

## Supplementary Tables:

**Table S1:** Verification results of the first planning using the first proposed model

		Kallel et al. [19]	Our work
Objective function		G= 1200 (hours)	G= 1200 (hours)
Response time		30.678 seconds	33.789 seconds
Decision variables	X <sub>131</sub>	1	1
	X <sub>162</sub>	1	1
	X <sub>221</sub>	1	1
	X <sub>272</sub>	1	1
	X <sub>311</sub>	1	1
	X <sub>352</sub>	1	1
	X <sub>343</sub>	1	1
	F <sub>131</sub>	140	140
	F <sub>162</sub>	171	171
	F <sub>221</sub>	184	184
	F <sub>272</sub>	251	251
	F <sub>311</sub>	53	53
	F <sub>352</sub>	45	45
	F <sub>343</sub>	356	356
	C <sub>131</sub>	203	203
	C <sub>162</sub>	337	337
	C <sub>221</sub>	233	233
	C <sub>272</sub>	426	426
	C <sub>311</sub>	95	95
	C <sub>352</sub>	196	196
	C <sub>343</sub>	459	459

**Table S2:** Verification results of the second planning using the first proposed model

		Kallel et al. [19]	Our work
Objective function		G= 787 (hours)	G= 787 (hours)
Response time		0.197 seconds	0.224 seconds
Decision Variables	X <sub>121</sub>	1	1
	X <sub>211</sub>	1	1
	X <sub>331</sub>	1	1
	X <sub>342</sub>	1	1
	F <sub>121</sub>	235	235
	F <sub>211</sub>	262	262
	F <sub>331</sub>	142	142
	F <sub>342</sub>	148	148
	C <sub>121</sub>	203	203
	C <sub>211</sub>	337	337
	C <sub>331</sub>	233	233
	C <sub>342</sub>	426	426

**Table S3:** Verification results of the third planning from 20/12/2016 to 31/12/2016 using the first proposed model

		Kallel et al. [19]	Our Work
Objective function		G= 631 (hours)	G= 631 (hours)
Response time		0.061 seconds	0.067 seconds
Decision Variables	X <sub>111</sub>	1	1
	X <sub>221</sub>	1	1
	X <sub>331</sub>	1	1
	F <sub>111</sub>	258	258
	F <sub>221</sub>	190	190
	F <sub>331</sub>	183	183
	C <sub>111</sub>	266	266
	C <sub>221</sub>	201	201
	C <sub>331</sub>	232	232

**Table S4:** Verification results of the first planning from 1/12/2016 to 10/12/2016 using the second proposed model

		Kallel et al. [19]	Our Work
Objective Function		H= 38447 (minutes)	H= 28835.25
Resolution time		0.059 seconds	1.003 seconds
Decision Variables	Y <sub>11</sub>	1	1
	Y <sub>26</sub>	1	1
	Y <sub>35</sub>	1	1
	Y <sub>42</sub>	1	1
	Y <sub>51</sub>	1	1
	Y <sub>66</sub>	1	1
	Y <sub>76</sub>	1	1
	C <sub>11</sub>	0	0
	C <sub>26</sub>	650	650
	C <sub>35</sub>	525	525
	C <sub>42</sub>	660	660
	C <sub>51</sub>	168	168
	C <sub>66</sub>	255	255
	C <sub>76</sub>	632	632

**Table S5:** Verification results of the second planning from 11/12/2016 to 20/12/2016 using the second proposed model

		Kallel et al. [19]	Our work
Objective Function		H= 23747 (minutes)	H= 17810.25
Resolution time		0.045 seconds	0.985 seconds
Decision Variables	Y <sub>13</sub>	1	1
	Y <sub>26</sub>	1	1
	Y <sub>31</sub>	1	1
	Y <sub>44</sub>	1	1
	C <sub>13</sub>	386	386
	C <sub>26</sub>	655	655
	C <sub>31</sub>	72	72
	C <sub>44</sub>	658	658

**Table S6:** Verification results of the third planning from 21/12/2016 to 31/12/2016 using the second proposed model

		Kallel et al. [19]	Our work
Objective Function		H= 19516 (minutes)	H= 14637
Resolution Time		0.043 seconds	0.871 seconds
Decision Variables	Y <sub>26</sub>	1	1
	Y <sub>16</sub>	1	1
	Y <sub>17</sub>	1	1
	Y <sub>32</sub>	1	1
	Y <sub>34</sub>	1	1
	C <sub>26</sub>	137	137
	C <sub>16</sub>	22	22
	C <sub>17</sub>	586	586
	C <sub>32</sub>	527	527
	C <sub>34</sub>	168	168
	Z <sub>16</sub>	22	22
	Z <sub>17</sub>	586	586
	Z <sub>32</sub>	527	527
	Z <sub>34</sub>	168	168