CONTENTS

Acknowledgement

List of Figures

List of Tables

Preface

1. Introduction **1**

1.1 Graphs 2

1.1.1 Types of Graphs 2

1.1.2 Application of Graphs 3

1.1.3 Graph Problems 4

1.2 Uncertainty in Real Life 7

1.3 Fuzzy Sets 7

1.4 Other Concepts Modelling Uncertainty 10

1.4.1 Rough Sets 10

1.4.2 Intuitionistic Fuzzy Sets or Vague Sets 11

1.4.3 Soft Sets 12

1.5 Related Work 13

1.6 Motivation 19

1.7 Research Contribution 19

1.8 Layout of Thesis 20

2. Fuzzy Numbers – Their Ranking Methods and Applications **22**

2.1 Introduction 23

2.2 Fuzzy Numbers 26

2.2.1 Quasi-Gaussian Fuzzy Number (QGFN) 27

2.2.2 Trapezoidal Fuzzy Number (TFN) 53

2.3 Max – Min Formulation for Orienteering Problem 77

2.3.1 Basic Definitions 78

2.3.2 Problem Definition 79

2.3.3 Fuzzy Formulation of OP 80

2.3.4 FOP Algorithm 83

2.3.5 Illustrative Example 84

2.3.6 Parallel Formulation of FOP 91

2.4 Conclusion 97

3. Intuitionistic Fuzzy Numbers and Intuitionistic Fuzzy Point 100

3.1 Introduction 102

3.2 Intuitionistic Fuzzy Numbers (IFN) 103

3.2.1 Trapezoidal Intuitionistic Fuzzy Number (TIFN) 104

3.2.2 Quasi-Gaussian Intuitionistic Fuzzy Number (QGIFN) 113

3.3 Max – Min Formulation for Intuitionistic Fuzzy Orienteering Problem 121

3.3.1 IFOP Algorithm 122

3.3.2 Illustrative Example 123

3.3.3 Work-depth Analysis of IFOP 128

3.4 Intuitionistic Fuzzy Metric Space using Intuitionistic Fuzzy Point 132

3.4.1 Intuitionistic Fuzzy Metric Space 133

3.4.2 Intuitionistic Fuzzy Orienteering Problem using Intuitionistic Fuzzy Points 137

3.5 Conclusion 143

4. Heuristic Algorithms for Graph Problems **145**

4.1 Introduction 147

4.2 Comparison of Selection Methods for Orienteering Problem 148

4.2.1 Selection Methods 149

4.2.2 Algorithm for Incomplete and Complete Graphs 151

4.2.3 Experimental Analysis 154

4.3 Roulette Wheel Selection based Heuristic Algorithm for the Orienteering Problem 161

4.3.1 Algorithm RWS_OP 163

4.3.2 Experimental Analysis 169

4.4 Flower Pollination Algorithm for Orienteering Problem 184

4.4.1 Algorithm FPA_OP 186

4.4.2 Experimental Analysis 188

4.5 Bidirectional Shortest Path Algorithm for the Constrained Shortest Path Problem with Good Average-Case Behavior 189

4.5.1 Algorithm 190

4.5.2 Experimental Analysis 194

4.6 Conclusion 197

5. Conclusion and Future Directions **199**

5.1 Concluding Remarks 200

5.2 Future Scope 203

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

COPIES OF PUBLISHED PAPERS

CURRICULUM VITAE

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. No.	Figure Title	Page No.
Fig. 1.1	Pictorial Representation of degree of membership	9
Fig. 2.1	Different shapes obtained by varying the value of fuzzification factor m	28
Fig. 2.2	Link Preference Index diagram	32
Fig. 2.3	Network for FSPP	36
Fig. 2.4	Ranking of paths in the network	40
Fig. 2.5	Network for FMST	44
Fig. 2.6	Fuzzy Minimum Spanning Tree for the given network	47
Fig. 2.7	Network for FSTP with Steiner points shown as double circles	48
Fig. 2.8	Fuzzy complete undirected distance graph G_1	50
Fig. 2.9	Fuzzy Minimal Spanning Tree $T_1 of\ G_1$	53
Fig. 2.10	Final Fuzzy Steiner Tree(T_{FS})	53
Fig. 2.11(a)	Behavior in terms of cost of shortest path shown by different ranking methods by varying the delay requirement on a random graph with 250 nodes generated by gengraph-win	66
Fig. 2.11(b)	Behavior in terms of path discretization error shown by different ranking methods by varying the delay requirement on a random graph with 250 nodes generated by gengraph-win	66
Fig. 2.11(c)	Behavior in terms of CPU Execution time shown by different ranking methods by varying the delay requirement on a random graph with 250 nodes generated by gengraph-win	67
Fig. 2.12	The point considered as Circumcenter of Centroid (COC) is shown by X	67
Fig. 2.13	A surface plot with the delay requirement, cost and CPU execution time of WF	68

Fig. 2.14	Box and Whisker plot showing the fuzzy cost as a TFN with four parameters at the delay requirement = 30 units	68
Fig. 2.15	Block diagram of a typical Wireless Sensor node (mote)	71
Fig. 2.16	A Wireless Sensor Network (WSN) represented as a Unit Disc Graph (UDG)	71
Fig. 2.17	Pictorial representation of trapezoidal fuzzy number	72
Fig. 2.18	(a) Behaviour of the CFSPP algorithm when applied on a graph with 200 nodes generated using gengraph-win with source (s) = 45 and target (t) = 68, (b) Comparison of the same behaviour for four different network sizes with source (s) = 4 and target (t) = 45	74
Fig. 2.19	Progress of the CFSPP algorithm in terms of energy consumption with a strict and a relaxed delay constraint when applied on a graph with 200 nodes generated using gengraph-win	76
Fig. 2.20	Progress of the CFSPP algorithm in terms of path delay with delay constraint= 350 when applied on a graph with 50, 100, 150, 200 nodes generated using gengraph-win	76
Fig. 2.21	Membership Function for total collected score of a path	82
Fig. 2.22	Membership Function for total time taken to traverse a path	82
Fig. 2.23	Fuzzy decision set Z *and* Z^*	83
Fig. 2.24	Input Graph $G(V, E)$ with source vertex = 1 and destination vertex = 5	84
Fig. 2.25	Several steps of the parallel formulation of FOP	92
Fig. 3.1	Trapezoidal intuitionistic fuzzy number (TIFN)	104
Fig. 3.2	The point of reference used for ranking a TIFN	107
Fig. 3.3	Behaviour shown by the cost of the shortest path on varying the input delay constraint for a graph with 200 nodes generated using *gengraph-win*	113
Fig. 3.4	Quasi-Gaussian Intuitionistic Fuzzy Number	115
Fig. 3.5	Centroid method of ranking for QGIFN	116

Fig. 3.6	Trend observed in the cost of the shortest path on varying the input delay constraint for a graph with 100 nodes generated using gengraph-win	121
Fig. 3.7	The input graph with $N = 5, v_1 = 1, v_N = 5$ and the time and score values associated with each edge and vertex respectively	123
Fig. 3.8	The sequential module executing step 1 of IFOP that computes all the distinct paths in the given graph G	130
Fig. 3.9	The parallel version of IFOP along with its work-depth analysis stating the work and depth value of each step	131
Fig. 3.10	Input graph G with number of nodes $(N) = 5$, source $(v_1) = 1$, target $(v_N) = 5$ and the co-ordinate values (intuitionistic fuzzy points) and the score values (trapezoidal intuitionistic fuzzy numbers) of each node	139
Fig. 4.1	Comparison of the maximum value of the total collected score obtained by four different selection methods for different T_{max} values (160 cities)	158
Fig. 4.2	Comparison of the maximum value of the total collected score obtained by four different selection methods for different T_{max} values (306 cities)	159
Fig. 4.3	Graph for (a) 160 cities and (b) 306 cities instance	160
Fig. 4.4	The process of selecting a path using roulette wheel selection function where the number in () denotes the probability of node selection	162
Fig. 4.5	Progression of RWS_OP algorithm for a graph with 25 nodes with source $(V_1) = 1$, destination $(V_N) = 25$ and $T_{max} = 70$	169
Fig. 4.6	Comparison of (a) maximum score and (b) mean score of each method with respect to time budget (T_{max})	173
Fig. 4.7	Comparison of execution time of each method with respect to time budget (T_{max}) based on 30 runs at $\alpha = 0.6$ for Real Road Network database with 306 cities of Poland	174
Fig. 4.8	Comparison of score with respect to α for (a) $T_{max} = 1500$ and (b) $T_{max} = 2500$ for a Real Road Network database with 306 cities of Poland	175
Fig. 4.9	Plots showing (a) utilization of the time budget and (b) increase in the total collected score at $\alpha = 0.6$ and $T_{max} = 1500$ for a Real Road Network database with 160 cities of Poland (c) Progression of RWS_OP algorithm	179

Fig. 4.10 Plots showing the observation of three different runs of RWS_OP with $\alpha = 0.2$ and $T_{max} = 1500$ for a Real Road Network database with 160 cities of Poland. As the algorithm progresses, it results in (a) decrease in the time budget and (b) increase in the total collected score as shown above 180

Fig. 4.11 Plots showing (a) utilization of the time budget and (b) increase in the total collected score for three different α values at $T_{max} = 1500$ for a Real Road Network database with 160 cities of Poland 181

Fig. 4.12 Plots showing (a) the percentage of nodes explored with the increase in T_{max} values at $\alpha = 0.6$ and (b) percentage of nodes explored and unexplored for different values of α at $T_{max} = 7000$ for a Real Road Network database with 160 cities of Poland for 30 runs 182

Fig. 4.13 Plot showing that RWS_OP can achieve higher total collected score for larger T_{max} values as compared to Ostrowski_CG and Ostrowski_IG methods when implemented on a Real Road Network database with 306 cities of Poland at $\alpha = 0.6$ 184

Fig. 4.14 Comparison of the total collected score value achieved by GRASP and FPA algorithms for different T_{max} values when applied on a graph with 102 nodes, source=1, destination=102 189

Fig. 4.15 Comparison of the average execution time (s) of the CSPP algorithm suggested by Chen *et al.* (2008) with the bidirectional search algorithm for different network sizes 197

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Table Title	Page No.
Table 2.1	LPI value and Ranks of different paths	39
Table 2.2	Initial values of the two arrays	46
Table 2.3	Initializing the LPI value of root node	46
Table 2.4	Status of the two arrays after the neighbours of root are explored	46
Table 2.5	Status of the two arrays after exploring the next node in the priority queue Q	46
Table 2.6	Final values returning the connections in MST	47
Table 2.7	Initial status of the two arrays	51
Table 2.8	LPI value for the root is initialized	52
Table 2.9	Showing the status of the two arrays after the neighbours of the root are explored	52
Table 2.10	Showing the final connections in the fuzzy minimal spanning tree $T_1 of\ G_1$	52
Table 2.11	The energy deviation from unconstrained optimum for increasing delay constraint	75
Table 2.12	The value of edge weights (time taken to travel from one node to another)	85
Table 2.13	The value of node weights (score values)	85
Table 2.14	The total time taken and total collected score for each of the paths	88
Table 2.15	The expected value of the total time taken to traverse the path and the total collected score for each of the paths	89

Table 2.16	The grade of membership of each possible path for both the membership functions of time and score	90
Table 2.17	Showing the ranks of the desirable paths	90
Table 3.1(a)	The values of total time taken and total collected score obtained for each possible path	125
Table 3.1(b)	The expected value for the total time taken and the total collected score of each possible path	126
Table 3.1(c)	The membership value for the total time taken and the total collected score for each possible path	127
Table 3.2	Ranks of the desirable paths	128
Table 3.3	The d_{ij} value of each edge	140
Table 3.4	The value of total distance covered and total score collected on traversing each path	141
Table 3.5	The solution set after discarding those paths that do not satisfy the distance bound (D_{max})	142
Table 3.6	Ranks assigned to the paths to determine the most desirable path	142
Table 4.1	Comparison of the mean and maximum value of the total collected score obtained by SEL_OP when executed with four different selection procedures for 160 cities	156
Table 4.2	Comparison of the mean and maximum value of the total collected score obtained by SEL_OP when executed with four different selection procedures for 306 cities	157
Table 4.3	Comparison of maximum, mean and confidence Interval (CI) for mean of scores obtained by RWS_OP (keeping $v_1 = v_N$ i.e., $v_1 = v_N = 1$) with those obtained by executing the Ostrowski's algorithm (Please refer (Ostrowski & Koszelew, 2011), their Table 5 for Ostrowski_CG and Table 7 for Ostrowski_IG) on Real Road Network database with 306 cities of Poland	172
Table 4.4	The Highest Score Collected, Mean of Score Collected, Mean Time to Traverse the Path and % of Time Budget Utilized values obtained by RWS_OP at $\alpha = 0.6$ (keeping $v_1 \neq v_N$ i.e., $v_1 = 1\ and\ v_N = 306$) when implemented on a Real Road Network database with 306 cities of Poland	176

Table 4.5 The Highest Score Collected, Mean of Score Collected, Mean Time to Traverse the Path and % of Time Budget Utilized values obtained by RWS_OP at $\alpha = 0.6$ (keeping $v_1 \neq v_N$ i.e., $v_1 = 1 \; and \; v_N = 160$) when implemented on a Real Road Network database with 160 cities of Poland 177

Table 4.6 The Highest Score Collected, Mean of Score Collected and confidence interval (CI) for Mean of Score Collected obtained by RWS_OP when implemented on a Real Road Network database with 306 cities of Poland for different T_{max} values at $\alpha = 0.6$ (keeping $v_1 = v_N$ i.e., $v_1 = v_N = 1$) 183