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#### Abstract

Transportation Problem (TP) is the study of strategy for shipping the product from the origin (supplier) to the destination (consumers) and the optimal shipment cost of the TP obtained from the initial basic feasible solution (IBFS). IBFS is the prime element of TP which helps to optimize the TP objective function. Existing methods for finding IBFS could not give the nearest value to minimal cost everywhere. Hence an innovative technique Known as TOCM-MT provides IBFS, which is the closest to an optimal solution. Many researchers have used this TOCM-MT technique through thousands of real-life TP problems, in every time got a better result than VAM, JHM, and TDM1 techniques. Hence, this technique is best for obtaining IBFS. This research is illustrated the TOCM-MT approach through time minimizing, transshipment, and profit maximization problems with some numerical examples.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

HE transportation problem is one of the most important problems in various sciences. This problem Transport some products from source to destination with minimal transportation costs, Meet supply and demand constraints. TP's goal is to achieve the lowest total cost as the best solution. First developed by Hitchcock. It can be applied to real-world problems such as: Personal Assignments, Task Assignments, Flow Shop Planning Issues and Vehicles routing.

There are two steps to get the optimal solution from TP. The first step is to find the initial basic feasible solution (IBFS) and the second step is to find the optimal solution of this IBFS. To solve transport problems, you need to start with IBFS. Finding an IBFS is important because it is a fundamental solution to achieve the best possible solution. The IBFS results may be similar or closer to the optimal solution values. Better IBFS results allow you to reduce the number of iterations to get the optimal solution. In this research, IBFS and transport issues are found.

VAM, JHM, and TDM1 have been explored to find IBFS, but do not always provide the best. Then TDM1 was chosen for the following reasons: The highest penalty (HP) is chosen arbitrarily, with the largest units directly assigned to the cheapest cell. Therefore, the optimal solution is not always obtained. Some studies used the TOCM matrix as the starting matrix and found IBFS to be superior. Therefore, in this study,
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we integrate TOCM with a modified TDM1 called Total Opportunity Cost Matrix-Minimal Total (TOCMMT) to determine the IBFS of TP.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Many studies on IBFS have been performed by multiple researchers, the three most popular being the Northwest Corner Method (NCM). Least Cost Method (LCM) and Vogel's Approximation Method (VAM). Several methods to find IBFS based on LCM have been developed by researchers such as Juman and Hoque, Babu, Dhurai, Kousalya and Malarvizhi, Ahmed et al., and Deshmukh. Juman and Hoque proposed the Juman-Hoque Method (JHM) to obtain IBFS. It was different in that it started with an infeasible solution and ended up with an efficient IBFS. Experiments have shown that JHM leads to the lowest total cost in 16 out of 18 transportation problems.

VAM is generally the best known early and basic viable solution. It has long been studied and modified by researchers such as Hosseini, Soomro et al, Rashid, Hakim, Goyal, Das et al, Azad and Hossain, Alkubaisi, Seethalakshmy, and Srinivasan. Hosseini proposed Total Difference Method 1 (TDM1) to obtain his IBFS of TP. VAM computes all row and column penalties, while TDM1 computes only row penalties. Another difference is how penalties are calculated. Penalty of TDM1 is more complete than VAM. This is so because TDM1 penalty is the sum of differences between the least and other costs, but VAM penalty is the difference between two least costs. Azad and Hossain took average row and column penalties into consideration. Alkubaisi calculated the penalty value using the median cost. The penalty value could be determined using an alternative method proposed by Seethalakshmy and Srinivasan. The column penalty is the difference between the maximum cost and the minimum cost, whereas the row penalty is the difference between the two greatest costs.

The Total Opportunity Cost Matrix (TOCM), developed by Kirca and Satir, was first used. By combining the row and column opportunity cost matrices, it converts the original TP matrix into an initial matrix. Every element is subtracted from the row/column opportunity cost matrix by the least expensive cost. In order to provide a workable solution to the transportation issue, Khan et al. suggested TOCM SUM. TOCM was utilized by Dubey and Shriviastura to enhance VAM. To determine the most fundamentally workable solution (BFS) to the transportation issue, Islam et al. presented the Total Opportunity Cost Table (TOCT). The distribution indicator for each cell or the TOCM was specified by Khan et al. Meenakshi and Mathirajan integrated TOCM and VAM to determine the transportation issue's lowest total cost.

## 1. Introduction

The Total Opportunity Cost Matrix (TOCM) was introduced by Kirca and Satir. Transform the matrix transportation problem from the original matrix to the initial matrix by adding row and column possibilities. The Opportunity row subtracts the lowest cost from each element in the row. The Opportunity column subtracts each element in the column with the lowest cost in it. TOCM is the sum of opportunity in rows and columns.

## Total Opportunity Cost Matrix - Minimal Total

Transportation Problem (TP) deals with delivering the product from the sources to the destinations and Initial Basic Feasible Solution (IBFS) is necessary to obtain an optimal solution. The previous methods related to it did not always provide the satisfied result all the time. Therefore a new method called

Total Opportunity Cost Matrix - Minimal Total (TOCMMT) was proposed to determine IBFS as a basic solution to solve TP. The objective is to achieve a total cost with similar or closer values to the optimal solution.

## Notations

| $m$ | Total number of supply $n$ | $n$ | Total number of demand |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $T_{i}$ | Supply $i$ |  |  |
| $R_{j}$ | Demand $j$ |  |  |
| $C_{i j}$ | Transportation cost from the supply $i$ to | demand $j$ |  |
| $Y_{i j}$ | Allocation made from the supply $i$ and |  |  |
|  | demand $j$ |  |  |

Abbreviations

| LP | Largest Penalty |
| :--- | :--- |
| MC | Minimum Cost |
| ROM | Row Opportunity Matrix |
| COM | Column Opportunity Matrix |
| TOCM | Total Opportunity Cost Matrix |
| TC | Total Cost |
| OV | Objective Value |

## Mathematical Model of Transportation problem

The objective of the TP can be formulated as follow:

```
            \(\operatorname{Min} Z=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} C_{i j} Y_{i j}\)
Subject to \(\sum_{j=1}^{n} Y_{i j}=T_{i}\) for \(i=1,2, \ldots, m\)
    where \(Y_{i j} \geq 0\)
```


## Algorithm for TOCM-MT Approach

The steps of TOCM-MT method can be described as follows:
Step 1: Consider an original TP matrix $\mathrm{m} \times \mathrm{n}$ with cost $C_{i j}$ demands $R_{j i j}=1,2, \ldots, \mathrm{n}$ and supplies $T_{i} ; i=1$, $2, \ldots, \mathrm{~m}$. When total supply and total demand are not equal, then we have to add a dummy row or column. Step 2: Obtain ROM from the original TP by finding the MC of each row and then subtracting each cost in the row with the MC.
Step 3: Obtain COM from the original TP by finding the MC of each column and then subtracting each cost in the column with the MC.
Step 4: Obtain the TOCM where the entries are the sum of the entries of ROM and COM.
Step 5: Find the penalty $P_{i}$ for each row where the penalty is the total difference between the minimum $\operatorname{cost} M C_{i}$ and other costs in the row, as shown in Equations (1) and (2).
$M C_{i}=\min \left(C_{i j}\right), j=1,2, \ldots, n$

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{i}=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(C_{i j}-M C_{i}\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

(2) Step 6: Choose the Largest Penalty (LP) as shown in Equation (3). Use the following tie-breakers in case of tie in the given order:
(i) Select LP with the smallest $C_{i j}$.
(ii) In case of a tie in (i), select penalty with the greatest total cost $T C_{i}$ as shown in Equation (4).
(iii) In case of a tie in (ii), select penalty with the maximum allocation of $Y_{i j}$.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{LP}=\max \left(P_{i}\right), i=1,2, \ldots m  \tag{3}\\
& \quad T C_{i}=\sum_{j=1}^{n} C_{i j} \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

Step 7: Select the minimum cost (MC)
from the largest penalty. In case of a tie (i.e. equal MC), select MC with the maximum allocation of $Y_{i j}$.
Step 8: Check the value of MC. If MC is not equal to zero, then go to step 9 , else if MC equal to zero then select the LP from the first LP $\left(L P_{1}\right)$ or second LP $\left(L P_{2}\right)$. Select the LP by comparing each cost cell in $L P_{1}$ and each cost cell in $L P_{2}$ as shown in
Equation (5), where $C_{1 j}$ is the cost at $L P_{1}$ and $C_{2 j}$ is the cost at $L P_{2}$. Total $O V_{1 j}$ is the sum of $O V_{1 j}$ and Total $O V_{2 j}$ is the sum of
$O V_{2 j}$. LP is selected on the basis of Equation (6).
Total $O V_{i}=\sum_{j=1}^{n} O V_{1 j}$
where, $O V_{2 j}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}1 \text { if } C_{1 j}<C_{2 j}, j=1,2, \ldots, n \\ 0 \text { if } C_{1 j} \geq C_{2 j}, j=1,2, \ldots, n\end{array}\right\}$
(5)

Total $G V_{2 j}=\sum_{j=1}^{n} O V_{2 j}$
where, LP $=\left\{\begin{array}{l}L P_{1} \text { if Total } O V_{1 j} \geq \text { Total } O V_{2 j} \\ L P_{2} \text { if Total } O V_{1 j}<\text { Total } O V_{2 j}\end{array}\right\}$
Step 9: Allocate the maximum possible units $Y_{i j}$ to the cell having minimum cost of LP.
Step 10: Cross out the satisfied column or row by adjusting the supply and demand.
Step 11: Without considering the cross out rows and columns recalculate the penalty.
Step 12: Repeat steps 6-11 until all the rows and columns are satisfied.
Step 13: Finally, calculate the Total Cost Transportation Problem (TCTP) by combining TOCM-MT with the penalty and the original TP.
$\mathrm{TCTP}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} C_{i j} Y_{i j}$
2. MINIMIZATION TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM Consider four bases of operations $B_{i}$ and three targets $T_{j}$. The tops of bombs per aircraft from any base that can be delivered to any target are given in the table below.

|  | $T_{1}$ | $T_{2}$ | $T_{3}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $B_{1}$ | 8 | 6 | 5 | 150 |
| $B_{2}$ | 6 | 6 | 6 | 150 |
| $B_{3}$ | 10 | 8 | 4 | 150 |
| $B_{4}$ | 8 | 6 | 4 | 150 |
| Demand | 200 | 200 | 200 |  |

The daily sortie capacity of each of the four bases is 150 sorties per day. The daily requirement in sorties over each individual target is 200 .

## Solution:

Step 1: Construct an original Transportation Problem. Step 2: Construct ROM from the original TP by subtracting each cost of the row from the least cost in that row. Here $5,6,4 \& 4$ are the minimum cost of row $1,2,3 \& 4$ respectively.
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## Table 1

Row opportunity matrix.

|  | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ | 3 | 1 | 0 | 150 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{3}$ | 6 | 4 | 0 | 150 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 4 | 2 | 0 | 150 |
| Demand | 200 | 200 | 200 |  |

Step 3: Construct COM from the original TP by subtracting each cost of the row from the least cost in that row. Here $6,6 \& 4$ are the least cost of column $1,2 \& 3$ respectively.

Table 2
Column opportunity matrix.

|  | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ | 2 | 0 | 1 | 150 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 2 | 150 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{3}$ | 4 | 2 | 0 | 150 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 2 | 0 | 0 | 150 |
| Demand | 200 | 200 | 200 |  |

Step 4: Construct the TOCM in which the entries are the sum of the row and column opportunity matrix.
Table 3 TOCM matrix.

|  | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ | 5 | 1 | 1 | 150 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 2 | 150 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{3}$ | 10 | 6 | 0 | 150 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 6 | 2 | 0 | 150 |
| Demand | 200 | 200 | 200 |  |

Step 5: Find the penalty for each row. Penalty 1 of row 1 is 4 , row 2 is 2 , row 3 is 16 and row 4 is 8 .

## Table 4

|  | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | Supply | Penalty <br> 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{1}$ | 5 | 1 | 1 | 150 | 4 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 2 | 150 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{3}$ | 10 | 6 | 0 | 150 | 16 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 6 | 2 | 0 | 150 | 8 |
| Demand | 200 | 200 | 200 |  |  |

Step 6: Select the LP from $L P_{\text {and }} L P_{2}$ by comparing each cost cell in $L P_{1}$ with costs of $L P_{2}$. The LP is $L P_{2}$ is 16 at row 3. Select the MC from the largest penalty. The MC is 0 .
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## Table 5

|  | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | Supply | Penalty <br> 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{1}$ | 5 | 1 | 1 | 150 | 4 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 2 | 150 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{3}$ | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 150 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 6 | 2 | 0 | 150 | 8 |
| Demand | 200 | 200 | 50 |  |  |

Step 7: Adjust the supply and demand then cross out the satisfied supply $B_{3}$. Recalculate the penalty 2.
Step 8: Select the LP. The $L P_{1}$ is 8 and $L P_{2}$ is 4 . By comparing each cost cell in $L P_{1}$ with costs of $L P_{2}$ we can get the LP as $L P_{2}$ is 8 at row 4 . Table 6

|  | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | Supply | Penalty <br> 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ | 5 | 1 | 1 | 150 | 4 |
| $\mathrm{B}_{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 2 | 150 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{B}_{4}$ | 6 | 2 | $\begin{array}{l\|l\|} \hline & 50 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 100 | 8 |
| Demand | 200 | 200 | 0 |  |  |

Step 9: By adjusting supply and demand, cross out the satisfied demand $T_{3}$. Recalculate the penalty 3 without considering the cross out rows and columns. Table 7

|  | $T_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | Supply | Penalty <br> 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{1}$ | 5 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 6 | 2 | 100 | 4 |
| Demand | 200 | 50 |  |  |

Step 10: Recalculate the Penalty 4 and Penalty 5 respectively. Table 8

|  | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | Supply | Penalty <br> 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 0 | 1 <br> 50 <br> 0 | 50 | 4 |
| Demand | 200 | 0 |  |  |

IJFMR

## Table 9

|  | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | Supply | Penalty 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{B}_{2}$ | $0_{0} \quad 150$ | 150 / 0 | 0 |
| $B_{4}$ | $6$ | $50 / 0$ | 6 |
| Demand | $\begin{array}{\|ll\|} \hline 200 & / \\ 150 / 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |

Step 11. Finally, calculate the Total Cost of Transportation Problem (TCTP) by combining TOCM-MT with the penalty and original transportation problem. Table 10


Hence the allocation units given from Final Table are as follows:
$\mathrm{X}_{12}=150, X_{21}=150, X_{33}=150, X_{41}=50, X_{42}=50, \mathrm{X}_{43}=50$
$\mathrm{TCTP}=6(150)+6(150)+4(150)+8(50)+6(50)+4(50)$

$$
=\text { Rs. } 3,300 .
$$

## 3. MAXIMIZATION TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM

Generally, in transportation problem the objective is to minimize. However, the transportation problem can also be useful for maximization. The procedure is as follows. Step-1. Convert the maximization problem into minimization problem where the entries are obtained by subtracting each element from the highest element of the table. Step-2. Find an initial feasible solution by using TOCM-MT method.
Step-3. Find an optimal solution by using MODI method.

## Experimental Result

A company has 3 factories. It provides readymade garments 4 dealers. The demand, supply and the transportation costs are given below in the following matrix. Obtain the distribution to maximize the profit.

|  | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{4}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{o}_{1}$ | 15 | 51 | 42 | 33 | 23 |
| $\mathrm{o}_{2}$ | 80 | 42 | 26 | 81 | 44 |
| $\mathrm{o}_{3}$ | 90 | 40 | 66 | 60 | 33 |
| Demand | 23 | 31 | 16 | 30 |  |

Step 1: Convert the maximization problem into minimization by subtracting all the elements from the largest element in the given transportation table. Here, the maximum element is 90 . So subtract each value from 90. Table 1

|  | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{4}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{o}_{1}$ | 75 | 39 | 48 | 57 | 23 |
| $\mathrm{o}_{2}$ | 10 | 48 | 64 | 9 | 44 |
| $\mathrm{o}_{3}$ | 0 | 50 | 24 | 30 | 33 |
| Demand | 23 | 31 | 16 | 30 |  |

Step 2: Construct the TOCM in which the entries are the sum of the row and column opportunity matrix.
Table 2

|  | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{4}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{o}_{1}$ | 111 | 0 | 33 | 66 | 23 |
| $\mathrm{o}_{2}$ | 11 | 48 | 95 | 0 | 44 |
| $\mathrm{o}_{3}$ | 0 | 61 | 24 | 51 | 33 |
| Demand | 23 | 31 | 16 | 30 |  |

Step 3: Select the Largest Penalty from $L P_{1}$ and $L P_{2}$ by comparing each cost cell in $L P_{1}$ with costs of $L P_{2}$. The LP is $L P_{1}$ is 210 at row 1 . Table 3

|  | $\mathrm{o}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{o}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{o}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{o}_{4}$ | Supply | Penalty <br> 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{o}_{1}$ |  | 23 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 111 | 0 | 33 | 66 | $23 / 0$ | 210 |
| $\mathrm{o}_{2}$ | 11 | 48 | 95 | 0 | 44 | 154 |
| $\mathrm{o}_{3}$ | 0 | 61 | 24 | 51 | 33 | 136 |
| Demand | 23 | 31 | 16 | 30 |  |  |

Step 4: Find the largest penalty and allocate the cell with minimum cost (MC). Table 4

|  | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{4}$ | Supply | Penalty |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |$|$|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{o}_{2}$ | 11 | 48 | 95 | 0 |  | 0 |
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Step 5: Adjust supply and demand then cross out the satisfied demand $D_{4}$. Recalculate the penalty 3 .
Step 6: Select the LP and allocate the cell having minimum cost (MC) from the largest penalty. The MC is 0 . Table 5

|  | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{o}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{o}_{3}$ | Supply | Penalty <br> 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | 14 |  |  |  |

Step 7: Adjust supply and demand then cross out the satisfied supply $O_{2}$. Recalculate the penalty 3 without considering the cross out rows and columns. Table 6

|  |  | $\mathrm{o}_{1}$ |  | $\mathrm{o}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{o}_{3}$ | SupplyPenalty <br> 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{o}_{3}$ |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 61 | 24 | 24 | 85 |
| Demand | 0 | 0 | 16 |  |  |  |

Step 8: Recalculate the Penalty 5 and Penalty 6 respectively. Table 7

|  | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{o}_{3}$ | $\text { Supply }{ }_{5}^{P}$ | Penalty $5$ | Penalty <br> 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{0}$ | $618$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 16 \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 / 8 / 3 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | 61 |
| Demand8 / 0 |  | 16/0 |  |  |  |

## Table 8



Use MODI method for finding an optimal solution. The initial basic feasible solution has $\mathrm{m}+\mathrm{n}-1$ allocations, that is $3+4-1=6$ allocations in independent positions.
Now, take $u_{3}=0$, we get $v_{1}=0, v_{2}=50, v_{3}=24$.
Similarly, $u_{1}+v_{2}=39$ or $u_{1}+50=39$ or $u_{1}=-11$.

Again, $u_{2}+v_{1}=10$ or $u_{2}+0=10$ or $u_{2}=10$.
In the same way, $u_{2}+v_{4}=9$ or $10+v_{4}=9$ or $v_{4}=-1$.
Compute empty cell evaluations $\Delta_{i j}=C_{i j}-\left(u_{j+} v_{j}\right)$.
Table 9 ([ $\left.C_{i j}\right]$ matrix)

|  | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{4}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{s}_{1}$ | 75 |  | 48 | 57 | 23 |
| $\mathrm{~s}_{2}$ |  | 48 | 57 |  | 44 |
| $\mathrm{~s}_{3}$ |  |  |  | 30 | 33 |
| Demand | 23 | 31 | 16 | 30 |  |

Table 10 ( $\left[u_{i+} v_{j}\right]$ matrix)

|  | $D_{1}$ | $D_{2}$ | $D_{3}$ | $D_{4}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $s_{1}$ | - |  | 13 | - | 23 |
|  | 11 |  |  | 12 |  |
| $s_{2}$ |  | 60 | 34 |  | 44 |
| $s_{3}$ |  |  |  | -1 | 33 |
| Demand | 23 | 31 | 16 | 30 |  |

Table $11\left(\left[{ }_{i j}-\left(u_{i}+v_{j}\right)\right]\right.$ matrix)

|  | $D_{1}$ | $D_{2}$ | $D_{3}$ | $D_{4}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $s_{1}$ | 86 |  | 35 | 69 | 23 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ |  | - | 30 |  | 44 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~s}_{3}$ |  |  |  | 31 | 33 |
| Demand | 23 | 31 | 16 | 30 |  |

Select the empty cell evaluation $\Delta_{22}=-12$ as it is negative. So allocate $\theta$ to the cell $(2,2)$ and form a closed loop followed by alternatively subtracting and adding the amount of this allocation to other corners of the loop.

## Table 12

|  | $\mathrm{o}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{4}$ | Supply |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{O}_{1}$ | 75 | 23 <br> 39 |  | 57 | 23 |
| $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | $\theta$ $-\quad 14$ $-\quad 10$ | $+\theta$ 48 | 64 | 30 9 | 44 |
| $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ | +9 $+\quad 0$ | $-8$ |  |  | 33 |
| Demand | 23 | 31 | 16 | 30 |  |

So, $\theta=\min (14,8)=8$ units from the cell $(3,2)$ to $(2,2)$. Table 13
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|  | $\mathrm{o}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{4}$ | Supply |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{o}_{1}$ | 75 | 23 39 | 48 | 57 | 23 |
| $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | $\frac{6}{10}$ | 8 <br> 48 |  | 30 9 |  |
| $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ | 17 0 |  | 16 24 | 30 | 33 |
|  | 23 | 31 | 16 | 30 |  |

Now, take $u_{2}=0$, we get $v_{1}=10, v_{2}=48, v_{4}=9$.
Similarly, $u_{1}+v_{2}=39$ or $u_{1}+48=39$ or $u_{1}=-9$.
Again, $u_{3}+v_{1}=0$ or $u_{3}+10=10$ or $u_{3}=-10$.
In the same way, $u_{3}+v_{3}=24$ or $-10+v_{3}=24$ or $v_{3}=34$.
Compute empty cell evaluations $\Delta_{i j}=C_{i j}-\left(u_{j+} v_{j}\right)$. Table 14 ([ $\left.C_{i j}\right]$ matrix)

|  | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{4}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{s}_{1}$ | 75 |  | 48 | 57 | 23 |
| $\mathrm{~s}_{2}$ |  |  | 64 |  | 44 |
| $\mathrm{~s}_{3}$ |  | 50 |  | 30 | 33 |
| Demand | 23 | 31 | 16 | 30 |  |

Table 15 ([ $\left.u_{i}+v_{j}\right]$ matrix)

|  | $D_{1}$ | $D_{2}$ | $D_{3}$ | $D_{4}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{s}_{1}$ | 1 |  | 25 | 0 | 23 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ |  |  | 34 |  | 44 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{3}$ |  | 38 |  | -1 | 33 |
| Demand | 23 | 31 | 16 | 30 |  |

Table $16\left(\left[C_{i j}-\left(u_{i}+v_{j}\right)\right]\right.$ matrix $)$

|  | $D_{1}$ | $D_{2}$ | $D_{3}$ | $D_{4}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $s_{1}$ | 74 |  | 23 | 57 | 23 |
| $s_{2}$ |  |  | 30 |  | 44 |
| $s_{3}$ |  | 12 |  | 31 | 33 |
| Demand | 23 | 31 | 16 | 30 |  |

All the empty cell evaluations are positive. Hence we reached at the optimal stage. The final solution table is given in table 17. Table 17

|  | $\mathrm{o}_{1}$ |  | $\mathrm{o}_{2}$ |  | $\mathrm{o}_{3}$ |  | $\mathrm{o}_{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Supply |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 23 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{o}_{1}$ | 15 | 5 | 1 | 42 | 33 | 23 |  |
| $\mathrm{o}_{2}$ |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 80 | 42 |  | 26 |  | 30 |
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| Demand 23 | 31 | 16 | 30 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

The allocation units for this solution becomes:

$$
X_{12}=23, X_{21}=6, X_{22}=8, X_{24}=30, X_{31}=17, X_{33}=16
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Cost } & =51 \times 23+80 \times 6+42 \times 8+81 \times 30+90 \times 17+66 \times 16 \\
& =\text { Rs. } 7,005 .
\end{aligned}
$$

## 4. TIME-MINIMIZING TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM

Instead of focusing on reducing the cost of transportation, time minimizing transportation problems aim to do the opposite. For instance, in the military, the time of supply is more valuable than the cost of transportation, hence it is always preferable to reduce the overall time of supply rather than the cost. These issues are frequently seen in emergency services, including the military, hospital administration, fire services, etc.

Time minimization transportation problems are actually quite similar to the cost-minimization transportation problems, with the exception that the unit time $t_{i j i s}$ used in place of unit cost $C_{i j}$, which is the cost per unit of time to transport the items from ith origin to jth destination.

First by applying TOCM-MT method, we have to find the initial basic feasible solution. Now if $\tilde{T}_{j}$ is the largest transportation time associated with the jth feasible plan, then we have to find such plan that gives minimum $\tilde{T}_{j}$.

## Mathematical model of TP

The objective of the TP can be formulated as follow:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\operatorname{Min} Z=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} t_{i j} x_{i j} \\
\text { Subject to } \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{i j}=S_{i} \text { for } I=1,2, \ldots m
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{i j}=D_{j} \text { for } j=1,2, \ldots, n
$$

where $x_{i j} \geq 0$

Notations $m \quad$ Total number of supply $n \quad$ Total number of demand
$S_{i} \quad$ Supply $I$
$D_{j} \quad$ Demand $j$
$t_{i j} \quad$ Transportation time from the supply $I$ to demand $j x_{i j} \quad$ Allocation made from the supply $I$ and demand $j$ Algorithm
Step-1. First apply TOCM-MT method and find the initial basic feasible solution.
Step-2. Compute $\tilde{T}_{j}$ for the basic feasible solution and cross out all the non-basic cells for which $t_{i j} \geq \tilde{T}_{j}$.
Step-3. Create a loop for the $\tilde{T}_{j}$-corresponding basic cells such that as the values in the cell's corners are moved around, this cell's values tend (not necessarily) to zero and none of the variables become zero. Then the solution is optimal, if such a closed path cannot exist, otherwise go to step-2. Step-4. Continue the process unless an optimum basic feasible solution is determined.

## Experimental Result

Consider the following transportation problem. Find the minimum shipping time.
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|  | $\mathrm{W}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~W}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~W}_{3}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ | 16 | 20 | 12 | 200 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{2}$ | 14 | 8 | 18 | 160 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{3}$ | 26 | 24 | 16 | 90 |
| Demand | 180 | 120 | 150 |  |

Step-1. Find an initial basic feasible solution using TOCM-MT method. Table 1 (TOCM matrix)

|  | $\mathrm{W}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~W}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~W}_{3}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ | 6 | 20 | 0 | 200 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{2}$ | 6 | 0 | 16 | 160 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{3}$ | 22 | 24 | 4 | 90 |
| Demand | 180 | 120 | 150 |  |

Table 2

|  | $\mathrm{W}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~W}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~W}_{3}$ | Supply | Penalty <br> 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{1}$ | 6 | 20 | 0 | 200 | 26 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{2}$ | 6 | 0 | 16 | 160 | 22 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{3}$ | 22 | 24 | 4 | 90 | 38 |
| Demand | 180 | 120 | 150 |  |  |

Table 3

|  | $\mathrm{W}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~W}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~W}_{3}$ | Supply | Penalty <br> 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{1}$ | 6 | 20 | 0 | 200 | 26 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{2}$ | 6 | 0 | 16 | 160 | 22 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{3}$ | 22 | 24 | 4 |  | 0 |
| Demand | 180 | 120 | 150 |  | 38 |

Table 4

|  | $\mathrm{W}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~W}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~W}_{3}$ | Supply | Penalty |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |$|$| $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ | 6 | 20 | 0 |  | 140 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{2}$ | 6 | 0 |  | 160 | 26 |
| Demand 180 | 120 | 0 |  |  |  |

Table 5
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|  | $\mathrm{W}_{1}$ |  | $\mathrm{~W}_{2}$ | Supply | Penalty <br> 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{1}$ | 6 |  | 20 | 0 | 14 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{2}$ | 6 | 0 | 160 | 6 |  |
| Demand | 40 | 120 |  |  |  |

Table 6

|  | $\mathrm{W}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{W}_{2}$ | Supply | Penalty <br> 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ | $40$ | $\begin{array}{l\|l\|} \hline & 120 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 6 |
| Demand | 0 | 0 |  |  |

Table 7

|  | $\mathrm{W}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{W}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{W}_{3}$ | Supply |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ | $16 \quad 140$ |  | $12 \quad 60$ | 200 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2}$ | $14$ | $8 \quad 120$ | 18 | 160 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{3}$ | 26 | 24 | $16 \quad 90$ | 90 |
| Demand | 180 | 120 | 150 |  |

Here, $t_{11}=16, t_{13}=12, t_{21}=14, t_{22}=8, t_{33}=16$.
$\tilde{T}_{1}=\max \{16,12,14,8\}=16$.
Cross out the non-basic cells, where $t_{i j}>\tilde{T}_{1}$.
Table 8


Now we cannot form any closed loop. So, the solution is optimal.
Hence, the shipping time is 16 time unit.

## 5. TRANSHIPMENT PROBLEM

The term "transhipment problem" refers to a situation where a commodity is readily available and regularly shifts between sources or destinations before arriving at its final destination.
Here are some key features of the transhipment problems:
a. In transportation problem, there are m sources and n destinations whereas, in transhipment problem, there are $\mathrm{m}+\mathrm{n}$ sources and destinations.
b. If $S_{i}$ is the ith source and $D_{j}$ is the jth destination then the transportation costs from $S_{i}$ to $S_{j}$ is zero and the transportation costs from $S_{i}$ to $S_{j}$ or $S_{i}$ to $D_{i}$ are not equal.
c. In order to solve the transhipment problem, we must find the optimum solution to the transportation problem. We then solve the transhipment problem in the same way.
d. $2 \mathrm{~m}+2 \mathrm{n}-1$ number of basic variables are there in basic feasible solution. We are left with $\mathrm{m}+\mathrm{n}-1$ basic variables after eliminating the variables that appear in the $m+n$ diagonal cells.

## Experimental Result

Consider the following transhipment problem with two sources and two destinations, the costs for shipment in rupees are given below. Determine an optimum shipping schedule.

|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 4 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 5 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 |  |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Demand |  |  | 3 | 6 |  |

Step-1. Each given source and destination in the transhipment problem may be referred as a source or destination. If we now assume that there is no demand at any of the destinations $S_{1}, S_{2}$ or any of the sources $\mathrm{D}_{1}, \mathrm{D}_{2}$ and that there is no amount available at any of them, then a hypothetical quantity of supply and demand known as "buffer stock" is added to all the points in order to have a supply and demand. The buffer stock is 9 units.

Table 1 An original transportation problem.

|  | $S_{1}$ | $S_{2}$ | $D_{1}$ | $D_{2}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $\mathbf{S}_{1}$ | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | ${ }^{13}$ |
| $\mathbf{S}_{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 8 | 2 | ${ }^{14}$ |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Demand 9 | 9 | 12 | 15 |  |  |

Table 2 TOCM matrix.

|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | Supply |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4 |  |
| $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ | 2 | 0 | 16 | 4 | 14 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | 0 | 14 | 0 | 6 | 9 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Demand | 19 | 9 | 12 | 15 |  |
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Table 3 (Penalty 1 for each row)

|  | S 1 |  |  |  |  |  | Penalty <br> 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | 0 | 2 |  | 12 | 4 | 13 | 18 |
| S | 2 | , |  |  | 4 | 5 | 22 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | 0 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 6 | 9 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | 2 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 9 |
|  | 9 | 0 |  | 12 | 15 |  |  |

Table 4 (Penalty 2 for each row)

|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ |  | Penalty <br> 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | 0 | 12 | 4 | 13 |  |
| $S_{2}$ | $2_{2} 5$ | 16 | 4 | 0 | 16 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 16 |
| D | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | ${ }^{6}$ |
| D | 2 |  | 0 | 9 | 4 |
|  | d 4 |  | 15 |  |  |

Table 5 (Penalty 3 for each row)

|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ |  | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | Supply | Penalty <br> 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{1}$ | 0 | 12 | 4 | 9 | 6 |  |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 6 |  |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | 2 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 4 |  |
| Demand | 4 | 12 | 15 |  |  |  |

Table 6 (Penalty 4 for each row)

|  | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ |  | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |$|$|  |  | 9 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{1}$ | 12 | 4 |  |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | 0 | 6 | 8 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | 2 | 0 | 9 |
| Demand | 12 | 6 |  |
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Table 7 (Penalty 5 for each row)

|  | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | Supply | Penalty <br> 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline & 9 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l\|l\|} \hline & 6 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 0 | 2 |
| Demand | 0 | 0 |  |  |

Table 8


Use MODI method for finding an optimal solution.
Now, take $u_{1}=0$, we get $v_{1}=0$.
Similarly, $u_{2}+v_{1}=2$ or $u_{2}=2$.
Again, $u_{2}+v_{2}=0$ or $v_{2}=-2$.
In the same way, $u_{1}+v_{4}=4$ or $v_{4}=4$ and $u_{4}+v_{3}=2$ or $v_{3}=6$ and $u_{3}=-6$.
Table 9 ([ $\left.C_{i j}\right]$ matrix)

|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ |  | 2 | 12 |  | 13 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ |  |  | 16 | 4 | 14 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | 0 | 14 |  | 6 | 9 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | 2 | 0 |  |  | 9 |
| Demand | 9 | 9 | 12 | 15 |  |

Table $10\left(\left[u_{i}+v_{j}\right]\right.$ matrix $)$

|  | $S_{1}$ | $S_{2}$ | $D_{1}$ | $D_{2}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ |  | -2 | 6 |  | 13 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ |  |  | 8 | 6 | 14 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | -6 | -8 |  | -2 | 9 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | -4 | -6 |  |  | 9 |
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| Demand | 9 | 9 | 12 | 15 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table $11\left(\left[C_{i j}-\left(u_{i}+v_{j}\right)\right]\right.$ matrix)

|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ |  | 4 | 6 |  | 13 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ |  |  | 8 | -2 | 14 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | 6 | 22 |  | 8 | 9 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | 6 | 6 |  |  | 9 |
| Demand | 9 | 9 | 12 | 15 |  |

Select the empty cell evaluation $\Delta_{24}=-2$ as it is negative. So allocate $\theta$ to the cell $(2,4)$ and form a closed loop followed by alternatively subtracting and adding the amount of this allocation to other corners of the loop. Table 12

|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | Supply |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\theta 04$ |  | 12 | $14 \quad 9$ |  |
| $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ | $825$ | $9$ |  | $+\theta$ | 14 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | 0 | 14 | $0$ |  | 9 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | 2 | 0 | $2^{3}$ | $06$ | 9 |
| Dem | d9 | 9 | 12 | 15 |  |

So, $\theta=\min (5,9)=5$ units from the cell $(1,4)$ to $(2,4)$.

Table 13


Now, take $u_{1}=0$, we get $v_{1}=0, v_{4}=4$.
Similarly, $u_{2}+v_{4}=4$ or $u_{2}=0$.
Again, $u_{2}+v_{2}=0$ or $v_{2}=0$.
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In the same way, $u_{4}+v_{4}=0$ or $u_{4}+4=0$ or $u_{4}=-4$ and $u_{4}+v_{3}=2$ or $-4+v_{3}=2$ or $v_{3}=6$ and $u_{3}=-6$. Compute empty cell evaluations $\Delta_{i j}=C_{i j}-\left(u_{j}+v_{j}\right)$. Table 14 ([ $\left.C_{i j}\right]$ matrix)

|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ |  | 2 | 12 |  | 13 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | 2 |  | 16 |  | 14 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | 0 | 14 |  | 6 | 9 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | 2 | 0 |  |  | 9 |
| Demand | 9 | 9 | 12 | 15 |  |

Table 15 ([ $\left.u_{i}+v_{j}\right]$ matrix)

|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ |  | 0 | 6 |  | 13 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | 0 |  | 6 |  | 14 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | -6 | -6 |  | -2 | 9 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | -4 | -4 |  |  | 9 |
| Demand | 9 | 9 | 12 | 15 |  |

Table 16 ([ $\left.C_{i j}-\left(u_{i}+v_{j}\right)\right]$ matrix)

|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | Supply |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ |  | 2 | 6 |  | 13 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | 2 |  | 10 |  | 14 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | 6 | 20 |  | 8 | 9 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ | 6 | 4 |  |  | 9 |
| Demand | 9 | 9 | 12 | 15 |  |

All the empty cell evaluations are positive and hence, we reached at the optimal stage. The final solution table is given in table 13 .
Total cost=Rs. $(4 \times 9+2 \times 5+2 \times 3)=$ Rs. 52 . The shipping cost is Rs. 52 .

## CONCLUSION

An optimal solution of the objective function for TP depends on non-degeneracy IBFS. This study provides a TOCM-MT technique for obtaining IBFS, which leads to a direct optimal solution for TP. After analyzing VAM, JHM, and TDM1 methods, including TOCM-MT, through various applications, it concludes that TOCM-MT gives the best result and can apply to solving real-life TP problems.
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