



Augmented Neural Networks and Problem-Structure Based Heuristics for the Bin-Packing Problem

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Systems Science</i>
Manuscript ID:	TSYS-2010-0126.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Kasap, Nihat; Sabanci University, Faculty of Management
Keywords:	Neural Networks < Artificial Intelligence, Optimization, Heuristics < Optimization
Keywords (author supplied):	Bin Packing

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 **Augmented Neural Networks and Problem-Structure Based**
14 **Heuristics for the Bin-Packing Problem**
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 ***Nihat Kasap***

26 *Faculty of Management, Sabanci University*
27 *Tuzla, 34956, Istanbul, Turkey*
28 *nihatk@sabanciuniv.edu*
29

30
31 *and*
32

33
34
35 ***Anurag Agarwal***

36 *Department of Information Systems and Decision Sciences*
37 *College of Business, University of South Florida*
38 *Sarasota, FL 34243, USA*
39 *agarwala@sar.usf.edu*
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Augmented Neural Networks and Problem-Structure Based Heuristics for the Bin-Packing Problem

Abstract

In this paper we report on a research project where we applied Augmented-neural-networks (AugNN) approach for solving the classical bin-packing problem (BPP). AugNN is a metaheuristic that combines a priority- rule heuristic with the iterative search approach of neural networks to generate good solutions fast. This is the first time this approach has been applied to the BPP. We also propose a decomposition approach for solving harder BPP, in which sub problems are solved using a combination of AugNN approach and heuristics that exploit the problem structure. We discuss the characteristics of problems on which such problem-structure based heuristics could be applied. We empirically show the effectiveness of the AugNN and the decomposition approach on many benchmark problems in the literature. For the 1210 benchmark problems tested, 917 problems were solved to optimality and the average gap between the obtained solution and the upper bound for all the problems was reduced to under 0.66% and computation time averaged below 33 seconds per problem. We also discuss the computational complexity of our approach.

Key Words: Bin Packing, Heuristics, Neural Networks, Optimization

1. Introduction

The one-dimensional bin-packing problem (BPP) involves minimizing the number of fixed-capacity bins required to pack n items of various sizes (or weights). This problem occurs frequently in distribution, production and task/resource allocation and cutting stock problems. For example, in distribution, packing containers for trucks/trains involves the BPP. In production, scheduling tasks on machines in shifts can be considered a BPP if we treat shifts as bins, and tasks as items. Like most optimization problems, the BPP belongs to the class of NP-hard problems (Garey and Johnson, 1979, Martello and Toth, 1990). Many heuristics and metaheuristics exist in the literature for generating good approximate solutions fast for the BPP. Heuristics are based on some kind of priority or dispatching rule such as 'first-fit descending' (FFD) or 'best-fit descending' (BFD). These heuristics produce good approximate solutions very fast and therefore can be applied to large problems, but they fail to make use of problem-specific structures and leave significant gaps from the optimal. Metaheuristics include iterative approaches such as tabu search, simulated annealing and genetic algorithms. These techniques find improved solutions, because they search a larger solution space. Depending on the number of iterations required, these metaheuristics may take very long and therefore not be suitable for solving very large problems in reasonable time.

In this paper we apply a neural-network based approach called Augmented Neural Networks (AugNN) for the BPP, and also a decomposition approach involving heuristics that exploit the problem structure. AugNN is a metaheuristic that takes advantage of both the heuristic and the iterative search approach. In this approach, the bin-packing problem is formulated as a neural network of input, hidden and output layer of nodes, with weights associated with links between nodes, much like in a neural network. Input, output and

1
2
3 activation functions are designed to (i) capture and enforce the constraints of the problem, and
4
5 (ii) apply a particular heuristic, such as FFD or BFD, to assign an item to a bin in each iteration.
6
7 After n iterations, or an epoch, n assignments take place and a feasible solution is generated.
8
9 Weights are modified after each epoch, allowing a neighboring feasible solution to be generated
10
11 in subsequent epochs. If improvements are found, the weights are reinforced, otherwise not.
12
13 After some epochs, the network learns a good set of weights that generate good solutions. Thus,
14
15 a non-deterministic local search is performed by perturbing the data using weights. This
16
17 approach was first introduced by Agarwal et al. (2003) for the task-scheduling problem.
18
19
20
21

22 We apply the AugNN approach in conjunction with two well-known heuristics, namely
23
24 FFD and BFD, on many benchmark problem sets in the literature. These problem sets fall under
25
26 three levels of difficulty – easy, medium and hard. For the easy and medium problems, the
27
28 AugNN approach found the best-known upper-bound solutions in 909 out of 1200 problems and
29
30 improved upon the heuristic solution on the remaining problems and gave an overall gap of
31
32 0.375% from known optimum solutions. For the hard benchmark problems, the AugNN
33
34 approach failed to provide very good results in reasonable time. For these hard problems, we
35
36 propose a decomposition approach in which we decompose the problem into sub problems and
37
38 solve the sub problems using heuristics that exploit the structure of the problem. Using this
39
40 decomposition strategy, upper-bound solutions were found for 8 out of 10 hard problems and
41
42 within 1 bin of the upper bound for the remaining 2 problems. All 10 solutions were found in
43
44 less than 0.25 seconds each.
45
46
47
48
49

50 We thus make a two-fold contribution to the bin-packing literature. First, we propose an
51
52 AugNN formulation for the first time for the BPP and show its effectiveness in terms of
53
54 improving upon a heuristic solution. Second, we propose new heuristics that exploit the
55
56 problem structure and solve the BPP using a decomposition strategy. Although the problem-
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 structure based heuristic, as the name suggests, may not be generalized, the lessons learnt from
4 solving the hard benchmark problems may be applied to other bin-packing problems. We
5 discuss the conditions under which some types of problem-structure based heuristics can be
6 applied.
7
8
9
10
11

12 The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the relevant bin-
13 packing literature. We explore the various heuristics used for this problem. In the following
14 section, we provide the details of the AugNN formulation for the BPP. We explain the neural-
15 network architecture for the BPP and present all the functions needed to solve the problem.
16 Search strategies are also discussed. Section 4 describes our decomposition approach, including
17 the problem-structure based heuristics for solving the hard benchmark problems. In Section 5,
18 we present our computational results. Section 6 provides the summary, conclusions and
19 suggestions for future research.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **2. Literature Review**

33
34

35 Since the BPP is NP-hard in the strong sense (Garey and Johnson, 1979), a polynomial time
36 algorithm to solve it optimally does not exist and is unlikely to be discovered in the future.
37 Scholl et al. (1997) provide a good survey of extant solution procedures, and also propose a new
38 heuristic that is a combination of tabu search and a branch-and-bound procedure based on
39 known and new bound arguments and a new branching scheme. They study the well-known
40 heuristics such as FFD, BFD, and worst fit descending (WFD) as well as the B2F heuristic,
41 which works like FFD until a bin is filled then tries to exchange the smallest item assigned to
42 the bin with two small-sized items not currently assigned such that the residual capacity is
43 decreased. Valerio de Carvalho (1999) gives an exact algorithm based on column generation
44 and branch-and-bound. Gupta and Ho (1999) give a heuristic called ‘minimum bin slack’ to
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 solve the BPP. This heuristic is bin centric. At each step, an attempt is made to find a set of
4
5 items (packing) that fits the bin capacity as much as possible. The worst-case performance of
6
7 heuristics for BPP has been studied in Anily et al. (1984).
8
9

10 Many metaheuristics have been proposed in the bin-packing literature, such as, genetic
11 algorithms (GAs), tabu search, simulated annealing (SA) and ant colonies (AC). However, no
12 study has focused on a neural-network approach in the bin-packing literature. In most cases
13 GAs were found to be relatively inefficient. As explained in (Reeves, 1995), the complexity of
14 the traditional GAs was high because of the length of the chromosome string required. Many of
15 the solutions generated in each generation were infeasible and checking the feasibility of each
16 generated solution was very time consuming. Reeves (1995) proposed hybrid GAs aimed at
17 improving the performance of traditional GAs. The performance improved for small size
18 problems, both in terms of probability of finding the optima and the processing time. However,
19 the solution quality for the larger size problems was not improved. Another GA approach was
20 used in (Corcoran and Wainwright, 1993). Performance is improved by using two mechanisms
21 - sliding window mechanism to identify highly fit sequences and reduction mechanism to
22 preserve fit sequences. Therefore, highly fit members can quickly dominate the population and
23 cause the GA to converge more quickly. SA approach has also been used in (Brusco et al, 1997,
24 Rao and Iyengar, 1994). The performance of SA with morphing is sensitive to parameter
25 choices. They have shown that no single version of their heuristic particularly dominates other
26 procedures in terms of solution quality. However, there is a notable difference in performance
27 associated with the different cooling factors.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Several new heuristics for solving the one-dimensional BPP are presented in (Fleszar
53 and Hindi, 2002; Singh and Gupta, 2007; Stawowy, 2008; Tambouratzis, 2001). Some
54 improvements on minimal-bin-slack heuristic have been made. They show that their heuristics
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 are very efficient even though they have high computational complexity. Variable
4 neighborhood search has also been developed and used in (Fleszar and Hindi, 2002). Singh and
5 Gupta (2007) developed a heuristic based steady-state grouping genetic algorithm (H-SGGA)
6 for the one-dimensional bin-packing problem. Stawowy (2008) investigated the use of
7 evolutionary based heuristic to the one-dimensional bin packing problem. Unlike other
8 evolutionary heuristics used with optimization problems, a non-specialized and non-hybridized
9 algorithm is proposed and analyzed for solving BPP. The set of experiments confirmed that the
10 proposed approach is comparable to much more complicated algorithms (Stawowy, 2008). An
11 incremental approach to bin packing is proposed and a harmony theory artificial neural network
12 is employed in Tambouratzis (2001). The proposed solutions suggest the exact placements of
13 the objects in the bins. For appropriate parameter values of the harmony theory network, the
14 smallest number of bins required for packing all the objects (i.e. an optimal solution) is
15 consistently determined, while all optimal solutions are settled upon with asymptotically equal
16 probability (Tambouratzis, 2001).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Gradisar et al. (1999) proposed a hybrid approach of combining pattern-oriented LP-
37 based method and the item-oriented sequential heuristic procedure. Their objective of
38 optimization is cutting order lengths into exact required number of pieces and cumulating
39 residual lengths into one piece suitable for later use. They mentioned that the method is
40 especially useful when average number of pieces cut out of an average stock length is large and
41 when the cost of changing the cutting pattern is low.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Alvim et al. (2004) propose a hybrid improvement procedure for the bin packing
51 problem. Their heuristics has several features such as the use of lower bounding strategies, the
52 generation of initial solution by reference to the dual min-max problems, the use of load
53 redistribution based on dominance and improvement process utilizing tabu search. Their
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 procedure compares favorable with all other heuristics in the literature. Their algorithm is the
4
5 only one that has succeeded in finding the best known results for all instances by using a single
6
7 heuristics. Considering that the best results previously reported in the literature were not all of
8
9 them obtained by a single heuristics our proposed solution method is still encouraging.
10
11

12
13 Loh et al. (2008) develop a new procedure that uses the concept of weight annealing to
14
15 solve the one-dimensional bin packing problem. Their procedure is straightforward and easy to
16
17 follow. They find that their procedure produce very high-quality solutions very quickly and
18
19 generates several new optimal solutions.
20
21

22
23 Agarwal et al. (2010) proposed NeuroGenetic approach combines AugNN and GA
24
25 search approaches by interleaving the two. They chose these two approaches to hybridize, as
26
27 they offer complementary advantages and disadvantages. GA needs thousands of iteration for
28
29 good solution. However, AugNN needs tens or hundreds of iteration for good solutions. Hence,
30
31 AugNN finds most of the improvement early in the search process. However, there is slow and
32
33 steady improvement in the solution quality in GA.
34
35

36
37 Agarwal (2009) develop theoretical justification for the Augmented Neural Network
38
39 approach as a metaheuristic for solving various optimization problems. The key element of
40
41 AugNN approach is the transformation of the search problem from the solution space of the
42
43 given problem to that of a search in the weight space of a temporary weight matrix. Some
44
45 weight adjustment strategies are then used to converge to a good set of weights for a locally
46
47 optimal solution. While empirical results have demonstrated the effectiveness of the AugNN
48
49 approach with regard to few other metaheuristics, little theoretical insights exist which justify
50
51 this approach and explain the effectiveness thereof. Agarwal (2009) develop a theorem which
52
53 establishes the existence of a weight matrix which gives an optimal solution to the given
54
55 problem. The existence of such a weight matrix establishes the justification for the use of the
56
57
58
59
60

AugNN approach. Agarwal (2009) then discusses various search strategies to bias the search towards a good weight vector.

We thus make a two-fold contribution to the bin-packing literature. This is the first time AugNN approach has been applied to the BPP. We show its effectiveness in terms of improving upon a heuristic solution. We also propose a decomposition approach for solving harder BPP, in which sub problems are solved using a combination of AugNN approach and heuristics that exploit the problem structure. We discuss the characteristics of problems on which such problem-structure based heuristics could be applied. We empirically show the effectiveness of the AugNN and the decomposition approach on many benchmark problems in the literature.

3. The AugNN Framework

We first describe the problem formally and then present the AugNN framework.

3.1 Problem Description

The BPP consists of packing a set of items into minimum number of bins such that the total size (or weight) does not exceed a maximum value (bin capacity). In other words, we define a bin-packing problem (BPP) as follows:

- We are given a finite set of n items each having a certain size.
- We define a group to be a subset of items such that the total size of the group does not exceed the bin capacity.
- The primary goal is to create a feasible solution with the minimum number of groups.

3.2 Neural Network Architecture

In the AugNN approach, we formulate the BPP as a neural network. Figure 1 shows the neural-network architecture and the correspondence with the BPP graphically. Each item and each bin is represented as a processing element (PE) of a neural network. The item PE nodes, denoted by T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n , constitute the item layer, similar to the input layer of a neural network. Similarly, the bin PE nodes, denoted by B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m , constitute the bin layer, which corresponds to the

1
2
3 hidden layer of a neural network. There is also an output layer with one node, called the 'Final
4 node', designed to capture the outputs of the bin and item layers. For ease of formulation, we
5
6 also add a dummy initial node linked to the item-layer nodes. It keeps track of the numbers of
7
8 epochs and iterations. Nodes in the item layer get an input signal from the initial node through
9
10 links. The item nodes are fully connected to the nodes of the bin layer through links
11
12 characterized by weights, denoted by $\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_n$. The item nodes are also connected to the
13
14 final node. Each bin node, except the rightmost, is connected to the bin node to its right. Bin
15
16 nodes are also connected to item nodes, to signal assignment.
17
18
19
20
21

22
23
24 take in Figure 1
25
26

27 For each set of nodes, including the initial, the item, the bin and the final node, we define
28
29 input, output and activation functions, just like in neural networks. These functions are
30
31 designed to (i) capture the constraints of the bin-packing problem and (ii) assign an item to a bin
32
33 in one iteration, using a certain priority rule heuristic, such as FFD or BFD. After n iterations,
34
35 the network produces a solution, i.e., the number of bins used. We call a set of n iterations an
36
37 epoch, much like in neural-network training. At the end of an epoch, the weights are modified
38
39 using a search strategy and a new epoch starts. Learning takes place in each epoch. The search
40
41 strategy involves reinforcing the weights if an improved solution is found, and backtracking to
42
43 the last best set of weights if no improvement occurs over a pre-specified number of epochs. On
44
45 an average, in less than 145 epochs, the AugNN approach found very good solutions for the
46
47 1210 test problems.
48
49
50
51

52 The activation functions are used to capture the state of a PE. For example, for the item
53
54 nodes, the state would indicate whether that item has been assigned or not. For the bin node, it
55
56
57
58
59
60

would indicate whether the bin is open, packed, or not yet opened. We now describe the mathematical formulation and algorithmic details of AugNN for the BPP.

3.3 Notation

n	: Number of items
m	: UB(Number of bins)
T	: Set of items = $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$
B	: Set of bins = $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$
C	: Capacity of bins
k	: Epoch number.
t	: Current assignment iteration $[0, n]$
I	: Initial node
F	: Final node
T_i	: i^{th} item node in the item layer, $i \in T$
B_j	: j^{th} bin node in the bin layer, $j \in B$
S_i	: Size of item i , $i \in T$
SUI	: Set of unassigned items.
LB	: Lower bound of the number of bins
UB	: Upper bound of the number of bins
RF	: Reinforcement factor
BF	: Backtracking factor
α	: Search coefficient

Following are all functions of assignment iteration t :

$IFI(t)$: Input function of the initial node
$IFT_i(t)$: Input function of item nodes T_i , $i \in T$
$IFB_{ij}(t)$: Input function of bin nodes B_j from Item nodes T_i , $i \in T, j \in B$
$IFFT(t)$: Input function of the final node from the item nodes
$IFFB(t)$: Input function of the final node from the bin nodes
$OFI(t)$: Output function of initial node
$OFTB_i(t)$: Output function of item nodes T_i to bin nodes, $i \in T$
$OFTF_i(t)$: Output function of item nodes T_i to final node, $i \in T$
$OFBF_j(t)$: Output function of bin nodes B_j to final node, $j \in B$
$OFBT_{ji}(t)$: Output function of bin nodes B_j to item node T_i , $i \in T, j \in B$
$OFBB_j(t)$: Output function of bin nodes B_j to B_{j+1} , $j \in B, j \neq m$
$OFFI(t)$: Output function of final node
$\theta I(t)$: Activation function of the initial node
$\theta T_i(t)$: Activation function of item nodes T_i , $i \in T$
$\theta B_j(t)$: Activation function of bin nodes B_j , $j \in B$
$\theta F(t)$: Activation function of the final node
$assign_{ij}(t)$: Item i assigned to bin j , $i \in T, j \in B$
$RC_j(t)$: Residual capacity for j^{th} bin, $j \in B$

Following are functions of k :

$OFF(k)$: Output function of final node.

$\omega_i(k)$: Weight on links from item nodes T_i to bin nodes, $i \in T$

$\varepsilon(k)$: Error or difference between solution and lower bound in epoch k

3.4 Preliminary Steps

1. Calculate the lower bound i.e. the minimum possible number of bins needed

$$\text{Lower Bound} = \lceil (\sum_{i \in T} S_i) / C \rceil$$

2. Calculate the upper bound i.e. the maximum possible number of bins needed

$$\text{Upper Bound} = \lceil n / (C / \text{Max}(S_i)) \rceil, i \in T$$

We want to use this many bins in the hidden layer. $m = \text{UB}(\text{number of bins})$.

3. Weights $\omega_i(0)$ are initialized at 1.00.

3.5 AugNN Functions

We present here the input, activation and output functions of each layer of nodes, starting with the initial node, followed by item nodes, bin nodes and then the final node.

3.5.1 Initial Node

$t = 0$ to begin with.

Input function

$$IFI(0) = 1$$

$$IFI(t) = OFFI(t), \text{ for } t > 0$$

The initial node gets an initial signal of 1 at the beginning to set off the first iteration of the first epoch. Thereafter, it receives an input from the final node.

Activation State

The state of the initial node is defined by t and k , where t is the assignment number and k is the epoch number.

$$\theta I(0): \{ t = 1, k = 1$$

For $t > 0$,

$$\theta I(t) = \begin{cases} t = t + 1, k = k & \text{if } IFI(t) = 1 \\ t = 1, k = k + 1 & \text{if } IFI(t) = 2 \\ t = 0, k = 0 & \text{if } IFI(t) = 3 \end{cases}$$

At the beginning, when $t = 0$, both t and the k are initialized at 1. IFI of 1 indicates a new assignment iteration for the same epoch. So, t is incremented by one, while k remains the same. At the end of an epoch, signified by IFI of 2, k is incremented by 1 while t is initialized to 1. At the end of the problem, i.e. when IFI is 3, both t and k are 0.

Output function

$$OFI(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Whenever $t > 0$, the problem needs to be solved, so the initial node sends an output signal of 1 to the item nodes, signaling that if they are not yet assigned, it is time to get assigned.

3.5.2 Item Layer

Input function

$$IFT_i(t) = OFI(t), i \in T$$

Activation function

$$\forall i \in T, j \in B,$$

$$\theta_{T_i}(0) = 1$$

$$\theta_{T_i}(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \theta_{T_i}(t-1) = 0 \vee (\theta_{T_i}(t-1) = 1 \wedge OFBT_{ji}(t) = 1), \quad t > 0 \\ 1, & \text{if } \theta_{T_i}(t-1) = 1 \vee (\theta_{T_i}(t-1) = 0 \wedge IFI_i(t) = 2) \end{cases}$$

State 1 above implies that item node T_i has not been assigned yet. State 0 implies that it has been assigned. Initially (i.e. at $t=0$) the state of all item nodes is initialized to 1. When the item is assigned (signified by $OFBT_{ji}(t) = 1$), its state changes to 0 and stays that way for the rest of the current epoch. The state changes back to 1 when a new epoch starts (i.e. when IFI is 2).

Output function

$$\forall i \in T$$

$$OFTB_i(t) = \theta_{T_i}(t) * S_i * \omega_i(k)$$

$$OFTF_i(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \theta_{T_i}(t) = 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The $OFTB$ signal sends a weighted size to the bin layer. $OFTB$ is 0 if the item is already assigned (due to $\theta_{T_i}(t) = 0$), and positive if not yet assigned.

$OFTF$ sends a signal to the final node indicating that the item has been assigned (indicated by $\theta T_i(t)=0$).

3.5.3 Bin layer

For the bin layer, we explain the activation function first, since it is used in the input function.

Activation function

$$RC_j(1) = C$$

$\theta B_1(1) = 1$ state of the first bin for the first assignment iteration is 1 (open).

$$j > 1 \wedge j \in B$$

$$\theta B_j(1) = 0$$

$$\theta B_j(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \theta B_j(t-1) = 0 \vee IFI(t) = 2 & : \text{bin not open yet} \\ 1, & \text{if } \theta B_j(t-1) = 1 \vee (\theta B_j(t) = 0 \wedge OFBB_{j-1}(t) = 1) & : \text{bin open} \\ 2, & \text{if } \theta B_j(t-1) = 1 \wedge (RC_j(t) < \text{Min}[S_l], l \in SUI) & : \text{bin packed/closed} \end{cases}$$

$$RC_j(t) = RC_j(t) - S_i \quad \text{where } i \text{ is the index for } \text{Max } OFTB_i(t)$$

At the beginning the first bin is open, rest are unopened. A new bin opens (i.e., assumes state 1) when it receives a signal ($OFBB_{j-1}(t)$) from the previous bin. The previous bin sends this signal when it cannot fit the item with maximum $OFTB_i(t)$. When an open bin's residual capacity is less than the minimum size unassigned item, then the bin closes (state 2).

Input function

$$\forall i \in T, j \in B$$

$$IFB_j(t) = \begin{cases} \text{Max}_i(OFTB_j(t)), & \text{if } \theta B_j(t) = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } \theta B_j(t) = 0 \vee \theta B_j(t) = 2 \end{cases}$$

If the bin is open (state of 1) then it accepts the maximum output of the item nodes as its input. If the bin is not yet open (state 0) or packed and closed (state 2), it does not accept any input.

Assignment of item to bin

$$\text{assign}_{ij}(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } S_i > RC_j(t) \\ 1, & \text{if } S_i \leq RC_j(t) \end{cases}$$

where i is the index for $\text{Max } OFTB_i(t)$

Since we are applying FFD and BFD, once an item is assigned to a bin, the rest of the bins do not attempt to pack the same item.

Output function

$$\forall i \in T, j \in B$$

$$OFBF_j(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \theta B_j(t) = 2 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

When a full bin closes (state 2), it sends a signal to the final node. The final node keeps a counter of the number of bins in state 2.

$$OFBB_j(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \theta B_j(t-1) = 1 \wedge RC_j(t) < S_i(t), \quad i \text{ is the index for } \text{Max } OFTB_i(t) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

When a bin cannot accept the biggest item due to small residual capacity, it sends a signal to the next bin to open.

$$OFBT_{ji}(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } assign_{ij}(t) = 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

When a bin accepts an item, it sends a signal of 1 to the item node.

3.5.4 Final Node

Input function

The final node receives two sets of inputs. One from the bin layer (*IFFB*) and one directly from the item layer (*IFFT*).

$$IFFB(t) = \sum_{j=1}^m OFBF_j(t)$$

$$IFFT(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n OFTF_i(t)$$

IFFB is essentially the sum of all filled bins.

IFFT is the sum of all assigned items.

Activation function

$$\theta F(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } IFFT(t) < n \\ 1, & \text{if } IFFT(t) = n \\ 2, & \text{if } IFFT(t) = n \wedge IFFB(t) = LB \end{cases}$$

State of 0 implies that not all n items are assigned.

State of 1 implies that all items are assigned, which is an indication of the end of the current epoch. State of 2 implies that a lower bound solution has been found and therefore the processing can stop.

Output function

$$OFFI(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \theta F(t) = 0 \\ 2, & \text{if } \theta F(t) = 1 \wedge k < k_{\max} \\ 3, & \text{if } (\theta F(t) = 1 \wedge k = k_{\max}) \vee \theta F(t) = 2 \end{cases}$$

$$OFF(k) = IFFB(t), \text{ if } OFFI(t) = 2 \text{ or } 3.$$

Output $OFFI$ of 1 implies that not all items have been assigned and the network should run a new assignment iteration. Output $OFFI$ of 2 implies that all items have been assigned but the lower-bound solution has not reached and the number of epochs has not reached the max, so the network should run another epoch. Output $OFFI$ of 3 acts as a stopping rule. If either a lower-bound solution is found or the number of epochs has reached its preset max limit, the network stops.

The output OFF represents the solution, i.e. the number of bins used to fill all the items.

3.5.5 Order of Evaluation of Functions

It is important to understand the order in which these functions are evaluated. The ordering is as shown in Figure 2. In general, in neural networks, input function is calculated first, followed by activation function followed by the output function. Further, in feed forward neural networks, input layer functions are followed by hidden layer functions, followed by output layer functions. In AugNN, we deviate slightly because of (i) the assignment function and (ii) need to open new bins if existing bins cannot fit an item. This requires evaluating certain functions within the same layer twice.

One of the advantages of this kind of formulation is that coding becomes easier. Also, a different heuristic, such as ‘worst fit descending’ can be applied by slightly modifying one of the functions above.

take in Figure 2

3.6 Search Strategy

A search strategy is required to modify the weights. Weights are modified once for each epoch. They are not modified from one assignment iteration to the next. The idea behind weight modification is that if the error in an epoch is too high, then the order in which items should be placed should be changed more than if the error is less. We employ the following search strategy.

$$\omega_i(k+1) = \omega_i(k) + \alpha * S_i * \varepsilon(k) \quad \forall i \in T$$

$$\text{where } \varepsilon(k) = OFF(k) - LB$$

In addition, we employ reinforcement and backtracking mechanisms to improve the solution quality.

3.6.1 Reinforcement

Whenever the solution improves in the current epoch compared to the previous epoch, i.e. whenever $OFF(k) < OFF(k-1)$, we reinforce the weights by magnifying the increases made during the previous epoch. We employ a reinforcement factor RF as follows:

$$\omega_i(k) = \omega_i(k) + RF * (\omega_i(k) - \omega_i(k-1)), \quad \forall i \in T$$

Such reinforcement acts as a reward for finding a better solution and helps preserve the relative weights of the items for a few epochs. RF can be any real number between 1 and infinity, although we found through some experimentation, that RF value of 3 gave good results.

3.6.2 Backtracking

If the solution does not improve for a certain number of epochs say 100 or 150, then it is advisable to backtrack to the previous best solution and forget the last few epochs and start over. This backtracking mechanism prevents the network from following a path of no improvement for any longer than necessary. We use a parameter called backtracking factor (BF) to implement such backtracking.

3.7 End of iteration routines

1. If OFF_i is 1, do not modify the weights and start with the next assignment iteration.
2. If OFF_i is 2, it signifies the end of an epoch. Do the following steps:
 - a. check if the current solution is the best so far. If so, store it as best solution.

Also, store the current weights as best weights.

- b. Calculate the error i.e., the difference between $OFF(k)$ and the lower bound.
 - c. Sense if reinforcement needed. If needed, apply reinforcement using the reinforcement strategy.
 - d. Sense if backtracking needed. If needed, apply backtracking.
 - e. Modify weights, using the search strategy.
3. If $OFFI$ is 3, stop the network, and display the best result so far.

3.8 Computation Complexity

The computational complexity of the FFD and BFD is $O(n \log n)$, primarily because sorting is required. Once the sorted list of unassigned items is available, the assignment is linear in n , or $O(n)$. The complexity of AugNN is the same for each epoch, i.e. $O(n \log n)$. Of course, time taken is more because of the number of epochs needed.

4. Decomposition Strategy and Problem-Structure Based Heuristic

For the set of hard instances, although AugNN improved significantly over the single-pass FFD and BFD, thus reducing the gap significantly from the upper bound, the gap was still too high. To reduce the gap further, we propose a decomposition strategy - breaking the problem into sub problems and solving them using heuristics that exploit the problem structure. Most heuristics are item centric, i.e. you take an item, in a certain order of size, and decide which bin it goes in. Our proposed heuristics are bin centric, similar to Gupta and Ho's (1999) 'minimum bin slack' heuristic, in which we take a bin and pack it with appropriate items with minimum residual capacity in each bin. Ours is a special case of the 'minimum bin slack' heuristic designed for a fixed number of items and involves a factor called tolerance for residual capacity.

We observed that for each of the ten hard problems, the maximum number of items that could fit in a bin was four, because even the five smallest items would exceed the bin capacity. So the trick was to first fill as many bins as possible with four items each, with minimum residual capacity, within a given tolerance. This became our first sub problem - i.e., fitting bins with four items within a tolerance. The next sub problem involved fitting as many bins as

possible with three items within tolerance. All remaining items were treated as the third sub problem, and solved using AugNN. In designing our ‘pack-four item bins’ and ‘pack-three item bins’ heuristics, we exploited the fact that the item sizes were drawn from a uniform distribution. With the help of Figures 3a and 3b, we will explain how.

In Figures 3a and 3b, we plot the items on the x-axis in the increasing order by size and we plot sizes on the y-axis. Since the sizes are drawn from a uniform distribution, we get a near-straight line plot. For the case of four-item packing let us look at Figure 3a. Suppose we find four adjacent items ‘c’, ‘d’, ‘e’ and ‘f’, such that the sum of their sizes is closest to but within the bin capacity. This group of four items can be placed in a bin. Due to the linearity of the plot, if we find a pair of adjacent items on either side of and equidistant from items ‘c’, ‘d’, ‘e’ and ‘f’, then the sum of the sizes of these four items should be close to the bin capacity. For example, items ‘a’ and ‘b’ on the left and items ‘g’ and ‘h’ on the right, equidistant from ‘c’, ‘d’, ‘e’ and ‘f’, should fit in a bin tightly. Extending this idea further, the sum of the sizes of items ‘j’ and ‘k’ and ‘p’ and ‘q’ will also be close to the bin capacity, assuming that ‘j’ and ‘k’ are about as far from ‘a’ and ‘b’ as ‘p’ and ‘q’ are from ‘g’ and ‘h’. Using this idea, we can find groups of four items that can be packed in a bin with little residual capacity, within a certain tolerance. Notice that the complexity of this heuristic is linear in n .

take in Figure 3

For the three-item bin packing heuristic, we make a similar observation. In Figure 3b, for example, sum of the sizes of items ‘a’, ‘c’ and ‘d’ will be about the same as that of items ‘b’, ‘c’ and ‘e’, assuming items ‘a’ and ‘b’ are as far from item ‘c’ as items ‘d’ and ‘e’. Of course,

1
2
3 we are assuming that the size ranges, with respect to bin capacity, are such that three items can
4
5 fit tightly.
6
7

8 Note that if the sizes of items were drawn from a distribution other than uniform, such
9
10 as, normal or exponential, we would not get a near-straight line plot in Figures 3a and 3b, and
11
12 we couldn't find groups of four (or three) items to pack in this manner. For the non-uniform
13
14 distribution case, the proposed heuristics would not work. Based on the above observations, we
15
16 outline the 'Pack Four-Item' heuristic and the 'Pack Three-Item' heuristic below, for solving the
17
18 first and the second sub problems.
19
20
21

22 **Sub Problem 1: Pack Four-Item Bins**

23
24 Step 1: Sort the items from smallest to largest.

25
26 Step 2: Open a new bin.

27
28 Step 3: Place the two smallest items in the open bin.

29
30 Step 4: Calculate the residual capacity of this bin and divide by two.

31
32 Step 5: Find the item with size closest to but less than the value obtained in Step 4, within a pre
33
34 specified tolerance (in this case 500, but could be different for a different problem).

35
36 If item found then place it in the bin and go to Step 6, else go to Step 10.

37
38 Step 6: Find the new residual capacity.

39
40 Step 7: Find the item with size closest to but less than the value obtained in Step 6 within a pre
41
42 specified tolerance (in this case 500, but could be different for a different problem).

43
44 Note that this fourth item should be found either adjacent to or very close to the third
45
46 item.

47
48 If found then place it in the bin and go to Step 8, else go to Step 10.

49
50 Step 8: Close the bin and count it as a packed bin.

51
52 Step 9: Remove these four items from the list of unassigned items and go to Step 2.

53
54 Step 10: Do not commit any items to this bin, close the bin and do not count it as a packed bin.

55
56 Give the total number of packed bins so far. Go to Sub Problem 2.
57
58
59
60

Sub Problem 2: Pack Three-item Bins.

Step 1: Sort the list of unassigned items from largest to smallest.

Step 2: Open a new bin.

Step 3: If there are at least three items in the set of unassigned items then, place the largest and the smallest items in this bin.

Step 4: Find the residual capacity of this bin.

Step 5: Find the item closest to but less than the value obtained in Step 4, within a pre specified tolerance (in this case 1000, but could differ).

If such an item found then place it in the bin and go to Step 6. If not, go to Step 8.

Step 6: Close this bin and count it as a packed bin.

Step 7: Remove these three items from the list of unassigned items and go to Step 2.

Step 8: Do not commit any items to this bin, close the bin and do not count it as a packed bin.

Give the total number of packed bins so far. Go to Sub Problem 3.

Sub Problem 3: AugNN

Step 1: Enlist all the remaining unassigned items.

Step 2: Apply AugNN for this set of items.

Finally, aggregate the solutions for the three sub problems.

Note that the above mentioned decomposition strategy worked well on all the ten hard problems. For 8 out of 10 problems, the upper bound solution was found in less than 0.5 seconds. For the remaining two problems, a solution was found within 1 bin of the upper bound. Decomposition Strategy and Problem-Structure Based Heuristic worked well compared to some heuristics available at the literature. In Fleszar and Hindi (2002), their heuristic found 2 out of 10 optimal solutions for the hard problem set. Note that if more than four items can fit in a bin, then we shouldn't apply our 'pack four-item bin' heuristics. We found that for such problems, AugNN worked well without the help of problem structure based heuristics.

5. Computational Experiments

5.1 Data Sets

For our empirical work, we used three sets of benchmark problems available at the OR-Library at the Technische Universitat Darmstadt¹. The three sets correspond to problems of three levels of difficulty - easy, medium and hard. Upper bounds for these problems using tabu search and branch-and-bound algorithms are also known.

There are other data sets available in the literature². We did not use them since the data set used in (Falkenauer, 1996) is very similar to data set we are using in our empirical work and the data set used in (Waescher and Gau, 1996) is very easy to solve since optimum solution can be found in the first iteration and a simple heuristic such as FFD.

The 720 instances of the easy dataset are divided into 36 subsets of 20 problems each with some common characteristics. The subsets of 20 problems are labeled “NxCyWz_v” where

$x = 1$ (for $n = 50$), $x = 2$ ($n = 100$)

$y = 1$ (for $C = 100$), $y = 2$ ($C = 120$), $y = 3$ ($C = 150$)

$z = 1$ (for S_i from $[1,100]$), $z = 2$ ($[20,100]$), $z = 4$ ($[30,100]$)

$v = A$ through T for the 20 instances of each class

The item sizes are chosen as integer values from the given intervals using uniformly distributed random numbers.

The instances in the medium difficulty set are divided into 48 subsets of 10 instances each with common characteristics. These subsets of 10 problems are labeled as “NxWyBzRv” where

¹ <http://www.wiwi.uni-jena.de/Entscheidung/binpp/index.htm> last visited on May 1,2004

² <http://www.apdio.pt/sicup/Sicuphomepage/research.htm> last visited on May 1,2004

1
2
3
4 $x = 1$ (for $n = 50$),

5
6 $y = 1$ (for $\text{avgSize} = C/3$), $y = 2$ ($C/5$), $y = 3$ ($C/7$), $y = 4$ ($C/9$) where $C = 1000$ for this set

7
8
9 $z = 1$ (for $\text{delta} = 20\%$), $z = 2$ (50%), $z = 3$ (90%)

10
11 $v = 0$ through 9 for the 10 instances of each class

12
13 The parameter avgSize represents the desired average size of the items, while delta specifies the
14
15 maximal deviation of the single value from avgSize . For example, the sizes are randomly
16
17 chosen from the interval $[160,240]$ in case of $\text{avgSize} = C/5$ and $\text{delta} = 20\%$.

18
19
20 The third data set contains 10 instances. The number of items and bin capacity for each
21
22 instance is 200 and 100,000 respectively. The item sizes are varying between 20,000 and
23
24 35,000. Therefore, the number of items for each bin is between 3 and 5.

25 26 27 **5.2 Platform and Parameters**

28
29 We coded our heuristics in Visual Basic ® 6.0, running on a Pentium-III PC with 512 MB
30
31 RAM. A user interface was created that allowed selection of data files, specification of
32
33 parameters such as maximum number of epochs, search rate, reinforcement factor etc. The
34
35 output files included details such as number of bins used, CPU time, and number of epochs
36
37 needed to find the best solution etc. We ran AugNN for a maximum of 2500 epochs to keep the
38
39 CPU time within reasonable limit. Higher number of epochs could give improved results. We
40
41 set our search coefficient at 0.0005 and the reinforcement factor at 3. We backtracked if the
42
43 solution did not improve in 500 epochs. These search parameter values were obtained after
44
45 considerable experimental effort.

46 47 48 49 50 51 **5.3 Results**

52
53
54 Tables I-a and I-b summarize the results of AugNN in conjunction with FFD and BFD
55
56 respectively for dataset 1 (easy instances). Tables II-a and II-b do the same for dataset 2
57
58
59
60

(medium instances). These tables report the minimum, maximum and mean number of iterations to solve the problem, run time (in seconds), solution to upper-bound ratio (Z/UB ratio), and the number of problems solved to optimality for each instance group. Each row in these tables represents average values for all instances in a subset of problems with similar characteristics. There are 20 and 10 problems per subset in datasets 1 and 2 respectively. Since there are only 10 instances in dataset 3, we have reported their results individually in Table V.

take in Table I-a & Table I-b

Tables I-c and I-d summarize the improvement by AugNN over single-pass solutions using FFD and BFD respectively, for dataset 1. Tables II-c and II-d do the same for dataset 2. As given in Tables I-c and I-d, AugNN reduces the number of bins value by one in all improved solutions. In other words, AugNN either got the same solution with single-pass heuristic or improve the solution by reducing number of bins by one. Similarly you can see the number of bins reduced (solution improved) in each problem subsets in Tables II-c and II-d for dataset 2. For example, for problem subset N4W1B1 AugNN improve solution over single-pass solutions using FFD by reducing number of bins value by at least 10 at most 12, using BFD by reducing number of bins value by at least 9 at most 12, for problem subset N3W1B1 AugNN improve solution over single-pass solutions using FFD by reducing number of bins value by at least 5 at most 6

take in Table I-c & Table I-d

1
2
3 For dataset 1, AugNN found the optimal solution for 597 of the 720 problems using
4 FFD, and for 587 problems using BFD (Tables I-a and I-b). The average Z/UB ratio for all
5 problems was 0.2595% for FFD and 0.33159% for BFD. As given in Tables III and IV, the
6 single-pass FFD and BFD heuristics found the optimal solution for 547 out of 720 problems
7 respectively. For the remaining problems, AugNN improved the solution for 78 problems with
8 FFD, 50 of which were solved to optimality and for 66 problems with BFD, of which 40 were
9 solved to optimality. The average time taken per problem was 38.8 seconds and 43.9 seconds
10 for FFD and BFD respectively.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 take in Table II-a & Table II-b
25
26
27
28
29

30 For dataset 2, AugNN found the optimal solution for 312 out of 480 problems using
31 FFD, and for 297 problems using BFD (Tables II-a and II-b). The average Z/UB ratio for all
32 problems was 1.2576% for FFD and 1.5566% for BFD. As given in Tables III and IV, the
33 single-pass FFD and BFD heuristics found the optimal solution for 236 of the 480 problems.
34 For the remaining 244 problems, AugNN improved the solution for 175 problems with FFD, 76
35 of which were solved to optimality and for 158 problems with BFD, of which 61 were solved to
36 optimality. The average time taken per problem was 25.3 seconds and 23.6 seconds for FFD
37 and BFD respectively.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 take in Table II-c & Table II-d
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The average number of epochs needed to find the best solution for dataset 1 was 58 with
4 FFD and 65 for BFD. For dataset 2, the average number of epochs was 273 for FFD and 179
5
6
7
8 for BFD.
9

10
11
12 take in Table III & Table IV
13
14
15

16 For the set of hard instances, although AugNN improved significantly over FFD
17 heuristic, reducing the gap from about 10% to 4% from the upper bound, the gap, at 4%, was
18 still too high. We applied the decomposition strategy and heuristics discussed in Section 4. The
19 results are summarized in Table V. 8 out of 10 problems were solved to optimality while the
20 other 2 were within 1 bin of the upper bound. The average gap for all ten problems was less
21 than 0.4 % and the run time to find the solution averaged 0.25 seconds.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 take in Table V
33
34
35

36 Previous researchers have found better results for datasets 1 and 2 but not for dataset 3.
37 For example, for dataset 1, DualTabu (Scholl et al. 1997) found the optimal for 666 of 720
38 problems, B2F for 545 problems, FFD-B2F for 617 problems and BISON (Scholl et al. 1997)
39 heuristic for 697 problems. For dataset 2, DualTabu found the optimal for 466 problems, B2F
40 for 292 problems, FFD-B2F for 319 problems and BISON for 473 problems. For dataset 3,
41 DualTabu found the optimal for 3 out of 10 problems, B2F for 0 problems, FFD-B2F for 0
42 problems and BISON for 3 problems. AugNN being a new approach, needs more research in
43 search rules to improve the solution. The initial results are encouraging because working with
44 very simple heuristics, AugNN was able to find good improvements. If more complex
45 heuristics are used in conjunction with AugNN, the results could be improved further.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

6. Summary and Conclusions

In this paper, we proposed two broad approaches for solving the classical BPP, in which n items are to be packed in minimum number of fixed-capacity bins. The first is a meta-heuristic approach based on neural-networks principles. The second is a decomposition approach, using heuristics that exploit the problem structure. Using these approaches, a large percentage of benchmark problems were solved to optimality and the rest to near optimality. The AugNN approach, first proposed by Agarwal et. al. (2003) for the task-scheduling problem, is applied to the BPP for the first time. The approach involves representing the problem as a neural network, with items forming the input layer and bins the hidden layer. Input, output and activation functions are defined in such a way that in one epoch of n assignment iterations, a feasible solution is obtained, without increasing the computational complexity of a simple heuristic, such as FFD.

The AugNN approach worked very well on two of the three benchmark datasets that we used - the easy and medium difficulty datasets. For the hard problem datasets, we propose a decomposition approach, in which a sub problem is solved using a 'pack-four-item bin' heuristic and another sub problem by a 'pack-three-item bin' and the rest by AugNN. These heuristics exploited certain problem specific characteristics, such as the fact that the sizes of the items were drawn from a uniform distribution and the range of the sizes was such that no more than four items could fit in a bin and there were enough items such that three items would fit in a bin tightly. Similar strategies can be employed on other BPP.

Of the 1210 problems tested, optimal solutions were found for 917 problems. The average gap between the obtained and the optimal solution was under 0.66%. Successful application of this new type of meta-heuristic opens up many opportunities for further research.

1
2
3 For example, the approach could be used for more complex BPP, involving more constraints,
4 such as conflicts. The approach can be tested in conjunction with other heuristics, other than
5 FFD and BFD used in this paper. Also, alternative search strategies can be developed which
6 might find improved solutions. Sensitivity analysis of the various search parameters would also
7 be a useful exercise.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table I-a: Results of AugNN with FFD for dataset 1

Problem Subsets	Iteration Number [min,max],mean	Run Time (Sec)	Z/UB ratio	Problems Solved to Optimality ¹ (out of 20)
N1C1W1	[1, 1746], 88.25	1.7117	1.002	19
N1C1W2	[1, 1], 1	2.1188	1	20
N1C1W4	[1, 72], 4.55	2.3590	1	20
N1C2W1	[1, 1], 1	1.7742	1	20
N1C2W2	[1, 2436], 122.75	1.8574	1	20
N1C2W4	[1, 1], 1	2.2648	1	20
N1C3W1	[1, 546], 39.55	1.5727	1.002941	19
N1C3W2	[1, 2290], 332.85	1.7363	1.002778	19
N1C3W4	[1, 1946], 350.25	1.7260	1.007262	17
N2C1W1	[1, 1], 1	5.2445	1	20
N2C1W2	[1, 1], 1	7.5484	1	20
N2C1W4	[1, 1], 1	8.0813	1	20
N2C2W1	[1, 1], 1	5.2773	1.001163	19
N2C2W2	[1, 437], 22.8	6.1191	1	20
N2C2W4	[1, 77], 4.8	7.5590	1	20
N2C3W1	[1, 1], 1	4.8363	1	20
N2C3W2	[1, 1322], 205	5.3854	1.008429	13
N2C3W4	[1, 2386], 386.7	5.2472	1.008016	13
N3C1W1	[1, 215], 11.7	20.4676	1.00051	19
N3C1W2	[1, 1], 1	26.3797	1.001211	17
N3C1W4	[1, 4], 1.15	27.7234	1	20
N3C2W1	[1, 279], 22	17.7504	1.001869	17
N3C2W2	[1, 489], 25.4	24.4938	1.000476	19
N3C2W4	[1, 146], 8.25	26.4816	1.000442	19
N3C3W1	[1, 1], 1	17.3965	1.001471	18
N3C3W2	[1, 1197], 175.25	18.6780	1.01054	3
N3C3W4	[1, 752], 175.4	23.3908	1.014399	2
N4C1W1	[1, 158], 8.85	123.3547	1.000619	17
N4C1W2	[1, 18], 1.85	145.2357	1.000486	17
N4C1W4	[1, 1], 1	146.8391	1	20
N4C2W1	[1, 474], 44.75	84.9664	1.001671	13
N4C2W2	[1, 44], 3.15	136.0320	1.000189	19
N4C2W4	[1, 1], 1	136.1516	1	20
N4C3W1	[1, 1], 1	82.5371	1.000599	18
N4C3W2	[1, 80], 11.3	132.3674	1.011473	0
N4C3W4	[1, 60], 17.65	133.5311	1.014886	0
Average		38.78323	1.002595	16.58

¹597 out of 720 individual instances were solved to optimality.

Table I-b: Results of AugNN with BFD for dataset 1

Problem Subsets	Iteration Number [min,max],mean	Run Time (Sec)	Z/UB ratio	Problems Solved to Optimality ¹ (out of 20)
N1C1W1	[1, 1], 1	0.8461	1.0045	18
N1C1W2	[1, 1], 1	1.3645	1	20
N1C1W4	[1, 239], 12.9	3.0969	1	20
N1C2W1	[1, 1], 1	0.8426	1	20
N1C2W2	[1, 1], 1	1.6508	1.002174	19
N1C2W4	[1, 1], 1	3.3336	1	20
N1C3W1	[1, 1882], 170.4	0.1883	1.002941	19
N1C3W2	[1, 2458], 224.7	0.5016	1.00779	17
N1C3W4	[1, 2350], 279.15	1.1512	1.011916	15
N2C1W1	[1, 1], 1	6.6035	1	20
N2C1W2	[1, 1], 1	9.3605	1	20
N2C1W4	[1, 1], 1	12.1773	1	20
N2C2W1	[1, 1], 1	3.8352	1.001163	19
N2C2W2	[1, 1928], 97.35	7.8691	1	20
N2C2W4	[1, 218], 11.85	9.4766	1	20
N2C3W1	[1, 1], 1	0.1621	1	20
N2C3W2	[1, 2424], 446.15	3.7227	1.009648	12
N2C3W4	[1, 2202], 474.5	5.957422	1.011374	10
N3C1W1	[1, 170], 9.45	23.9207	1.00051	19
N3C1W2	[1, 1], 1	35.7215	1.001211	17
N3C1W4	[1, 9], 1.4	37.5270	1	20
N3C2W1	[1, 721], 45.9	13.1901	1.001869	17
N3C2W2	[1, 317], 16.8	33.5038	1.000476	19
N3C2W4	[1, 148], 8.35	38.6088	1.000442	19
N3C3W1	[1, 1], 1	1.3190	1.001471	18
N3C3W2	[1, 1775], 302.4	20.9008	1.010524	4
N3C3W4	[1, 605], 127.65	29.7615	1.016118	2
N4C1W1	[1, 135], 7.7	157.1093	1.000619	17
N4C1W2	[1, 1], 1	188.0017	1.000648	16
N4C1W4	[1, 1], 1	196.9160	1	20
N4C2W1	[1, 433], 48.95	49.7987	1.001671	13
N4C2W2	[1, 41], 3	169.7114	1.000189	19
N4C2W4	[1, 1], 1	184.1120	1	20
N4C3W1	[1, 1], 1	9.1160	1.000599	18
N4C3W2	[1, 140], 27.75	151.4313	1.010967	0
N4C3W4	[1, 124], 22.25	166.4911	1.014888	0
Average		43.8689	1.003159	16.31

¹587 out of 720 individual instances were solved to optimality.

Table I-c: Improvement by AugNN over single-pass FFD for dataset 1

Problem Subsets	Min	Max	Avg	Problem Subsets	Min	Max	Avg
N1C1W1	0	1	0.05	N3C1W1	0	1	0.05
N1C1W2	0	0	0	N3C1W2	0	0	0
N1C1W4	0	1	0.05	N3C1W4	0	1	0.05
N1C2W1	0	0	0	N3C2W1	0	1	0.1
N1C2W2	0	1	0.05	N3C2W2	0	1	0.05
N1C2W4	0	0	0	N3C2W4	0	1	0.05
N1C3W1	0	1	0.1	N3C3W1	0	0	0
N1C3W2	0	1	0.25	N3C3W2	0	1	0.35
N1C3W4	0	1	0.25	N3C3W4	0	1	0.5
N2C1W1	0	0	0	N4C1W1	0	1	0.05
N2C1W2	0	0	0	N4C1W2	0	1	0.05
N2C1W4	0	0	0	N4C1W4	0	0	0
N2C2W1	0	0	0	N4C2W1	0	1	0.15
N2C2W2	0	1	0.05	N4C2W2	0	1	0.05
N2C2W4	0	1	0.05	N4C2W4	0	0	0
N2C3W1	0	0	0	N4C3W1	0	0	0
N2C3W2	0	1	0.3	N4C3W2	0	1	0.25
N2C3W4	0	1	0.55	N4C3W4	0	1	0.5

Table I-d: Improvement by AugNN over single-pass BFD for dataset 1

Problem Subsets	Min	Max	Avg	Problem Subsets	Min	Max	Avg
N1C1W1	0	0	0	N3C1W1	0	1	0.05
N1C1W2	0	0	0	N3C1W2	0	0	0
N1C1W4	0	1	0.05	N3C1W4	0	1	0.05
N1C2W1	0	0	0	N3C2W1	0	1	0.1
N1C2W2	0	0	0	N3C2W2	0	1	0.05
N1C2W4	0	0	0	N3C2W4	0	1	0.05
N1C3W1	0	1	0.1	N3C3W1	0	0	0
N1C3W2	0	1	0.15	N3C3W2	0	1	0.35
N1C3W4	0	1	0.15	N3C3W4	0	1	0.35
N2C1W1	0	0	0	N4C1W1	0	1	0.05
N2C1W2	0	0	0	N4C1W2	0	0	0
N2C1W4	0	0	0	N4C1W4	0	0	0
N2C2W1	0	0	0	N4C2W1	0	1	0.15
N2C2W2	0	1	0.05	N4C2W2	0	1	0.05
N2C2W4	0	1	0.05	N4C2W4	0	0	0
N2C3W1	0	0	0	N4C3W1	0	0	0
N2C3W2	0	1	0.25	N4C3W2	0	1	0.35
N2C3W4	0	1	0.4	N4C3W4	0	1	0.5

Table II-a: Results of AugNN with FFD for dataset 2

Problem Subsets	Iteration Number [min,max],mean	Run Time (Sec)	Z/UB ratio	Problems Solved to Optimality ¹ (out of 10)
N1W1B1	[73, 1909], 465.3	1.0016	1.01732	7
N1W1B2	[1, 2285], 610.6	1.0654	1.024265	6
N1W1B3	[1, 1], 1	0.6695	1.017688	7
N1W2B1	[1, 270], 72.2	0.9852	1.02	8
N1W2B2	[1, 955], 152.2	0.7195	1	10
N1W2B3	[1, 1], 1	0.7336	1	10
N1W3B1	[1, 5254], 526.3	1.2375	1.028571	8
N1W3B2	[1, 721], 72.1	0.7898	1	10
N1W3B3	[1, 1], 1	0.8336	1	10
N1W4B1	[1, 1], 1	0.8961	1	10
N1W4B2	[1, 1412], 241.4	0.8172	1	10
N1W4B3	[1, 1], 1	0.9375	1	10
N2W1B1	[87, 1858], 1086.9	5.2414	1.017647	4
N2W1B2	[1, 460], 118.8	3.8977	1.032205	1
N2W1B3	[1, 124], 13.3	3.7299	1.009315	7
N2W2B1	[1, 1192], 497.1	4.7645	1.024524	5
N2W2B2	[1, 85], 11.5	3.7016	1.01	8
N2W2B3	[1, 1], 1	3.1898	1.004762	9
N2W3B1	[1, 144], 15.3	3.8938	1.014286	8
N2W3B2	[1, 2027], 203.6	3.2281	1	10
N2W3B3	[1, 1], 1	3.2844	1	10
N2W4B1	[1, 1], 1	3.3609	1.027273	7
N2W4B2	[1, 140], 26.5	3.6828	1	10
N2W4B3	[1, 212], 22.1	2.4813	1	10
N3W1B1	[79, 1923], 1063	18.9223	1.032792	0
N3W1B2	[1, 2222], 420.7	19.0676	1.037774	0
N3W1B3	[1, 5] 1.4	12.3445	1.006039	6
N3W2B1	[329, 2370], 836.6	18.3568	1.027012	0
N3W2B2	[1, 476], 125.9	13.2742	1.012564	5
N3W2B3	[1, 9] 1.8	10.5547	1.005	8
N3W3B1	[1, 1178] 327.2	16.6313	1.020936	4
N3W3B2	[1, 114] 25.4	11.8172	1.003571	9
N3W3B3	[1, 1], 1	11.5531	1.003571	9
N3W4B1	[1, 215] 85.8	15.4055	1	10
N3W4B2	[1, 798] 180.5	13.8186	1	10
N3W4B3	[1, 1], 1	9.2484	1	10
N4W1B1	[52, 2490], 2126.1	88.6285	1.041289	0
N4W1B2	[1, 1953], 704.8	110.2297	1.041544	0
N4W1B3	[1, 33], 4.2	67.2305	1.001761	7
N4W2B1	[154, 2495], 769.4	112.8489	1.044469	0
N4W2B2	[1, 1881], 446.9	97.5063	1.011833	0
N4W2B3	[1, 32], 4.1	53.7844	1.001	9
N4W3B1	[28, 953], 442.8	110.4699	1.029577	0
N4W3B2	[1, 189], 41.4	84.5820	1.00988	3
N4W3B3	[1, 10], 1.9	58.4973	1	10
N4W4B1	[1, 2290], 352.7	88.0484	1.019708	0
N4W4B2	[1, 49], 5.8	67.7868	1.005455	7
N4W4B3	[1, 1], 1	48.6267	1	10
Average		25.2995	1.012576	6.5

¹312 out of 480 individual instances were solved to optimality.

Table II-b: Results of AugNN with BFD for dataset 2

Problem Subsets	Iteration Number [min,max],mean	Run Time (Sec)	Z/UB ratio	Problems Solved to Optimality ¹ (out of 10)
N1W1B1	[66, 2454], 570.8	1.2605	1.023529	6
N1W1B2	[1, 1667], 343.7	0.7525	1.041585	3
N1W1B3	[1, 1], 1	0.3393	1.017688	7
N1W2B1	[1, 1076], 245.6	0.5135	1.02	8
N1W2B2	[1, 1511], 298.2	0.3008	1	10
N1W2B3	[1, 1], 1	0.1350	1	10
N1W3B1	[1, 1], 1	0.5287	1.042857	7
N1W3B2	[1, 1], 1	0.1135	1.014286	9
N1W3B3	[1, 1], 1	0.1756	1	10
N1W4B1	[1, 1], 1	0.4408	1	10
N1W4B2	[1, 1], 1	0.1117	1.033333	8
N1W4B3	[1, 1], 1	0.2949	1	10
N2W1B1	[101, 1071], 582.3	9.3422	1.023529	2
N2W1B2	[1, 934], 198.7	5.2975	1.032205	1
N2W1B3	[1, 475], 48.4	2.0344	1.009315	7
N2W2B1	[1, 2403], 357.9	7.2531	1.043571	1
N2W2B2	[1, 104], 15.4	0.6615	1.01	8
N2W2B3	[1, 1], 1	0.5602	1.004762	9
N2W3B1	[1, 976], 98.5	1.2215	1.014286	8
N2W3B2	[1, 1], 1	0.1033	1.007143	9
N2W3B3	[1, 1], 1	0.3707	1	10
N2W4B1	[1, 1], 1	2.0504	1.027273	7
N2W4B2	[1, 616], 158.6	0.2764	1	10
N2W4B3	[1, 755], 76.4	0.1967	1	10
N3W1B1	[136, 1307], 407.8	34.8127	1.040233	0
N3W1B2	[1, 421], 99	29.7865	1.039289	0
N3W1B3	[1, 5], 1.4	7.7762	1.006039	6
N3W2B1	[327, 2160], 1183.7	27.1352	1.029451	0
N3W2B2	[1, 1483], 292.3	10.3301	1.012564	5
N3W2B3	[1, 51], 9.6	0.4990	1.0025	9
N3W3B1	[1, 2056], 725.2	15.8553	1.020936	4
N3W3B2	[1, 349], 60.8	2.2695	1.003571	9
N3W3B3	[1, 1], 1	1.0689	1.003571	9
N3W4B1	[1, 793], 285.9	0.9541	1	10
N3W4B2	[1, 1079], 275.1	1.9922	1.004545	9
N3W4B3	[1, 1], 1	0.0719	1	10
N4W1B1	[65, 1809], 545.2	161.8008	1.047869	0
N4W1B2	[1, 101], 28	182.8211	1.044549	0
N4W1B3	[1, 32], 4.1	30.3496	1.001761	7
N4W2B1	[144, 1480], 513.7	144.7898	1.044488	0
N4W2B2	[1, 186], 22.1	112.6480	1.014804	0
N4W2B3	[1, 32], 4.1	7.6566	1.001	9
N4W3B1	[89, 2346], 762.1	131.3199	1.029577	0
N4W3B2	[1, 716], 132.2	61.9070	1.00988	3
N4W3B3	[1, 39], 4.8	0.0828	1	10
N4W4B1	[1, 757], 235.7	112.6926	1.019708	0
N4W4B2	[1, 91], 10	21.3766	1.005455	7
N4W4B3	[1, 1], 1	0.0066	1	10
Average		23.63204	1.015566	6.19

¹297 out of 480 individual instances were solved to optimality.

Table II-c: Improvement by AugNN over single-pass FFD for dataset 2

Problem Subsets	Min	Max	Avg	Problem Subsets	Min	Max	Avg
N1W1B1	1	2	1.5	N3W1B1	5	6	5.4
N1W1B2	0	1	0.6	N3W1B2	0	1	0.8
N1W1B3	0	0	0	N3W1B3	0	1	0.1
N1W2B1	0	1	0.4	N3W2B1	0	1	1.9
N1W2B2	0	1	0.4	N3W2B2	0	1	0.4
N1W2B3	0	0	0	N3W2B3	0	1	0.1
N1W3B1	0	1	0.1	N3W3B1	0	1	0.6
N1W3B2	0	1	0.1	N3W3B2	0	1	0.3
N1W3B3	0	0	0	N3W3B3	0	0	0
N1W4B1	0	0	0	N3W4B1	0	1	0.8
N1W4B2	0	1	0.2	N3W4B2	0	1	0.5
N1W4B3	0	0	0	N3W4B3	0	0	0
N2W1B1	2	3	2.8	N4W1B1	10	12	11.3
N2W1B2	0	1	0.4	N4W1B2	1	2	1.2
N2W1B3	0	1	0.1	N4W1B3	0	1	0.1
N2W2B1	0	1	0.8	N4W2B1	3	4	3.3
N2W2B2	0	1	0.2	N4W2B2	0	1	0.6
N2W2B3	0	0	0	N4W2B3	0	1	0.1
N2W3B1	0	1	0.1	N4W3B1	1	2	1.2
N2W3B2	0	1	0.1	N4W3B2	0	1	0.4
N2W3B3	0	0	0	N4W3B3	0	1	0.1
N2W4B1	0	0	0	N4W4B1	0	1	0.9
N2W4B2	0	1	0.3	N4W4B2	0	1	0.1
N2W4B3	0	1	0.1	N4W4B3	0	0	0

Table II-d: Improvement by AugNN over single-pass BFD for dataset 2

Problem Subsets	Min	Max	Avg	Problem Subsets	Min	Max	Avg
N1W1B1	1	2	1.4	N3W1B1	4	5	4.9
N1W1B2	0	1	0.3	N3W1B2	0	1	0.7
N1W1B3	0	0	0	N3W1B3	0	1	0.1
N1W2B1	0	1	0.4	N3W2B1	1	2	1.8
N1W2B2	0	1	0.3	N3W2B2	0	1	0.4
N1W2B3	0	0	0	N3W2B3	0	1	0.2
N1W3B1	0	0	0	N3W3B1	0	1	0.6
N1W3B2	0	0	0	N3W3B2	0	1	0.3
N1W3B3	0	0	0	N3W3B3	0	0	0
N1W4B1	0	0	0	N3W4B1	0	1	0.8
N1W4B2	0	0	0	N3W4B2	0	1	0.4
N1W4B3	0	0	0	N3W4B3	0	0	0
N2W1B1	2	3	2.6	N4W1B1	9	12	10.2
N2W1B2	0	1	0.4	N4W1B2	0	1	0.7
N2W1B3	0	1	0.1	N4W1B3	0	1	0.1
N2W2B1	0	1	0.4	N4W2B1	3	4	3.3
N2W2B2	0	1	0.2	N4W2B2	0	1	0.3
N2W2B3	0	0	0	N4W2B3	0	1	0.1
N2W3B1	0	1	0.1	N4W3B1	1	2	1.2
N2W3B2	0	0	0	N4W3B2	0	1	0.4
N2W3B3	0	0	0	N4W3B3	0	1	0.1
N2W4B1	0	0	0	N4W4B1	0	1	0.9
N2W4B2	0	1	0.3	N4W4B2	0	1	0.1
N2W4B3	0	1	0.1	N4W4B3	0	0	0

Table III: Improvement by AugNN over single-pass FFD

Dataset	Single Pass FFD	AugNN (optimal)	AugNN (improvement)	Problems Solved to Optimality
Dataset 1	547	50	28	597
Dataset 2	236	76	99	312

Table IV: Improvement by AugNN over single-pass BFD

Dataset	Single Pass BFD	AugNN (optimal)	AugNN (improvement)	Problems Solved to Optimality
Dataset 1	547	40	26	587
Dataset 2	236	61	97	297

Table V: Results for dataset 3

Problem Name	Number of Bins filled			Run Time (Sec)	Z/UB ¹
	4-Pack	3-Pack	After AugNN		
Hard0	32	43	56	0.2560	1
Hard1	31	44	57	0.2656	1
Hard2	31	45	57	0.1406	1.0178571
Hard3	35	45	55	0.2265	1
Hard4	29	39	57	0.1758	1
Hard5	32	43	56	0.2773	1
Hard6	29	42	57	0.3945	1
Hard7	26	38	55	0.1893	1
Hard8	31	44	57	0.2657	1
Hard9	23	37	57	0.3867	1.0178571
				0.2580	1.0035714

¹8 out of 10 individual instances were solved to optimality.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1: Neural Network representation of the Bin Packing Problem




Figure 2: Order of evaluation of AugNN functions

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3a: Plot of items and their sizes (for four-item bin packing)




Figure 3b: Plot of items and their sizes (for three-item bin packing)

REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, A., 2009. Theoretical insights into the augmented-neural-network approach for combinatorial optimization, *Annals of Operations Research* 168 101-117.
2. Agarwal, A., Colak, S. and Deane, J., 2010. NeuroGenetic approach for combinatorial optimization: an exploratory analysis, *Annals of Operations Research* 174 185-199.
3. Agarwal, A., Pirkul, H. and Jacob, V.S., 2003. Augmented neural networks for task scheduling, *European Journal of Operational Research* 151(3) 481-502.
4. Alvim, A.C.F., Ribeiro, C.C., Glover, F. and Aloise, D.J., 2004, A hybrid improvement heuristic for the one-dimensional bin packing problem, *Journal of Heuristics* 10 205-229
5. Anily, S., Bramel, J. and Simchi-Levi, D., 1984. Worst case analysis of heuristics for the bin-packing problem with general cost structures, *Operations Research* 42 287-298.
6. Brusco, M.J., Thompson, G.M. and Jacobs, L.W., 1997. A morph-based simulated annealing heuristic for a modified bin-packing problem, *Journal of Operational Research Society* 48 433-439.
7. Corcoran, A.L. and Wainwright, R.L., 1993. A heuristic for improved genetic bin packing, *University of Tulsa Technical Report UTULSA-MCS-93-8*, Tulsa, OK.
8. Fleszar, K. and Hindi, K.S., 2002. New heuristics for one-dimensional bin packing, *Computers and Operations Research* 29 821-839.
9. Garey, M.R. and Johnson, D.S., 1979. *Computers and intractability. a guide to the theory of NP-completeness*, 22 ed. A Series of Books in the Mathematical Sciences, ed. V Klee New York, W.H. Freeman and Company.
10. Gradisar, M., Resinovic, G. and Kljajic, M., 1999. A hybrid approach for optimization of the one-dimensional cutting, *European Journal of Operational Research* 119 719-728.

11. Gupta, J. and Ho, J.C., 1999. A new heuristic algorithm for the one-dimensional bin-packing problem, *Production Planning and Control* 10(6) 598-603.
12. Loh, K.H., Golden, B., Wasil, E., 2008. Solving the one-dimensional bin packing problem with a weight annealing heuristic, *Computers and Operations Research* 35(7) 2283-2291
13. Martello, S. and Toth, P., 1990. *Knapsack problems: algorithms and computer Implementations*, Chichester, England, John Wiley and Sons.
14. Rao, R.L. and Iyengar, S.S., 1994. Bin packing by simulated annealing, *Computers and Mathematics with Applications* 27(5) 71-82.
15. Reeves, C., 1995. Hybrid genetic algorithms for bin packing and related problems, *Annals of Operations Research* 63 371-396.
16. Scholl, A., Klein, R. and Jtirgens, C., 1997. BISON: A fast hybrid procedure for exactly solving the one-dimensional bin-packing problem, *Computers and Operations Research* 24(7) 627-645.
17. Singh, A. and Gupta, A. K., 2007. Two heuristics for the one-dimensional bin-packing problem, *OR Spectrum* 29(4) 765-781.
18. Stawowy, A., 2008. Evolutionary based heuristic for bin packing problem, *Computers and Industrial Engineering* 55(2) 465-474.
19. Tambouratzis, T., 2001. Incremental bin packing, *Neural, Parallel and Scientific Computations* 9(2) 175-186.
20. Valerio de Carvalho J.M., 1999. Exact solution of bin-packing problems using column generation and branch-and-bound, *Annals of Operations Research* 86 629-659.