-optimized over time. The re-optimization process is typically composed of the production and evaluation of a plethora of potential solutions. The evaluation of these solutions is performed by scheduling algorithms, whose goals are to determine the timing of the sequential decisions, while respecting several time-related constraints and objectives (e.g., Vidal et al. 2015). Their efficient resolution is particularly relevant for large-scale and dynamic problems, since in these cases scheduling decisions must be made frequently and quickly, as for example in the context of large neighborhood search methods (e.g., Gschwind and Drexler 2019). In addition to computational efficiency, it is essential that scheduling algorithms provide high-quality solutions, given their direct impact on the quality of routing decisions and thus on the overall performance of the optimization strategy.

Scheduling algorithms are of utmost importance for hardly-constrained vehicle routing problems. They consider feasible vehicle routes in terms of capacity and precedence constraints and are designed to provide feasible decisions on time-related variables (e.g., service start times and waiting times at each node). Demonstrating the feasibility of a fixed route and composing high-quality vehicle schedules is a challenging task for most vehicle routing problems because of the presence of time constraints (e.g., time windows and maximum path length). For dial-a-ride (DARP) problems, this task is made even more challenging by the presence of constraints on maximum user travel time (Cordeau and Laporte 2007), as well as constraints on battery management and charging for fleets composed of electric and autonomous vehicles (e-ADARP, Bongiovanni et al. 2019). Consequently, the goal of scheduling algorithms for DARPs is to find the right trade-off between time constraints and level of service. The latter can be measured by the user excess ride time,

that is the delay users experience for sharing rides, in comparison to a taxi service (e.g., see the review in Molenbruch et al. 2017a).

A variety of heuristics have been proposed in the DARP literature to manage path planning. However, these procedures typically face a trade-off between returning correct feasibility declarations and increasing the quality of the returned solutions. Cordeau and Laporte (2003) propose a 8-step procedure setting the earliest start time at each vertex in the route and using forward slack times to delay the start times at pickup locations in vision of maximum ride time constraints (Savelsbergh 1992). Parragh et al. (2009) observe that adopting a sequential approach to avoid maximum ride time violations does not necessarily minimize the total user excess ride time in the schedules. In fact, delaying the service start time at a given pickup location may decrease the excess ride time of the specific request but increase the excess ride time for other requests in the route. As such, Parragh et al. (2009) modify the procedure in Cordeau and Laporte (2003) by adapting the computation of forward slack times such that increases in the user excess ride time of any request in the route is avoided. As a result, the returned feasible schedules minimize the total user excess ride time at the expense of incorrect infeasibility declarations. This last aspect is a drawback that is tackled in Molenbruch et al. (2017b), who propose a procedure starting by considering a possibly travel-time infeasible schedule setting the excess ride time of each user at its lowest bound. Infeasibility relates to travel time shortages between successive nodes and is successively recovered by shifting service start times such that the total user excess ride time is minimized.

In this work, we propose a novel scheduling algorithm which is numerically shown to provide excess-time optimal solutions. The designed scheduling algorithm is complemented by a battery management heuristic to deal with DARP extensions employing electric autonomous vehicles, i.e., e-ADARPs. The goal of the battery management heuristic is to assign charging times at the visited stations. Indeed, a schedule minimizing excess ride time may not be battery feasible, and vice versa. The procedure builds on two main observations: (i) minimizing excess-time while respecting time-window and user-ride-time constraints is in fact equivalent to assigning the right amount of waiting time at all nodes in the routes; and (ii) ensuring battery feasibility is in fact possible by recharging as much as possible at the visited facilities, as early as possible. The proposed scheduling and battery management algorithms are tested on millions of DARP and e-ADARP routing solutions obtained by developing an adaptive large neighborhood search heuristic (Ropke and Pisinger 2006). The quality of the obtained scheduling solutions are compared against: (i) a linear program; and (ii) the well-known 8-step scheduling procedures by Cordeau and Laporte (2003) and Parragh et al. (2009).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the excess-ride-time scheduling problem, Section 3 provides the scheduling algorithm, Section 4 explains the heuristic procedure to provide battery-feasibility. Finally, Section 5 provides numerical experiments comparing the scheduling algorithm against state-of-the-art procedures, and Section 6 summarizes the main concepts of this paper and provides an overlook to future research.

2 Scheduling Problem

Consider a predetermined route sequence \mathcal{I} of M nodes, which includes pickup locations, dropoff locations, and potentially some charging stations. Without loss of generality, assume that the sequence satisfies routing constraints, as well as precedence and load constraints. Note that the given sequence may not necessarily satisfy all timing and battery management constraints. Then, the optimization problem consists in scheduling the service start times in the sequence as to minimize the total user excess ride time, guarantee battery, time window, and maximum ride time feasibility.

Start by considering a specific sub-sequence $\bar{\mathcal{I}}$ of $\bar{M} \leq M$ nodes, which is one of the derived sub-sequences obtained by splitting \mathcal{I} by the visited charging stations. Without loss of generality, assume that the visited charging station at the beginning of $\bar{\mathcal{I}}$ represents an origin depot and the charging station at the end of $\bar{\mathcal{I}}$ represents a destination depot. Furthermore, denote by $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ the set of requests contained in sequence $\bar{\mathcal{I}}$, P_i the set of pickups, and D_i the set of dropoffs. Pickup locations are characterized by loads l_{P_i} and dropoff locations by loads $l_{D_i} = -l_{P_i}$. Furthermore, all locations $i, j \in \bar{\mathcal{I}}$ feature service times d_i , direct travel times $t_{i,j}$, and time windows $[arr_i, dep_i]$ limiting the time at which service may start. Note that, in vision of user maximum ride times u_{P_i} , it is possible to set time windows around the pickup locations and derive the time windows around the corresponding dropoff locations, and vice versa (Cordeau and Laporte 2003). The goal is to be able to optimize $\bar{\mathcal{I}}$ with respect to the total excess ride time by setting optimal service start times T_i with $i \in \{1, \dots, \bar{M}\}$ in vision of maximum ride time and time window constraints. As such, the scheduling problem for sub-sequence $\bar{\mathcal{I}}$ can be stated as the following linear program (LP1):

$$(LP1) \quad \min \quad \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} (T_{D_i} - T_{P_i} - d_{P_i} - t_{P_i, D_i}) \quad (1)$$

s.t. :

$$T_i + t_{i, i+1} + d_i \leq T_{i+1} \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \bar{M} - 1\} \quad (2)$$

$$T_{D_i} - T_{P_i} - d_{P_i} \leq u_{P_i} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad (3)$$

$$arr_i \leq T_i \leq dep_i \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \bar{M}\} \quad (4)$$

where the objective function (1) minimizes the excess ride time for each request in \bar{L} , constraints (2) set the service start times between consecutive nodes, while constraints (3)-(4) impose maximum ride time and time window constraints respectively.

Note that time windows $[arr_i, dep_i]$ can be tightened in light of the travel times and service times between consecutive nodes. As such, by sequentially inspecting the sequence, it is possible to calculate the earliest time ET_i and latest time LT_i at which service can start at node i by using the following recursive formulas:

$$ET_i = \max\{arr_i, ET_{i-1} + t_{i-1,i} + d_i\} \quad \forall i \in \{2, \dots, \bar{M}\}, ET_1 = arr_1 \quad (5)$$

$$LT_i = \max\{dep_i, LT_{i+1} - t_{i,i+1} - d_i\} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, \bar{M} - 1\}, LT_{\bar{M}} = dep_{\bar{M}} \quad (6)$$

Hence, a tighter formulation to LP1 can be obtained by substituting constraints (4) with:

$$ET_i \leq T_i \leq LT_i \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \bar{M}\} \quad (7)$$

Service start time T_i at node i depends on the initial departure time from the depot, the total travel time up to i , the total service time spent serving nodes before i , and the total vehicle waiting time up to i . That is:

$$T_i = T_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_{j,j+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} d_j + \sum_{j=1}^i w_j \quad (8)$$

Here, w_i denotes the waiting time at node i . Note that, service may start as soon as possible without penalizing the objective function, i.e. $T_1 = ET_1$. With such representation of service start times, the objective function (1) can be re-written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} (T_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{D_i-1} t_{j,j+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{D_i-1} d_j + \sum_{j=1}^{D_i} w_j) - (T_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{P_i-1} t_{j,j+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{P_i-1} d_j + \sum_{j=1}^{P_i} w_j) - d_{P_i} - t_{P_i, D_i} = \\ \min \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \left(\sum_{j=P_i}^{D_i-1} t_{j,j+1} + \sum_{j=P_i}^{D_i-1} d_j + \sum_{j=P_i}^{D_i} w_j - d_{P_i} - t_{P_i, D_i} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Since travel times between consecutive nodes and the service times are deterministic parameters, minimizing the objective function (9) is equivalent to:

$$\min \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \sum_{j=P_i+1}^{D_i} w_j = \min \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{M}} L_i w_i \quad (10)$$

Where $L_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} l_j$ represents the vehicle load up to node i .

Equivalent to the re-writing of the objective function, constraints (7) can be re-defined through (8) as follows:

$$\sum_{j=1}^i w_j \geq ET_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_{j,j+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} d_j - ET_1 \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \bar{M}\} \quad (11)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^i w_j \leq LT_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_{j,j+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} d_j - ET_1 \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \bar{M}\} \quad (12)$$

Note that these constraints provide lower and upper bounds to the total waiting time amount that needs to be distributed

between i and all nodes preceding i . As such, the linear program (LP1) can be equivalently re-defined as the following linear program (LP2):

$$(LP2) \quad \min \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{M}} L_i w_i \quad (13)$$

$$s.t. :$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^i w_j \geq ET_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_{j,j+1} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} d_j - ET_1 \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \bar{M}\} \quad (14)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^i w_j \leq LT_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_{j,j+1} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} d_j - ET_1 \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \bar{M}\} \quad (15)$$

$$\sum_{j=i+1}^{D_i} w_j \leq u_i - \sum_{j=i}^{D_i-1} t_{j,j+1} - \sum_{j=i+1}^{D_i-1} d_j \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{P} \quad (16)$$

Remark that constraints (2) from (LP1) are guaranteed by the definition of equation (8), which now composes constraints (14) and (15). The right-hand side of (14) and (15) represent the minimal total waiting time that must be assigned up to node i , and the maximal total waiting time that can be assigned up to node i , without violating the time windows at successive nodes in the sequence. For convenience, denote the right-hand side of constraints (14) and (15) by Δ_i and Θ_i respectively. Using equations (5) and (6) we have that $\Delta_i \leq \Delta_{i+1} \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, M-1\}$ and $\Theta_i \leq \Theta_{i+1} \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, M-1\}$. That is, the total minimal and maximal waiting time that needs to be distributed in the sequence may only increase between consecutive nodes. As such, note that the total minimal waiting time Δ_M , i.e. at the destination depot, represents a waiting time amount that cannot be avoided in any feasible solution. Finally, the objective of the problem reduces to optimally distribute Δ_M among all nodes $\{1, \dots, M\}$ in consideration of the total load L_i at each node in the sequence, which impacts the total user excess ride time.

3 Scheduling Procedure

In order to solve (LP2), we propose the procedure reported in the pseudo-code from Algorithm (1) and explained next. The algorithm proceeds in the sense of the sequence and checks that, for each encountered node $i \in \{1, \dots, \bar{M}\}$, a minimal total waiting time Δ_i has been assigned up to node i . If the algorithm detects a total waiting time shortage

at node i , i.e. $\sum_{k=1}^i w_k < \Delta_i$, the total waiting time at i and its preceding nodes needs to be increased. Given that the

objective function depends on the total vehicle load L_i , the algorithm starts by considering adding waiting time to nodes $j \leq i$ featuring the lowest minimal total load up to i , i.e. $j = \operatorname{argmin}_{k \in \{1, \dots, i\}} L_k$. Note that, if multiple nodes featuring an equivalent minimal total load exist, the first node can be selected without loss of generality. For node j , the total waiting time can be feasibly increased by a maximum amount δw_j defined by constraints (15) and (16). That is, while deciding upon an increment in waiting time at node j , one needs to check that excess-ride time constraints are not violated for requests whose pickups precede j and whose dropoffs follow j . Furthermore, in order to guarantee time-window feasibility of the whole sequence, one needs to check that an increment in waiting time at j does not

exceed the maximal waiting time that can be assigned to up to node j , i.e. $\Theta_j - \sum_{k=1}^j w_k$. Finally, waiting time at node

j can be incremented by δw_j , which is computed as the minimum between the amount defined by excess-ride time constraints, time-window constraints, and the total waiting time shortage defined by $\Delta_i - \sum_{k=1}^i w_k$. After the update

of w_j , if node j has reached its maximum waiting time limit by updating Δ_i , that is $\delta w_j < \Delta_i - \sum_{k=1}^i w_k$, node j is

removed from the list Ω of potential nodes whose waiting time may be further increased. If $\sum_{k=1}^i w_k < \Delta_i$, i.e. there is

still a total waiting time shortage at i , the total waiting time is increased at the next node \bar{j} up to i featuring the second lowest total vehicle load. This iterative process terminates as soon as $\sum_{k=1}^i w_k \geq \Delta_i$, that is when sufficient waiting time

Algorithm 1: Ride time-oriented scheduling algorithm

Input: vehicle route sequence ($\bar{I} = \{1, \dots, \bar{M}\}$), pickups P_i , dropoffs D_i , earliest start times ET_i , latest start times LT_i , maximum ride times u_{P_i} , service durations d_i , travel times $t_{i,j}$

Output: Waiting times w_i with $i \in \bar{I}$, feasibility check

```

1 initialize  $w_i = 0 \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, \bar{M}\}$ ;
2 initialize  $\Omega = \emptyset$ ;
3 initialize  $start\ node = 1$ ;
4 initialize  $check = true$ ;
5 while  $check = true$  do
6   for  $i \rightarrow start\ node: \bar{M}$  do
7     Update:  $\Omega = \Omega \cup \{i\}$ ;
8     while  $\sum_{k=1}^i w_k < \Delta_i$  do
9       Set:  $j = \operatorname{argmin}_{k \in \Omega} L_k$ ;
10      Compute:  $\delta w_j = \min\{\min_{k \in \{P|k \leq j \ \& \ n+k \geq j\}} u_k - \sum_{l=k}^{(n+k)-1} t_{l,l+1} - \sum_{l=k+1}^{(n+k)-1} d_l - \sum_{l=k+1}^{n+k} w_l; \Theta_j - \sum_{k=1}^j w_k; \Delta_i - \sum_{k=1}^i w_k\}$ ;
11      Set:  $w_j = w_j + \delta w_j$ ;
12      if  $\delta w_j < \Delta_i - \sum_{k=1}^i w_k$  then
13        Update:  $\Omega = \Omega \setminus \{j\}$ ;
14      if  $\sum_{k=1}^i w_k \geq \Delta_i$  then
15        break;
16      if  $\sum_{k=1}^i w_k < \Delta_i \ \& \ \Omega = \emptyset$  then
17        Employ: Recourse heuristic (Algorithm 2);
18        if Recourse heuristic is not successful then
19           $check = false$ ;
20          break;
21        else
22           $start\ node = j + 1 \leq i$ ;
23          Update waiting times;
24          Restart algorithm from line 6.

```

has been assigned to i and all of its preceding nodes. In this case, the algorithm moves inspecting $i + 1$ and up to the end of the sequence. If at the end of the whole process, $\Delta_{\bar{M}}$ has been feasibly assigned, the algorithm terminates with a basic feasible solution. Note that the procedure results in a worst-time complexity of $O(\bar{M}^2)$, since in the worst case, the step reported in line 4. of Algorithm (1) may be executed \bar{M} times and the procedure in line 6. contains at most \bar{M} components. The next Sections demonstrate that if a basic feasible solution is obtained, this solution is optimal. However, if a basic feasible solution is not obtained, this may lead to an incorrect infeasibility declarations for the reasons explained in Section 3.2. On these solutions, it is possible to recover feasibility although, in this case, the returned solutions may be suboptimal. This is achieved through the recourse heuristic presented in Section 3.3, which is applied at step 17 in Algorithm (1). Finally, note that Algorithm (1) can either terminate with a basic feasible solution which is optimal or with an incorrect infeasible solution, on which feasibility can be heuristically recovered to provide a suboptimal solution.

3.1 Optimality proof of basic feasible solutions

In order to demonstrate that Algorithm (1) returns basic feasible solutions that are optimal, it is sufficient to show that there does not exist a neighboring basic feasible solution that strictly improves the objective function (13). By construction, since $\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{M}} w_i = \Delta_{\bar{M}}$, any decrease of w_i at some node i would require an increase of waiting time at some other node j . Node j may either precede i (i.e. $j < i$) or succeed i (i.e. $j > i$). Next, both cases are analyzed:

- (i) $j < i$: if decreasing the waiting time at i and increasing it at j by the same amount results in a decrease of the objective function value, this means that $L_j < L_i$. However, in this case, the algorithm would have exploited all the waiting at j before considering i . Therefore, increasing the waiting at a preceding node is either infeasible or would not result in a decrease in the objective function.
- (ii) $j > i$: decreasing the waiting time at i and increasing it at j is feasible if and only if we have $\sum_{k=1}^l w_k > \Delta_l \quad \forall i \leq l < j$. By construction, this may be the case if $L_i \leq L_j$. This implies that such a transition does not result in an improvement of the objective function value.




Figure 1: Example of a route leading to an incorrect infeasibility declaration

To conclude, for an obtained basic feasible solution, there is no neighboring feasible solution which strictly improves the objective function. Therefore, all basic feasible solutions obtained by Algorithm (1) are optimal. The implications can be summarized as follows:

- (i) there exists an optimal solution minimizing completions time, i.e. in which service at end depot starts at the earliest time possible $T_{\bar{M}} = ET_{\bar{M}}$.
- (ii) there exists an optimal solution in which service at the first node begins as late as possible, i.e. $T_1 = LT_1$. In fact, given that at the beginning of the sequence the vehicle is empty, i.e. $L_1 = 0$, waiting in the first node can be maximized without affecting the objective function, i.e. $w_1 = \Theta_1$.
- (iii) building on the previous point, there exists an optimal solution in which service at the first node begins at any time between ET_1 and LT_1 without increasing the excess ride time of any request in the route.
- (iv) for the case in which $\Theta_1 \geq \Delta_{\bar{M}}$, the entire necessary waiting can be done at the first node. As a result, we obtain multiple solutions in the following structure: $\Theta_1 - \Delta_{\bar{M}} \leq w_1 \leq \Theta_1$ and $w_i = 0 \quad \forall i \in \{2, \dots, \bar{M}\}$.
- (v) for the case $\Theta_1 \leq \Delta_{\bar{M}}$ there exists an optimal solution where service at the first node begins as late as possible at the first node ($w_1 = \Theta_1$) and begins as early as possible at the last node ($\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{M}} w_i = \Delta_{\bar{M}}$).

3.2 Incorrect infeasibility declarations

There may be cases in which, at the end of Algorithm (1), the total waiting time shortage $\Delta_{\bar{M}}$ cannot be feasibly assigned. That is, Algorithm (1) can either terminate with a basic feasible solution which is optimal or with an incorrect infeasibility declaration. In particular, it is possible that the waiting times at all nodes preceding i have been updated, i.e., $\Omega = \emptyset$, but there is still a shortage of waiting time at node i , i.e., $\sum_{k=1}^i w_k < \Delta_i$. In this case, the Algorithm (1) prematurely terminates and the sequence is deemed infeasible. However, note that, due to the myopic nature of the procedure, this may result in an incorrect infeasibility declaration. In fact, the procedure is designed to assign waiting times to nodes $j \leq i$ based on the waiting times shortage Δ_i and without considering the waiting times shortages at subsequent nodes $\{i+1, \dots, \bar{M}\}$. To ensure feasibility at subsequent nodes after detecting a waiting times shortage Δ_i , it may be necessary to apply waiting times to nodes $j \leq i$ that: 1. are not the first node among nodes featuring the lowest total load; and 2. do not feature the lowest total load. Failing to apply waiting times at the right nodes without knowledge of future waiting times shortages may result in situations in which the nodes in Ω cannot be further pushed forward in time without violating the maximum ride time constraints of nodes in Ω and, consequently, an incorrect infeasibility declaration.

This drawback is illustrated in the routing sequence in Figure 1 and explained next. Suppose that, at iteration ten, Algorithm (1) detects a waiting time shortage $\Delta_{P_{10}} > 0$ and that all of this waiting time shortage is applied at pickup node P_{10} , given that it features the lowest total load among all of its preceding nodes. As a consequence of increasing the waiting times at node P_{10} , suppose that the service start time at node D_6 reaches the latest service start time dep_{D_6} and that the ride time of node P_7 , with dropoff location D_7 , reaches its maximum. The algorithm proceeds inspecting the sequence and a new waiting times shortage is detected at node P_{12} , i.e., $\Delta_{P_{12}} > 0$. However, it is not possible to increase waiting times at nodes preceding P_{12} , given the time window constraints at node D_6 , and it is not possible to increase the waiting times at node $\Delta_{P_{12}}$, given the maximum ride time constraints at node D_7 . In this case, the scheduling algorithm prematurely terminates and returns an infeasibility declaration for the given sequence. However, this is an incorrect infeasibility declaration given that a feasible solution can be constructed by applying the waiting time shortage $\Delta_{P_{10}}$ at node P_7 instead of node P_{10} , although the total load at node P_7 is higher than the total load at node P_{10} . This reduces the ride time of node P_7 , with dropoff location D_7 following node P_{12} . Consequently, the waiting times shortage $\Delta_{P_{12}}$ can be applied at node P_{12} , without violating the maximum ride time constraints of node P_7 and a feasible solution is returned. To prevent incorrect infeasibility declarations, we propose a recourse heuristic, whose aim is to revisit previously-made waiting time decisions and decrease the chances of obtaining incorrect infeasibility declarations. The details of the recourse heuristic are provided in Algorithm 2 and are explained next.

Algorithm 2: Recourse algorithm

Input: vehicle route sequence ($\bar{I} = \{1, \dots, \bar{M}\}$), pickups P_i , dropoffs D_i , earliest start times ET_i , latest start times LT_i , maximum ride times u_{P_i} , service durations d_i , travel times $t_{i,j}$, waiting times w_i , remaining waiting time shortening Δ_i

Output: start node $start\ node$, waiting times w_i with $i \in \bar{I}$, feasibility $check_{recourse}$

```

1 initialize  $start\ node = 1$ ;
2 initialize  $check_{recourse} = false$ ;
3 find all nodes  $j_l \leq i, l \in \{1, \dots, \bar{M}\}$  that have reached maximum ride time constraints;
4 for  $l \rightarrow 1: \bar{M}$  do
5     Set:  $\tilde{w}_i = w_i, \tilde{w}_i = 0 \forall i \in \{j_{l+1}, \dots, i\}$ ;
6     Recompute:  $LT_i$ ;
7     Compute:  $\delta \tilde{w}_{j_l}$  as in step 10 of Algorithm 1;
8     if  $\delta w_{j_l} > 0$  then
9         Update:  $\tilde{w}_{j_l} = \tilde{w}_{j_l} + \delta w_{j_l}$ ;
10        Update:  $start\ node = j_l$ ;
11        Update:  $check_{recourse} = true$ ;
12        Set:  $w_i = \tilde{w}_i$ ;
13        break;
```

Algorithm 3: Battery management algorithm

Input: vehicle route sequence ($I = \{1, \dots, \bar{M}\}$), charging facilities $\{s_1, \dots, s_N\}$, charging rates α_i , discharging rate β , travel times $t_{i,j}$, earliest start times ET_i , latest start times LT_i , State of charge B_i

Output: Charging times E_i with $i \in \{s_1, \dots, s_N\}$, Boolean battery feasibility check

```

1 initialize  $check = true$ ;
2 initialize  $B_1 = B_0$ ;
3 while  $check = true$  do
4     for  $i \rightarrow 2: \bar{M}$  do
5         Compute:  $B_i = B_{i-1} - \beta \times t_{i,j}$ ;
6         if  $B_i < 0$  then
7             the sub-sequence is infeasible  $\rightarrow check = false$ ;
8         if  $i \in S$  then
9             Set:  $E_i = \min\{LT_{i+1} - ET_i; (Q - B_i)/\alpha_i\}$ ;
10            Set:  $B_i = B_i + E_i$ ;
```

3.3 Recourse heuristic to reduce incorrect infeasibility declarations

Suppose that the scheduling algorithm has detected a waiting times shortage Δ_i at node i and that, after inspecting all nodes $j \leq i$, $\Delta_i > 0$ and $\Omega = \emptyset$. In this case, it may be necessary to modify waiting time decisions that were taken at steps preceding i through a heuristic procedure, e.g., Algorithm 2. In particular, there may exist nodes that reached their maximum ride time as a consequence of waiting time decisions at previous nodes featuring the lowest total loads. Nodes $j \leq i$ that reached their maximum ride time can be detected by employing the first term in step 10 of Algorithm 1. In order to recover feasibility, the service start times at these nodes need to be shifted by the remaining $\Delta_i > 0$ at node i . Suppose that \bar{M} nodes $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_i$ have reached their maximum ride time at iteration i . This means that, in order to recover a feasible route, the sum of the waiting time at these nodes need to be shifted by a total of Δ_i . Note that postponing the service start time at $j_l, l \in \{1, \dots, \bar{M}\}$, automatically postpones the service start times at any successive nodes, including nodes j_2, \dots, j_i . Furthermore, it may modify waiting time decisions at nodes following j_l . As such, the recourse heuristic iteratively explores possibilities to postpone service start times at nodes $j_l, l \in \{1, \dots, \bar{M}\}$, by employing the conditions defined by constraints (15) and (16) and employed in step 10 of Algorithm (1). Note that the proposed recourse algorithm is a heuristic, given that the waiting time shortage could be applied at nodes j_l as well as nodes preceding j_l . If the waiting times at node j_l can be postponed by a maximum amount $\delta w_{j_l} > 0$, the waiting time at j_l is updated, the waiting times at all nodes following j_l are re-initialized, and Algorithm (1) is re-started from j_{l+1} . Otherwise, if $\delta w_{j_l} = 0 \forall j_l, l \in \{1, \dots, \bar{M}\}$, then the solution is deemed infeasible and Algorithm (1) is prematurely terminated.

4 Battery Management Heuristic

In the case of electric and autonomous vehicles, i.e., an e-ADARP, it is necessary to show that the retrieved excess-time optimal schedules are also battery-feasible. Indeed, Algorithm (1) disregards battery considerations which are instead part of e-ADARPs. Battery-feasibility aspects can be implemented by integrating battery-related decision variables and constraints into (LP1), as presented in Section 2.2 in Bongiovanni et al. (2019).

Table 1: Scheduling algorithms on DARP instances: number of incorrect infeasible declarations, number of deviating solutions, and average relative deviation.

Name	#Routes	Size range	Algorithm (1)			Cordeau and Laporte (2003)			Parragh et al. (2009)		
			#Inf.	#Dev.	Avg. dev. %	#Inf.	#Dev.	Avg. dev. %	#Inf.	#Dev.	Avg. dev. %
pr01	116424	4 to 24	0	0	0.000	0	30878	18.671	0	29	8.392
pr02	208788	4 to 32	0	0	0.000	0	50337	19.099	20	411	4.832
pr03	410037	4 to 32	0	0	0.000	0	113534	14.160	2	979	4.758
pr04	960999	4 to 34	0	0	0.000	0	261004	18.209	26	2603	7.242
pr05	1337562	4 to 38	0	2	4.368	0	389184	15.080	31	7895	9.723
pr06	1627203	4 to 36	0	0	0.000	0	471613	17.507	2	11062	8.803
pr07	135429	4 to 28	0	0	0.000	0	39360	20.305	0	251	6.079
pr08	248041	4 to 32	0	0	0.000	0	53596	11.538	4	1047	9.777
pr09	438970	4 to 40	0	0	0.000	0	185523	7.833	267	32848	3.896
pr10	725096	4 to 38	0	0	0.000	0	272779	8.350	75	9965	3.600
pr11	196546	4 to 24	0	0	0.000	0	33463	28.068	6	59	6.293
pr12	658908	4 to 32	0	0	0.000	0	145429	26.882	51	789	5.448
pr13	1155426	4 to 32	0	0	0.000	0	328438	22.490	22	1468	10.602
pr14	1805561	4 to 34	0	5	2.292	0	310912	21.617	101	1672	6.129
pr15	2964203	4 to 38	0	0	0.000	0	893939	29.973	218	12521	10.774
pr16	4007191	4 to 40	0	0	0.000	0	1107728	24.767	560	16405	5.475
pr17	352657	4 to 28	0	0	0.000	0	70577	24.164	10	1089	6.769
pr18	916192	4 to 36	0	0	0.000	0	242315	22.611	35	4081	8.233
pr19	1433358	4 to 40	0	0	0.000	0	321561	18.675	32	4362	6.551
pr20	1670526	4 to 42	0	19	1.371	0	412707	14.925	162	17204	3.701

Note that vehicle battery levels can be seen as an inventory which can only decrease with traveling. Then, for feasibility purposes, it is always better to recharge as much as possible, as early as possible. If the schedule that maximizes battery recharging does not satisfy the imposed battery management constraints, the given sequence and excess-time optimal schedule is declared infeasible. Following implications 4. and 5. from the previous page, if battery-feasible schedules do exist, at least one of them exhibits the total user excess-ride time computed through the proposed scheduling algorithm. Note that the proposed recharging procedure is a heuristic since it cannot be formally proven optimal (e.g. maximizing the charging time at station i may decrease opportunities to recharge more at following charging stations). Denote by N the number of charging stations contained in sequence \mathcal{I} . Let Q represent the nominal capacity of the electric and autonomous vehicles, β the discharging rate, and B_i the battery inventory level at locations $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and α_s the charging rate at charging facilities $s \in \mathcal{S}$.

The procedure in Algorithm 3 is proposed for battery management. The algorithm sequentially computes the battery inventory between successive nodes in consideration of the initial battery level B_1 , the battery discharge rate β , and the total travel time up to i . Note that battery discharge can be equally computed by energy consumption models (Goeke and Schneider 2015, Pelletier et al. 2017). During this iterative process, when a charging facility is encountered, its maximal recharging time is bound by: (i) the difference between the service start time at the current node and the latest service start time at the following node, and (ii) the time needed to fully recharge. To ensure feasibility, the recharging time at the station needs to be set to the minimum of the two. Furthermore, earliest start times E_i and latest start times L_i are computed by taking into account the eventual waiting times obtained from the scheduling algorithm. The procedure prematurely terminates only if a node i features a negative battery inventory, after which the route is declared battery-infeasible.

5 Numerical Results

Numerical experiments are performed on the DARP instances presented in Cordeau and Laporte (2003) and on the e-ADARP instances presented in Bongiovanni et al. (2019). Specifically, we extract routing solutions by employing the adaptive large neighborhood search in Ropke and Pisinger (2006), with 1,000 iterations. At every iteration of the large neighborhood search, we solve the scheduling problem through a linear program and compare its results to the route evaluation procedures by Cordeau and Laporte (2003) and Parragh et al. (2009), as well as this paper. This results in a thorough comparison of the scheduling algorithms on about 15,000,000 feasible DARP solutions and about 2,500,000 feasible e-ADARP solutions. As explained in Section 4, for the e-ADARP, the linear program is obtained by supplementing (LP1) with charging and battery management constraints/decision variables as proposed in Bongiovanni et al. (2019). The numerical experiments are implemented in Julia v1.8.2 and run on 2 x AMD Rome 7532 @ 2.40 GHz 256M cache L3 CPU clusters. Each instance is run on two of such CPUs with 8 Gb of RAM. The LP is implemented in the JuMP modeling language (Dunning et al. 2017) v1.3.1 and solved with Gurobi v0.11.3.

Table 1 shows a comparison between the scheduling procedures on DARP instances. The first column indicates the instance name, following the convention employed in Cordeau and Laporte (2003). These are instances that consider

Table 2: Scheduling algorithms on DARP instances: CPU times [ms]

	Linear Program	Algorithm (1)	Cordeau and Laporte (2003)	Parragh et al. (2009)
Name	Avg. CPU [ms]	Avg. CPU [ms]	Avg. CPU [ms]	Avg. CPU [ms]
pr01	1.211	0.495	0.362	0.342
pr02	1.286	0.480	0.448	0.427
pr03	1.317	0.580	0.544	0.528
pr04	1.366	0.686	0.616	0.586
pr05	1.325	0.650	0.608	0.578
pr06	1.378	0.681	0.626	0.593
pr07	1.271	0.557	0.425	0.406
pr08	1.317	0.540	0.580	0.570
pr09	1.410	0.632	0.737	0.715
pr10	1.447	0.656	0.759	0.759
pr11	1.223	0.431	0.367	0.352
pr12	1.282	0.526	0.501	0.488
pr13	1.342	0.548	0.566	0.568
pr14	1.368	0.487	0.611	0.580
pr15	1.399	0.560	0.655	0.641
pr16	1.491	0.594	0.680	0.639
pr17	1.215	0.418	0.416	0.397
pr18	1.437	0.587	0.727	0.712
pr19	1.465	0.492	0.814	0.809
pr20	1.518	0.485	0.865	0.863

three to 13 vehicles and 24 to 144 requests. For further information on the generation of these DARP instances, the reader is referred to Cordeau and Laporte (2003). The second column indicates the total number of evaluated feasible routes, and the third column their size range. The fourth to sixth column shows the total number of incorrect infeasible declarations, the total number of deviating solutions, and their absolute average percentage deviation from the optimal solution, by employing Algorithm (1). The following columns show the same results for the 8-step scheduling algorithms by Cordeau and Laporte (2003) and Parragh et al. (2009). As it can be noted, Algorithm (1) does not return any incorrect infeasibility declaration. However, in some rare cases (i.e., in at most 0.001% of the times), it does return suboptimal solutions, namely for instances pr05, pr14, and pr20. For these instances, the returned suboptimal solutions deviate by as little as 1.371% and by as much as 4.368%, on absolute average terms. This consists of a proportion of suboptimal solutions, compared to the results obtained by employing the scheduling algorithms by Cordeau and Laporte (2003) and Parragh et al. (2009). Consistently with reported results from the literature, the approach by Cordeau and Laporte (2003) has the tendency to minimize the total number of incorrect infeasibility declarations at the cost of a higher number of suboptimal solutions and their average deviations. Namely, the approach can return as much as 42% suboptimal solutions, with deviations between about 8% and 28%. The approach by Parragh et al. (2009), instead, has the tendency to minimize the total number of suboptimal solutions and their average deviation, at the cost of a higher number of incorrect infeasibility declarations. Namely, the approach can return up to 0.06% incorrect infeasibility declarations but reduces the number of suboptimal solutions to up to about 7.5%, with deviations between about 3.5% and 10%. It is worth noting that, in our numerical experiments, all incorrect infeasibility declarations returned by this last scheduling algorithm are due to violations of maximum ride time constraints. In addition to producing solutions of higher quality with respect to state-of-the-art scheduling algorithms, Algorithm (1) is computationally efficient, as shown in Table 2. It is about 60% faster than a linear program and comparably efficient with respect to the 8-step scheduling algorithms by Cordeau and Laporte (2003) and Parragh et al. (2009), with a slight computational advantage for larger-scale instances, e.g., instances pr18, pr19, and pr20.

Table 3 shows a comparison between the investigated scheduling procedures on e-ADARP instances. The first column indicates the instance name, following the convention employed in Bongiovanni et al. (2019), i.e., $\langle u \rangle \langle \text{number of vehicles} \rangle \langle \text{number of customers} \rangle \langle \text{minimum battery inventory ratio at the destination depot} \rangle$, “u” is used to refer to the instances adapted from real data from Uber Technologies Inc. Furthermore, the reader is reminded that the minimum battery inventory ratio is used to compute the minimal battery levels that all vehicles need to have at the destination depot, i.e. a minimal battery ratio of 0.7 means vehicles need to have at least 70% of their nominal battery capacity at the destination depot. The following columns adopt the same convention used in Table 1. As it can be noted, in this case Algorithm (1) always returns optimal scheduling solutions, which include charging decisions. Differently from the DARP results shown in Table 1, the approach of Cordeau and Laporte (2003) return some incorrect infeasibility declarations, although this remains limited to about 0.39%. The number of suboptimal solutions, however, rise up to about 70% and so their absolute average deviations from the optimal solution, which range between about 20% and more than 150%. The approach of Parragh et al. (2009) also shows an increase in the total number of incorrect infeasibility declarations with respect to the DARP results shown in Table 1. Namely, the total number of infeasibility declarations rise to at most about 34%, however, the number of suboptimal solutions decrease to at most 0.1%, with deviations which are contained between about 0.5% and 8%. As shown in Table 4, in the case of an e-ADARP, the procedure

Table 3: Scheduling algorithms on E-ADARP instances: number of incorrect infeasible declarations, number of deviating solutions, and average relative deviation.

Name	#Routes	Size range	Algorithm (1)			Cordeau and Laporte (2003)			Parragh et al. (2009)		
			#Inf.	#Dev.	Avg. dev. %	#Inf.	#Dev.	Avg. dev. %	#Inf.	#Dev.	Avg. dev. %
u2-16-0.1	37506	4 to 24	0	0	0	15439	32.672	174	0	0.000	
u2-16-0.4	17459	5 to 23	0	0	0	3005	36.522	2970	0	0.000	
u2-16-0.7	16218	5 to 22	0	0	0	1232	33.471	4292	0	0.000	
u2-20-0.1	49772	5 to 30	0	0	106	22709	149.782	1197	0	0.000	
u2-20-0.4	46648	5 to 31	0	0	39	18725	161.562	13431	0	0.000	
u2-20-0.7	33466	7 to 28	0	0	60	5817	60.147	2212	0	0.000	
u2-24-0.1	28964	6 to 32	0	0	0	11259	25.464	3414	0	0.000	
u2-24-0.4	25508	6 to 34	0	0	0	8775	21.962	4043	0	0.000	
u2-24-0.7	4181	5 to 21	0	0	0	140	43.802	1415	0	0.000	
u3-18-0.1	53995	4 to 22	0	0	0	11791	42.518	331	0	0.000	
u3-18-0.4	46186	4 to 22	0	0	0	10980	47.314	66	0	0.000	
u3-18-0.7	49025	5 to 21	0	0	0	9918	39.471	8423	0	0.000	
u3-24-0.1	64003	4 to 25	0	0	0	34225	80.061	34	1	0.502	
u3-24-0.4	60025	5 to 25	0	0	0	31842	70.972	4672	4	0.565	
u3-24-0.7	35284	5 to 25	0	0	0	17606	51.760	9584	1	0.565	
u3-30-0.1	76249	4 to 32	0	0	0	20910	57.921	33	0	0.000	
u3-30-0.4	54627	4 to 35	0	0	0	13459	68.553	7724	2	7.932	
u3-30-0.7	63063	5 to 34	0	0	0	15523	79.629	18753	0	0.000	
u3-36-0.1	64160	5 to 35	0	0	0	33510	68.038	4012	0	0.000	
u3-36-0.4	50633	5 to 35	0	0	0	29071	69.993	8768	0	0.000	
u3-36-0.7	66053	5 to 36	0	0	0	48186	81.351	9446	0	0.000	
u4-16-0.1	53726	4 to 16	0	0	41	7694	45.799	0	0	0.000	
u4-16-0.4	61489	4 to 14	0	0	0	9362	98.971	0	0	0.000	
u4-16-0.7	38409	4 to 17	0	0	8	7147	72.386	6452	0	0.000	
u4-24-0.1	55836	4 to 25	0	0	39	8838	36.993	301	0	0.000	
u4-24-0.4	63134	5 to 23	0	0	6	10315	33.213	6230	0	0.000	
u4-24-0.7	38254	4 to 25	0	0	1	8526	31.563	4230	0	0.000	
u4-32-0.1	112512	4 to 27	0	0	444	56642	48.282	776	0	0.000	
u4-32-0.4	45326	4 to 27	0	0	29	8727	52.708	8432	0	0.000	
u4-32-0.7	47388	5 to 25	0	0	56	17166	46.741	12162	0	0.000	
u4-40-0.1	45948	4 to 29	0	0	0	26003	64.942	5392	0	0.000	
u4-40-0.4	42945	5 to 29	0	0	0	14366	112.962	13812	0	0.000	
u4-40-0.7	42222	5 to 23	0	0	0	5928	109.270	4809	0	0.000	
u4-48-0.1	95770	5 to 37	0	0	54	62613	40.254	2054	0	0.000	
u4-48-0.4	59347	5 to 31	0	0	0	6439	47.066	1894	0	0.000	
u4-48-0.7	26414	5 to 31	0	0	0	2979	45.184	207	0	0.000	
u5-40-0.1	133324	4 to 25	0	0	0	80461	87.970	321	0	0.000	
u5-40-0.4	113239	4 to 27	0	0	0	59492	81.366	8865	2	4.458	
u5-40-0.7	84812	5 to 19	0	0	0	6132	65.630	5694	0	0.000	
u5-50-0.1	114210	4 to 32	0	0	0	41649	61.809	309	4	3.584	
u5-50-0.4	104755	4 to 29	0	0	0	39808	67.803	10871	3	5.177	
u5-50-0.7	83897	5 to 35	0	0	2	45238	66.567	11438	102	5.671	

by Cordeau and Laporte (2003) has a tendency to produce solutions that violate ride time constraints, whereas the procedure by Parragh et al. (2009) has a tendency to violate time window and battery constraints. This last procedure is in fact designed to minimize completion time, which, in turn, may increase the chances of violating battery management constraints. Finally, Table 5 shows the average CPU times, in milliseconds, obtained by running the linear program, Algorithm (1), and the scheduling procedures by Cordeau and Laporte (2003) and Parragh et al. (2009) on the e-ADARP. As it can be noted, also in this case, Algorithm (1) is about 50% faster with respect to a linear program, on average, and up to about 80% faster for instances u5-40-0.7 and instances u4-16. Savings in terms of computing time might be even more significant when considering larger problem instances or when several static problems are solved in real time, e.g. as in the dynamic e-ADARP presented in Bongiovanni et al. (2022).

6 Summary

This work proposed an excess-ride-time procedure for scheduling dial-a-ride instances. The procedure is shown to produce high-quality solutions, which are only very rarely suboptimal, in at least half the time of a linear program and in comparable time with respect to state-of-the-art scheduling algorithms. The proposed procedure can be potentially employed to: (i) reduce mixed-integer-linear programs by time-dependent decision variables and constraints, even when the objective function includes time-related aspects; and (ii) efficiently solve scheduling problems from static and dynamic metaheuristic approaches. For the e-ADARP, we further propose a battery heuristic which can be used when the vehicle routes include one or more visits to charging facilities. The heuristic is needed to provide battery-feasible charging plans for excess-time-optimal vehicle schedules. The battery heuristic builds on the assumption that charging as much as possible as early as possible is the best strategy for battery-feasibility.

Table 4: Scheduling algorithms on E-ADARP instances: infeasibility reasons

Name	Cordeau and Laporte (2003)			Parragh et al. (2009)		
	#Inf. TW	#Inf. RT	#Inf. BATT	#Inf. TW	#Inf. RT	#Inf. BATT
u2-16-0.1	0	0	0	157	0	78
u2-16-0.4	0	0	0	136	0	2886
u2-16-0.7	0	0	0	77	0	4277
u2-20-0.1	0	106	0	42	0	1171
u2-20-0.4	0	39	0	25	0	13422
u2-20-0.7	0	60	0	13	0	2212
u2-24-0.1	0	0	0	1186	0	3006
u2-24-0.4	0	0	0	2240	0	3121
u2-24-0.7	0	0	0	1009	0	1393
u3-18-0.1	0	0	0	331	0	46
u3-18-0.4	0	0	0	31	0	48
u3-18-0.7	0	0	0	23	0	8423
u3-24-0.1	0	0	0	30	0	15
u3-24-0.4	0	0	0	180	0	4661
u3-24-0.7	0	0	0	473	0	9579
u3-30-0.1	0	0	0	27	0	15
u3-30-0.4	0	0	0	23	0	7707
u3-30-0.7	0	0	0	83	0	18737
u3-36-0.1	0	0	0	333	0	4488
u3-36-0.4	0	0	0	51	0	8766
u3-36-0.7	0	0	0	45	0	9433
u4-16-0.1	0	41	0	0	0	0
u4-16-0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0
u4-16-0.7	0	8	0	14	0	6452
u4-24-0.1	0	39	0	222	0	125
u4-24-0.4	0	6	0	280	0	6185
u4-24-0.7	0	1	0	9	0	4229
u4-32-0.1	0	444	0	744	0	297
u4-32-0.4	0	29	0	104	0	8407
u4-32-0.7	0	56	0	20	0	12162
u4-40-0.1	0	0	0	158	0	5685
u4-40-0.4	0	0	0	58	0	13807
u4-40-0.7	0	0	0	0	0	4809
u4-48-0.1	0	54	0	425	52	2277
u4-48-0.4	0	0	0	854	0	1672
u4-48-0.7	0	0	0	1	0	207
u5-40-0.1	0	0	0	203	0	219
u5-40-0.4	0	0	0	141	0	8819
u5-40-0.7	0	0	0	71	0	5694
u5-50-0.1	0	0	0	42	0	286
u5-50-0.4	0	0	0	84	0	10852
u5-50-0.7	0	2	0	7	0	11438

Computational experiments are carried on a plethora of static DARP and e-ADARP instances from the literature, which are extracted from an adaptive large neighborhood search with 1,000 iterations. Experiments show that the route evaluation procedure is computationally more efficient than solving a linear program, while higher-quality solutions with respect to popular scheduling heuristics from the literature. Furthermore, results show that the proposed scheduling procedure does not produce incorrect infeasibility declarations and produces suboptimal solutions in very rare cases (i.e., less than 0.001% of the times), which deviate up to 5% from optimal solutions, on average.

Acknowledgments

This research was enabled in part by support provided by Calcul Québec (www.calculquebec.ca/en/) and Compute Canada (www.computeCanada.ca).

References

- Bongiovanni, C., Kaspi, M., Cordeau, J.F., Geroliminis, N., 2022. A machine learning-driven two-phase metaheuristic for autonomous ridesharing operations. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review* 165, 102835.
- Bongiovanni, C., Kaspi, M., Geroliminis, N., 2019. The electric autonomous dial-a-ride problem. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 122, 436–456.
- Cordeau, J.F., Laporte, G., 2003. A tabu search heuristic for the static multi-vehicle dial-a-ride problem. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 37(6), 579–594.
- Cordeau, J.F., Laporte, G., 2007. The dial-a-ride problem: models and algorithms. *Annals of Operations Research* 153, 29–46.
- Dunning, I., Huchette, J., Lubin, M., 2017. Jump: A modeling language for mathematical optimization. *SIAM Review* 59, 295–320.
- Goeke, D., Schneider, M., 2015. Routing a mixed fleet of electric and conventional vehicles. *European Journal of Operational Research* 245, 81–99.

Table 5: Scheduling algorithms on E-ADARP instances: CPU times [ms]

	Linear Program	Algorithm (1)	Cordeau and Laporte (2003)	Parragh et al. (2009)
Name	Avg. CPU [ms]	Avg. CPU [ms]	Avg. CPU [ms]	Avg. CPU [ms]
u2-16-0.1	1.153	0.501	0.338	0.323
u2-16-0.4	1.519	0.505	0.329	0.300
u2-16-0.7	1.153	0.351	0.280	0.261
u2-20-0.1	1.305	0.782	0.475	0.457
u2-20-0.4	1.313	0.830	0.522	0.564
u2-20-0.7	1.344	0.594	0.447	0.432
u2-24-0.1	1.737	0.759	0.460	0.435
u2-24-0.4	1.508	0.626	0.460	0.418
u2-24-0.7	0.886	0.346	0.242	0.114
u3-18-0.1	1.089	0.464	0.272	0.254
u3-18-0.4	1.253	0.486	0.267	0.254
u3-18-0.7	1.319	0.463	0.276	0.257
u3-24-0.1	1.314	0.585	0.345	0.334
u3-24-0.4	1.384	0.556	0.358	0.345
u3-24-0.7	1.204	0.527	0.379	0.364
u3-30-0.1	1.486	0.886	0.506	0.490
u3-30-0.4	1.382	0.974	0.582	0.590
u3-30-0.7	1.492	0.738	0.452	0.402
u3-36-0.1	1.415	1.046	0.643	0.614
u3-36-0.4	1.400	1.019	0.587	0.563
u3-36-0.7	1.447	0.791	0.543	0.513
u4-16-0.1	0.900	0.192	0.139	0.130
u4-16-0.4	0.891	0.197	0.143	0.131
u4-16-0.7	0.983	0.192	0.174	0.160
u4-24-0.1	1.073	0.487	0.259	0.240
u4-24-0.4	1.127	0.481	0.260	0.246
u4-24-0.7	1.148	0.496	0.269	0.262
u4-32-0.1	1.241	0.585	0.373	0.359
u4-32-0.4	1.156	0.501	0.355	0.303
u4-32-0.7	1.201	0.528	0.350	0.325
u4-40-0.1	1.337	0.804	0.469	0.423
u4-40-0.4	1.252	0.749	0.418	0.374
u4-40-0.7	0.958	0.369	0.213	0.187
u4-48-0.1	1.479	1.022	0.694	0.686
u4-48-0.4	1.245	0.348	0.286	0.269
u4-48-0.7	1.102	0.332	0.335	0.299
u5-40-0.1	1.279	0.656	0.389	0.367
u5-40-0.4	1.266	0.563	0.352	0.337
u5-40-0.7	0.861	0.180	0.149	0.132
u5-50-0.1	1.426	0.832	0.501	0.474
u5-50-0.4	1.365	0.850	0.477	0.463
u5-50-0.7	1.320	0.777	0.495	0.488

Gschwind, T., Drexl, M., 2019. Adaptive large neighborhood search with a constant-time feasibility test for the dial-a-ride problem. *Transportation Science* 53, 480–491.

Molenbruch, Y., Braekers, K., Caris, A., 2017a. Typology and literature review for dial-a-ride problems. *Annals of Operations Research* 259 (1-2), 295–325.

Molenbruch, Y., Braekers, K., Caris, A., Berghe, G.V., 2017b. Multi-directional local search for a bi-objective dial-a-ride problem in patient transportation. *Computers & Operations Research* 77, 58–71.

Parragh, S.N., Doerner, K.F., Hartl, R.F., Gandibleux, X., 2009. A heuristic two-phase solution approach for the multi-objective dial-a-ride problem. *Networks: An International Journal* 54, 227–242.

Pelletier, S., Jabali, O., Laporte, G., Veneroni, M., 2017. Battery degradation and behavior for electric vehicles: Review and numerical analyses of several models. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 103, 158–187.

Ropke, S., Pisinger, D., 2006. An adaptive large neighborhood search heuristic for the pickup and delivery problem with time windows. *Transportation science* 40, 455–472.

Savelsbergh, M.W., 1992. The vehicle routing problem with time windows: Minimizing route duration. *ORSA Journal on Computing* 4, 146–154.

Vidal, T., Crainic, T.G., Gendreau, M., Prins, C., 2015. Timing problems and algorithms: Time decisions for sequences of activities. *Networks* 65, 102–128.