

USING TRANSFORMATION TECHNIQUE TO SOLVE MULTI-OBJECTIVE LINEAR FRACTIONAL PROGRAMMING PROBLEM

Nejmaddin A. Sulaiman & Basiya K. Abulrahim

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Education, School of Science Education, University of Salahaddin
Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Education, School of Science Education University of Garmian

ABSTRACT

In this paper we used a new transformation technique for solving multi-objective linear fractional programming problem (MOLFPP) to single-Objective linear fractional programming problem (SOLFPP), through a new method using mean and median, and then solve the problem by modified simplex method [5]. The obtain results are compared with that of modified methods in [9].

Keywords: Solve MOLFPP by using average mean and average median, new average mean and new average median techniques.

1. INTRODUCTION

Linear fraction maximum problems (i.e. ratio objective that have numerator and denominator) have attracted considerable research and interest, since they are useful in production planning, financial and corporative planning, health care and hospital planning. Several methods to solve such problems are proposed in(1962)[2]. Their method depends on transforming the linear fractional programming to an equivalent linear program. Sing (1981) in his paper did a useful study about the optimality condition in fractional programming[8]. A multi-objective linear programming problem (MOLPP) is solved by Chandra Sen. in (1983)[6]; Sulaiman and Othman (2007)[7] suggested an approach to construct the multi-objective function. Also Sulaiman and Sadiq in (2006) studied the multi-objective function by using mean and median value[4]. In (1993) Abdil-kadir and Sulaiman[1] studied the multi-objective fractional programming problem. In (2008) Hamad Amin studied multi-objective linear programming problem using Arithmetic Average[3].Also Sulaiman and Salih in (2010) studied the MOLFPP by using mean and median value [9]. In order to extend this work we have defined a MOLFPP and investigated the algorithm to solve fractional programming problem for multi-objective function, irrespective of the number of objectives with less computational burden and suggest a new technique by using average mean, average median, new average mean and new average median values of objective functions, to generate the best optimal solution. The computer application of our algorithm has also been discussed by solving a numerical example. Finally we have shown results and comparisons between different techniques.

2. DEFINITION AND MATHEMATICAL MODELS

The mathematical from of MOLPP is given as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{Max. } Z_1 = c_1^t x + \gamma_1 \\
 \text{Max. } Z_2 = c_2^t x + \gamma_2 \\
 \quad \quad \quad \cdot \\
 \quad \quad \quad \cdot \\
 \quad \quad \quad \cdot \\
 \text{Max. } Z_r = c_r^t x + \gamma_r \\
 \text{Min. } Z_{r+1} = c_{r+1}^t x + \gamma_{r+1} \\
 \quad \quad \quad \cdot \\
 \quad \quad \quad \cdot \\
 \text{Min. } Z_s = c_s^t x + \gamma_s
 \end{array} \quad \left. \begin{array}{l} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \right\} \begin{array}{l} \\ \\ \\ \text{Subject to:} \\ \\ (2.1) \quad Ax = b \\ \\ x > 0 \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array}$$

Where r is the number of objective function that to be maximized, s is the number of objective functions that is to be maximized and minimized and $s - r$ is the number of objective function that is to be minimized, other symbols have the same meaning as previously mentioned, for more details see[7].

3. MULTI-OBJECTIVE FRACTIONAL PROGRAMMING PROBLEM

Multi-Objective function that are the ratio of two linear objective functions are said to be MOLFPP [1,9] then can be defined:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left. \begin{aligned}
 & \text{Max. } Z_1 = (c_1^t x + \gamma_1)/(d_1^t x + \beta_1) \\
 & \text{Max. } Z_2 = (c_2^t x + \gamma_2)/(d_2^t x + \beta_2) \\
 & \quad \vdots \\
 & \quad \vdots \\
 & \text{Max. } Z_r = (c_r^t x + \beta_r)/(d_r^t x + \beta_r) \\
 & \text{Min. } Z_{r+1} = (c_{r+1}^t x + \beta_{r+1})/(d_{r+1}^t x + \beta_{r+1}) \\
 & \quad \vdots \\
 & \quad \vdots \\
 & \text{Min. } Z_s = (c_s^t x + \gamma_s)/(d_s^t x + \beta_s)
 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{(3.2) Subject to:} \\
 & Ax = b \text{(3.3)} \\
 & x \geq 0 \text{(3.4)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Where b is m –dimensional vector of constants, x is n –dimensional vector of decision variables and A is $m \times n$ matrix of constants other symbols have the same meaning as before [7].

4. SOLVING MOLFP BY USING CHANDRA SEN. TECHNIQUE

The same approach which was taken by Sen. (1983)[6] is followed here to formulate the constraint objective function for the MOLFP. Suppose we obtain a single value corresponding to each of the objective functions of the MOLFP of equation (3.2). They are being optimized individually subject to the constraints (3.3) and (3.4) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left. \begin{aligned}
 & \text{Max. } Z_1 = \varphi_1 \\
 & \text{Max. } Z_2 = \varphi_2 \\
 & \quad \vdots \\
 & \quad \vdots \\
 & \text{Max. } Z_r = \varphi_r \\
 & \text{Min. } Z_{r+1} = \varphi_{r+1} \\
 & \quad \vdots \\
 & \quad \vdots \\
 & \text{Min. } Z_s = \varphi_s
 \end{aligned} \right\} \text{(4.5)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Where $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_s$ are value of the objective functions, the level of the decision variable may not necessarily be the same for all optimal solutions in presence of conflicts among objectives. But we require the common set of decision variables to be the best compromising optimal solution that we can determine for the common set of the decision variables from the following combined objective function, which formulate the MOLFP given in equation (4.5)

$$\text{Max. } Z = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{Z_i}{|\varphi_i|} - \sum_{i=r+1}^s \frac{Z_i}{|\varphi_i|} \text{(4.6)}$$

Where $\varphi_i \neq 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, s$. Subject to constraints (3.3) and (3.4), and the optimum value of the objective functions $\varphi_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ may be positive or negative.

5. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

In this section, we present numerical examples.

Example 5.1: Solve the following MOLFP by Chandra Sen. technique[6,9]

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Max. } Z_1 = (5x_1 + 3x_2)/(x_1 + x_2 + 1) \\
 & \text{Max. } Z_2 = (9x_1 + 5x_2)/(3x_1 + 3x_2 + 3) \\
 & \text{Max. } Z_3 = (3x_1 - 4x_2)/(x_1 + x_2 + 1) \\
 & \text{Max. } Z_4 = (3x_1 + 2x_2)/(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2) \\
 & \text{Subject to:} \\
 & 2x_1 + 4x_2 \geq 8 \\
 & x_1 + x_2 \leq 3 \\
 & x_1 + 2x_2 \leq 10 \\
 & 2x_1 + x_2 \leq 5 \\
 & x_1 \leq 2 \\
 & x_1, x_2 \geq 0
 \end{aligned}$$

Solution: After finding the value of each of individual objective functions of example 5.1 by Modified Simplex method [5], the results obtained by using Chandra Sen.'s technique [6,9] are given and the numerical results as below in table 1:

Table 1: Results of example 5.1 by using modified simplex method

i	Z_i	x_i	φ_i	$AA_i = \varphi A_i $ $\forall i = 1, 2, \dots, r$	$AL_i = \varphi A_i $ $\forall i = r + 1, \dots, s$
1	13/4	(2,1)	13/4	13/4	
2	23/12	(2,1)	23/12	23/12	
3	1/2	(2,1)	1/2	1/2	
4	1	(2,1)	1	1	

$$TG = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{Z_i}{AA_i} = \sum_{i=1}^4 HG_i = \frac{(6341x_1 - 3114x_2)}{(598x_1 + 598x_2 + 598)}$$

$$TL = \sum_{i=r+1}^s \frac{Z_i}{AL_i} = \sum_{i=r+1}^s HL_i = 0$$

$$Max.Z = TG - TL = \frac{(6341x_1 - 3114x_2)}{(598x_1 + 598x_2 + 598)}$$

Subject to:

$$\begin{aligned} 2x_1 + 4x_2 &\geq 8 \\ x_1 + x_2 &\leq 3 \\ x_1 + 2x_2 &\leq 10 \\ 2x_1 + x_2 &\leq 5 \\ x_1 &\leq 2 \\ x_1, x_2 &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

After solving it, we get $Max.Z = 4$ and $x_1 = 2, x_2 = 1$

Example 5.2: Solve the following MOLFP by Chandra Sen. Technique [6,9]

$$\begin{aligned} Max.Z_1 &= (3x_1 - 2x_2)/(x_1 + x_2 + 1) \\ Max.Z_2 &= (9x_1 + 3x_2)/(x_1 + x_2 + 1) \\ Max.Z_3 &= (3x_1 - 5x_2)/(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2) \\ Min.Z_4 &= (-6x_1 + 2x_2)/(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2) \\ Min.Z_5 &= (-3x_1 - x_2)/(x_1 + x_2 + 1) \end{aligned}$$

Subject to:

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 + x_2 &\leq 2 \\ 9x_1 + x_2 &\leq 9 \\ x_1, x_2 &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Solution: After finding the value of each of individual objective functions of example 5.2 by Modified Simplex method [5], the results obtained by using Chandra Sen.'s technique [6,9] are given and the numerical results as below in table 2:

Table 2: Results of example 5.2 by using modified simplex method

i	Z_i	x_i	φ_i	$AA_i = \varphi A_i $ $\forall i = 1, 2, \dots, r$	$AL_i = \varphi A_i $ $\forall i = r + 1, \dots, s$
1	3/2	(1,0)	3/2	3/2	
2	9/2	(1,0)	9/2	9/2	
3	3/4	(1,0)	3/4	3/4	
4	-3/2	(1,0)	-3/2		3/2
5	-3/2	(1,0)	-3/2		3/2

$$TG = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{Z_i}{AA_i} = \sum_{i=1}^3 HG_i = \frac{(18x_1 - 12x_2)}{(3x_1 + 3x_2 + 3)}$$

$$TL = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{Z_i}{AL_i} = \sum_{i=4}^5 HL_i = \frac{(-12x_1)}{(3x_1 + 3x_2 + 3)}$$

$$Max. Z = TG - TL = \frac{(10x_1 - 4x_2)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)}$$

Subject to:

$$x_1 + x_2 \leq 2$$

$$9x_1 + x_2 \leq 9$$

$$x_1, x_2 \geq 0$$

After solving it, we get $Max. Z = 5$ and $x_1 = 1, x_2 = 0$

The solution for example 5.1 when applying algorithm in [9] by using mean is the same optimal solution shown in table 1, then the combined objective linear fractional function is:

$$SM = \sum_{i=1}^r Z_i = \sum_{i=1}^4 Z_i = \frac{(75x_1 + 10x_2)}{(6x_1 + 6x_2 + 6)}, SN = \sum_{i=r+1}^s Z_i = 0$$

$$VM = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{AA_i}{r} = \frac{5}{3}, VN = \sum_{i=r+1}^s \frac{AL_i}{s-r} = 0$$

$$S_1 = \frac{SM}{VM} = \frac{(15x_1 + 2x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)}, S_2 = \frac{SN}{VN} = 0$$

$$Max. Z = S_1 - S_2 = \frac{(15x_1 + 2x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)}$$

After solving it subject to the same constraints as before, we get

$Max. Z = 4$ and $x_1 = 2, x_2 = 1$

The solution for example 5.2 when applying algorithm in [9] by using mean is the same optimal solution shown in table 2, then the combined objective linear fractional function is:

$$\begin{aligned}
SM &= \sum_{i=1}^r Z_i = \sum_{i=1}^3 Z_i = \frac{(27x_1 - 3x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)} \\
SN &= \sum_{i=r+1}^s Z_i = \sum_{i=4}^5 Z_i = \frac{(-6x_1)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)} \\
VM &= \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{AA_i}{r} = \frac{27}{12}, VN = \sum_{i=r+1}^s \frac{AL_i}{s-r} = \frac{3}{2} \\
S_1 &= \frac{SM}{VM} = \frac{(18x_1 - 2x_2)}{(3x_1 + 3x_2 + 3)}, S_2 = \frac{SN}{VN} = \frac{(-4x_1)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)} \\
Max. Z &= S_1 - S_2 = \frac{(30x_1 - 2x_2)}{(3x_1 + 3x_2 + 3)}
\end{aligned}$$

After solving it subject to the same constraints as before, we get

$Max. Z = 5$ and $x_1 = 1, x_2 = 0$

The solution for example 5.1 when applying algorithm in [9] by using median is the same optimal solution shown in table 1, then the combined objective linear fractional function is:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{To find median, first arrange } AA_i \text{ as: } \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{23}{12}, \frac{13}{4} \\
SM &= \sum_{i=1}^r Z_i = \sum_{i=1}^4 \frac{(75x_1 + 10x_2)}{(6x_1 + 6x_2 + 6)} \\
SN &= \sum_{i=r+1}^s Z_i = 0, WM = \frac{35}{24}, \quad WN = 0 \\
S_1 &= \frac{SM}{WM} = \frac{\frac{(75x_1 + 10x_2)}{(6x_1 + 6x_2 + 6)}}{\frac{35}{24}} = \frac{(60x_1 + 8x_2)}{(7x_1 + 7x_2 + 7)}, S_2 = \frac{SN}{WN} = 0 \\
Max. Z &= S_1 - S_2 = \frac{(60x_1 + 8x_2)}{(7x_1 + 7x_2 + 7)}
\end{aligned}$$

After solving it subject to the same constraints as before, we get

$Max. Z = 4.57$ and $x_1 = 2, x_2 = 1$

The solution for example 5.2 when applying algorithm in [9] by using median is the same optimal solution shown in table 2, then the combined objective linear fractional function is:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{To find median, first arrange } AA_i \text{ as: } \frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{9}{2} \text{ and } AL_i \text{ as: } \frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \\
SM &= \sum_{i=1}^r Z_i = \sum_{i=1}^3 Z_i = \frac{(27x_1 - 3x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)} \\
SN &= \sum_{i=r+1}^s Z_i = \sum_{i=4}^5 Z_i = \frac{(-6x_1)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)}, WM = \frac{3}{2}, WN = \frac{3}{2} \\
S_1 &= \frac{SM}{WM} = \frac{\frac{(27x_1 - 3x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)}}{\frac{3}{2}} = \frac{(9x_1 - x_2)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)} \\
S_2 &= \frac{SN}{WN} = \frac{\frac{(-6x_1)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)}}{\frac{3}{2}} = \frac{(-4x_1)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)} \\
Max. Z &= S_1 - S_2 = \frac{(13x_1 - x_2)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)}
\end{aligned}$$

After solving it subject to the same constraints as before, we get

$Max. Z = 6.5$ and $x_1 = 1, x_2 = 0$

6. SOLVING MOLFP BY USING NEW TECHNIQUES

We formulate the combined objective function (4.6) as follows to determine the common set of decision variable. To solve MOLFP by modified technique using average mean and average median, new average mean and new average median techniques consider below:

6.1 Solving MOLFP by Using Average Mean and Average Median Techniques

$$SM = \sum_{i=1}^r Z_i, SN = \sum_{i=r+1}^s Z_i$$

$$Max. Z = \frac{SM - SN}{VM_2} \quad (6.1.7)$$

$$Max. Z = \frac{SM - SN}{WM_2} \quad (6.1.8)$$

$$VM_2 = \frac{VM + VN}{2} \text{ is average mean}$$

$$WM_2 = \frac{WM + WN}{2} \text{ is average median}$$

Subject to the constraints (3.3) and (3.4)

VM: is the mean for all maximum value, $\forall i = 1, 2, \dots, r$

VN: is the mean for all minimum value, $\forall i = r + 1, r + 2, \dots, s$

WM: is the median for all maximum value, $\forall i = 1, 2, \dots, r$

WN: is the median for all minimum value, $\forall i = r + 1, \dots, s$

6.1.1 Algorithm :(Using Average Mean and Average Median Techniques)

An algorithm for obtaining the optimal solution for the MOLFP defined in equation (3.2) can be summarized as follows:

Step1: Assign arbitrary values to each of the individual objective functions which are to be maximized or minimized.

Step2: solve the first objective function by the modified simplex method, for linear fractional programming subject to constraints.

Step3: Check the feasibility of the solution obtained in step2, if it is feasible then go to step4, otherwise use dual simplex method to remove infeasibility.

Step4: Assign a name to the optimum value of the first objective function Z_1 , say φ_1 .

Step5: Find the maximum mean, median of $\varphi_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, r$ and find the minimum mean, median of $\varphi_i, i = r + 1, \dots, s$.

Step6: Construct the combined objective function which has formula (6.1.7) or (6.1.8).

Step7: Optimize the combined objective function under the same constraints (3.3) and (3.4)

The solution for example 5.1 when applying algorithm in the section 6.1.1 by using mean is the same optimal solution shown in table 1, then the combined objective linear fractional function is:

$$SM = \sum_{i=1}^r Z_i = \sum_{i=1}^4 Z_i = \frac{(75x_1 + 10x_2)}{(6x_1 + 6x_2 + 6)}, SN = \sum_{i=r+1}^s Z_i = 0$$

$$VM_2 = \frac{VM + VN}{2} = \frac{5}{6}$$

$$Max. Z = \frac{SM - SN}{VM_2} = \frac{\frac{(75x_1 + 10x_2)}{(6x_1 + 6x_2 + 6)}}{\frac{5}{6}} = \frac{(15x_1 + 2x_2)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)}$$

After solving it subject to the same constraints as before, we get

$$Max. Z = 8 \text{ and } x_1 = 2, x_2 = 1$$

The solution for example 5.2 when applying algorithm in the section 6.1.1 by using mean is the same optimal solution shown in table 2, then the combined objective linear fractional function is:

$$SM = \sum_{i=1}^r Z_i = \sum_{i=1}^3 Z_i = \frac{(27x_1 - 3x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)}$$

$$SN = \sum_{i=r+1}^s Z_i = \sum_{i=4}^5 Z_i = \frac{(-6x_1)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)}, VM_2 = \frac{VM + VN}{2} = \frac{15}{8}$$

$$Max. Z = \frac{SM - SN}{VM_2} = \frac{\frac{(39x_1 - 3x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)}}{\frac{15}{8}} = \frac{(52x_1 - 4x_2)}{(5x_1 + 5x_2 + 5)}$$

After solving it subject to the same constraints as before, we get

$Max. Z = 5.2$ and $x_1 = 1, x_2 = 0$

The solution for example 5.1 when applying algorithm in the section 6.1.1 by using median is the same optimal solution shown in table 1, then the combined objective linear fractional function is:

To find median, first arrange AA_i as: $\frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{23}{12}, \frac{13}{4}$

$$SM = \sum_{i=1}^r Z_i = \sum_{i=1}^4 Z_i = \frac{(75x_1 + 10x_2)}{(6x_1 + 6x_2 + 6)}$$

$$SN = \sum_{i=r+1}^s Z_i = 0, WM_2 = \frac{WM + WN}{2} = \frac{35}{48}$$

$$Max. Z = \frac{SM - SN}{WM_2} = \frac{\frac{(75x_1 + 10x_2)}{(6x_1 + 6x_2 + 6)}}{\frac{35}{48}} = \frac{(120x_1 + 16x_2)}{(7x_1 + 7x_2 + 7)}$$

After solving it subject to the same constraints as before, we get

$Max. Z = 9.14$ and $x_1 = 2, x_2 = 1$

The solution for example 5.2 when applying algorithm in the section 6.1.1 by using median is the same optimal solution shown in table 2, then the combined objective linear fractional function is:

To find median, first arrange AA_i as: $\frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{9}{2}$ and AL_i as: $\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$

$$SM = \sum_{i=1}^r Z_i = \sum_{i=1}^3 Z_i = \frac{(27x_1 - 3x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)}$$

$$SN = \sum_{i=r+1}^s Z_i = \sum_{i=4}^5 Z_i = \frac{(-6x_1)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)}, WM_2 = \frac{WM + WN}{2} = \frac{3}{2}$$

$$Max. Z = \frac{SM - SN}{WM_2} = \frac{\frac{(39x_1 - 3x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)}}{\frac{3}{2}} = \frac{(13x_1 - x_2)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)}$$

After solving it subject to the same constraints as before, we get

$Max. Z = 6.5$ and $x_1 = 1, x_2 = 0$

6.2 Solving MOLFP by Using New Average Mean and New Average Median Techniques

$$Max. Z = \frac{SM - SN}{M_s} \quad (6.2.9)$$

$$Max. Z = \frac{SM - SN}{WM_s} \quad (6.2.10)$$

$$VM_s = \frac{VM + VN}{s} \quad \text{is new average mean and}$$

$$WM_s = \frac{WM + WN}{s} \quad \text{is new average median.}$$

Subject to the some constraints (3.3) and (3.4) where VM_s denoted the mean divided by s , WM_s denoted the median divided by s , where s is the number of objective function.

6.2.1 Algorithm : (Using New Average Mean and New Average Median Techniques)

An algorithm for obtaining the optimal solution for the MOLFP defined in equation (3.2) can be summarized as follows:

Step1, step2, step3 and step4 are the same as given in algorithm in the section 7 say φ_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ as before

Step5: Construct the combined objective function which has formula (6.2.9) or (6.2.10).

Step6: Optimize the combined objective function under the same constraints (3.3) and (3.4)

The solution for example 5.1 when applying algorithm in the section 9 by using mean is the same optimal solution shown in table 1, then the combined objective linear fractional function is:

$$SM = \sum_{i=1}^r Z_i = \sum_{i=1}^4 Z_i = \frac{(75x_1 + 10x_2)}{(6x_1 + 6x_2 + 6)}, SN = \sum_{i=r+1}^s Z_i = 0$$

$$VM_s = \frac{VM + VN}{S} = \frac{5}{12}$$

$$Max.Z = \frac{SM - SN}{VM_s} = \frac{\frac{(75x_1 + 10x_2)}{(6x_1 + 6x_2 + 6)}}{\frac{5}{12}} = \frac{(30x_1 + 4x_2)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)}$$

After solving it subject to the same constraints as before, we get

$$Max.Z = 16 \text{ and } x_1 = 2, x_2 = 1$$

The solution for example 5.2 when applying algorithm in the section 6.2.1 by using mean is the same optimal solution shown in table 2, then the combined objective linear fractional function is:

$$SM = \sum_{i=1}^r Z_i = \sum_{i=1}^3 Z_i = \frac{(27x_1 - 3x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)}$$

$$SN = \sum_{i=r+1}^s Z_i = \sum_{i=4}^5 Z_i = \frac{(-6x_1)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)}, VM_s = \frac{VM + VN}{S} = \frac{15}{20}$$

$$Max.Z = \frac{SM - SN}{VM_s} = \frac{\frac{(39x_1 - 3x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)}}{\frac{15}{20}} = \frac{(78x_1 - 6x_2)}{(3x_1 + 3x_2 + 3)}$$

After solving it subject to the same constraints as before, we get

$$Max.Z = 13 \text{ and } x_1 = 1, x_2 = 0$$

The solution for example 5.1 when applying algorithm in the section 6.2.1 by using median is the same optimal solution shown in table 1, then the combined objective linear fractional function is:

To find median, first arrange AA_i as: $\frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{23}{12}, \frac{13}{14}$

$$SM = \sum_{i=1}^r Z_i = \sum_{i=1}^4 Z_i = \frac{(75x_1 + 10x_2)}{(6x_1 + 6x_2 + 6)}, SN = \sum_{i=r+1}^s Z_i = 0$$

$$WM_s = \frac{WM + WN}{S} = \frac{35}{96}$$

$$Max.Z = \frac{SM - SN}{WM_s} = \frac{\frac{(75x_1 + 10x_2)}{(6x_1 + 6x_2 + 6)}}{\frac{35}{96}} = \frac{(240x_1 + 32x_2)}{(7x_1 + 7x_2 + 7)}$$

After solving it subject to the same constraints as before, we get

$$Max.Z = 18.28 \text{ and } x_1 = 2, x_2 = 1$$

The solution for example 5.2 when applying algorithm in the section 6.2.1 by using median is the same optimal solution shown in table 2, then the combined objective linear fractional function is:

To find median, first arrange AA_i as : $\frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{9}{2}$ and AL_i as: $\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$

$$SM = \sum_{i=1}^r Z_i = \sum_{i=1}^3 Z_i = \frac{(27x_1 - 3x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)}$$

$$SN = \sum_{i=r+1}^s Z_i = \sum_{i=4}^5 Z_i = \frac{(-6x_1)}{(x_1 + x_2 + 1)}, \quad WM_s = \frac{WM + WN}{S} = \frac{3}{5}$$

$$Max. Z = \frac{SM - SN}{WM_s} = \frac{\frac{(39x_1 - 3x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)}}{\frac{3}{5}} = \frac{(65x_1 - 5x_2)}{(2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2)}$$

After solving it subject to the same constraints as before, we get

$$Max. Z = 16.25 \text{ and } x_1 = 1, x_2 = 0$$

7. COMPARISON OF THE NUMERICAL RESULTS

Now, we are going to compare the numerical results which are obtained of the examples as below in table 3:

Table 3: Comparison between results of the numerical techniques

Techniques		Example 5.1:	Example 5.2:
Chandra Sen. Technique		<i>Max. Z = 4</i>	<i>Max. Z = 5</i>
Mean Technique		<i>Max. Z = 4</i>	<i>Max. Z = 5</i>
Median Technique		<i>Max. Z = 4.57</i>	<i>Max. Z = 6.5</i>
Average Techniques	Mean Technique	<i>Max. Z = 8</i>	<i>Max. Z = 5.2</i>
	Median Technique	<i>Max. Z = 9.14</i>	<i>Max. Z = 6.5</i>
New Average Techniques	Mean Technique	<i>Max. Z = 16</i>	<i>Max. Z = 13</i>
	Median Technique	<i>Max. Z = 18.28</i>	<i>Max. Z = 16.5</i>

In table 3; it is clear that the results obtained in examples 5.1, 5.2 when using new average technique are better than other results which are obtained by using new average mean and new average median, techniques.

8. DISCUSSION

In This paper, we have defined and discussed a number of techniques, which we have used in order to get the optimal solution of the MOLFP. The comparisons of these techniques are based on the values of the objective functions; therefore we have tested two numerical examples. To show the best technique among these techniques we have obtained that new average mean and new average median was better than the techniques namely Chandra Sen., mean and median, and average mean and average median, and new average mean and new average median techniques, table 3 was presented. We have used MATLAB program version [7.12.0.635 (R2011a)].

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abdil-Kadir, M.S. and Suleiman, N.A., (1993) "An Approach for Multi-objective Fractional programming problem", Journal of the college of Education, University of Salahaddin, Erbil/Iraq, Vol. 3, No.1, PP.1-5.
- [2]. Charanes, A and Cooper, W.W.(1962) "Programming with linear fractional function", Nava research Quarterly, Vol.9, No.3-4, PP.181-186.
- [3]. Hamad-Amin A.O., (2008) "An Adaptive Arithmetic Average Transformation Technique for Solving MOOPP", M.Sc. Thesis, University of Koya, Koya/Iraq.
- [4]. Sulaiman, N. A. and Sadiq, G. W., (2006) "Solving the linear multi-objective programming problems; using mean and median value", Al-Rafiden Journal of computer sciences and mathematics, University of Mosul, Vol. 3, No.1, PP. 69-83.
- [5]. Sharma, S. D., (1980) "Nonlinear and Dynamic Programming", KedarNath Ram Nath and CO., Meerut, India, P(547).
- [6]. Sen., Ch., (1983) "A new approach for multi-objective rural development planning", The India Economic Journal, Vol. 30, No. 4, PP.91-96.
- [7]. Sulaiman, N.A. and Othman, A.Q., (2007) "Optimal transformation Technique to solve multi-objective linear programming problem", Journal of University of Kirkuk, Vol. 2, No. 2.
- [8]. Sing, H. C., (1981) "Optimality condition in functional programming", Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, Vol. 33, pp.287-294.
- [9]. Sulaiman, N. A. and Salih, A. D. (2010) "Using mean and median values to solve linear fractional multi objective programming problem", Zanco Journal for pure and applied Science, Salahaddin-Erbil university, Vol.22, No.5.