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Abstract

The picking efficiency of warehouses assisted by KIVA robots benefit from exploiting synergy effect between order assignment and picking station scheduling. We treat an integrated optimization which contains both allocating orders and racks to multiple stations and concurrently sequencing their interlinked processing flows at each individual one. The various decisions included in our problem, which are closely associated and must be solved in real time, are often tackled separately for ease of treatment in past. We, however, develop a comprehensive mathematical model under the consideration of the minimum total rack visits. The problem can be proven NP-hard. Consequently, an efficient algorithm based on simulated annealing and dynamic programming is developed. The experimental results show that the proposed approach has more advantage in the light of solution quality as compared with actual rule-based policies. Moreover, the results reveal that ignoring order assignment policy leads to considerable optimality gaps under realistically sized settings.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Background and motivation

Order picking, dealing with retrieval of SKUs to satisfy customer demand, plays the most crucial role in operating any type of warehouse and directly affects the overall fulfillment efficiency. In this paper, we consider this process in the context of KIVA warehouses (Enright and Wurman, 2011), where many automated guided vehicles (AGVs) travel through the warehouse, lifting racks and transporting them directly to the static pickers. The corporation between mobile robots and movable racks successfully eliminates pickers’ unproductive movement in traditional manual systems. Although KIVA system has shown its remarkable picking performance in modern distribution centers (e.g., Wulfraat, 2012; Banker, 2016), its reversal of manual picking logic brings about a brand-new set of decision problems to be investigated.

In KIVA warehouses, orders, movable racks, and picking stations are the most crucial elements affecting efficiency (Weidinger et al., 2018). First, a batch of orders received by the system needs to be distributed as evenly as possible to the individual picking stations. Integrating aspects should be considered if multiple orders can be satisfied by the same racks, such that processing at the same station seems promising. Then, each picking station receives a fixed set of orders with sequence, in which they are processed successively on the workbench. For a specific workbench, order sequencing determines the SKUs being assembled simultaneously, which need to be synchronized with the racks assigned to this station satisfying the corresponding demands. Thus, a detailed schedule of rack visits should contain both rack allocation and their disposing sequence. Previous studies tackle the above interlinked and interacted steps separately.

Motivated by the above observation, we focus on a specific joint optimization in KIVA warehouses, seeking to address the following questions to reduce total rack visits: First, which orders should be assigned to the same picking station? Second, how to sort the pending orders at each station? Third, which racks and when should they be selected
to satisfy the orders synchronously active on every single workbench at the time, i.e., which racks should be moved to which picker, and to the sequence in which racks are presented to a picker?

1.2 Contributions and paper organization

Nowadays, increasing numbers of similar robotic systems, which subversively affect the manual picking decision, have been applied to support modern B2C distribution centers. Compared to the widespread use of this type of system in real life, it has not received enough attention in the academic world.

In this paper, we focus on a joint optimization within the order picking process in KIVA warehouses, which assigns orders to multiple stations while determining the processing sequences of orders and the synchronizations of racks, at all pickers. The contribution of this paper is threefold: First, we derive a mathematical model that can be adopted to obtain optimal solutions for small-sized instances. We show that the problem is NP-hard. Thus, we propose a hybrid search approach based on simulated annealing and dynamic programming, which is shown to provide good quality solutions for realistically sized instances. Second, we conduct numerical studies to test our proposed method, finding that it outperforms the well-established rule widely applied in real-life robotic warehouses. Third, we assess the potential benefits of joint optimization of order assignment and picking station scheduling. Specifically, the effect of whether utilizing the proposed order-assignment rules is investigated, and their performance with respect to total rack visits is evaluated.

In Section 2 we present the related literature. We describe the practical workflow and introduce the problem in Section 3. In Section 4 we formulate the problem as a mathematical model. We describe the proposed heuristic procedure in Section 5, and the results of the numerical studies are reported in Section 6, which assess the heuristic performance and generate managerial insights. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section 7.
2 Literature review

There has been an abundance of research on optimizing order processing in picker-to-parts warehouses, the detailed summary can be found in de Koster et al. (2007) and Gu et al. (2010). As the scales of e-commerce shipments expand, many B2C distribution centers have applied automatic systems involving a wide range of parts-to-picker technologies to release the manual labor (e.g., see Zaerpour et al., 2015; Kumawat and Roy, 2021). The elementary decisions during the daily processes of a robotic warehousing system are basically the same as the traditional manual warehouses. However, the autonomous rack delivery of the robots requires modifications of the decision-making process (Weidinger et al., 2018).

Specifically, in traditional warehouses, the storage area is settled, where each picker carries one fixed order batch each time, walking or driving through the area to satisfy it. The source of gaining efficiency often covers the optimization of zoning, order batching, batch sequencing, and picker routing (Scholz et al., 2017). However, in KIVA warehouses, thanks to the presence of mobile robots and movable racks, the storage assignment changes dynamically, orders are processed one after the other instead of fixed batches, and the picker can reach any rack without moving, so picking efficiency will benefit from the interaction among orders, racks and picking stations. Accordingly, there exist significant and challenging decisions concerning parts-to-picker in KIVA systems, such as layout design, storage assignment, order picking, and robotic planning, that have not been adequately addressed (Azadeh et al., 2019; Boysen et al., 2019).

- Most studies on layout design can be categorized as systematic analysis, focusing on modeling techniques to estimate the performance of different system scenarios without constructing any optimization. Lamballais et al. (2017) used queueing theory to analytically estimate maximum order throughput, average order cycle time and robot utilization in a robotic mobile fulfillment system. These analytic estimates were further validated by simulation. They finally derived the optimal
configuration and reasonable operating policies for warehouse managers, i.e., the maximum order throughput was insensitive to the dimensional parameters of the storage area.

- Most studies on storage assignment consider two elementary decisions: one is which SKUs should be stored together in the same rack, and the other is where racks should be in the storage area. A typical storage choice in KIVA warehouses is a mixed-shelves policy, in which items of the same SKU are spread all over the warehouse in multiple racks (Bartholdi and Hackman, 2014). This scattered storage contributes to a greater probability to always have some rack close by which holds a requested item (Weidinger and Boysen, 2018). Moreover, all racks are identical and can be relocated dynamically toward any parking position. Thus, for the later decision, Weidinger et al. (2018) addressed the problem where to park the racks during order processing when they are consistently moved between the picking stations and the storage area.

- Most studies on robotic planning concentrate on the task allocation and traffic planning, which coordinate the mobile robots with all their different destinations and avoid deadlocks. The coordination of multiple agents has attracted most research on rack-moving mobile robots (see Wurman et al., 2008; D’Andrea and Wurman, 2008; Roodbergen and Vis, 2009).

This paper concentrates on the order picking process, which forms the heart of any warehouse (Azadeh K et al., 2017). Van Gils et al. (2018) presented a comprehensive classification and review of picking systems. Winkelhaus et al. (2021) developed a framework for Order Picking 4.0 as a sociotechnical system, considering substitutive and supportive technologies. KIVA picking system deploys mobile robots to bring movable racks to stationary pickers so that each picker concentrates only on picking station scheduling. Note that the orders always far exceed the station capacity, which implies that a batching decision should be made to concurrently process some orders on the workbench. By synchronizing the batches of orders jointly tackled on the bench
and the racks visiting a station, fewer racks may have to be delivered to a station (Boysen et al., 2017). There has been a huge body of research on order batching in traditional warehouses, which divides orders by certain rules to achieve specified objectives (Pan et al., 2015; Çeven and Gue, 2017; Ardjmand et al., 2018). Compared with them, the batches in KIVA setting change in real-time because each order may have a different processing time, which brings new decisions amounting to sorting a given set of orders dynamically according to actual processing.

Considering that orders and racks are processed in a synchronized manner, there exists a close and mutually restrictive connection among the orders, racks, and workstations. The picking station scheduling problem is called the “mobile-robots based order picking problem” in the past literature (Boysen et al., 2017), which considered the problem of a single picker with a given set of orders to be picked from a given set of racks. Moreover, the order sequencing decision is closely coupled to rack scheduling, necessitating the choice of the most suited racks, and determining their arrival sequence (Yang et al., 2021). They both treated an isolated picking station, however, in practice, multiple stations operate in parallel and the racks assigned to each station are not clear before order allocation. Therefore, how to schedule the allocation of both orders and racks to meet the minimization of the overall rack visits becomes another important issue in the mobile-robots-based distribution warehouses (Valle and Beasley, 2021; Xie et al., 2020). Consequently, KIVA picking process involves several interrelated decision problems, but which are addressed separately for ease of treatment.

In conclusion, there exist no studies on the problem of joint optimization of order assignment and picking station scheduling in KIVA warehouses, i.e., simultaneously deciding the order sets and rack sets assigned to stations, and synchronizing their processing sequence. Regarding the contribution made by this paper to the literature, our work fits within the operations and control section of the structure suggested by Azadeh et al. (2019), and addresses the first two most important decisions of the structure proposed by Weidinger et al. (2018).
3 Problem description

This paper focuses on an integrated scheduling optimization of both orders and racks during the picking process, which contains their allocation to pickers and disposing sequence at each picker. There is growing concern about this joint problem for the interrelated impacts among its subproblems when operating warehouses, which were often tackled separately for ease of treatment. Weidinger et al. (2018) provided a four-level hierarchy for order picking, where order selection with assignment and picking station scheduling are the first and foremost two levels. Merschformann et al. (2017) also sketched a crucial relationship between our decision problems that may exploit synergy effects or sabotage each other’s success. We outline the whole problem below after introducing KIVA robots-based systems.

3.1 KIVA robots-based order picking system

A warehousing system is defined as a combination of hardware and processes regulating the workflow among the hardware elements applied (Boysen et al., 2017). KIVA system treated in this paper covers four basic elements to enable picking function: movable storage racks, picking workstations, multiple pickers, and mobile robots. Mobile robots are powered by electricity, and they perform rotation and lifting mechanisms by flexible wheels. As for their moving directions, the warehouse floor is invisibly subdivided into grids, each of which is marked with a barcode. An integrated camera system is relied on to continuously read these barcodes and position robots themselves. The rotation mechanism makes them move linearly on all sides and the lifting unit has the capability to support more than 1,000 kilograms, so that the robot can complete a robotic task of moving under the rack, lifting it, and transporting it from the storage area to a workstation (D’Andrea et al., 2008). More details of this system are given (Enright and Wurman, 2011).

The elementary picking workflow in a KIVA system can be concluded as follows. The warehousing management system receives plenty of orders, which are divided into
several batches. A static picker operating a workstation receives a batch assigned by the system of fixed orders to be disposed of (1). The system simultaneously determines which racks are allocated to a certain picker. These selected racks must enable the picker to satisfy all the SKUs for the assigned orders (2). At each workstation, the picker identifies the order bins with barcode labels and places them on the bench in turn based on the defined sequence. Whenever an order is completed, the corresponding bin is packed and moved out of the station. The vacant position is replaced by the subsequent one (3). According to the active orders on the bench, the allocated racks arrive in line. The picker retrieves items from the current rack and puts them into the relevant bins to satisfy each order (4).

3.2 Order assignment and picking station scheduling problem (OAPSSP)

The above order picking process is treated in a KIVA system with a set of workstations $P = \{1, ..., m\}$, each of which is operated by a static picker $p$, i.e., $p \in P$. We predefine $S$ as the set of total SKUs that can be purchased by customers from this warehouse. First, the system receives $n$ orders to be processed altogether, which are thus divided into $m$ sets, and each set contains an approximate average number of orders. Then we should also determine $m$ sets of given racks. The set of total orders is defined by $O = O^1 \cup O^2 \ldots \cup O^m$, where $O^{p'} \cap O^p = 0$, $1 \leq p' < p \leq m$. Specifically, each picker $p$ tackles a set of orders $O^p = \{o^p_1, ..., o^p_{|O^p|}\}$, $\sum_{p=1}^{m} |O^p| = n$. Each order $o^p_i \subseteq S, i = 1, ..., |O^p|$ allocated to the picker $p$ is defined as a set of SKUs required by the customer. Note that the subscript $i$ implies the processing sequence of this order at station $p$. Then we have a given set of all useable mobile racks $R = R^1 \cup R^2 \ldots \cup R^m$, where each $R^p = \{r^p_1, ..., r^p_{|R^p|}\}$ is the rack set allocated to picker $p$ to enable the picking of his or her assigned orders. Each rack $r^p_j \subseteq S, j = 1, ..., |R^p|$ allocated to the picker $p$ is defined by the set of SKUs it contains, where the subscript also implies a permutation. Note that a rack can be allocated to different stations, and rack revisits are allowed. Furthermore, the processing capacity of each workbench is $C$ order bins in parallel, i.e.,
the active orders tackled simultaneously per picker are limited to $C$. Suppose that the number of orders contained in each order set assigned to its relevant picker is much larger than $C$, so coordinating the displayed sequence of the bins on the workbench and of the rational racks serving them is necessary over time. Note that under our setting, after finishing an order, the successive order, which substitutes its predecessor at the same position of the workbench, is still able to pick items from the current rack. Each sub-solution for a single station covers two aspects of the crucial characteristics, i.e., the processing sequence of orders and the arriving sequence of racks.

**Example:** Consider the total set $S = \{A, B, C, D, E, F, G\}$ of different SKUs, which are contained in $n = 25$ orders divided into five sets $\{O^1, O^2, O^3, O^4, O^5\}$. Each set thus covers five orders and is assigned to a specific station. Although we address the following problem for all the stations simultaneously, we only take picker 5 as a detailed case: He or she receives a given order set $O^5 = \{o_5, o_2, o_4, o_1, o_3\}$. Then three racks containing the following SKUs: $r_1 = \{A, B\}$, $r_2 = \{C, F\}$, and $r_4 = \{E, G\}$, are selected. The capacity of the workbench is limited to $C = 3$. Fig.3 depicts a solution based on rack synchronization $R^5 = \{r_4, r_2, r_1\}$, so that all orders are satisfied after three rack visits.

![Figure 1. A representation of order assignment and picking station scheduling problem](image-url)
4 Model formulation

According to the above defined OAPSSP, we propose a comprehensive mixed-integer programming model to determine order allocation, rack allocation, order sequencing and rack sequencing strategy under the minimum of the total visits of mobile racks, which has been proven as a well-suited and fundamental objective in such systems (Boysen et al., 2017). Before presenting the model formulation, we introduce the corresponding sets, indices, input parameters, and decision variables as follows:

**Sets**

| \( \mathcal{P} \) | Set of all the workstations |
| \( \mathcal{S} \) | Set of all the SKUs the warehouse holds |
| \( \mathcal{R} \) | Set of all the usable racks |
| \( \mathcal{R}_i \) | Set of racks which contain a certain SKU \( i \) (\( \mathcal{R}_i \subseteq \mathcal{R} \)) |
| \( \mathcal{O} \) | Set of all the orders to be processed |

**Indices**

| \( p \) | Workstation index, \( p \in \mathcal{P} \) |
| \( o \) | Order index (\( o \subseteq \mathcal{S}, o \in \mathcal{O} \)) |
| \( i \) | SKU index, \( i \in \mathcal{S} \) |
| \( r \) | Usable rack index (\( r \subseteq \mathcal{S}, r \in \mathcal{R} \)) |

**Parameters**

| \( m \) | Number of workstations, the same as which of order sets and rack sets (\( p = 1, \ldots, m \)) |
| \( n \) | Number of orders to be processed |
| \( C \) | Capacity of each workstation |
| \( T \) | Number of time slots (\( t = 1, \ldots, T \)) |

**Decision variables**

| \( \alpha^p_t \) | Continuous variables: 1, if the racks at station \( p \) visiting in \( t - 1 \) and \( t \) differ |
| \( x^p_o \) | Binary variables: 1, if order \( o \) is assigned to station \( p \) |
| \( k^p_{ot} \) | Continuous variables: 1, if order \( o \) is tackled at station \( p \) in time slot \( t \) |
| \( y^p_r \) | Binary variables: 1, if rack \( r \) is assigned to station \( p \) |
| \( l^p_{rt} \) | Binary variables: 1, if rack \( r \) arrives at station \( p \) in time slot \( t \) |
| \( \pi^p_{iot} \) | Binary variables: 1, if SKU \( i \) of order \( o \) tackled at station \( p \) is delivered in slot \( t \) |
Applying the notation summarized above, our mixed-integer programming (MIP) model-JASP consists of the objective function (1) and constraints (2) to (19). We define \( \alpha_t^p \) as “time slots” in the model set, each of which comprises the time interval where a certain sub-set of orders and a certain rack are concurrently processed at a workstation.

The next time slot will not reach until one or more of the changes mentioned before, i.e., two successive slots differ in at least one order being tackled or in the visiting rack. Thus, we can easily derive a trivial upper bound for the number of time slots, i.e., \( T = \left\lceil \frac{n}{m} \right\rceil \cdot |O| \cdot |R| \), where \( \left\lceil \frac{x}{y} \right\rceil \) means rounding the result of the division \( \frac{x}{y} \) upwards (while \( \left\lfloor \frac{x}{y} \right\rfloor \) means rounding the result of the division \( \frac{x}{y} \) downwards).

\[(OAPSSP) \text{ Minimize } \Gamma = \sum_{p \in P} \sum_{t=2}^{T} \alpha_t^p \quad (1)\]

subject to

\[
\sum_{o \in O} x_o^p = \begin{cases} \left\lfloor \frac{n}{m} \right\rfloor, & 1 \leq p \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{m} \right\rfloor - 1, \\ \left\lceil \frac{n}{m} \right\rceil, & \left\lfloor \frac{n}{m} \right\rfloor \leq p \leq m, \end{cases} \quad \forall p \in P \quad (2)
\]

\[
\sum_{p \in P} x_o^p \leq 1, \quad \forall o \in O \quad (3)
\]

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{T} k_{ot}^p \leq T \cdot x_o^p, \quad \forall o \in O, \forall p \in P \quad (4)
\]

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{T} k_{ot}^p \geq x_o^p, \quad \forall o \in O, \forall p \in P \quad (5)
\]

\[
\sum_{o \in O} k_{ot}^p \leq C, \quad \forall t = 1, \ldots, T, \forall p \in P \quad (6)
\]

\[
\sum_{r \in R} l_{rt}^p \leq 1, \quad \forall t = 1, \ldots, T, \forall p \in P \quad (7)
\]

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{T} l_{rt}^p \leq T \cdot y_r^p, \quad \forall r \in R, \forall p \in P \quad (8)
\]

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{T} l_{rt}^p \geq y_r^p, \quad \forall r \in R, \forall p \in P \quad (9)
\]
\[
\sum_{t=1}^{T} \pi_{iot}^p \geq x_{o}^p, \quad \forall i \in o, \forall o \in O, \forall p \in P
\] (10)

\[
\sum_{r \in R_t} l_{rt}^p + k_{ot}^p \geq 2\pi_{iot}^p, \quad \forall i \in o, \forall o \in O, \forall p \in P, \forall t = 1, ..., T
\] (11)

\[
k_{ot}^p + k_{ot}^p \leq k_{ot}^p + 1, \quad \forall o \in 0, 1 \leq t < t'' < t' \leq T, \forall p \in P
\] (12)

\[
l_{rt}^p - l_{r(t-1)}^p \leq \alpha_{t}^p, \quad \forall r \in R, \forall p \in P, \forall t = 2, ..., T
\] (13)

\[
0 \leq \alpha_{t}^p \leq 1, \quad \forall t = 1, ..., T, \forall p \in P
\] (14)

\[
0 \leq k_{ot}^p \leq 1, \quad \forall o \in 0, \forall t = 1, ..., T, \forall p \in P
\] (15)

\[
x_{o}^p \in \{0,1\}, \quad \forall o \in O, \forall p \in P
\] (16)

\[
y_{r}^p \in \{0,1\}, \quad \forall r \in R, \forall p \in P
\] (17)

\[
l_{rt}^p \in \{0,1\}, \quad \forall r \in R, \forall t = 1, ..., T, \forall p \in P
\] (18)

\[
\pi_{iot}^p \in \{0,1\}, \quad \forall i \in o, \forall o \in O, \forall t = 1, ..., T, \forall p \in P
\] (19)

Objective (1) minimizes the total number of rack visits at all workstations. Eq. (2) ensures that the workload assigned to each workstation is approximately balanced (Weidinger, 2018), where \( \% \) means the modulus operation. Eq. (3) guarantees that each order can be allocated to only one workstation. Eq. (4) and (5) ensure that only if an order is allocated to a certain workstation, it will be tackled at this station in some time slot(s), or not tackled at this station at all. Eqs. (6) and (7) guarantee that in each time slot, at most \( C \) orders are processed or at most one rack is visiting. Eqs. (8) and (9) ensure that only if a rack is assigned to a certain workstation, it will be tackled at this station in some time slot(s), or not tackled at this station at all. Eq. (10) states that all the SKUs required by order \( o_i \) allocated to workstation \( p \) should be delivered at this station, which can happen only in a slot where both \( o_i \) and a suitable rack is concurrently processed due to (11). Eq. (12) guarantees that an order must be processed in succession. Finally, (13) records rack visiting changes. Eqs. (14) to (19) are the integrality constraints, i.e., the domain restricts of the decision variables. Note that \( \alpha_{t}^p \) and \( k_{ot}^p \) are either forced to take value 1 or 0 due to (12), (13) and the binary nature of other variables.
The complexity of the proposed mathematical programming model relies on the number of customer orders, required SKUs, feasible racks, and workstations. Moreover, this model consists of \(|O||P| + |R||P| + |R||T||P| + |o||O||T'|||P|\) binary variables, \(|T||P| + |O||T'|||P|\) continuous variables and \(|P| + |O| + 3|O||P| + 3|T||P| + 2|R||P| + |o||O||P| + 2|o||O||T'| + 2|R||P||T| + \{1(|T| - 2) + 2(|T| - 3) + 3(|T| - 4) + \cdots + (|T| - 2)(|T| - (|T| - 1))\}\) constraints. Note that the final term of total constraint calculation is caused by constraint (12). The larger the problem sizes become, the larger solution spaces and huger number of constraints will exist. Therefore, solving this mathematical model through a commercial solver such as Gurobi is very difficult and time-consuming. In addition, the OAPSSP is not only a complicated mixed-integer programming model but also an \(NP\text{-}hard\) problem that can be easily proven. If the orders and racks allocated to each workstation are fixed, the OAPSSP problem can be reduced to a mobile robot-based order picking problem (MROP) (Boysen et al., 2017). They have proved that the MROP problem is \(NP\text{-}hard\) by reducing it as the set covering problem (Garey & Johnson, 1979). As a result, the OAPSSP problem is certainly \(NP\text{-}hard\). Consequently, efficient heuristic algorithms are necessary, the development and implementation of which are shown in the next section.

5 The proposed approach

We develop a metaheuristic algorithm to effectively find a good feasible solution for real-world-sized instances, the general search framework is based on simulated annealing (SA, see Kirkpatrick et al., 1983). SA is an algorithmic approach to solve combinatorial optimization problems (Cerný, 1985; Aarts et al., 1997). It randomizes the local search procedure and accepts changes, which worsen the solution, with some probability. Thus, SA constitutes an attempt to reduce the probability of getting trapped in a suboptimal solution. In the following, we first outline the framework of the proposed approach along with the primary SA principles. Then we present a model-based matheuristics method as a reduction rule to narrow the search space of each instance, i.e., eliminating part of racks the warehouse holds while maintaining our
optimization direction. We next introduce a heuristic search procedure to construct complete candidate solutions, and describe the neighborhood operators.

5.1 The heuristics framework

The heuristic operates as follows. First, an initial feasible solution \( x_0 = (\theta_0, \mu_0) \) is constructed. Each solution \( x \) consists of both schedule \( \theta = \{O^1, \ldots, O^p, \ldots, O^m\} \) and schedule \( \mu = \{R^1, \ldots, R^p, \ldots, R^m\} \), where \( \theta \) contains \( m \) detailed schedules for \( m \) picking stations and so does \( \mu \). Let the fitness value \( f(x) \) reflect the objective value of the solution \( x \), i.e., \( \sum_{p=1, \ldots, m} |\mu^p| \), which is calculated by a beam search procedure based on dynamic programming. Then the heuristic keeps iterating before the terminating criterion is met. In each iteration, the algorithm tries to find a solution with a lower objective value by changing a part of the solution, namely, \( \theta \), for which one of its neighbors has been selected at random. Then a new order schedule \( \theta' \) is obtained from the neighborhood. Once \( \theta' \) is given, the problem to obtain a new feasible solution \( x' \) reduces to deciding which racks should be delivered to each station and their representation sequences. The current solution is updated following the primary SA principles, which have several key parameters: a temperature \( \tau \), a cooling rate \( \alpha \) (\( 0 < \alpha < 1 \)), and the length of each iteration epoch. The pseudocode of the SA is presented as follows.

- Following Ropke and Pisinger (2006) and Masson et al. (2013), the temperature \( \tau \) is initialized in such a way that \( \tau = -w \cdot \frac{f(x_0)}{\ln 0.5} \), where \( w \) is an arbitrary parameter and \( x_0 \) is the initial solution, i.e., a solution that is \( w\% \) worse than \( f(x_0) \) has 50% probability to be accepted (cf. Kovacs et al. 2012).
- Once a temperature value \( \tau \) is given, an epoch of \( K \) iterations is started. Then \( \tau \) is lowered to \( \alpha \tau \) when an epoch is finished, and the next one is started. Finally, we set the terminating criterion so that at most 5000 iterations are executed or \( \tau \) falls below 0.01 or a given time frame is consumed.
- According to Cho et al. (2005), the length of the initial epoch is set as 10, and
modified as $K := K + \left[ K \cdot \left(1 - \exp\left(\frac{f_{\min} - f_{\max}}{f_{\max}}\right)\right)\right]$ after each epoch. Note that $f_{\min}$ is the lowest fitness value recorded in the past epoch, and $f_{\max}$ is the highest.

In each iteration, a neighborhood solution $x'$ is reached. Then, the difference in fitness values $\Delta f = f(x') - f(x)$ is calculated. The new feasible solution $x'$ always accepted if its objective value is better than that of $x$, i.e., $\Delta f < 0$. Otherwise, $x'$ substitutes $x$ with probability $p = \exp\left(-\Delta f / \tau\right)$.

Algorithm 1 (Pseudocode of the implemented heuristic)

1: Apply RSP, resulting in $\theta_0$
2: Apply IBS based on $\theta_0$, resulting in $\mu_0$
3: Construct a feasible initial solution $x_0 = (\theta_0, \mu_0)$
4: Set $T = -w \cdot f(x_0)/\ln 0.5$, $K = 10$
5: Set the current solution $x \leftarrow x_0$, $f(x) \leftarrow f(x_0)$
6: while stop criterion is not met do
7:   Initialize $x_{\min}, x_{\max}, k = 1$
8:   while $k < K$ do
9:      Randomly choose a neighborhood operator $n() \in N$
10:     Apply $n()$ to $\theta$, resulting in $\theta'$
11:     Calculating $f(x')$ through IBS
12:    if $f(x') < f(x)$ then
13:       Set $x \leftarrow x'$, $x_{\min} \leftarrow x'$, $x^* \leftarrow x'$
14:    else
15:       Set $x \leftarrow x'$ with probability $p = \exp\left(\frac{f(x') - f(x)}{T}\right)$
16:    end if
17:   end while
18:   $K = K + \left[ K \cdot \left(1 - \exp\left(\frac{f(x_{\min}) - f(x_{\max})}{f(x_{\max})}\right)\right)\right]$
19:   $T = \alpha \cdot T$
20: end while
21: return $x^*$
5.2 Reduction rule

Given that this type of warehouse often operates a mixed-shelves or scattered storage policy, i.e., the same products are stored in multiple racks (Weidinger and Boysen, 2018), there exist many interchangeable racks which can be sieved out to narrow the search space. In the following, we first propose a mixed integer programming (MIP) formulation derived from model-OAPSSP to reflect the above rack selection problem (shortly named RSP). Note that our objective of RSP is to minimize the total number of racks allocated to picking stations, which does contribute to less movement of racks and encourage the picking of multiple products for different orders from the same rack as discussed in Boysen et al. (2017) and Hanson et al. (2018). Then we apply a heuristic method to solve it, which draws mainly on the specific mathematical formulation (matheuristics, cf. Boschetti et al., 2009; Valley and Beasley, 2021) and makes direct use of a standard optimization solver. Experiments show that the software like Gurobi can solve the RSP efficiently by exploiting the mentioned method.

There exists an added element $\delta^p_{io}$ of model-RSP, which is the transformation of $\pi^p_{iot}$ and represents that SKU $i$ of order $o$ is processed at station $p$. Our objective (20) minimizes the total number of racks allocated to satisfy all the pending orders. Eqs. (21) and (22) are the same as (2) and (3), which mean the constraints of workload balance and order assignment, respectively. Eq. (23) states that all the SKUs required by order $o_i$ allocated to workstation $p$ should be delivered at this station, which only happens when both conditions hold, i.e., order $o$ and some rack containing its required SKUs are assigned to the special workstation due to (24). Note that each SKU $i$ of order $o$ can be traversed under our setting.

\[(RSP) \text{ Minimize } \Lambda = \sum_{p \in P} \sum_{r \in R} y^p_r \]  
\[\text{subject to} \]  
\[\sum_{o \in O} x^p_o = \begin{cases} \lfloor n/m \rfloor, & 1 \leq p \leq n \% m, \\ \lfloor n/m \rfloor, & n \% m < p \leq m, \end{cases} \forall p \in P \]  

\[(20)\]  
\[(21)\]
\[ \sum_{p \in P} x^o_p \leq 1, \quad \forall o \in O \]  
(22)

\[ \delta^o_{lo} \geq x^o_p, \quad \forall i \in o, \forall o \in O, \forall p \in P \]  
(23)

\[ \sum_{r \in R_i} y^r_p + x^o_p \geq 2\delta^o_{lo}, \quad \forall i \in o, \forall o \in O, \forall p \in P, \forall t = 1, ..., T \]  
(24)

\[ x^o_p \in \{0,1\}, \quad \forall o \in O, \forall p \in P \]  
(25)

\[ y^r_p \in \{0,1\}, \quad \forall r \in R, \forall p \in P \]  
(26)

\[ \delta^o_{lo} \in \{0,1\}, \quad \forall i \in o, \forall o \in O, \forall p \in P \]  
(27)

Specifically, our matheuristics method is executed as follows: the above model-RSP is solved optimally for each single picking station in a sequential manner, until all stations have been considered. As supposed above, the picking stations and their corresponding pickers are indexed in decreasing order, i.e., \( P = \{1, ..., m\}, p \in P \). Thus, there exists a natural ordering for them. The detailed procedure and pseudocode are shown as:

(a) Set \( p = 1 \);

(b) Use the standard solver to optimally solve model-RSP, which has the single workstation and picker \( p \);

(c) Remove the orders assigned to the picker from the given data set and record the chosen racks;

(d) Set \( p = p + 1 \) and if \( p \leq m \) return to (b);

(e) Use the solver to simultaneously solve model-RSP for all \( m \) workstations and pickers, but only attending to those racks which were chosen when the workstations were calculated individually.

If we complete steps (a)-(d) in turn for every picker, a heuristic solution will be received for this problem. However, performing step (e) is potentially possible to further improve the quality of this solution, which utilizes our proposed formulation to solve the RSP problem, but only focusing on the subset of movable racks which were chosen for each workstation. Obviously, the number of racks which is related to the
computation scale will become far small. Furthermore, this procedure needs to perform $m + 1$ optimizations as the total computational effort.

**Algorithm 2 (Pseudocode of RSP)**

1: Input order set $O$, rack set $R$, $m$
2: Initialize $p = 1, R^m = \emptyset$
2: **while** $p < m$ **do**
3: Solve RSP model to allocate order set $O^p$ and rack set $R^p$ to $p$
4: Remove $O^p$ from $O$
5: Add $R^p$ into $R^m$
6: **end while**
7: Solve RSP model to allocate $O$ and $R^m$ to all $m$ pickers, resulting $\theta_0$
8: **return** $\theta_0$

5.3 Constructing candidate solutions

5.3.1 An initial feasible solution

As proposed above, a complete candidate solution $x$ consists of two elements $\theta$ and $\mu$. The initial solution is generated as follows. We obtain an order schedule $\theta = \{O^1, ... O^p, ... O^m\}$ from the solution of model-RAP, which concludes the orders assigned to each picking station. Accordingly, $\theta_0$ can be determined in the way that orders assigned to each station are encoded as a random permutation. Moreover, the whole order sequence is represented by a tuple where the sets of orders processed at the same station are separated by a symbol, e.g., symbol zero (see Fig. 2). Once the order sequence is given, we can apply the following search procedure to obtain a high-quality rack schedule $\mu$, thus a complete initial feasible solution can be returned.

![Figure 2. Order schedule $\theta$ representation](image)

5.3.2 Neighborhood operators

In this section, we employ three types of neighborhood structures $n() \in N$. As
mentioned before, when the SA algorithm attempts to move to a new solution, one of these types is selected randomly with equal probability. Then the algorithm moves to the new solution which is a feasible solution chosen stochastically among neighboring solutions of this type. Position-based neighborhoods are commonly used for permutations that represent scheduling problems. Therefore, we selected three position-based neighborhood operators for this problem.

* **Swap:** select two points at random and swap the positions of these two points;

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 5 \\
\theta & 1 & 2 & 9 & 4 & 0 \\
\theta' & 1 & 2 & 9 & 4 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

![Figure 3(a). Neighborhood operator n(1)](image)

* **Shift:** randomly select three points and shift the points between the first two points to after the third point;

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 5 \\
\theta & 1 & 2 & 8 & 9 & 0 \\
\theta' & 1 & 2 & 8 & 9 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

![Figure 3(b). Neighborhood operator n(2)](image)

* **Inversion:** randomly select two points and reverse the order between them completely.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 5 \\
\theta & 1 & 2 & 3 & 8 & 0 \\
\theta' & 1 & 2 & 3 & 8 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

![Figure 3(c). Neighborhood operator n(3)](image)

5.3.3 Fitness value

Given a feasible solution \( x = (\theta, \mu) \) of the OAPSSP problem, \( x \) is evaluated with the
equation $f(x) = \sum_{p=1}^{m} |\mu^P|$, where $m$ is the number of picking stations and $|\mu^P|$ is the length of rack schedule (i.e., the number of rack visits) at picker $p$. We derive $f(x)$ from a designed beam search (BS) procedure, which is based on dynamic programming to seek for optimal solutions.

First, the general BS mechanism is briefly introduced. BS is a graph search heuristic initially applied within the field of speech recognition, which was first introduced to solve scheduling problems and compared with other well-known heuristics by Ow and Morton (1988). Since then, BS has been extended to a powerful meta-heuristic applicable to many real-world optimization problems (Blum, 2005; Boysen and Zenker, 2013). More details of this heuristic and its extensions can be found from Sabuncuoglu et al. (2008). BS executes the searching procedure based on a tree representation of the solution. However, it does not apply a breadth-first version (e.g., Branch & Bound) but restricting the number of nodes per stage to be further branched to a promising subset. The size of the subset is determined by a given parameter, i.e., beam width $BW$, and the nodes to be selected in the subset are evaluated by the filtering process. Thus, the search process can be illustrated as below: Starting with the root node, all nodes of stage 1 are built, among which promising nodes are identified by the filtering. Note that the filtering can be obtained by a priority value based on every specific issue. Thus, the promising subset of stage 1 consists of the $BW$ best nodes found by the filtering, which are further branched to construct the set of nodes in stage 2. Then again, the filtering is applied to delete some poor nodes of stage 2. The above steps are not stopped until the final stage is reached and the result of BS is returned.

There exist three components needfully predefined when applying BS in a specific problem: graph structure, parameter $BW$, and filtering. In the following, we provide these specifications for our problem.

- **Graph structure**

  We introduce the DP procedure which can be directly used for BS. The procedure can be subdivided into no more than $m(T + 1)$ stages, where the stage $s^p =$
0, 1, ..., $T$ ($1 \leq p \leq m$) determines the allocation of racks to each sequence position at station $p$. Note that $T$ corresponds to the trivial upper bound for the number of time slots mentioned in Section 4. Each stage contains states $(\tilde{o}_1^p, ..., \tilde{o}_c^p, \psi, s^p)$, where:

- $\tilde{o}_c^p$ represents the set of unsatisfied SKUs required by the order currently tackled at space $c$ on the workbench;
- $\psi$ is the pointer as the next permutation to be tackled of the order sequence $\theta^p$;
- $s_0^p$ is the initial state holding $(o_1^p, ..., o_c^p, C + 1, 0)$.

As mentioned before, once an order is satisfied it does not need to wait for the successive rack coming. Moreover, SKUs in $o_i$ should be provided from the first available rack containing it when $o_i$ is active on the workbench. Then, we specify the transitions as follows, which exist only between two coterminous stages $s^p$. There exist two possible transitions when assigning rack $j$ as the next rack based on the state $(\tilde{o}_1^p, ..., \tilde{o}_c^p, \psi, s^p)$:

- if $\tilde{o}_c^p \setminus r_j \neq \emptyset$ for each $c$, then the state turns to $(\tilde{o}_1^p \setminus r_j, ..., \tilde{o}_c^p \setminus r_j, \psi, s^p + 1)$;
- if $\tilde{o}_c^p \setminus r_j = \emptyset$ for any $c$ (maybe more than one), i.e., there exist $\bar{C}$ ($\bar{C} \leq C$) positions on the workbench in which orders can be satisfied with rack $j$, then the pending orders in $[\psi, ..., \psi + C - 1]$ positions of $\theta^p$ substitutes these orders. Consequently, the corresponding states, pointer, and stage turn to $o_{\psi}^p \setminus r_j, ..., o_{\psi + \bar{C} - 1}^p \setminus r_j, \psi + \bar{C}, s^p + 1$, respectively.

Finally, the successor states will not terminate until a state $(\tilde{o}_1^p = \emptyset, ..., \tilde{o}_c^p = \emptyset, |O^p| + 1, s^p)$ is reached, which represents that the order picking process in workstation $p$ is finished. Furthermore, for each picking station, the optimal objective value is equal to $s^p^*$, and the optimal rack sequence $\mu^p$ can be simply obtained based on the backward recursion.

**Parameter BW**

There may exist a poor upper bound $UB$ when applying a comparatively large $BW$, which hurts the performance of BS. Thus, an iterated beam search (IBS) can be applied to make BS benefit from a tight $UB$. Specifically, we initialize with an ordered list of
increasing beam widths $BW$. First, BS is executed with a small $BW$ for quickly generating an initial $UB$, which is passed to the next iteration of BS executed with a larger $BW$ and so on.

**Algorithm 3 (Pseudocode of the IBS)**

1: Input: the ordered list $\gamma$ of increasing beam widths $BW$
2: Initialize $UB = \infty$, $i = 1$
3: while $i$ not reach the length of $\gamma$ do
4:   Solve Beam Search with $UB$ and $BW = \gamma_i$
5:   Update $UB = \text{result of BS}$
6: end while
7: Calculate $f(x)$ based on the optimal sequence
8: return $f(x)$

- **Filtering process**

BS restricts the number of states which are further explored in each stage to the $BW$ most promising ones. To select $BW$ states out of the set of branched states per stage, we rank them according to the number of orders that have not been processed, i.e., $|O^p| - \psi$, and apply the minimum number of currently remaining SKUs on the workbench as tie-breaker, i.e., $|\bigcup_{c=1}^C \tilde{\alpha}_c^p|$.

6 Computational studies

This section tests the performance of our proposed metaheuristic approach, and reports on the results of our computational study. Unfortunately, there exists no established testbed for our OAPSSP problem, so that we had to generate our own instances. First, we detail how our test instances have been generated in Section 6.1. Then, we present the computational performance of our heuristic solution procedures in Section 6.2, which are compared to Gurobi. Finally, we give managerial insights and suggestions with respect to a real-life robotic mobile fulfillment system in Section 6.3. Specifically, we introduce a traditional policy as a benchmark which has widespread use in this type of warehouse. A series of sensitivity analyses are executed to explore how different
parameters impact the order picking process.

All computations were executed on a 64-bit PC with an Intel Core i7-10510U (1.80GHz & 2.30GHz), 16.0 GB main memory and Windows 10. The procedures were implemented using C++ (Visual Studio 2019) and off-the-shelf solver Gurobi (version 9.1.0) was applied to solve all the mathematical models. We repeat the solution procedure 10 times for each parameter setting.

6.1 Instance generation

KIVA systems are typically applied in intelligent distribution centers where many small SKUs are stored in a scattered manner on racks. Our instance generation will follow the real-world operating rules based on JingDong Asia NO.1 Warehouse that uses the similar system (Neuhub, 2019). Our test instances are subdivided into small and large sizes. The former can still be solved to optimality by the standard solver and the latter represent instances of real-world size.

The basic steps of instance generation are elaborated in the following. First, a total of \( n \) orders require to be completed by \( m \) parallel picking stations during our processing horizon. We then have the SKU set \( S \) with the rack set \( R \) and put \( \beta \) different SKUs contained in each rack. Then, the number of spaces on each workbench \( C \) is given. The number of covered SKUs within \([\theta; \theta']\) for each of the \( n \) orders is randomly picked according to a discrete uniform distribution. To be more specific, some more detailed explanations are given.

The average order comprises just 1.6 items (Boysen et al., 2019) and the vast number of orders contain only one or two items (Weidinger, 2018). Accordingly, we set \([\theta; \theta']\) as \([1; 2]\). Regarding the racks then racks may have up to 50 storage locations (see CNN Business, 2018). In Valle and Beasley (2021), they chose to regard racks as being able to store 25 different products per rack. Accordingly, we set \( \beta \) varying from 10 to 30 for different sized instances. Moreover, it is obvious that different SKUs in distribution centers have varying picking frequencies, i.e., some SKUs belong to the best-selling products. To take this into consideration, we make the following rule to
generate the SKUs required by each order, which are randomly selected via an exponential distribution with exponent 0.5 (referred to Boysen et al., 2017). Each SKU contained on the racks is also selected according to the same exponential distribution, so that the better-selling items are more likely to appear on several racks concurrently.

6.2 Algorithmic performance

In this section, we test small-sized instances, and provide computational results when they are solved by the standard solver Gurobi and our proposed heuristic algorithm. We aim to demonstrate the sensitivity of solution quality and computation time to the following input characteristics: number of picking stations ($m$), number of orders ($n$), number of total SKUs ($|S|$), the capacity of each workbench ($C$), and the storage diversity of each rack ($\beta$).

We use the relative difference $rd$ (%) as an evaluation metric (Bodnar et al., 2015). Specifically, given two objective function values $f_A(x)$ and $f_B(x)$ obtained by applying algorithms $A$ and $B$, respectively, to solve a problem instance $x$, the $rd$ of $A$ is then computed as follows: $rd = \left(\frac{f_A(x)}{f_B(x)} - 1\right) \cdot 100\%$. Note that Opt. means the number of instances where Gurobi found the proven optimum within the given time frame of 600 CPU seconds; $rd$ refers to the percentage of the relative difference when the best solution found by SA is compared to the one provided by Gurobi; CPU time is in seconds. Tables 1 and 2 present the numerical results for a total of 72 instances. The testing results are concluded as follows and provide some positive findings.

- Table 1 shows the results for instances with 2 picking stations in total, where each picker tackles no more than 10 orders. The standard solver Gurobi finds feasible solutions in all the instances, among which 63.9% are proven optimality. Our SA is always within a 7.9% gap from the proven optimal solution derived from Gurobi, and within 2% on average, whereas the average CPU time is less than 60 seconds (1 minute).
Table 1 Numerical results with $m = 2$ picking stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Gurobi</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Gurobi</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Gurobi</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Gurobi</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opt. CPU</td>
<td>$rd$</td>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>Opt. CPU</td>
<td>$rd$</td>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>Opt. CPU</td>
<td>$rd$</td>
<td>CPU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It is also clear from Table 1 that the computation time to obtain an optimal solution with Gurobi depends on the number of orders allocated to each station, the number of total SKUs held in the warehouse, and the storage diversity per rack. Indeed, these parameters can be used to characterize the complexity of the order picking operations.

- We next investigate instances when the number of stations is extended to three, the results of which are presented in Table 2. It illustrates that the standard solver struggles to provide an optimal solution within the given time frame as the size of the problem increases. Specifically, Gurobi finds the optimal solution for only one twelfth instances. It should be mentioned that even when we relax the time limit to 1800 CPU seconds (30 minutes), the performance of the commercial software has hardly any improvement. In contrast, our SA is always within a 9.8% gap from the best know solution, and the average gap of SA is 4.8% when only considering the instances where the optimal solution is found.
Table 2 Numerical results with $m = 3$ picking stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$n = 25$</th>
<th>$n = 30$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$c = 3$</td>
<td>Gurobi</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt.</td>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) No. of total SKUs $|S| = 20$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$n = 25$</th>
<th>$n = 30$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$c = 3$</td>
<td>Gurobi</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt.</td>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) No. of total SKUs $|S| = 25$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$n = 30$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$c = 3$</td>
<td>Gurobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt.</td>
<td>CPU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) No. of total SKUs $|S| = 30$

It can be concluded that Gurobi seems not fit for solving OAPSSP problem in realistically sized instances. Moreover, our proposed solution approach performs well for small cases, but further exploration of its performance at real-world operation is needed.

6.3 Managerial aspects

This section aims to reveal how SA performs under real-life-sized instances, in which Gurobi is always weeded out for its lack of computing power. We thus introduce a representative rule-based method which has widespread use in the real-world as a benchmark. Furthermore, we present a less sophisticated method as another benchmark process, which executes random order assignment, to investigate how much performance can joint optimization improve.

6.3.1 Benchmark processes

- Rule-based method (RB)
In fact, many realistic warehouses simply take FCFS (first-come-first-served) rule into consideration when processing orders (Yang et al., 2021). Specifically, according to the arriving time, orders in the order pool have a natural permutation. Suppose that the set of orders to be processed is fixed. Then, the first order is assigned to station one, the second order assigned to station two, and the circle repeats until all the orders have been allocated. Each picker will respectively receive a picking list with a given sequence. For each station, the orders are released into the workbench sequentially from the given list. Then, selected racks are delivered successively (i.e., one by one), each of which covers the most items required by currently active orders. Once an order is completed, it is substituted with the next order defined in the list, and further racks arrive until the whole picking process is completed.

- **Random order assignment (ROA)**

To illustrate that jointly optimizing the interrelated picking links plays an indispensable positive role in efficiency, we compare our proposed solution method with a separate optimization of picking station scheduling without any reliable order assignment policy. Specifically, the separate method assigns orders to stations randomly and evenly, and generates an arbitrary processing sequence for each order set. Then, the picking station scheduling follows the elementary procedure introduced in Section 5.1 in detail, however, the original neighborhood operators are restricted to apply within a single station.

6.3.2 Numerical results

In this section, we further test moderate size and large instances under realistic settings. We reset a time frame of 1800 CPU seconds for solving each instance, which is acknowledged as a reasonable cap on the elapsed time applied in actual operation considering the time interval for batch generation in the order pool. The parameters handed over to our generator are summarized in Table 3. Each one of the parameter combinations is tested 10 times, and all results got are to be applied in the following computation and sensitivity analysis.
Table 3 Varying parameter values for realistic instance generation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Number of orders</td>
<td>500, 750</td>
<td>1000, 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Number of picking stations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Capacity per workbench</td>
<td>10, 15, 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>Storage per rack</td>
<td>15, 25, 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[θ; θ′]</td>
<td>Quantity range of SKUs per order</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1; 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Total number of SKUs</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 4 and 5 present the numerical results for instances with 5 and 10 picking stations in total, respectively, where the number of orders assigned to each station is set as 100 and 150. Column “Sol.” means the average objective value for each instance, and “rd” refers to the percentage of the relative difference when the best solution found by ROA or RB method is compared to that of SA. We first present the algorithmic performance of these three methods. Then some managerial insights and operating suggestions are given from the following computation and sensitivity analysis.

Table 4 Numerical results with \( m = 5 \) picking stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>ROA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sol.</td>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Capacity per workbench ( C = 10 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Capacity per workbench ( C = 15 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Capacity per workbench ( C = 20 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The straightforward rule-based method (RB) always consumes nearly negligible runtime to generate a feasible solution, even facing 1500 orders with 10 picking stations. However, it creates a considerable and unacceptable gap to the solution value of ROA and SA, increasing with the more orders to be processed per station. In the worst-case scenario, the gaps to RB and SA reach 94.3% and 1077.4%, respectively.

Table 5 Numerical results with $m = 10$ picking stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>1000</th>
<th>1500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Capacity per workbench $C = 10$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SA Sol.</th>
<th>CPU rd</th>
<th>ROA Sol.</th>
<th>CPU rd</th>
<th>RB Sol.</th>
<th>CPU rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>130.9</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>169.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>270.9</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>369.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>287.7</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>409.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Capacity per workbench $C = 15$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SA Sol.</th>
<th>CPU rd</th>
<th>ROA Sol.</th>
<th>CPU rd</th>
<th>RB Sol.</th>
<th>CPU rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1442</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>156.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>169.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Capacity per workbench $C = 20$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SA Sol.</th>
<th>CPU rd</th>
<th>ROA Sol.</th>
<th>CPU rd</th>
<th>RB Sol.</th>
<th>CPU rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>208.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>234.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For ROA, while it does optimize the solution value derived from RB to some extent, it is dwarfed by SA. The capacity of ROA falls behind by an average of over 100 percent gap compared with SA. In addition, the advantage of ROA over SA in terms of runtime shrinks as the size of the instance increases. Indeed, as the number of picking stations doubles, the computation of ROA tends to require twice as much time. However, the CPU time for the SA heuristic is not affected by this characteristic. In other words, ROA takes considerable time, yet has little improvement, which means that, the time spent on the picking station scheduling is close to futile if a reasonable order allocation policy cannot be implemented.
Finally, our proposed SA algorithm can always provide satisfying solutions within the given time frame even facing the largest-scale instances. Moreover, the results show that the quality of SA is sensitive to the number of orders assigned to each station. When all other parameters are held constant, the improvement of SA over the other two methods is always better when the average workload per station is 150 orders rather than 100 orders.

Furthermore, we focus on the results of the large-scale instances \((m = 10)\) and further explore the impact of different operating settings on the picking efficiency. We define a new evaluation metric: order fulfillment per unit rack visit \((of.)\), which indicates the number of orders fulfilled during a rack visit, i.e., \(of. = \frac{n}{Sol.}\).

\[ \text{Figure 4. Sensitivity analysis} \]

The above figure visually confirms our previously proposed conclusion that SA outperforms the other two methods by a wide margin, and that ignoring order assignment policy leads to considerable optimality gaps. At the same time, we gain some managerial insights.

- First, SA optimizes more effectively when the number of orders processed by a single picker is larger, while the other two approaches have the opposite characteristic. The cause may be that SA creates a scale effect through the
interlinked optimization of order assignment, and the latter implies that the closely associated relationship between our decision problems can either exploit synergy effects or sabotage each other’s success.

- For the SA results we present, no evidence expanding handling capacity per workbench $C$ necessarily increases $of.$ for a given amount of rack storage $\beta$, while expanding storage density always increases $of.$ for a given $C$. Therefore, the right setting combination needs to be found when designing the warehouse. Specifically, for our experimental combination, the optimal combination setting is: $\frac{n}{m} = 150$, $C = 10$, $\beta = 30$, where $of. = 6.8$. In other words, compared to the best case of ROA, a single rack visit can satisfy nearly 4 times the number of orders.

7 Conclusions

This paper investigates the joint optimization of order assignment and picking station scheduling in KIVA warehouses. Contrary to picker-to-parts warehouses, KIVA handles the order picking process with static pickers and movable racks delivered to stations by mobile robots. Therefore, order assignment policy has a direct impact on the subsequent rack selection, whereas picking station scheduling deals with synchronization of processing sequencing of assigned orders and arrived racks. These two interrelated decisions together determine the total number of robotic tasks. We formalize the resulting decision problem as a mixed-integer programming model and demonstrate its computational complexity. Our computational experiments show that Gurobi cannot provide a solution for large instances in a reasonable time. Therefore, we propose a heuristic algorithm, which adapts the basic logic of simulated annealing, and applies a beam search framework to construct fitness value. The computational study shows that our solution approach can successfully be applied even for large instances with thousands of orders and ten picking stations. Furthermore, we compare our approach with a simple rule-based method applied widely in realistic operations and a separate optimization without order assignment policy. It is shown that our proposed approach
always achieves outstanding performance, and the joint optimization of interlinked processes is quite necessary. Therefore, the SA is an adequate procedure to answer the questions posed by the real-life B2C distribution centers.

Regarding KIVA warehouses, future research should be more focused on the stochastic nature of the problem. In addition, more holistic problem settings should be tested in future research, where OAPSSP is coupled with the rack storage assignment and/or robotic task allocation and traffic planning. This way, further decision support of how to organize the complicated operations in real-world parts-to-picker warehouses could be gained.
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