Abstract—This paper considers the vehicle routing problem of a fleet operator to serve a set of transportation requests with flexible time windows. That is, the operator presents discounted transportation costs to customers to exchange the flexibility of pickup or delivery. A win-win routing schedule can be achieved via such a process. Different from previous research, we propose a novel bi-level optimization framework, to fully characterize the interaction and negotiation between the fleet operator and customers. In addition, by utilizing the property of strong duality, and the KKT optimality condition of customer optimization problem, the bi-level vehicle routing problem can be equivalently reformulated as a mixed integer nonlinear programming (MINLP) problem. Besides, an efficient algorithm combining the merits of Lagrangian dual decomposition method and Benders decomposition method, is devised to solve the resultant MINLP problem. Finally, extensive numerical experiments are conducted, which validates the effectiveness of proposed bi-level model on the operation cost saving, and the efficacy of proposed solution algorithm on computation speed.
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I. INTRODUCTION

O

ver the past decade, due to the blossoming development of e-commerce, the transportation system has witnessed an astonishing increase in the number of delivery vehicles. With the continuously increasing number of delivery vehicle, considering the flexible time window, the fleet operator needs to precisely devise a routing schedule. Different customers in practice hold diverse attitude towards the punctuality, which means that the fleet operator can exploit the difference of customers sensitivity in pickup (delivery) time to design a better routing schedule.

In recent years, the demand management strategy in a logistic environment belonging to the class of multi-period vehicle routing problem [1], has attracted immense attention [1–7]. The adoption of demand management strategy in the vehicle routing problem has a positive impact both on the increase of revenue and the reduction of cost. As for the multi-period vehicle routing problem with due dates, where customers have to be served between a release and a due date, Archetti et al. [2] propose a mechanism under which customers with due dates exceeding the planning period may be postponed at a cost. Based on the their work, Estrada-Moreno et al. [3] introduce the possibility to offer price discounts to gain service time flexibility. However, contrary to our research, the aforementioned papers assume that the price discounts are fixed by the operator, which is improper in practice. Under the context of the single-item and uncapacitated lot-sizing problem, Li et al. [5] investigate the value of adjusting prices (offering discounts) to increase delivery flexibility with the reduction of logistics cost. In [1], Yildiz et al. extend the strategy of demand management to a variant of the multi-period vehicle routing problem where a service provider offers a discount to customer in exchange for delivery flexibility, and use an exact dynamic programming algorithm to obtain the numerical results, which shows that cost saving up to 30% can be achieved. However, all these papers related with pricing for time flexibility do not investigate the interaction and negotiation between the fleet operator and customers. That is, they assume that customers do not participate in the decision of discounts and flexibility. Actually, considering that the fleet operator and the company with massive customers are two independent entities, it is unpractical to model the routing problem solely from the perspective of the fleet operator. To this end, the research gap is bridged by our paper.

To tackle the difficulties in the solution process of vehicle routing problem, numerous papers have proposed a set of algorithms [3], [4], [8]–[15]. The provided solution algorithms can be roughly classified as two categories, a) the heuristics approaches [3], [8], [10] such as search based algorithm [3], [8], [9], and learning based heuristics method [10]; b) the exact methods such as branch and cut method [11], [12], branch and price method [13], [14], column and row generation method [4], and Benders decomposition method [15]. In [3], a metaheuristic approach is proposed to find low-cost solution, which includes both the transportation costs and the cost of the price discounts offered. To determine a distribution plan to visit a set of customers, Larraín et al. [11] embed the new families of valid inequalities within the framework of branch and bound to improve its performance. However, there are still some limitations associated with these solution approach. For instance, the heuristics based algorithms obtain the near optimal solution with a good performance on computation time, but without the theoretical guarantee on the solution quality. As for the exact algorithms like Benders decomposition method, these solution approaches can obtain an optimal
solution, but there is too much effort put on the computation process.

In this paper, we focus on the transportation request routing problem between a company with massive transportation requests and a transportation company. A fleet of vehicle operated by the transportation company is used to serve as the freight distributors. To achieve a better routing schedule, the operator of transportation company provides a transportation fee discount to the company with massive transportation requests in exchange for delivery (pickup) time flexibility. Note that with the adoption of demand management strategy into the routing problem, the following two-fold benefits emerge, 1) customers will receive the delivery cost savings with the discount offered; 2) when the fleet operator has a flexible time window of customers, more flexibility for making the routing schedule will be obtained resulting in the reduced operation cost. In the following section, the transportation requests and customers are used interchangeably.

The main contributions of this paper are presented as follows

- To the best knowledge of authors, a novel bi-level vehicle routing model characterizing the interaction between fleet operator and customers is proposed for the first time in the field of vehicle routing problem.
- Due to the NP hardness of bi-level vehicle routing problem, exact reformulation techniques based on the KKT optimality condition of convex optimization problem are proposed, which is used to transform the bi-level vehicle routing problem as a single-level mixed integer nonlinear programming problem (MINLP).
- In order to further reduce the computation complexity, these nonlinear terms in MINLP can be exactly linearized by exploiting the property of strong duality. Then the MINLP problem is equivalently converted into a simpler mixed integer programming (MIP) problem.
- Owing to the inherent complexities of the MIP problem and the independent characteristics between the company with transportation requests and the transportation company, we devise a novel decomposition method named as Benders dual decomposition (BDD) algorithm which combines the merits of Benders decomposition method and Lagrangian dual decomposition method.

The paper is organized as follows. We elaborate the system models and the mathematical formulation of bi-level vehicle routing problem with flexible time window in Section II. In order to tackle the NP hardness brought by the bi-level framework and computation difficulties from nonlinear terms in the objective function, we propose a set of exact reformulation techniques to transform the original bi-level model into the single-level MIP based mathematical model in Section III. In addition, a computationally efficient decomposition based algorithm, which combines the complementary advantages of Benders decomposition and Lagrangian dual decomposition method, is proposed in Section IV. Extensive simulation experiments are conducted in Section V to prove the validity of proposed algorithm. Finally, Section VI concludes this paper.

II. Bi-level Model of Fleet Operator and Customers

In practice, among the scenario where a fleet operator serves massive customers, customers set the expected service start time (delivery or pickup time) individually before the fleet operator assigns specific vehicle to serve them. As for customers who are insensitivity to the service start time, to obtain the delivery (pickup) time flexibility for making better routing schedule, the fleet operator is prone to provide the service fee discount. Meanwhile customers who provide time flexibility for fleet operator will receive the delivery fee reduction. In this paper, we propose a novel pricing mechanism to guide the behavior of fleet operator and customers. Unlike the similar papers considering the strategy of demand management [1], [3], [16], a bi-level optimization model is employed to characterize the interaction between a company with massive customers and a fleet operator, which is shown in Fig[1]. In the following subsection, the details concerning lower-level customers model and upper-level operator model are introduced firstly, then we present the bi-level model.

Fig. 1: The interaction between a fleet operator and a company with massive transportation requests. The green symbols represent the vectors.

A. Mathematical Model of Customers

As the followers, to reduce the delivery fee, customers are willing to set their time flexibility $\delta_i$ according to the discount price $q_i$ set by leader (fleet operator). In addition, $\delta_i$ could also cause inconvenience for customers due to the delayed delivery (pickup) time. Then, we propose a convex function $\mathcal{I}(\cdot)$ to quantify the inconvenience. Specifically, given the discount price $q_i$ from the leader problem, we can define the follower problem for each customer as follows

$$\min_{\delta_j} \quad \mathcal{I}(\delta_j) - q_j \delta_j,$$

s.t. $0 \leq \delta_j \leq \bar{\delta}_j$, $\sigma_j, u_j$ (1)

Considering that the time sensitivity varies over different customers, a lower and upper bound constraint is also included in (1). Besides, $\sigma_j$ and $u_j$ are the corresponding dual variables for these two constraints.
B. Mathematical Model of Fleet Operator

We propose to use a directed graph to characterize the relation between depots and customers. The transportation network is modeled as a directed graph \( G(V, E) \), where \( V = \{ v_1, \ldots, v_n \} \) represents start depot, end depot, as well as customer nodes, and \( E \) denotes the set of paths with \((i, j) \in E \) denoting a path from vertex \( i \) to \( j \). The start depot and end depot are denoted as \( v_1 \) and \( v_n \) respectively. We denote \( T_{ij} \) as the travel time of paths between nodes \( i, j \in V \) respectively. The binary variable \( x_{ij}^k \) represents whether vehicle \( k \) is assigned to traverse path \( ij \). In addition, \( c_i \) denotes a unified cost vector which represents both the vehicle usage fee \( c_v \) and the negative delivery fee \(-. \in M\):

\[
c_i = \begin{cases} 
-M, & \text{if } i \in R \\
-c_v, & \text{if } i = v_1 
\end{cases}
\]

Given the time flexibility \( \delta_j \) provided by customers, the fleet operator, as a leader, aims to minimize its operation cost comprising of monetary value of travel time, delivery cost, vehicle usage cost, and accrued discount cost \( \sum_{j \in R} q_j \delta_j \left( \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{k \in K} x_{ij}^k \right) \), occurred during the process of serving customers.

\[
\min x_{ij}^k, q_j \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in V} \left( GT_{ij} + c_i \right) x_{ij}^k + \sum_{j \in R} q_j \delta_j \left( \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{k \in K} x_{ij}^k \right)
\]

s.t. \( x_{ij}^k - \sum_{j \in V} x_{ji}^k = b_i, \forall i \in V, k \in K; \)

\[
b_{v_1} = 1, b_{v_n} = -1, b_i = 0,
\]

\[
\sum_{k \in K} x_{ij}^k \leq 1, \forall i \in R \tag{3}
\]

\[
t_j \geq T_{ij} + t_i - M(1 - x_{ij}^k), \forall i \in V \setminus v_n, j \in V \setminus v_1, k \in K
\]

\[
t_j \leq t_j \leq \tau_j + \delta_j, \forall j \in V \setminus v_1 \tag{5}
\]

In order to satisfy the physical requirements of transportation system, network flow conservation constraints, pickup (delivery) time constraints, and flexible time window constraints are defined as \([2]-[5]\) in above mathematical formulation. Constraint \([2]\) indicates that all vehicles are subject to the flow conservation constraint. In other words, a vehicle entering in the request node has to exit out at the same request node, and vehicle starts at the start depot while returning back to the end depot. Constraint \([3]\) means each customer can be served at most once by the vehicle fleet. Note that some transportation requests may not be served by the fleet if the cost is higher than the benefit. Time characteristics of customer are specified in \([4]\), which states that the arrival time at request nodes should not be later than pickup (delivery) time for transportation requests. In addition, the flexible time window constraint is characterized by \([5]\).

C. Bi-level Model of Operator and Customers

Considering the coupling between operator problem and customer problem which can be modeled as the hierarchical decision process, thus, bi-level optimization framework is employed to characterize the vehicle routing problem with flexible time window. With the customers model and fleet operator model formulated in above subsection, bi-level vehicle routing problem (BVRP) is formulated as follows,

\[
\min x_{ij}^k, q_j \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in V} \left( GT_{ij} + c_i \right) x_{ij}^k + \sum_{j \in R} q_j \delta_j \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{k \in K} x_{ij}^k
\]

s.t. \( \delta_j \in \arg \min_{\delta} \left\{ \sum_{j \in R} \left( I(\delta_j) - q_j \delta_j \right), 0 \leq \delta_j \leq \bar{\delta}_j \right\}, \forall j \in R \)

and \([2]-[5]\)

where the customers problems are constraints to the upper level operator problem, such that, the only members that are considered feasible are the lower level optimal and must also satisfy the upper level constraints.

However, even for the simplest bi-level optimization problem e.g., convex bi-level optimization problem, there is no polynomial time guarantee for any algorithm \([17]\). Specifically, in addition to the difficulties brought by the framework of bi-level model, there is also a complicating term \( \sum_{j \in R} q_j \delta_j^* \), which consists of the product of two continuous decision variables, in the objective function of BVRP. In the following section, a set of reformulation techniques are carefully devised in order to equivalently transform the original bi-level optimization problem as a single-level MIP based optimization problem.

III. MATHEMATICAL REFORMULATION OF BI-LEVEL OPTIMIZATION MODEL

In this part, thanks to the convexity of customer optimization problem, the BVRP is reformulated as a single-level MIP problem with \(a) \) the customer problem transformation which is achieved by equivalently replacing the customer problem with its Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) optimality condition, and \(b) \) the exact linearization approach of nonlinear objective function.

A. Mathematical Reformulation of Customer Side Problem

The bi-level optimization problem, even for the convex bi-level optimization problem, has been shown to be NP-hard \([17]\). Hence, to tackle the NP-hardness of the bi-level model, we propose to represent the follower problem, a convex optimization problem, with its KKT optimality condition. Firstly, a set of non-negative dual variables \( (u_j, \sigma_j) \) are introduced for the constraints of customers model. As a result, the KKT condition of customers problem is derived and shown in \([6]\).

\[
\nabla I(\delta_j) - q_j - \sigma_j + u_j = 0, \forall j \in R
\]

\[
0 \leq u_j \leq (\delta_j - \bar{\delta}_j) \geq 0, \forall j \in R
\]

\[
0 \leq \sigma_j \leq \bar{\delta}_j \geq 0, \forall j \in R
\]
where the expression "a \perp b" means at most one of a and b can take a strictly nonzero value with the other value being 0. The stationarity conditions are specified in Eq. (6a). Primal feasibility, dual feasibility, and complementary condition are shown in constraints (6b), and (6c). Then original BVRP is reformulated as a single-level problem.

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{x_{ijk}, q_j} \sum_{k \in K, i \in V, j \in V} (GT_{ij} + c_i) x_{ijk}^k + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}} q_j \left( \sum_{i \in V, k \in K} x_{ijk}^k \right)
\end{align*}
\]  
\[\text{s.t.} \quad (2)-(6) \]  

Note that there are still some hard-to-solve terms both in the objective function and constraints of \([P1]\) thus, we propose a set of exact linearization approaches to handle the difficulties from these nonlinear terms of \([P1]\) in the later subsection.

### B. Exact Linearization Approach for Nonlinear Terms

In this subsection, in order to reduce the computation complexity of \([P1]\) which is a MINLP problem, we propose a set of equivalent linearization methods, \(a)\) linearizing the nonlinear complementary constraint by introducing additional binary variables, and \(b)\) exploiting the power of strong duality to exactly linearize the nonlinear term \(q_j \delta_j\).

1) **Linearization of complementary optimization constraint:** Due to the nonlinear nature of complementary constraints \((6b), (6c)\) which render \([P1]\) extremely hard to solve, we propose to linearize these nonlinear terms by introducing \(|\mathcal{R}|\) additional auxiliary binary variables \(\omega_j^1, \omega_j^2\) and a sufficiently large constant \(M\), yielding the following disjunctive constraints \([18]\)

\[
\begin{align*}
0 \leq \bar{\delta}_j - \delta_j &\leq M \omega_j^1, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{R} \quad (7a) \\
0 \leq u_j &\leq M(1 - \omega_j^1) \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{R} \\
0 \leq \bar{\delta}_j &\leq M \omega_j^2, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{R} \quad (7b) \\
0 \leq \sigma_j &\leq M(1 - \omega_j^2) \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{R} 
\end{align*}
\]

2) **Linearization of nonlinear terms in objective function:** Note that there is still a nonlinear term \(q_j \delta_j\) in the objective function of \([P1]\). With the customer model \([1]\), in which \(I(\delta_j)\) is a convex function, the Lagrangian function can be obtained as shown below:

\[
L(\delta_j, u_j, \sigma_j) = \mathcal{I}_j(\delta_j) - q_j \delta_j - \sigma_j \delta_j + u_j(\delta_j - \bar{\delta}_j) = \mathcal{I}_j(\delta_j) + (u_j - q_j - \sigma_j) \delta_j - u_j \bar{\delta}_j
\]

The dual function can be obtained as follow:\([4]\)

\[
g(u_j, \sigma_j) = \inf_{\delta_j} \mathcal{I}_j(\delta_j) + (u_j - q_j - \sigma_j) \delta_j - u_j \bar{\delta}_j = -u_j \bar{\delta}_j + \inf_{\delta_j} \phi(\delta_j)
\]

\[
= -u_j \bar{\delta}_j + \phi^*(\delta_j^*)
\]

According to the strong duality of convex optimization problem, the objective value of lower level problem \([1]\) and the objective value of its dual problem are equal at the optimal solution. Then, the complicating nonlinear term \(q_j \delta_j\) can be exactly linearized as follows,

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{I}_j(\delta_j) - q_j \delta_j &= -u_j \bar{\delta}_j + \phi^*(\delta_j^*) \\
q_j \delta_j &= \mathcal{I}_j(\delta_j) + u_j \bar{\delta}_j - \phi^*(\delta_j^*)
\end{align*}
\]

Then, the nonlinear terms \(q_j \delta_j\) in the objective function of \([P1]\) can be exactly linearized by replacing \(q_j \delta_j\) with \(\mathcal{I}_j(\delta_j) + u_j \bar{\delta}_j - \phi^*(\delta_j^*)\). As a result, to handle the resultant bilinear terms \(\mathcal{I}_j(\delta_j) + u_j \bar{\delta}_j - \phi^*(\delta_j^*)\) in the objective function, Big-M method is employed. Specifically, a continuous auxiliary \(\eta_j\) and addition constraint \((8)\) are introduced.

\[
\eta_j \geq \mathcal{I}_j(\delta_j) + u_j \bar{\delta}_j - \phi^*(\delta_j^*) - M(1 - \sum_{k \in K, i \in J} x_{ijk}^k), \forall j \in \mathcal{R} \quad (8)
\]

Following above linearization techniques, \([P1]\) can be equivalently reformulated as \([P2]\) which essentially is a MIP problem:\(4\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{k \in K, i \in V, j \in V} (GT_{ij} + c_i) x_{ijk}^k + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}} \eta_j
\end{align*}
\]  
\[\text{s.t.} \quad (2)-(5) \text{, and } \mathcal{X}, [4], [18]\]

However, considering the independent characteristics of the transportation service operator and the company with massive transportation requests, it is unrealistic to directly solve \([P2]\) with off-the-shelf algorithms. Hence, to protect the privacy of both sides, we propose a decomposition based solution algorithm to solve \([P2]\).

### IV. Decomposition Based Approach

Due to the absence of information needed for centralized method, and the privacy protection for both the transportation company and the company with massive requests, we propose to solve the resultant \([P2]\) with the BDD method. Note that the BDD method combines the complementary merits of Lagrangian dual decomposition and Benders decomposition method \([19]-[22]\). Specifically, by exploiting the power of Lagrangian dual decomposition method, we devise a novel form of subproblem which is a MIP problem. With the newly formulated subproblem, valid Benders cuts are generated which are stronger than the classic Benders cuts derived from the generalized Benders decomposition (GBD) method.

#### A. Generalized Benders Decomposition Approach

Considering that the BDD method is based on the GBD method, thus, to validate the superiority of proposed BDD approach, the details of GBD method are illustrated firstly as follows \([20], [23], [24]\).
1) **Master problem:** By relaxing constraints (4a-5), (6a), (7), (8), the resultant master problem which is a relaxed version of (LSP) provides the lower bound for (LSP).

\[
\min_{x_{ij}, \omega_{mn} \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i,j \in V} \sum_{j \in V} \Theta + (c_i + \Gamma T_j)x_{ij}^k
\]

\[\text{s.t. } (2a-b)]\]

where \(\Theta\) is an auxiliary variable representing the lower bound of (LSP) (Benders subproblem).

2) **Primal Benders subproblem:** With the integer solution obtained from solving MP, the primal subproblem can be formulated as follows with the copies of master problem decision variables \(x_{ij}^k, \Omega_j\), which has been used in previous research (21, 23, 25, 26).

\[
\min_{x_{ij}^*, \omega_{j}^*} \sum_{j \in R} \eta_j
\]

\[\text{s.t. } (9a)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
x_{ij}^* &= x_{ij}^k, \quad \forall i, j \in V, k \in K \triangleleft \lambda_{ij}^k, \\
\omega_{j}^* &= \Omega_j^m, \quad \forall j \in R, m \in M \triangleleft \lambda_{j}^m
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\sum_{j \in V} \lambda_{ij}^k - \sum_{j \in V} \lambda_{ij}^k = b_i, \quad \forall i \in V; k \in K
\]

\[
b_{u1} = 1, b_{u2} = -1, b_i = 0,
\]

\[
\sum_{k \in K} \sum_{j \in V} \lambda_{ij}^k \leq 1, \quad \forall i \in R
\]

\[
t_j \geq T_i + t_i - M(1 - \lambda_{ij}^k), \forall i \in V \setminus V_n,
\]

\[
j \in V \setminus V_n, k \in K
\]

\[
\tau_j \leq t_j \leq \tau_j + \delta_j, \forall j \in V \setminus V_n
\]

\[
\nabla \Theta(\delta_j) - g_j - \sigma_j + u_j = 0, \forall j \in R
\]

\[
0 \leq \delta_j - \delta_j \leq M\Omega_j^m
\]

\[
0 \leq u_j \leq M(1 - \Omega_j^m)
\]

\[
0 \leq \delta_j - M\Omega_j^m
\]

\[
0 \leq \sigma_j \leq M(1 - \Omega_j^m)
\]

\[
\eta_j \geq \lambda_j(\delta_j) + u_j \delta_j - \phi^*(\delta_j) - M(1 - \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i \in J} \lambda_{ij}^k),
\]

\[\forall j \in R
\]

where \(x_{ij}^k, \omega_{j}^m\) are the solution of current master problem. We use \(X_{pss} = \{x_{ij}^k, \Omega_j^m \in [0, 1]\} \cup X \setminus \{x_{ij}^k, \omega_{j}^m\}\) to denote the feasible region of [PSP].

**B. Benders Dual Decomposition Approach**

To reduce the computation time of the GBD method, by exploiting the property of Lagrangian dual decomposition, we propose a novel decomposition method, BDD algorithm, which iteratively strengthens the master problem with stronger optimality and feasibility cut.

Specifically, in order to strengthen the classic generalized Benders cut, two constraints (9a) and (9b) are relaxed into the objective function by introducing two dual multipliers \(\lambda_{ij}^k\) and \(\lambda_{j}^m\). The Lagrangian dual problem is formulated as follows,

\[
\max \min_{\lambda} \lambda_{pss} \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in V} \Theta - \sum_{j \in R} \sum_{m \in M} \lambda_{j}^m(\omega_j^* - \omega_j^m)
\]

\[\text{s.t. } (10a-10d)]\]

By applying this relaxation step, integrality requirements can be imposed on any subset of the variables \(x_{ij}^k\) and \(\omega_j^m\) given they are no longer equal to \(x_{ij}^k\) and \(\omega_j^m\) respectively. In Lemma I it is shown that a valid optimality cut can be generated by optimizing a MIP based subproblem.

**Lemma 1.** Given the linear relaxation solution of master problem \(x_{ij}^k, \omega_j^m \in \mathbb{R}\), and dual multipliers \(\lambda_{ij}^k, \lambda_{j}^m \in \mathbb{R}\), solving the (LSP) a MIP problem, provides the optimal solution \(\{\Omega_j^m, \lambda_{ij}^k, \eta_j\}\). Then,

\[
\Theta \geq \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i \in V} \lambda_{ij}^k(x_{ij}^k - \bar{x}_{ij}^k) - \sum_{j \in R} \sum_{m \in M} \lambda_{j}^m(\omega_j^m - \bar{\omega}_j)
\]

is a valid optimality cut for the master problem (MP).

The proof is in Appendix A.

Compared with the valid cut generated by (PSP) the effectiveness of proposed valid cut (11) has been rigorously proven in Theorem I.

**Theorem 1.** Given the dual multipliers from solving (PSP), the optimality cut (11) is parallel to generalized Benders optimality cut and at least \(\Xi \geq 0\) units tighter, where

\[
\Xi = \min_{\lambda_{pss}} \left\{ \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in V} \Theta - \sum_{j \in R} \sum_{m \in M} \lambda_{ij}^k \lambda_{ij}^m + \sum_{j \in R} \sum_{m \in M} \lambda_{j}^m(\omega_j^m - \bar{\omega}_j), \lambda_{ij}^k, \Omega_j^m \in \mathbb{R} \right\}
\]

The proof is in Appendix B.

As for the feasibility valid cut, the same rule applies.

**Lemma 2.** Given the infeasible linear relaxation solution of master problem \(x_{ij}^k, \omega_j^m \in \mathbb{R}\), and dual multipliers \(\lambda_{ij}^k, \lambda_{j}^m \in \mathbb{R}\) solving the (PSP) which is a MIP problem...
and shown in Appendix C provides the optimal solution \( \{\bar{Q}_j^m, \bar{X}_{ij}^k\} \).

Then,

\[
0 \geq \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in V} S_{1ijk} + \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{r \in \{15, 16\}} S_{rjk} + \sum_{j \in V} \sum_{r \in \{2, \ldots, 17\}} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{k \in K} \lambda_{ij}^k (x_{ik}^j - \bar{X}_{ij}^k)
+ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{m \in M} \lambda_{ij}^m (\bar{\omega}_{ij}^m - \bar{X}_{ij}^m)
\]

(12)

is a valid feasibility cut for the master problem.

With these stronger Benders cuts (11), (12) obtained, compared with the GBD method, the performance of proposed BDD method is theoretically enhanced, which will be validated in later simulation results. However, there are still some implementation details that need to be clarified in the following subsection.

C. Implementation Details of Benders Dual Decomposition Approach

Given the theoretical results clarified in Theorem 1, the solution of LP relaxation [MP] can derive stronger Benders cut than the solution of [MP] scenario.

1) Fractional solution: To quickly derive valid cuts, we first solve the LP relaxation of the [MP] with classical cuts, which is a strategy that was originally devised by McDaniel and Devine [20], [27].

2) Stronger cut generation: The strengthened Benders cuts (11), (12) are generated in the following steps, i) the value of dual multipliers \( \lambda \) is obtained by solving the [PSP] with the dual multipliers \( \lambda \), stronger Benders cuts are generated by solving [LSF] with classical cuts.

Thanks to the power of stronger optimality and feasibility cut, compared with the GBD method, the proposed BDD method holds a faster convergence rate for the entire solution process.

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, extensive simulations are carried out to validate a) the superiority of proposed bi-level model in saving the delivery cost for customer and reducing the operation cost for operator, as well as b) the performance of proposed BDD method in computation time savings and the reduction of the number of iteration compared with the GBD method.

A. Parameter Settings

Modified from the data set of Yao [28], we adopt the map data of Belgium, which records the geographic coordinates of 1000 nodes, and construct its transportation network. In terms of parameter settings, revenue from serving a request is set as $9.05\] and the usage cost for vehicle is set as $99\].

The following numerical experiments are all implemented 50 times for each instance [3] and statistical results are shown and analyzed. For example, when the size of network is 21, these 21 nodes will be randomly selected from the 1000-node map at each run of simulation experiments. In this case, due to the different road topology of randomly selected nodes, the performance of BDD method on different road topology is evaluated. Besides, for brevity, the inconvenience function is modeled as a two-segment piecewise linear function in simulations. \( \bar{I}(\delta_j) = \max_{n \in \{1, 2\}} \gamma_n \delta_j + \chi_n \). Note that the inconvenience function can be easily extended to any form of convex optimization problem as explained in above theoretical analysis. In addition, Table I showcases the details of numerical data. All optimization methods are implemented with Python 3.7 on Intel Core i9-10980XE CPU 3.00GHz \times 36 with 64 GB of memory.

Table I: Numerical data for simulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The slope of the inconvenience function</td>
<td>( \gamma_{1, 2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intercept of the inconvenience function</td>
<td>( \chi_{1, 2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time flexibility</td>
<td>( \delta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle usage cost</td>
<td>( c_v )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery fee</td>
<td>( \ell_i )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Performance of Bi-level Model

Compared with the VRP model in Appendix D, the performance of BVRP is evaluated in terms of the operation cost reduction for fleet operator, and the delivery fee saving of customers.

1) The superiority of bi-level model in the operation cost reduction of fleet operator: As illustrated in Fig 2, comparison between the proposed BVRP and VRP showcases that the proposed bi-level optimization model has a good performance on the operation cost saving of fleet operator. Note that with the increase of the number of customers, the reduction of operation cost becomes larger, which can explained as that more customers potentially provides more time flexibility for the scheduling of vehicle routing problem.

Furthermore, to test the impact of the different degree of time sensitiveness of customers on the operation cost reductions, we carry out three sets of experiments with different value of \( \gamma = \{0.05, 0.5, 5\} \). Specifically, as illustrated in Fig 3, the value of average operation cost reductions becomes larger as the increase of the value of \( \gamma \). Since if the fleet operator wants to obtain time flexibility from these customers whose delivery time delay will cause more inconvenience for them, the fleet operator needs to provide the higher delivery fee discount.

The same reason applies to the simulation results of following delivery fee savings.

7Only considering 5 vehicles. The instances with more vehicles are evaluated in later subsection.

8The details concerning vehicle routing problem without incorporating time flexibility are represented in Appendix D.
2) The superiority of bi-level model in the delivery fee savings of customers: As shown in Fig. 3, the highest value of average delivery fee reductions of customers has exceeded 25%, which demonstrates the power of BVRP in the delivery fee reductions. In addition, the value of average delivery fee reductions becomes larger as the increase of the value of $\gamma$. The reason has been clarified in above subsection.

C. Performance of Proposed BDD Method

In this subsection, compared with the GBD method, the performance of proposed BDD method is evaluated in the following two aspects (i) the number of the iteration, (ii) and the computation time. Due to the power of stronger Benders cuts, the number of iteration of BDD method will be less than GBD method inherently, which has been illustrated in Fig. 4. Consequently, compared with the GBD method, the BDD method, which involves in the computation of mixed integer subproblem, still achieves better performances over all instances in terms of the computation time as illustrated in Fig. 5.

D. Parameter Sensitivity Test on The Time Flexibility

In order to investigate the impact of different length of time flexibility on the reduction of operation cost, and the delivery fee saving, we conduct 3 sets of experiments by increasing the value of $\delta$ from 0.5 hour to 1.5 hour. As shown in Fig. 6, the operation cost becomes smaller with the increase of $\delta$ over all instances, which reveals that the operation cost can be further reduced with more time flexibility obtained. As a result, the larger value of time flexibility will enable the customers to obtain the larger delivery fee saving, which is validated in Fig. 7.

---

9In Fig. 6 and 7 $\delta$ denotes the upper bound of the time flexibility $\Delta$. 

---

Fig. 2: The average operation cost reduction over 50 times of experiments

Fig. 3: The average delivery fee reduction over 50 times of experiments

Fig. 4: The average iteration number over 50 times of experiments

Fig. 5: The average computation time over 50 times of experiments

Fig. 6: The impact of $\delta$ on the reduction of operation cost

Fig. 7: The impact of $\Delta$ on the reduction of operation cost
decomposition method and Benders decomposition method, power of KKT optimality condition. As a result, the single-level vehicle routing problem can be exactly reformulated as a single-level vehicle routing problem by exploiting the inherent difficulties of bi-level optimization model, we aim to develop a bi-level optimization framework to characterize the vehicle routing problem with flexible time windows for the first time. Due to the computation speed.

VI. CONCLUSION

Considering the delivery time flexibility on the vehicle routing problem, this paper proposes a bi-level optimization framework to characterize the vehicle routing problem with flexible time windows for the first time. Due to the inherent difficulties of bi-level optimization model, we aim to exactly reformulate the bi-level vehicle routing problem as a single-level vehicle routing problem by exploiting the power of KKT optimality condition. As a result, the single-level vehicle routing problem is a MIP problem. Besides, an efficient algorithm combining the merits of Lagrangian dual decomposition method and Benders decomposition method, is devised to solve the resultant single-level vehicle routing problem. Finally, to evaluate the performance of the proposed bi-level optimization model and the solution method, extensive numerical experiments are conducted, which validate the effectiveness of proposed bi-level model on the operation cost saving of fleet operator and the delivery fee reduction of customers, and the efficacy of proposed solution algorithm on computation speed.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF LEMMA 1

Proof. The Benders cut is valid if any \((\Theta, x^k_{ij}, \Omega^m_{ij})\) satisfying

\[
\Theta \geq \min_{x_{prop}} \left\{ \sum_{j \in V} \sum_{i \in V} \eta_j \left[ \Theta^k_i + \lambda^k_{ij} \Omega^m_{ij} \right] \right\}
\]

also satisfies the cut. Given any \((\Theta, x^k_{ij}, \Omega^m_{ij})\) satisfying the above inequality, we have

\[
\Theta \geq \min_{x_{prop}} \left\{ \sum_{j \in V} \sum_{i \in V} \eta_j - \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{k \in K} \lambda^k_{ij} x^k_{ij} \right\}
\]

Fig. 7: The impact of \(\delta\) on the savings of delivery fee

Fig. 8: The scalability of proposed BDD method

\[
\bar{\gamma}^m_{ij} \geq \gamma^m_{ij} - \Theta^k_{ij} - \lambda^k_{ij} \Omega^m_{ij}
\]

where the second line follows from weak duality and the fourth line follows from the optimality of \((\tilde{\eta}_j, \tilde{\lambda}^k_{ij}, \tilde{\Omega}^m_{ij})\). Thus, the proposed Benders cut is valid.
APPENDIX B

Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Given feasible linearization relaxation solution of master problem \( \omega_j^{m^*}, x_{ij}^{k^*} \), and \( \lambda^{jm}, \hat{\lambda}^{ijk} \), we have

\[
\Theta \geq \max_{\lambda^{jm}, \lambda^{jk}} \left\{ \sum_{j \in R} \sum_{m \in M} \lambda^{jm} \omega_j^{m^*} + \sum_{i,j \in V} \sum_{k \in K} \hat{\lambda}^{ijk} x_{ij}^{k^*} \right\} + \min_{\lambda^{jk}} \left\{ \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i,j \in V} \sum_{m \in M} \eta_j - \sum_{i,j \in V} \sum_{k \in K} \hat{\lambda}^{ijk} \lambda^{jk} \right\}
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{j \in R} \sum_{m \in M} \lambda^{jm} \omega_j^{m^*} + \sum_{i,j \in V} \sum_{k \in K} \hat{\lambda}^{ijk} x_{ij}^{k^*} + \min_{\lambda^{jk}} \left\{ \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i,j \in V} \sum_{m \in M} \eta_j - \sum_{i,j \in V} \sum_{k \in K} \hat{\lambda}^{ijk} \lambda^{jk} \right\}
\]

\[
\Xi = \min_{\lambda^{jk}} \left\{ \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i,j \in V} \sum_{m \in M} \eta_j - \sum_{i,j \in V} \sum_{k \in K} \hat{\lambda}^{ijk} \lambda^{jk} \right\}
\]

Note that the second inequation and third inequation corresponds to strengthened and classic generalized Benders optimality cut respectively. These two optimality cuts are in parallel due to the same slope of these optimality cuts. We use

\[
\Xi = \min_{\lambda^{jk}} \left\{ \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i,j \in V} \sum_{m \in M} \eta_j - \sum_{i,j \in V} \sum_{k \in K} \hat{\lambda}^{ijk} \lambda^{jk} \right\}
\]

\[
- \sum_{j \in R} \sum_{m \in M} \lambda^{jm} \omega_j^{m^*} \bigg|_{[\mathbf{6} - \mathbf{7}]} \bigg| \hat{\lambda}^{ijk} \omega_j^{m^*} \in \mathbb{B} \bigg) \bigg\}
\]

\[
- \sum_{j \in V} \sum_{k \in K} \hat{\lambda}^{ijk} \omega_j^{m^*} \bigg|_{[\mathbf{6} - \mathbf{7}]} \bigg| \hat{\lambda}^{ijk} \omega_j^{m^*} \in \mathbb{B} \bigg) \bigg\}
\]

\[
\text{APPENDIX C}
\]

Feasibility subproblem of Benders dual decomposition method

We denote the decision variables set of feasibility subproblem by \( X_{fsp} = \{ S \in \mathcal{R}_+, \mathcal{X} \setminus \{ x_{ij}^{k^*}, \omega_j^{m^*} \}, \mathcal{X}^{k^*}, \Omega_j^{m^*} \} \).
\begin{align*}
t_j & \geq t_i + x_{i,j} - M (1 - x_{i,j}), \\
\forall i & \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{v_0\}, j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus v_1, k \in K \\
\tau_j & \leq t_j, \forall j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus v_1
\end{align*}
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