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#### Abstract

The aim of this paper is to present a fuzzy multi-objective multi-index transportation problem and develop multi-objective multi-index fuzzy programming model. This model cannot only satisfy more of the actual requirements of the integral system but is also more flexible than conventional transportation problems. Furthermore, it can offer more information to the decision maker (DM) for reference, and then it can raise the quality for decision-making. This paper, we use a special type of linear and non-linear membership functions to solve the multi-objective multi-index transportation problem. It gives an optimal compromise solution.
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## Introduction

Fuzzy set theory was proposed by L. A. Zadeh and has been found extensive in various fields. Bellman and Zadeh [2] were the first to consider the application of the fuzzy set theory in solving optimization problems in a fuzzy environment, these investigators constraints that both the objective function and the constraints that exist in the model could be represented by corresponding fuzzy set and should be treated in the same manner. The earliest application of it to transportation problems include Prade [11], O'he'igeartaigh [10], Chanas et al. [4]. But these researcher emphases on investigating theory and algorithm. Furthermore, these above investigations are illustrated with simple instance slacking in actual cases of submition. On the other hand, these models are only of single objective and are classical two index transportation problems. In actual transportation problem, the multi-objective functions are generally considered, which includes average delivery time of the commodities, minimum cost, etc. Zimmermann [15] applied the fuzzy set theory to the linear multicriteria decision making problem. It used the linear fuzzy membership function and presented the application of fuzzy linear vector maximum problem. He showed that solutions obtained by fuzzy linear programming always provide efficient solutions and also an optimal compromised solution. Aneja and Nair [1] Showed that the problem model. Multi-index transportation problem are the extension of conventional transportation problems, and are appropriate for solving transportation problems with multiple supply points, multiple demand points as well as problems using diverse modes of transportation demand or delivering different kinds of merchandises. Thus, the forwarded problem would be more complicated than conventional transportation problems. Junginger [9] who proposed a set of logic problems, to solve multi-index transportation problems, has also conducted a detailed investigation regarding the characteristics of multi-index transportation problem model.

Rautman et al. [12] used multi-index transportation problem model to solve the shipping scheduling suggested that the employment of such transportation efficiency but also optimize the inegral system.

## Mathematical Model Multi-objective Multi-index Transportation Problem

Let $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{ij} 1}$ be multi-dimensional array
$1 \leq \mathrm{i} \leq \mathrm{m}, \quad 1 \leq \mathrm{j} \leq \mathrm{n}, \quad 1 \leq 1 \leq \mathrm{k}$ and let
$\mathrm{A}=\left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{ij}}\right), \mathrm{B}=\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{jl}}\right), \mathrm{C}=\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{il}}\right)$ be multi-matrices then multi-index transportation problem is defined as follows

Minimize $\mathrm{Z}=\sum_{\mathrm{i}} \sum_{\mathrm{j}} \sum_{\mathrm{l}} \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{ijl}} \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{ijl}}{ }^{(1)}$
Subject to

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\sum_{l} X_{i j l}=a_{i j} & \forall(i, j) \\
\sum_{j} X_{i j l}=c_{i l} & \forall(i, 1) \\
\sum_{i} X_{i j l}=b_{j l} & \forall(j, 1) \\
X_{i j l} \geq 0 \quad \forall(i, j, 1) & \\
\text { It is immediate that }
\end{array}
$$

$\sum_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\sum_{\mathrm{l}} \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{jl}} ; \quad \sum_{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\sum_{\mathrm{l}} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{il}} ; \quad \sum_{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{jl}}=\sum_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{il}}(3)$
are three necessary conditions however they are noted to be non sufficient.

Multi-objective double transportation
problem as follows

```
Minimize \(Z_{p}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} k_{i j}^{(1)} x_{i j}^{(1)}+\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} k_{i j}^{(2)} x_{i j}^{(2)}\)
Subject to
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\(\sum_{\mathrm{j}=1}^{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{(1)}=\mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{i}}\) & \(\forall \mathrm{i}\) \\
\(\sum_{\mathrm{j}=1}^{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{(2)}=\mathrm{a}_{2 \mathrm{i}}\) & \(\forall \mathrm{i}\) \\
\(\sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{(1)}=\mathrm{b}_{1 \mathrm{j}}\) & \(\forall \mathrm{j}\) \\
\(\sum_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{(2)}=\mathrm{b}_{2 \mathrm{j}}\) & \(\forall \mathrm{j}\) \\
\(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{(1)}+\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{(2)}=c_{\mathrm{ij}}\) & \(\forall \mathrm{i} . \mathrm{j}\) \\
\(x_{\mathrm{ij}}^{(1)}, x_{\mathrm{ij}}^{(2)} \geq 0\) & \(\forall \mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}\)
\end{tabular}
```

(4)

It may be easily seen that for existence of solution following set of conditions are necessary

| $\sum_{\mathrm{j}=1}^{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{ij}}+\mathrm{a}_{2 \mathrm{i}} \quad \forall \mathrm{i}$ |  | (11) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\mathrm{b}_{1 \mathrm{j}}+\mathrm{a}_{2 \mathrm{j}} \quad \forall \mathrm{j}$ |  | (12) |
| $\sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{i}}=\sum_{\mathrm{j}=1}^{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{j}}$ |  | (13) |
| $\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{2 i}=\sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{2 j}$ |  | (14) |
| $\sum \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{ij}} \leq \operatorname{Min}\left(\mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{i}}+\mathrm{b}_{1 \mathrm{j}}\right)+\operatorname{Min}\left(\mathrm{a}_{2 \mathrm{i}}+\mathrm{b}_{2 \mathrm{j}}\right)$ | $\forall(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j})$ | (15) |

It may be easily seen that DTP is composed of two transportation tables and one C matrix as given below.


Fuzzy Algorithm to solve multi-objective multi-index transportation problem Step 1:
Solve the multi-objective multi-index transportation problem as a single objective transportation problem P times by taking one of the objectives at a time

## Step 2 :

From the results of step 1, determine the corresponding values for every objective at each solution derived. According to each solution and value for every objective, we can find pay-off matrix as follows

$$
\mathrm{Z}_{1}(\mathrm{X}) \quad \mathrm{Z}_{2}(\mathrm{X}) \quad \ldots \quad \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathrm{X})
$$

$\mathrm{X}^{(2)}\left[\begin{array}{cccc}\mathrm{Z}_{11} & \mathrm{Z}_{12} & \cdots & \mathrm{Z}_{1 \mathrm{p}} \\ \mathrm{Z}_{21} & \mathrm{Z}_{22} & \cdots & \mathrm{Z}_{2} \mathrm{p} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \mathrm{X}^{(\mathrm{P})}\end{array}\right]$

Where, $\mathrm{X}^{(1)}, \mathrm{X}^{(2)}, \ldots, \mathrm{X}^{(\mathrm{p})}$ are the isolated optimal solutions of the $P$ different transportation problems for P different objective functions
$Z_{i j}=Z_{j}\left(X^{i}\right) \quad(i=1,2, \ldots, p \quad \& j=1,2, \ldots, p)$ be the i-th row and j-th column element of the pay-off matrix.

## Step 3:

From step 2, we find for each objective the worst ( $U_{p}$ ) and the best ( $L_{p}$ )
values corresponding to the set of solutions, where,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& U_{p}=\max \left(Z_{1 p}, Z_{2 p}, \ldots, Z_{p p}\right) \text { and } \\
& L_{p}=Z_{p p} \quad p=1,2, \ldots, P
\end{aligned}
$$

An initial fuzzy model of the problem (4)-(10) can be stated as

$$
\begin{array}{lcc}
\text { Find } \quad X_{i j} & i=1,2, \ldots, m & j=1,2, \ldots, n, \\
\text { so as to satisfy } & Z_{p}<L_{p} & p=1,2, \ldots, P \\
& \text { subject to } & (4)-(10)
\end{array}
$$

Step 4: Case (i)
Define membership function for the $p$-th objective
function as follows:
$\mu_{p}(X)= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } Z_{p}(X) \leq L_{p} \\ \frac{U_{p}-Z_{p}(X)}{U_{p}-L_{p}} & \text { if } L_{p}<Z_{p}<U_{p} \\ 0 & \text { if } Z_{p} \geq U_{p}\end{cases}$

Step 5:
Find an equivalent crisp model by using a linear membership function for the initial fuzzy model
Maximize $\lambda$
$\lambda \leq \frac{U_{p}-Z_{p}(X)}{U_{p}-L_{p}}$
subject to (5)-(10)

Step 6: Solve the crisp model by an appropriate mathematical programming algorithm.
Maximize $\lambda$
Subject to
(22)
$C_{i j}^{p} X_{i j}+\lambda\left(U_{p}-L_{p}\right) \leq U_{p} \quad p=1,2, \ldots, P$
subject to (5)-(10)
Now, by using hyperbolic membership function for the P-th objective function


Where, $\alpha_{p}=\frac{3}{U_{p}-L_{p}}=\frac{6}{U_{p}-L_{p}}$
Crisp model for the fuzzy model can be formulated as:
Maximize $\lambda$ subject to
$\lambda \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^{\left\{\frac{\left(U_{p}+L_{p}\right)}{2}-Z_{p}(x)\right\} \alpha_{p}}-e^{-\left\{\frac{\left(U_{p}+L_{p}\right)}{2}-Z_{p}(x)\right\} \alpha_{p}}}{e^{\left(\frac{\left.U_{p}+L_{p}\right)}{2}-Z_{p}(x)\right\} \alpha_{p}}+e^{-\left\{\frac{\left(U_{p}+L_{p}\right)}{2}-Z_{p}(x)\right\} \alpha_{p}}}+\frac{1}{2}(24)$
subject to $(5)-(10) \quad \& \quad \lambda \geq 0$
Solve the crisp model as
Maximize Xmn+1
subject to
$\alpha_{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathrm{x})+\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{mn}+1} \leq \alpha_{\mathrm{p}}\left(\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{p}}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{p}}\right) / 2, \quad \mathrm{p}=1,2,-\cdots \mathrm{P}$
subject to (5)-(10) and $X_{m+1} \geq 0$
Where, $X_{m n+1}=\tanh ^{-1}(2 \lambda-1)$
Now, by using exponential membership function for the $p$ th objective function and is defined as

$$
\mu^{E} Z_{p}(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
1, & \text { if } Z_{p} \leq L_{p}  \tag{26}\\
\frac{e^{-S \Psi_{p}(X)}-e^{-S}}{1-e^{-S}}, & \text { if } L_{p}<Z_{p}<U_{p} \\
0, & \text { if } Z_{p} \geq U_{p}
\end{array}\right.
$$

Where, $\Psi_{p}(X)=\frac{Z_{p}-L_{P}}{U_{p}-L_{p}} \quad \mathrm{p}=1,2, \ldots, \mathrm{P}$
$S$ is a non zero parameter, prescribed by the decision maker

\section*{Numerical Examples <br> Example 1 <br> 

## Example 2

Example 2 is simplified as
Minimize $\mathrm{Z}_{2}=5 X_{11}^{(1)}+6 \mathrm{X}_{12}^{(1)}+7 \mathrm{X}_{13}^{(1)}+4 \mathrm{X}_{21}^{(1)}+5 \mathrm{X}_{22}^{(1)}+2 \mathrm{X}_{23}^{(1)}+1 \mathrm{X}_{31}^{(1)}+3 \mathrm{X}_{32}^{(1)}+(31)$
$4 x_{32}^{(1)}+4 x_{41}^{(1)}+2 x_{42}^{(1)}+3 x_{43}^{(1)}+10 x_{11}^{(2)}+9 x_{12}^{(2)}+9 x_{13}^{(2)}+7 x_{21}^{(2)}+$
$9 x_{22}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{23}^{(2)}+\mathrm{x}_{31}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{32}^{(2)}+9 \mathrm{X}_{33}^{(2)}+8 \mathrm{X}_{41}^{(2)}+4 \mathrm{X}_{42}^{(2)}+5 \mathrm{X}_{43}^{(2)}$
Subject to
$X_{11}^{(1)}+X_{12}^{(1)}+X_{13}^{(1)}=9$
$X_{21}^{(1)}+X_{22}^{(1)}+X_{23}^{(1)}=14$
$X_{31}^{(1)}+X_{32}^{(1)}+X_{33}^{(1)}=6$
$X_{41}^{(1)}+X_{42}^{(1)}+X_{43}^{(1)}=7$
$\mathrm{X}_{11}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{12}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{13}^{(2)}=6$
$\mathrm{X}_{21}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{22}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{23}^{(2)}=7$
$X_{31}^{(2)}+X_{32}^{(2)}+X_{33}^{(2)}=5$
$X_{41}^{(2)}+X_{42}^{(2)}+X_{43}^{(2)}=6$
$\mathrm{X}_{11}^{(1)}+\mathrm{X}_{21}^{(1)}+\mathrm{X}_{31}^{(1)}+\mathrm{X}_{41}^{(1)}=14$
$X_{12}^{(1)}+X_{22}^{(1)}+X_{32}^{(1)}+X_{42}^{(1)}=12$
$X_{13}^{(1)}+X_{23}^{(1)}+X_{33}^{(1)}+X_{43}^{(1)}=10$
$\mathrm{X}_{11}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{21}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{31}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{41}^{(2)}=5$
$\mathrm{X}_{12}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{22}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{32}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{42}^{(2)}=8$
$\mathrm{X}_{13}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{23}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{33}^{(2)}+\mathrm{X}_{43}^{(2)}=11$
$X_{11}^{(1)}+X_{11}^{(2)}=5$
$X_{12}^{(1)}+X_{12}^{(2)}=7$
$X_{13}^{(1)}+X_{13}^{(2)}=3$
$X_{21}^{(1)}+X_{21}^{(2)}=8$
$X_{22}^{(1)}+X_{22}^{(2)}=4$
$\mathrm{X}_{23}^{(1)}+\mathrm{X}_{23}^{(2)}=9$
$X_{31}^{(1)}+X_{31}^{(2)}=4$
$X_{32}^{(1)}+X_{32}^{(2)}=1$
$X_{33}^{(1)}+X_{33}^{(2)}=6$
$X_{41}^{(1)}+X_{41}^{(2)}=2$
$\mathrm{X}_{42}^{(1)}+\mathrm{X}_{42}^{(2)}=8$
$X_{43}^{(1)}+X_{43}^{(2)}=3$

For objective $Z_{1}$, we find the optimal solution as

$$
X^{(1)}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
X_{11}^{(1)}=5 ; X_{12}^{(1)}=4 ; X_{21}^{(1)}=8 ; X_{22}^{(1)}=2, \\
X_{23}^{(1)}=4 ; X_{33}^{(1)}=6 ; X_{41}^{(1)}=1 ; X_{42}^{(1)}=6 ; \\
X_{12}^{(2)}=3 ; X_{13}^{(2)}=3 ; X_{22}^{(2)}=2 ; X_{23}^{(2)}=5, \\
X_{31}^{(2)}=4 ; X_{32}^{(2)}=1 ; X_{41}^{(2)}=1 ; X_{42}^{(2)}=2 ; \\
X_{43}^{(2)}=3
\end{array}\right\}
$$

For objective $Z_{2}$, we find the optimal solution as

$$
X^{(2)}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
X_{11}^{(1)}=4 ; X_{12}^{(1)}=5 ; X_{21}^{(1)}=8 ; X_{22}^{(1)}=4, \\
X_{23}^{(1)}=2 ; X_{31}^{(1)}=1 ; X_{33}^{(1)}=5 ; X_{41}^{(1)}=1 ; \\
X_{42}^{(1)}=3 ; X_{43}^{(1)}=3 ; X_{11}^{(2)}=1 ; X_{12}^{(2)}=2 ; \\
X_{13}^{(2)}=3 ; X_{23}^{(2)}=7 ; X_{31}^{(2)}=3 ; X_{32}^{(2)}=1 ; \\
X_{33}^{(2)}=1 ; X_{41}^{(2)}=1 ; X_{42}^{(2)}=5 ;
\end{array}\right\}
$$

$$
\mathrm{Z}_{1}=283
$$

Now for $X^{(1)}$ we can find out $Z_{2}$, $\mathrm{Z}_{2}\left(\mathrm{X}^{(1)}\right)=291$
Now for $X^{(2)}$ we can find out $Z_{1}$ $\mathrm{Z}_{1}\left(\mathrm{X}^{(2)}\right)=330$
Pay-off matrix is
$Z_{1}$
$Z_{2}$
$X^{(1)}\left[\begin{array}{cc}300 & 291 \\ X^{(2)} \\ 330 & 283\end{array}\right]$

From this matrix
$\mathrm{U}_{1}=330, \quad \mathrm{U}_{2}=291, \quad \mathrm{~L}_{1}=300, \quad \mathrm{~L}_{2}=283$
$\operatorname{Frid}\left\{\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{ij}}, j=1,23, j=1,23\right\}$, sostostisy $Z_{1} \leq m 0 \operatorname{adZ}_{2} \leq 233$,
Define membership function for the objective functions $\mathrm{Z}_{1}(\mathrm{X})$ and $\mathrm{Z}_{2}(\mathrm{X})$ respectively

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mu_{1}(X)=\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
\frac{1,}{\frac{330-Z_{1}(X)}{330-300},}, & \text { if } & 300<Z_{1}(X)<330 \\
0, & \text { if } & Z_{1}(X) \geq 330
\end{array}\right. \\
& ;
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{array}{lll}
1, & \text { if } & Z_{2}(X) \leq 283 \\
\mu_{2}(X)=\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
\frac{291-Z_{2}(X)}{291-283}, & \text { if } 283<Z_{2}(X)<291 \\
0, & \text { if } & Z_{2}(X) \geq 291
\end{array}\right.
\end{array}
$$

Find an equivalent crisp model
Maximize $\lambda, \quad \lambda+Z_{1}(X) \leq 330$ and
$5 \lambda+Z_{2}(\mathrm{X}) \leq 291$
Solve the crisp model by using an appropriate mathematical algorithm.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4 \mathrm{X}_{11}^{(1)}+3 \mathrm{X}_{12}^{(1)}+5 \mathrm{X}_{13}^{(1)}+8 \mathrm{X}_{21}^{(1)}+6 \mathrm{X}_{22}^{(1)}+2 \mathrm{X}_{23}^{(1)}+7 \mathrm{X}_{31}^{(1)}+4 \mathrm{X}_{32}^{(1)}+ \\
& x_{33}^{(1)}+9 x_{41}^{(1)}+10 x_{42}^{(1)}+12 x_{43}^{(1)}+8 x_{11}^{(2)}+6 x_{12}^{(2)}+3 x_{13}^{(2)}+5 x_{21}^{(2)}+ \\
& 4 X_{22}^{(2)}+x_{23}^{(2)}+9 x_{31}^{(2)}+2 x_{32}^{(2)}+6 x_{33}^{(2)}+4 x_{41}^{(2)}++9 x_{42}^{(2)}+3 x_{43}^{(2)}+302 \leq 330 \\
& 5 x_{11}^{(1)}+6 x_{12}^{(1)}+7 x_{13}^{(1)}+4 \mathrm{X}_{21}^{(1)}+5 \mathrm{X}_{22}^{(1)}+2 x_{23}^{(1)}+1 x_{31}^{(1)}+3 \mathrm{X}_{32}^{(1)}+ \\
& 4 X_{33}^{(1)}+4 x_{11}^{(1)}+2 x_{42}^{(1)}+3 x_{43}^{(1)}+10 x_{11}^{(2)}+9 x_{12}^{(2)}+9 x_{13}^{(2)}+7 x_{21}^{(2)}+ \\
& 9 X_{22}^{(2)}+2 X_{23}^{(2)}+8 X_{31}^{(2)}+7 X_{32}^{(2)}+9 X_{33}^{(2)}+8 X_{41}^{(2)}+4 X_{42}^{(2)}+5 X_{43}^{(2)}+8 \lambda \leq 291
\end{aligned}
$$

Subject to (30)
The optimal compromise solution of the problem is represented as
$\lambda=0.6521$

$$
\mathrm{x}^{(*)}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{x}_{11}^{(1)}=5 ; \mathrm{x}_{12}^{(1)}=2.2608 ; \mathrm{x}_{13}^{(1)}=1.7391 ; \mathrm{x}_{21}^{(1)}=8 ; \\
\mathrm{x}_{22}^{(1)}=3.7391 ; \mathrm{x}_{23}^{(1)}=2.2608 ; \mathrm{x}_{33}^{(1)}=6 ; \mathrm{x}_{41}^{(1)}=1 ; \\
\mathrm{x}_{42}^{(1)}=6 ; \mathrm{x}_{12}^{(2)}=4.7391 ; \mathrm{F}_{13}^{(2)}=1.2608 ; \mathrm{x}_{23}^{(2)}=6.7391 ; \\
\mathrm{x}_{31}^{(2)}=4 ; \mathrm{x}_{32}^{(2)}=1 ; \mathrm{x}_{41}^{(2)}=1 ; \mathrm{x}_{42}^{(2)}=2 ; \mathrm{x}_{43}^{(2)}=3 \\
\mathrm{z}_{1}^{*}=309.3902 \quad \text { and } \quad \mathrm{z}_{2}^{*}=283.4329
\end{array}\right\}
$$

Then we get the membership functions $\mu_{1}^{\mathrm{H}}\left(\mathrm{Z}_{1}\right)$ and $\mu_{2}^{\mathrm{H}}\left(\mathrm{Z}_{2}\right)$
for the objectives $Z_{1} \& Z_{2}$ respectively, are defined as follows:
$\mu H_{Z_{1}(x)}=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}1, & \text { if } Z_{1}(X) \leq 300 \\ \frac{1}{2} \tanh \left\{315-Z_{1}(X)\right\} \frac{6}{30}+\frac{1}{2} & \text { if } 300<Z_{1}(X)<330 \\ 0, & \text { if } Z_{1}(X) \geq 330\end{array}\right.$
$\mu H_{Z_{2}}(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}1, & \text { if } Z_{2}(X) \leq 283 \\ \frac{1}{2} \tanh \left\{287-Z_{2}(X)\right\} \frac{6}{8} & \text { if } 283<Z_{2}(X)<291 \\ 0, & \text { if } Z_{2}(X) \geq 291\end{array}\right.$
We get an equivalent crisp model
Maximize $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{mn}+1}$
Subject to
$\alpha_{1} \mathrm{Z}_{1}(\mathrm{X})+\mathrm{X}_{10} \leq \frac{\alpha_{1}}{2}\left(\mathrm{U}_{1}+\mathrm{L}_{1}\right)$
$\frac{6}{30}\left(4 x_{11}^{(1)}+3 x_{12}^{(1)}+5 x_{13}^{(1)}+8 x_{21}^{(1)}++6 x_{22}^{(1)}+2 x_{23}^{(1)}+7 x_{31}^{(1)}+4 x_{32}^{(1)}+\right.$
$x_{33}^{(1)}+9 x_{41}^{(1)}+10 x_{42}^{(1)}+12 x_{43}^{(1)}+x_{11}^{(2)}+6 x_{12}^{(2)}+3 x_{13}^{(2)}+5 x_{21}^{(2)}+$
$4 x_{22}^{(2)}+x_{23}^{(2)}+9 X_{31}^{(2)}+2 x_{32}^{(2)}+6 x_{33}^{(2)}+4 x_{41}^{(2)}+9 X_{42}^{(2)}+3 x_{43}^{(2)}+x_{m n+1} \leq \frac{6}{30} 315$
$24 x_{11}^{(1)}+18 x_{12}^{(1)}+30 x_{13}^{(1)}+48 x_{12}^{(1)}+36 x_{22}^{(1)}+12 x_{13}^{(1)}+42 x_{31}^{(1)}+24 x_{12}^{(1)}+$
$6 x_{33}^{(1)}+5 x_{11}^{(1)}+6 x_{12}^{(1)}+2 x_{13}^{(1)}+48 x_{11}^{(2)}+36 x_{12}^{(2)}+18 x_{13}^{(2)}+30 x_{21}^{(2)+}$
$\left.24 x_{22}^{(2)}+6 x_{23}^{(2)}+54 x_{31}^{(2)}+2 x x_{32}^{2}\right)+36 x_{33}^{(2)}+24 x_{41}^{(2)}+54 x_{12}^{(2)}+18 x_{43}^{(2)}+30 x_{\text {mm+1 }} \leq 1890$
And
$\alpha_{2} Z_{2}(\mathrm{X})+\mathrm{X} \leq \frac{\alpha_{2}}{2}\left(\mathrm{U}_{2}+\mathrm{L}_{2}\right)$
${ }_{8}^{6}\left(5 x_{11}^{(1)}+6 x_{12}^{(1)}+7 x_{13}^{(1)}+4 x_{21}^{(1)}+5 x_{22}^{(1)}+2 x_{23}^{(1)}+1 x_{31}^{(1)}+3 x_{32}^{(1)}+\right.$
$4 x_{33}^{(1)}+4 x_{41}^{(1)}+2 x_{42}^{(1)}+3 x_{43}^{(1)}+10 x_{11}^{(2)}+9 x_{12}^{(2)}+9 x_{13}^{(2)}+7 x_{21}^{(2)}+$
$9 x_{22}^{(2)}+2 x_{23}^{(2)}+8 x_{31}^{(2)}+7 x_{32}^{(2)}+9 x_{33}^{(2)}+8 x_{41}^{(2)}+4 x_{42}^{(2)}+5 x_{43}^{(2)}+x_{\text {mn+1 }} \leq \frac{6}{8} 291$

$24 X_{3}^{(1)}+24 X_{4}^{(1)}+12 X_{\mathbb{P}^{(1)}}^{(1)}+X_{13}^{(1)}+6 X_{11}^{(2)}+5 X_{12}^{(2)}+5 X_{13}^{(2)}+4 X_{21}^{(2)}$

Subject to (30)
The problem was solved by using the linear interactive and discrete optimization (LINDO) software, the optimal compromise solution is

If we use hyperbolic membership function with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \alpha_{1}=\frac{6}{\mathrm{U}_{1}-\mathrm{L}_{1}}=\frac{6}{330-300}=\frac{6}{30} ; \quad \alpha_{2}=\frac{6}{\mathrm{U}_{2}-\mathrm{L}_{2}}=\frac{6}{291-283}=\frac{6}{8} \\
& \frac{\mathrm{U}_{1}+\mathrm{L}_{1}}{2}=\frac{630}{2}=315 ; \quad \frac{\mathrm{U}_{2}+\mathrm{L}_{2}}{2}=\frac{574}{2}=287
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{mn}+1}=1.9608 \\
& X^{(*)}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
X_{11}^{(1)}=5 ; X_{12}^{(1)}=3.1304 ; X_{21}^{(1)}=8 ; X_{22}^{(1)}=2.8695 ; \\
X_{23}^{(1)}=3.1304 ; X_{33}^{(1)}=6 ; X_{41}^{(1)}=1 ; X_{42}^{(1)}=6 ; \\
X_{12}^{(2)}=3.8695 ; X_{13}^{(2)}=2.1304 ; X_{22}^{(2)}=1.1304 ; \\
X_{23}^{(2)}=5.8695 ; X_{31}^{(2)}=4 ; X_{32}^{(2)}=1 ; X_{41}^{(2)}=1 ; X_{42}^{(2)}=2 ; X_{43}^{(2)}=3 \\
Z_{1}^{*}=300.8683 \quad \text { and } \quad Z_{2}^{*}=282.3024 \\
\lambda=0.9804
\end{array}\right\} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\mu^{E} Z_{1}(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
1, & \text { if } Z_{1} \leq 300 \\
\frac{e^{-1 \Psi_{1}(X)}-e^{-1}}{1-e^{-S}}, & \text { if } 300<Z_{1}<330 \\
0, & \text { if } Z_{1} \geq 330
\end{array}\right. \\
\mu^{E_{Z_{2}}(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
1, & \text { if } Z_{2} \leq 283 \\
\frac{e^{-1 \Psi_{2}(X)}-e^{-1}}{1-e^{-S}}, & \text { if } 283<Z_{2}<291 \\
0, &
\end{array}\right.} . \begin{array}{l}
\text { if } Z_{2} \geq 291
\end{array}
\end{array} \\
& \text { Then an equivalent crisp model for fuzzy model } \\
& \text { can be formulated as } \\
& \text { Maximize } \lambda \text { subject to } \\
& \lambda \leq \frac{e^{-s \psi_{p}(x)}-e^{-s}}{1-e^{-s}}, \quad \mathrm{p}=1,2,-\cdots--P \quad \text { and } \\
& \text { subject to (7)-(9) }
\end{aligned}
$$

$\lambda \leq \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\psi_{2}(\mathrm{x})}-\mathrm{e}^{-1}}{1-\mathrm{e}^{-1}}$,
And subject to (30)
Then the problem can be simplified as
Maximize $\lambda$

Subject to

$$
\mathrm{e}^{-S \Psi_{p}(X)}-\left(1-\mathrm{e}^{-S}\right) \lambda \geq \mathrm{e}^{-S} \quad \mathrm{p}=1,2, \ldots, P
$$

$$
(3.2)-(3.4) \quad \forall \quad i, j \quad \& \quad \lambda \geq 0
$$

$\Rightarrow$ Maximize $\lambda$
$e^{-\Psi(X)}-\left(1 e^{-1}\right) \lambda \geq e^{-1} \Rightarrow e^{-\Psi(X)}-(1-0 \nvdash) \lambda \geq 036 B \Rightarrow e^{-\Psi(X)}-(0621) \lambda \geq 0368$

$$
\mathrm{e}^{-\Psi_{2}(\mathrm{X})}-\left(1-\mathrm{e}^{-1}\right) \lambda \geq \mathrm{e}^{-1} \Rightarrow \mathrm{e}^{-\Psi_{2}(\mathrm{X})}-(0.6321 \lambda \geq 0.368
$$

The problem is solved by the general interactive optimization (LINGO) software
$\lambda=0.7084$

$$
\mathrm{X}^{(*)}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{X}_{11}^{(1)}=5 ; \mathrm{X}_{12}^{(1)}=2.3703 ; \mathrm{X}_{13}^{(1)}=1.6296 ; \mathrm{X}_{21}^{(1)}=8 ; \mathrm{X}_{22}^{(1)}=4 ; \\
\mathrm{X}_{23}^{(1)}=2 ; \mathrm{X}_{33}^{(1)}=6 ; \mathrm{X}_{41}^{(1)}=1 ; \mathrm{X}_{42}^{(1)}=5.6296 ; \mathrm{X}_{43}^{(1)}=0.3703 \\
\mathrm{X}_{12}^{(2)}=4.6296 ; \mathrm{X}_{13}^{(2)}=1.3703 ; \mathrm{X}_{31}^{(2)}=4 ; \mathrm{X}_{32}^{(2)}=1 ; \mathrm{X}_{41}^{(2)}=1 ; \\
\mathrm{X}_{42}^{(2)}=2.3703 ; \mathrm{X}_{43}^{(2)}=2.6296 \\
\mathrm{Z}_{1}^{*}=306.1085 \quad \text { and } \quad \mathrm{Z}_{2}^{*}=270.6274
\end{array}\right\}
$$

## Conclusion

In this paper multi-objective multi-index transportation problem is defined and problem is solved by using fuzzy programming technique (Linear, Hyperbolic and Exponential membership function). The multi-index transportation problem can represent different modes of origins and destination or it may represent a set of intermediate warehouse. If we use the hyperbolic membership function, then the crisp model becomes linear. The optimal compromise solution of hyperbolic membership function changes significantly if we compare with the solution obtained by the linear membership function but the optimal compromise solution of exponential membership function does not change significantly if we compare with the solution obtained by the linear membership function.
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