

**A NEW HYBRID METAHEURISTIC
TECHNIQUE BASED ON GREY WOLF
OPTIMIZATION, SYMBIOTIC ORGANISM
SEARCH, AND ANT COLONY OPTIMIZATION
FOR SOLVING MULTI-OBJECTIVE VEHICLE
ROUTING PROBLEMS**

MAXSARY

**ASIA e UNIVERSITY
2025**

A NEW HYBRID METAHEURISTIC TECHNIQUE BASED ON GREY
WOLF OPTIMIZATION, SYMBIOTIC ORGANISM SEARCH, AND ANT
COLONY OPTIMIZATION FOR SOLVING MULTI-OBJECTIVE
VEHICLE ROUTING PROBLEMS

MAXSIRY

A Thesis Submitted to Asia e University in
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

July 2025

ABSTRACT

The Vehicle Routing Problem (VRP) presents a critical challenge in logistics and transportation, requiring optimisation techniques that minimise travel distances and costs while ensuring efficient delivery operations. The objectives of the multi-objective VRP addressed in this study are to minimise the total travel distance and the overall transportation cost. This study developed a hybrid metaheuristic algorithm involving grey wolf optimization, symbiotic organism search, and ant colony optimization (HMGSA) to address the multi-objective VRP. The hybridisation mechanism combines the global exploration strength of GWO, the solution refinement capability of SOS, and the effective path construction of ACO into an integrated search strategy. The algorithm was first developed and tested using a standard benchmark dataset (Dantzig42), which was selected due to its standard usage in VRP research and its suitability for performance comparison owing to its structured complexity. The results were followed by actual shipment data from PT Pos Indonesia's Boyolali to evaluate its consistency, computational efficiency, and solution quality. The real-world dataset consists of 19 delivery nodes, 2 available vehicles, and operational time-window constraints between 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM. Experimental results demonstrated that HMGSA consistently produced reliable, stable, and high-quality routing solutions across various configurations, with systematic convergence behaviour and effective minimisation of travel distance. The outcome of the first research objective shows that the algorithm exhibited strong performance in generating consistent optimisation outcomes with structured convergence and minimal performance fluctuation under both standard tests and real-world conditions. For objective two, three routing strategies were evaluated. Based on a single-vehicle optimal route, the algorithm provided the shortest distance, 91.74 km. However, the single-vehicle route has limited operational scalability. A hub-based Strategy was introduced to improve workload distribution at the expense of an increase in the total travel distance of 119.56 km. The Multi-Vehicle Routing Optimisation strategy proved the most operationally effective despite a longer distance of 182.23 km by allowing two vehicles to operate independently from a shared depot, achieving faster delivery and a balanced workload. Finally, for the third objective, five multi-objective optimisation strategies were applied. Among them, Performance-Based Adaptive Weighting emerged as the most effective technique, achieving the lowest multi-objective fitness score of 611,910.39 while maintaining route stability. Complementary approaches, including the Weighted Sum Method, Pareto-based Trade-Offs, Pareto Front Evaluation, and Hybrid Greedy HMGSA, further supported its performance. Beyond its application in the Boyolali case, validation through benchmark datasets and various optimisation strategies confirms that HMGSA can be applied to other logistics routing scenarios across different operational contexts. HMGSA has shown to be reliable and, therefore, an adaptable solution for various distribution systems. The findings also highlight the applicability of HMGSA in real-world courier services, contributing theoretically and practically to logistics optimisation. The hybrid approach presented in this study offers a scalable and adaptable solution for large-scale VRP problems, paving the way for future research on hybrid metaheuristics in logistics and supply chain management.

Keywords: Hybrid metaheuristics, Vehicle Routing Problem (VRP), Grey Wolf optimization, logistics optimisation, multi-objective optimisation

APPROVAL

This is to certify that this thesis conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in quality and scope, for the fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

The student has been supervised by: **Professor Dr Titik Khawa Abdul Rahman**

The thesis has been examined and endorsed by:

Professor Dr Nooritawati binti MD Tahir,

Asia e University

Examiner 1

Professor Ts Dr Mokhairi Makhtar,

Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin

Examiner 2

This thesis was submitted to Asia e University and is accepted as fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.



Professor Dr Siow Heng Loke

Asia e University

Chairperson, Examination Committee

(1 July 2025)

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy is my own work and that all contributions from any other persons or sources are properly and duly cited. I further declare that the material has not been submitted either in whole or in part, for a degree at this or any other university. In making this declaration, I understand and acknowledge any breaches in this declaration constitute academic misconduct, which may result in my expulsion from the programme and/or exclusion from the award of the degree.

Name: Maxi Ary

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Maxi Ary', written over a large, loopy initial 'M'.

Signature of Student:

Date: 1 July 2025

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All praise and gratitude are due to Allah Subhanahu wa Ta'ala for His endless mercy and guidance, without which this doctoral dissertation would not have been completed. The author sincerely thanks his beloved family for their unwavering support, patience, and prayers throughout this academic journey. Heartfelt appreciation is extended to the dissertation supervisor and co-author for their collaborative mentorship, constructive feedback, and continuous encouragement in developing the HMGSA model and completing this work. The author also gratefully acknowledges Asia e University for providing an academic platform to pursue doctoral studies and Universitas Adhirajasa Reswara Sanjaya (ARS University), the author's home institution, for granting official study leave and supporting the completion of this dissertation. Special thanks go to PT Pos Indonesia, Boyolali Branch, for granting access to valuable logistics data, which served as a crucial component in the validation of the proposed optimisation model. This dissertation reflects an integration of applied research and academic guidance. In preparing this work, several digital tools were utilised to improve the quality and clarity of both research and writing: MATLAB (R2024a) for simulation and analysis; Grammarly for enhancing grammar and writing precision; and ChatGPT (OpenAI, GPT-4) for refining idea structuring and language. The author has thoroughly reviewed and edited all outputs produced using these tools and takes full responsibility for the content and findings presented herein.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
APPROVAL	iii
DECLARATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xx
LIST OF ABBREVIATION	xxxvi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.1.1 State of the Art in VRP Optimisation	7
1.1.2 Need for a New Method: HMGSA for VRP	9
1.2 Problem Statement	11
1.3 Research Objectives	15
1.4 Research Questions	15
1.5 Novelty of The Research	17
1.6 Justifications and Significance of the Study	18
1.6.1 Theoretical Contributions	19
1.6.2 Practical Contributions	19
1.6.3 Contribution to the Methodology	20
1.7 Justification for Selecting HMGSA	20
1.8 Chapter Summary	22
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	24
2.0 Introduction	24
2.1 Logistic and Transportation Challenges	26
2.1.1 Definition and Scope of Logistics	27
2.1.2 Logistics Cost Classification	28
2.1.3 Logistics Performance Index (LPI)	30
2.2 Travelling Salesman Problem (TSP)	32
2.2.1 Mathematical Formulation of TSP	32
2.2.2 TSP as a Basic for VRP	34
2.3 Vehicle Routing Problem (VRP)	35
2.3.1 Mathematical Formulation of VRP	38
2.3.2 Variants of VRP	40
2.3.3 Capacitated Vehicle Routing Problem (CVRP)	41
2.3.4 VRP Applications in Real-World Logistics	44
2.3.5 VRP for Courier Services in Indonesia	45
2.3.6 Distance-Based Transportation Cost Model	51
2.3.7 Equirectangular Projection for Distance Calculation	52
2.4 Approaches to Solving VRP	55
2.4.1 Heuristic-Based Methods for VRP	56
2.4.2 Non-Metaheuristic Optimisation Techniques	61
2.4.3 Metaheuristic Approaches for VRP	63
2.4.4 Hybrid Optimisation Technique	78

2.4.5	Hybrid Metaheuristics for VRP Optimisation	81
2.4.6	Hybrid Metaheuristic HMGSA for VRP	89
2.5	Operational Research System (ORS) in VRP	112
2.5.1	ORS Models for Vehicle Routing and Logistics Planning	112
2.5.2	Comparison between ORS and Metaheuristics Approaches	113
2.6	Previous Research on Solving VRP	115
2.6.1	Literature Review of Solving VRP	116
2.6.2	Benchmark Datasets in VRP Research	123
2.6.3	Positioning The Current Research	124
2.6.4	Foundational Metaheuristics Supporting Hybrid VRP Solutions	124
2.7	Identifying Research Gap (Method and Application)	127
2.7.1	Gaps in Methodological Approaches	127
2.7.2	Gaps in Real-World Applications	129
2.8	Chapter Summary	133
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY		135
3.0	Introduction	135
3.1	Operation Definition	135
3.1.1	Definition of the HMGSA Algorithm	136
3.1.2	Definition of Key Variables	136
3.1.3	Data Processing and Preprocessing	140
3.1.4	Evaluation Metrics	142
3.2	Research Design	143
3.2.1	Research Phases	143
3.2.2	Research Approach	151
3.3	Data Collection	153
3.3.1	Post Office Location Data and Distance Matrix	154
3.3.2	Depot Location	155
3.3.3	Distance Matrix	156
3.3.4	Demand Data	157
3.3.5	Average Daily Volume	158
3.3.6	Vehicle Capacity	159
3.3.7	Operational Cost	160
3.4	Methodological Framework	167
3.4.1	Fitness Function Design	167
3.4.2	Constraint Modelling and Feasibility Integration	168
3.4.3	Parameter Sensitivity Analysis for All Algorithms	169
3.4.4	Runtime vs. Problem Size: Scalability Evaluation	170
3.4.5	Multi-Objective Optimisation and Pareto Front	171
3.5	Development of Optimisation Technique based on GWO, SOS, ACO and their Hybrids	172
3.5.1	Development of GWO to Minimise Total Distance	172
3.5.2	Development of SOS to Minimise Total Distance	178
3.5.3	Development of ACO to Minimise Total Distance	185
3.5.4	Development of a Hybrid GWO-SOS to Minimise Total Distance	192

3.5.5	Development of a Hybrid GWO-ACO to Minimise Total Distance	202
3.5.6	Development of a Hybrid SOS-ACO to Minimise Total Distance	211
3.5.7	Development of a HMGSA to Minimise Total Distance	222
3.5.8	Development of the Best Algorithm to Minimize Total Distance	237
3.6	Optimisation Process using HMGSA	239
3.6.1	Initialisation Phase	239
3.6.2	Exploration and Exploitation	241
3.6.3	Iterative Optimisation Process	243
3.6.4	Final Solution Selection	245
3.7	Method of Analysis	247
3.7.1	Comparative Algorithm Performance Analysis	247
3.7.2	Multi-Objective Trade-Off Analysis	248
3.7.3	Sensitivity and Robustness Testing	249
3.8	Determining the Total Distance and the Best Route based on HMGSA in the Existing Courier Company	249
3.8.1	Data Application and Route Initialization	250
3.8.2	Fitness Function Evaluation	251
3.8.3	Iterative Optimization and Route Refinement	253
3.8.4	Selection of the Best Route	255
3.8.5	Practical Implementation in PT Pos Indonesia	257
3.9	Development and Optimisation of The Multi-Objective VRP using HMGSA: Minimising Distance and Delivery Cost	259
3.9.1	Objective Functions in the Multi-Objective Model	259
3.9.2	Application of the HMGSA Algorithm to Multi-Objective Optimisation	262
3.9.3	Trade-Off Analysis and Pareto-Optimal Solutions	264
3.9.4	Selection of the Optimal Solution	266
3.9.5	Practical Implementation and Expected Impact	267
3.10	Chapter Summary	268
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION		270
4.0	Introduction	270
4.1	Results of the Development and Implementation of Optimisation Techniques based on GWO, SOS, ACO and Their Hybrids for Solving the VRP	271
4.1.1	Distance Matrix	273
4.1.2	Minimising Total Distance based on GWO	274
4.1.3	Minimising Total Distance based on SOS	292
4.1.4	Minimising Total Distance based on ACO	313
4.1.5	Minimising Total Distance using Hybrid GWO and SOS Algorithm (GWO-SOS)	333
4.1.6	Minimising Total Distance using Hybrid GWO and ACO Algorithm (GWO-ACO)	366
4.1.7	Minimising Total Distance using Hybrid SOS and ACO Algorithm (SOS-ACO)	399

4.1.8	Minimising Total Distance using Hybrid GWO, SOS and ACO Algorithm (HMGSA)	430
4.1.9	The Best Algorithm for Minimising Total Distance	459
4.2	HMGSA Algorithm for Determining the Best Route with the Minimum Total Distance in Solving the VRP in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	492
4.2.1	Single Optimal Route Analysis using HMGSA in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	508
4.2.2	Practical Considerations for Implementing the Optimal Route in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	510
4.2.3	Proposed Routing Strategies for VRP in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region Practical Considerations for Implementing the Optimal Route in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	512
4.2.4	Routing Strategy using HMGSA in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	514
4.2.5	Multi-Vehicle Routing Optimisation using HMGSA in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	528
4.2.6	Comparative Analysis of Single Optimal Route, Hub-Based, and Multi-Vehicle Routing Optimisation using HMGSA in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	537
4.2.7	Evaluation of Routing Strategies using HMGSA: Single, Hub-Based, and Multi-Vehicle Optimisation in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	541
4.3	Results of the Development and Optimisation of the Multi-Objective VRP using HMGSA: Minimising Distance and Delivery Cost in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	554
4.3.1	Mathematical Modeling of the Multi-Objective VRP	555
4.3.2	Distance and Transportation Cost Matrix Representation in VRP Modelling	558
4.3.3	Weighted Sum Method to Weight Determination in Multi-Objective Optimisation	564
4.3.4	Performance-Based Adaptive Weighting in Multi-Objective Optimisation	573
4.3.5	Pareto-Based Trade-Off Strategy to Weight Determination in Multi-Objective Optimisation	583
4.3.6	Pareto-Front Evaluation and Solution Selection in Multi-Objective Optimisation	599
4.3.7	Optimisation of the Multi-Objective VRP using HMGSA: Minimising Distance and Delivery Cost in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	616
4.3.8	Comparison of Multi-Objective VRP Optimisation Results using HMGSA: Minimising Distance and Delivery Cost in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	625
4.3.9	Evaluation of Multi-Objective VRP Optimisation Results using HMGSA: Minimising Distance and Delivery Cost in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	630
4.4	Chapter Summary	637

CHAPTER 5	CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	639
5.0	Introduction	639
5.1	Conclusion	639
5.2	Research Contribution	646
	5.2.1 Theoretical Contributions	646
	5.2.2 Practical Contributions	647
5.3	Limitation of The Study	647
5.4	Recommendation for Future Research	648
	REFERENCES	650
	APPENDICES	663
	Appendix A	663
	Appendix B	667
	Appendix C	698
	Appendix D	731

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
Table 1.1	Comparative Analysis of Metaheuristics used in HMGSA for VRP Optimisation	10
Table 1.2	The Relation between the Problem Statement and Research Question to the Objective Research	16
Table 2.1	Logistics Cost Breakdown in Indonesia (2023–2024)	29
Table 2.2	Differences in Features between TSP and VRP	35
Table 2.3	Boyolali Regional VI Semarang Branch Post Office (KPC) 57300	45
Table 2.4	Node Assignment for KPC Boyolali to Support Graph Modelling	47
Table 2.5	Comparison of Common Distance Calculation Methods	53
Table 2.6	Cartesian Coordinates of Post Office based on Equirectangular Projection	55
Table 2.7	Summary of Heuristic-Based Methods for VRP	60
Table 2.8	Examples of Hybrid Optimisation Algorithms	79
Table 2.9	Comparison of Hybrid Metaheuristics for VRP	87
Table 2.10	Key Feature Comparison Between HMGSA and GWO-SOS Hybrid Metaheuristics for VRP	107
Table 2.11	Key Feature Comparison Between HMGSA and GWO-ACO Hybrid Metaheuristics for VRP	108
Table 2.12	Key Feature Comparison Between HMGSA and SOS-ACO Hybrid Metaheuristics for VRP	109

Table 2.13	Performance Evaluation Metrics for Hybrid Metaheuristics in Vehicle Routing Problem Optimisation	110
Table 2.14	Comparison Between Operational Research System (ORS) and Metaheuristic Approaches in VRP Optimisation	114
Table 2.15	Summary of Previous Studies on VRP Algorithms	116
Table 2.16	Common Benchmark Datasets in VRP Research	123
Table 2.17	Selected Foundational Metaheuristics in Optimisation Research	125
Table 2.18	Ranked Research Gaps Based on Impact on Real-World VRP Applications	131
Table 3.1	Summary of Evaluation Metrics	142
Table 3.2	Mapping of Research Objectives, Approaches, Activities, and Expected Outcomes	147
Table 3.3	Experimental Research Design Overview	152
Table 3.4	Post Office Location and Coordinates	154
Table 3.5	Distance Matrix between Post Offices in Boyolali Region (km) based on Google Maps Routes	156
Table 3.6	Demand Report for Post Offices in Boyolali – July 2024	157
Table 3.7	Average Daily Volume for Post Offices in Boyolali – July 2024	158
Table 3.8	Vehicle Capacity for Post Office Deliveries	160
Table 3.9	Summary of Fixed Costs for Pos Office Deliveries	163
Table 3.10	Summary of Variable Cost Components for Post Office Deliveries	165
Table 4.1	Distance Matrix (km) in VRP Nodes	274
Table 4.2	GWO Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 10 Wolves and 50 Iterations	275

Table 4.3	GWO Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 50 Wolves and 100 Iterations	278
Table 4.4	GWO Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 100 Wolves and 200 Iterations	281
Table 4.5	GWO Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 10 Wolves and 50 Iterations	284
Table 4.6	GWO Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 50 Wolves and 100 Iterations	287
Table 4.7	GWO Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 100 Wolves and 200 Iterations	289
Table 4.8	SOS Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 10 Organisms and 50 Iterations	293
Table 4.9	SOS Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 50 Organisms and 100 Iterations	297
Table 4.10	SOS Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 100 Organisms and 200 Iterations	300
Table 4.11	SOS Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 10 Organisms and 50 Iterations	303
Table 4.12	SOS Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 50 Organisms and 100 Iterations	307
Table 4.13	SOS Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 100 Organisms and 200 Iterations	310
Table 4.14	ACO Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 10 Ants and 50 Iterations	313

Table 4.15	ACO Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 50 Ants and 100 Iterations	317
Table 4.16	Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 100 Ants and 200 Iterations	321
Table 4.17	ACO Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 10 Ants and 50 Iterations	325
Table 4.18	ACO Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 50 Ants and 100 Iterations	328
Table 4.19	ACO Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 100 Ants and 200 Iterations	331
Table 4.20	GWO-SOS Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 10 Wolves, 10 Organisms and 50 Iterations	335
Table 4.21	GWO-SOS Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 50 Wolves, 50 Organisms and 100 Iterations	342
Table 4.22	GWO-SOS Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 100 Wolves, 100 Organisms and 200 Iterations	349
Table 4.23	GWO-SOS Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 10 Wolves, 10 Organisms and 50 Iterations	356
Table 4.24	GWO-SOS Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 50 Wolves, 50 Organisms and 100 Iterations	359
Table 4.25	GWO-SOS Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 100 Wolves, 100 Organisms and 200 Iterations	363
Table 4.26	GWO-ACO Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 10 Wolves, 10 Ants and 50 Iterations	367

Table 4.27	GWO-ACO Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 50 Wolves, 50 Ants and 100 Iterations	374
Table 4.28	GWO-ACO Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 100 Wolves, 100 Ants and 200 Iterations	381
Table 4.29	GWO-ACO Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 10 Wolves, 10 Ants and 50 Iterations	388
Table 4.30	GWO-ACO Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 50 Wolves, 50 Ants and 100 Iterations	392
Table 4.31	GWO-ACO Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 100 Wolves, 100 Ants and 200 Iterations	396
Table 4.32	SOS-ACO Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 10 Organisms, 10 Ants and 50 Iterations	400
Table 4.33	SOS-ACO Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 50 Organisms, 50 Ants and 100 Iterations	406
Table 4.34	SOS-ACO Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 100 Organisms, 100 Ants and 200 Iterations	412
Table 4.35	SOS-ACO Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 10 Organisms, 10 Ants and 50 Iterations	419
Table 4.36	SOS-ACO Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 50 Organisms, 50 Ants and 100 Iterations	422
Table 4.37	SOS-ACO Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 100 Organisms, 100 Ants and 200 Iterations	426
Table 4.38	HMGSA Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 10 Wolves, 10 Organisms, 10 Ants and 50 Iterations	431

Table 4.39	HMGSA Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 50 Wolves, 50 Organisms, 50 Ants and 100 Iterations	437
Table 4.40	HMGSA Results for Dantzig42 Dataset using 100 Wolves, 100 Organisms, 100 Ants and 200 Iterations	444
Table 4.41	HMGSA Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 10 Wolves, 10 Organisms, 10 Ants and 50 Iterations	449
Table 4.42	HMGSA Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 50 Wolves, 50 Organisms, 50 Ants and 100 Iterations	452
Table 4.43	HMGSA Results for Boyolali Branch Dataset using 100 Wolves, 100 Organisms, 100 Ants and 200 Iterations	456
Table 4.44	Performance Comparison of GWO, SOS, ACO, and Hybrid GWO-SOS, GWO-ACO, SOS-ACO, HMGSA Models on Dantzig42 Dataset	462
Table 4.45	Performance Comparison of GWO, SOS, ACO, and Hybrid GWO-SOS, GWO-ACO, SOS-ACO, HMGSA Models on Boyolali Branch Dataset	477
Table 4.46	PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region Locations with Geographic Coordinates and Cartesian Transformations	493
Table 4.47	Distance Matrix of PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	495
Table 4.48	HMGSA Results for PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region using 10 Wolves, 10 Organisms, 10 Ants, and 100 Iteration	497
Table 4.49	HMGSA Results for PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region using 50 Wolves, 50 Organisms, 50 Ants, and 100 Iteration	501
Table 4.50	HMGSA Results for PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region using 100 Wolves, 100 Organisms, 100 Ants, and 100 Iteration	505

Table 4.51	Performance Comparison of HMGSA on PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	510
Table 4.52	HMGSA Results for Boyolali Post Office Hub using 50 Wolves, 50 Organisms, 50 Ants, and 100 Iteration	516
Table 4.53	HMGSA Results for Mojosongo Post Office Hub using 50 Wolves, 50 Organisms, 50 Ants, and 100 Iteration	521
Table 4.54	HMGSA Results for Two-Vehicle using 50 Wolves, 50 Organisms, 50 Ants, and 100 Iteration	532
Table 4.55	Performance Metrics and Computational Results of Routing Strategies in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	539
Table 4.56	Evaluation of Routing Strategies using HMGSA – Single, Hub- Based, and Multi-Vehicle Optimisation in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	542
Table 4.57	Calculation of Transportation Costs Based on Distance and Demand	564
Table 4.58	Optimisation Results of Multi-Objective HMGSA using Weighted Sum Method for Route Planning in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	569
Table 4.59	Comparison Weight Sum Method and Performance-Based Adaptive Weighting	576
Table 4.60	Optimisation Results of Multi-Objective HMGSA using Performance-Based Adaptive Weighting for Route Planning in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	578

Table 4.61	Optimisation Results of Multi-Objective HMGSA using Pareto-Based Trade-Off Strategy for Distance and Cost in VRP at PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	589
Table 4.62	Alternative Optimisation Results of Multi-Objective HMGSA using Pareto-Based Trade-Off Strategy for Distance and Cost in VRP at PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	590
Table 4.63	Optimisation Results of Multi-Objective HMGSA using Pareto-Front for Distance and Cost in VRP at PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	603
Table 4.64	Alternative Optimisation Results of Multi-Objective HMGSA using Pareto-Front for Distance and Cost in VRP at PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	606
Table 4.65	Optimised Route for Distance Minimisation using Greedy Approach in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	619
Table 4.66	Optimised Route for Cost Minimisation using Greedy Approach in PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	620
Table 4.67	Trade-Off Results for Greedy Distance Minimisation Route	623
Table 4.68	Trade-Off Results for Greedy Cost Minimisation Route	625
Table 4.69	Comparison of Multi-Objective VRP Optimisation Methods using HMGSA	628

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
Figure 1.1	Logistic Distribution Network of PT Pos Indonesia Boyolali Region	6
Figure 2.1	Relationship between TSP and VRP	37
Figure 2.2	Sample of Solving VRP	39
Figure 2.3	Example of CVRP as a Directed Graph	43
Figure 2.4	Node Code for each KPC in the Boyolali Area	48
Figure 2.5	The Results of the Analysis Conducted, the Route of the Visit that should be used by The Boyolali Post Office	50
Figure 2.6	Social Hierarchy of Grey Wolves	67
Figure 3.1	Flowchart of GWO Algorithm	175
Figure 3.2	Flowchart of SOS Algorithm	181
Figure 3.3	Flowchart of ACO Algorithm	187
Figure 3.4	Flowchart of The Hybrid GWO-SOS Algorithm	198
Figure 3.5	Flowchart of the Hybrid GWO-ACO Algorithm	207
Figure 3.6	Flowchart of the Hybrid SOS-ACO Algorithm	218
Figure 3.7	Flowchart HMGSA Algorithm	232
Figure 4.1	Graphical Representation of Route 6 using 10 Wolves and 50 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 1821 km	276
Figure 4.2	Convergence Performance of GWO for Route 6 using 10 Wolves and 50 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	277

Figure 4.3	Graphical Representation of Route 4 using 50 Wolves and 100 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 1726 km	279
Figure 4.4	Convergence Performance of GWO for Route 4 using 50 Wolves and 100 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	280
Figure 4.5	Graphical Representation of Route 16 using 100 Wolves and 200 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 1555 km	282
Figure 4.6	Convergence Performance of GWO for Route 16 using 100 Wolves and 200 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	283
Figure 4.7	Graphical Representation of Route 17 using 10 Wolves and 50 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 57.90 km	285
Figure 4.8	Convergence Performance of GWO for Route 17 using 10 Wolves and 50 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	286
Figure 4.9	Graphical Representation of Route 18 using 50 Wolves and 100 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 57.90 km	288
Figure 4.10	Convergence Performance of GWO for Route 18 using 50 Wolves and 100 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	289
Figure 4.11	Graphical Representation of Route 18 using 100 Wolves and 200 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 57.90 km	291
Figure 4.12	Convergence Performance of GWO for Route 18 using 100 Wolves and 200 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	292

Figure 4.13	Graphical representation of Route 12 using 10 Organisms and 50 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 699 km	295
Figure 4.14	Convergence Performance of SOS for Route 12 using 10 Organisms and 50 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	296
Figure 4.15	Graphical representation of Route 15 using 50 Organisms and 100 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 699 km	298
Figure 4.16	Convergence Performance of SOS for Route 15 using 50 Organisms and 100 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	299
Figure 4.17	Graphical representation of Route 9 using 100 Organisms and 200 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 699 km	302
Figure 4.18	Convergence Performance of SOS for Route 9 using 100 Organisms and 200 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	303
Figure 4.19	Graphical representation of Route 8 using 10 Organisms and 50 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 61.50 km	305
Figure 4.20	Convergence Performance of SOS for Route 8 using 10 Organisms and 50 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	306
Figure 4.21	Graphical representation of Route 6 using 50 Organisms and 100 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 61.50 km	308
Figure 4.22	Convergence Performance of SOS for Route 6 using 10 Organisms and 50 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	309

Figure 4.23	Graphical representation of Route 6 using 100 Organisms and 200 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 61.50 km	311
Figure 4.24	Convergence Performance of SOS for Route 6 using 100 Organisms and 200 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	312
Figure 4.25	Graphical representation of Route 10 using 10 Ants and 50 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 723 km	315
Figure 4.26	Convergence Performance of ACO for Route 10 using 10 Ants and 50 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	316
Figure 4.27	Graphical representation of Route 15 using 10 Ants and 50 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 712 km	319
Figure 4.28	Convergence Performance of ACO for Route 15 using 10 Ants and 50 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	320
Figure 4.29	Graphical representation of Route 16 using 100 Ants and 200 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 706 km	323
Figure 4.30	Convergence Performance of ACO for Route 16 using 100 Ants and 200 Iterations Reaching the Optimal	324
Figure 4.31	Graphical representation of Route 9 using 10 Ants and 50 Iterations Showing the Efficient Sequence with a Total Distance of 57.90 km	326
Figure 4.32	Convergence Performance of ACO for Route 9 using 10 Ants and 50 Iterations Reaching the Optimal Solution	327