

Joint Machine-Transporter Scheduling for Multistage Jobs with Adjustable Computation Time

Koresh Khateri and Giovanni Beltrame

Abstract—This paper presents a scalable solution with adjustable computation time for the joint problem of scheduling and assigning machines and transporters for missions that must be completed in a fixed order of operations across multiple stages. A battery-operated multi-robot system with a maximum travel range is employed as the transporter between stages and charging them is considered as an operation. Robots are assigned to a single job until its completion. Additionally, The operation completion time is assumed to be dependent on the machine and the type of operation, but independent of the job. This work aims to minimize a weighted multi-objective goal that includes both the required time and energy consumed by the transporters. This problem is a variation of the flexible flow shop with transports, that is proven to be NP-complete. To provide a solution, time is discretized, the solution space is divided temporally, and jobs are clustered into diverse groups. Finally, an integer linear programming solver is applied within a sliding time window to determine assignments and create a schedule that minimizes the objective. The computation time can be reduced depending on the number of jobs selected at each segment, with a trade-off on optimality. The proposed algorithm finds its application in a water sampling project, where water sampling jobs are assigned to robots, sample deliveries at laboratories are scheduled, and the robots are routed to charging stations.

I. INTRODUCTION

Scheduling and machine assignment for optimizing time and energy has been extensively analyzed in different settings [1], [2], [3]. This paper considers a water sampling scenario in which robots pick up water samples, deliver them to a set of laboratories, and recharge themselves in a dedicated facility. The robots' constraints are limited travel range, the capacity of chargers, laboratories, and base stations. The goal is to provide an optimal or close to optimal assignment and scheduling of robots, laboratories, chargers, and base stations. this paper provides an optimization heuristic for a generalized form of this problem where multi-staged jobs with a similar sequence of operations are scheduled and assigned to the machines and transporters with a limited travel range.

Similar problems have been considered in industry [4], [5] focusing on machines' processing time and constraints to optimize machine utilization in factories or job shops. The expansion of the manufacturing plants and the rise of distributed manufacturing necessitated considering transportation time. Several authors have studied the scheduling

of transporters alongside machine sequencing [6] considering travel time as a key factor and assuming an unlimited travel range and number of transporters. However, with the introduction of robots as transporters, other limitations like the travel range and availability cannot be ignored [7], but the complexity of the problem increases further when coupled with transporter scheduling. Soukhal et al. [8] prove that a two-machine Flexible Flow Shop Problem with Transport (FFSPT) is strongly NP-hard. Several studies have attempted to address the combined problem [9], [10], [11], using exact, heuristic, and meta-heuristic algorithms. However, these studies consider small-scale scenarios and due to the inherent complexity of NP-hard combinatorial problems, these solutions are not scalable. In this paper, we propose a specific class of joint scheduling and assignment of machines and transporters (as in the water sampling application) in which the problem is dividable in the time dimension and it clusters jobs based on their properties to be able to optimize a large-scale problem.

II. RELATED WORK

The Job Shop Problem (JSP) considers scheduling N jobs that each must be performed in its given order. The machines can only perform one operation at a time, and there is a processing time associated with completing an operation on a machine [12]. A variant of JSP is the Flow Shop Problem (FSP) in which there is an identical flow of operations for each job (i.e., the process route is identical) and the s -th operation of a job must be performed on the s -th machine.

The FFSP is a generalized version of FSP where parallel machines are arranged in multiple stages and there is at least one stage containing two or more machines that are able to perform the same operation [13]. Recently, several studies are concerned with using automated robots or human-operated transporters to transport between different machines [14], [9], [6] that is called FFSPT [14], [9], [8], [11]. This paper's problem is a specific class of FFSPT with range limited transporters where the transporters are assigned to a job until it is finished, the problem is defined mathematically in Section III. The FFSP formulation has been used in the scheduling and assignment of several projects. It is encountered in multiple real-world applications and is used in the process optimization of several industries like steel production [15], producing LCDs [16], and concrete production [17]. To the best of our knowledge, there is no work applying the FFSPT formulation to a multi-robot sample collection system.

This work was supported by MITACS and Spiri Robotics

The authors are with Department of Computer and Software Engineering, Polytechnique Montréal, 2500 Chem. de Polytechnique. khateri.koresh@polymtl.ca and giovanni.beltrame@polymtl.ca




Fig. 1. Jobs with several stages of operations with parallel machines at each stage.

The proposed method divides the problem into several subproblems in such a way as to minimize the loss of optimality. Exact, heuristic and metaheuristic algorithms have been developed for solving this problem [18]. Exact methods like the branch and bound are only used for toy examples like a two-machine two-stage setting [19]. Lee & Kim [20] show that the branch and bound can provide a solution in a reasonable time for up to 15 jobs in a 2-stage problem. Heuristics that are closer to the proposed approach involve dispatching rules that are mostly used in dynamic environments where jobs are arriving in real-time. Li et al. [21] provide a new heuristic dispatching rule H' and compare it with classical dispatching rules. The shortest processing time dispatching rule follows a scheduling approach where jobs are arranged in increasing order of priority. Specifically, jobs are scheduled starting from the one with the shortest processing time and proceeding toward the one with the longest processing time.

Additional research endeavors have also explored variations of FFSP: Defersha [22] considers stage omissions and several works include tardiness minimization [23], [24], [25].

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider a set of N jobs $J = \{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{N-1}\}$ where each job has a starting location (e.g., to acquire a sample of water at a certain location, or to pick up an object from a warehouse) and consists of S operations $O = \{o_0, o_1, \dots, o_{S-1}\}$ that have to be performed in order in S stages. Each stage s has G_s parallel machines $M_s = \{m_{0,s}, m_{1,s}, \dots, m_{G_s-1,s}\}$ that can perform o_s with processing time $pt(m_{k,s})$ and capacity $c(m_{k,s})$ (i.e., the maximum number of operations that can be performed in parallel by $m_{k,s}$ at any time t) and $c(m_{k,s}, t)$ as the number of under process operations by $m_{k,s}$. Furthermore, each machine has a geographical location x . We define the *transport time* $tt(m_{q,s_h}, m_{r,s_{h+1}})$ (i.e., transport time between machine q at stage h and machine r at stage $h+1$) and, similarly, the *transport energy* $te(m_{q,s_h}, m_{r,s_{h+1}})$.

We assume that there are transporter *base stations* $b_i \in B$ that contain $A(b_i, t)$ available and charged transporters at

time t with a capacity $c(b_i)$ (i.e., the maximum number of transporters that can be stored at b_i at any time, available or not) and $c(b_i, t)$ as the number of stored transporters at time t in b_i . Each base station has a location and a transporter is *dispatched* from a base station b_d , visits the job location, and then proceeds with different stages of processing on the machines, finally returning to a *receiving* base station b_r as shown in Fig 1. We assume that once a transporter is assigned to a job j_i , it cannot be reassigned until the completion of j_i . Let a facility be a general term referring to a machine or base station

The problem is to assign a schedule P to a sequence of machines and two base stations (the dispatch and receiving base stations) for each job j_i :

$$P(j_i) = b_d | t_D, j_i | t_1, m_{b,2} | t_2, \dots, m_{z,S-2} | t_{S-2}, b_r | t_R$$

where $m_{x,y} | t_z$ is the arrival of the transporter to the machine m_x of stage y at time t_z . Similarly, $b_d | t_D, j_i | t_1, b_r | t_R$ represents assigning a transporter from base station b_d where a transporter is dispatched at time t_D to visit job j_i 's initial location at time t_1 , and return to base station b_r at time t_R . In the following, we use the notation P, j instead of $P(j_i), j_i$ for brevity when there is no ambiguity. Subscript indexing is used for referring to the timing sequence of P and superscript for the facility sequence (i.e., P^s is the machine at stage s and P_s is the timing to arrive (dispatch time in case of $s=0$) at stage s of P)

A job j_i is finished after the transporter is at its receiving base station and has been recharged (i.e. processed) at the time $t_f(P) = P_{S-1} + pt(P^{S-1})$. The energy used for job i is the sum of the transport energy of each stage $E(P) = \sum_{0 \leq s \leq S-2} te(P^s, P^{s+1})$. Type of a facility type(P^s) is defined to be the type of P^s (i.e., base dispatch, job, machine, base receive types), and $attached(P^s)$ is a function that returns 0 if the transporter is not needed while the operation is processing (e.g., delivering a sample to a laboratory), 1 otherwise. Our goal is to find job schedules that:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_P \quad & \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \alpha E(P(j_i)) + \beta t_f(P(j_i)) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \forall j \in J \quad E(p(j)) < E_{max} \\ & \forall m \in M \quad c(m, t) \leq c(m) \\ & \forall b \in B \quad A(b, t) \geq 0, \quad c(b, t) \leq c(b) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

IV. MAIN RESULTS

As the problem's dimension grows the optimization becomes computationally infeasible. To address this, a subset of jobs within a specified time window T_w are scheduled at each segment of optimization. While the proposed solution may not guarantee optimality, two heuristics are incorporated to enhance its effectiveness.

- 1) jobs are clustered, based on the closeness of their location, in N_c clusters using K-means where N_c is given by the user or is determined by a method like the Elbow method [26]. Then for each segment of optimization, N_s jobs are selected from the clusters in

proportion to the number of unassigned jobs in each cluster. Because the jobs are selected from different clusters the locations of selected jobs are different. Such a subset of jobs will be called *diverse*. Let $select(N_s)$ select N_s unassigned jobs in this manner.

- 2) Optimization is divided into several segments, each in a time window, for optimizing the next segment a portion of the previous time window is considered again such that if it was possible to find a time slot for one of the next segment's jobs in the previous time window, the possibility can be used.

A discrete-time model is assumed where time t , is represented as a natural number to approximate continuous time, a time resolution parameter ΔT , which determines the granularity of the time intervals is used in the model. The time sequence of found solutions should be multiplied by ΔT to get real time. The proposed algorithm consists of the following steps and is illustrated in Fig 2:




Fig. 2. An overview of the proposed algorithm.

- 1) Find possible paths between base stations without passing through jobs or machines;
- 2) Select a diverse subset of jobs;
- 3) Find paths for selected jobs;
- 4) Set the time window T_w .
- 5) Append possible timing to paths for each job in the selected subset, to be called a candidate schedule.
- 6) Add constraints regarding capacity, processing time and availability of the machines used in each candidate schedule.
- 7) Solve the associate boolean linear program.

Steps 2 to 7 are repeated until all the jobs are scheduled.

Step 1 is to exchange transporters between base stations without performing any jobs. This is required when there is no available transporter in the base stations within the feasible paths for a specific job (i.e., a path with a length smaller than the transporter's range). In such cases, a transporter can be transferred and recharged at an intermediary base station.

In step 3, to comply with the limited range restriction, a predefined number of facility-disjoint shortest paths (i.e., paths that are at least different in one of the facilities assigned with minimum energy needed) for each job are found. Each path is a sequence $p = b_{D_k}, j_i, m_{b,2}, m_{c,3}, \dots, m_{z,S-2}, b_{R_l}$ that has the same properties of the facility sequence of

P and must satisfy $E(p) < E_{max}$. An implementation of Dijkstra's single source shortest paths algorithm¹ is used to find the shortest path and then a node of each found path is discarded to find a different shortest path without the discarded nodes to make the paths facility-disjoint. A time window in step 4 is selected and a set of candidate schedules are built in step 5 with Algorithm 3 for all the paths generated in step 3. Each candidate $\rho_c(j_i)$ is like $P(j_i)$, with all its properties, where ρ_{c_0} (i.e. the candidate's dispatching time) is selected from the time window T_w and $\rho_{c_1}, \dots, \rho_{c_{S-1}}$ are calculated based on the transportation and processing times. Additionally, each candidate has a boolean decision accessible by $value(\rho_c)$. Google's OR-Tools² is selected as the solver, and the candidate value is added as an integer variable to the solver that can take only 0 or 1 for each candidate schedule. Value 1 specifies that the candidate will be used in the solution. The proposed method is represented in Algorithm 5 where it fetches, from the user: the jobs J , N_s , N_c , the moving horizon time (τ_h) which specifies the time duration that is added to the time window at each segment of optimization, and γ to specify how much the current segment's time window overlaps with the previous. The minimum number of paths P_{min} that should exist for a job (i.e., the minimum number of facility-disjoint paths to search for that are complying with the range limitation). Also, the maximum number of paths P_{max} to skip searching for more disjoint paths. Then, the time window is calculated. Let τ be the finish time when all assigned jobs in the last optimization segment are finished. The time window for the following segment of optimization is determined in Algorithm 5 as the interval $[\tau - \gamma\tau_h, \tau + \tau_h]$. Then using $select(N_s)$ a set of jobs for the following segment of optimization is selected. For each job in this set Algorithm 2 finds at most P_{max} paths for each job or throws a warning if P_{min} paths do not exist for a job. Consequently, algorithm 3 is used to create candidate schedules based on possible paths and the calculated time window. Finally, the constraints are imposed and the optimization for each segment is done with Algorithm 4. This process is repeated until all the jobs are scheduled.

Algorithm 2 uses Algorithm 1 to make a graph_job for each job to find at least P_{min} and at most P_{max} candidate paths going through require machines and the base stations. This graph_job is constructed with all the machines and only the selected job as its nodes. The base stations are duplicated as base_dispatch and base_recieve to distinguish when a transporter is dispatched from a base station and when a transporter returns. A virtual start node before base_dispatch and a virtual end node after base_recieve stage are added with zero time and energy edges to all bases, so that we can search for paths from the start node to the end node. Each edge has two properties: the transportation time and energy required to traverse that edge. Between each consequent stage, edges with the required transportation time and energy are created.

¹<https://pypi.org/project/Dijkstra/>

²<https://developers.google.com/optimization>

Then Algorithm 2 uses Dijkstra to find the shortest path, concerning the required energy and keeps it as a candidate path if it requires less energy than the maximum energy E_{max} of a transporter. To find more facility-disjoint paths, nodes of a point in the discrete cartesian space of the set of founded paths (i.e., the space made of the nodes of each path as points on each axis) are eliminated from the job graph and then another shortest path is searched for. If less than P_{min} paths are found for a job the algorithm returns a warning. This is to inform the user that there are not enough candidate paths. Particularly, if P_{min} is set to 1 this means that a feasible path does not exist for the job and this job can not be assigned. As there can be a feasible path for a job from a base station that does not contain a transporter, Algorithm 2 finds the possibility of sending a transporter from a base station to another base station without any job assigned as an intermediary base station.

To address the optimization task at each segment, Algorithm 4 is employed. Here the $add(,)$ function is to add candidate values to a constraint container. Let $\sigma = 0$ be an empty constraint container then $add(\sigma, c1)$ and $add(\sigma, c2)$ will result in $\sigma = value(c1) + value(c2)$. The $sub(,)$ function is defined likewise with $-$ as the operator. The Constraints considered for the solver are:

- Constraints for previously assigned candidates. That is for each candidate in the previous segment with value=1 a constraint is added to keep the value equal to 1 in the next segments.
- Constraints regarding jobs being assigned only once. Let j_i be a job, all the candidates that are associated with j_i (i.e., $\rho^1 = j_i$) are added to the job's constraint container $\sigma[j_i]$ (i.e., $add(\sigma[j_i], \rho)$) and then for each job, a constraint is added to the solver such that the job's constraint container equals 1 (i.e., for each job $solver.addConstraint(\sigma[j_i] = 1)$).
- Constraints regarding machines. Each machine has a processing time and a capacity which means that at any time there must be fewer ongoing operations than its capacity. Let $m_{i,s}$ be a machine at stage s , to comply with this restriction each candidate ρ which $m_{i,s} \in \rho$ is added to the machine's constraint container $\sigma[m_{i,s}]$ for an interval with the duration of the processing time of the machine (i.e., $\forall t \in [\rho_s, \rho_s + pt(\rho^s)]$), $add(\sigma[m_{i,s}], \rho)$.
- One of the constraints of the base stations is the conservation of transporters, which implies that the number of transporters dispatched from a base station can not be more than the number of transporters received plus the number of transporters initially existing in the base station. Let b_i be a base station. To address this constraint any candidate that has $\rho^0 = b_i$ (i.e., the transporter is dispatched from b_i) is subtracted from the availability constraint container of b_i for an interval starting from ρ to the end of the current time window (i.e., $\forall t \geq \rho_0 \cap T_w$, $sub(\sigma_A[b_i][t], \rho)$). Also, a base station can be functioning like a machine (e.g., maintenance of

transporters or integration of chargers in base stations). Thus, when a transporter is received, it gets ready to dispatch only after a processing time. In this case, any candidate that has $\rho^{S-1} = b_i$ is added to the availability constraint container of b_i for an interval starting from the arriving time plus processing time of b_i to the end of the time window (i.e., $\forall t \geq \rho_{S-1} + pt(b_i) \cap T_w$ $add(\sigma_A[b_i][t], \rho)$). Finally, the net number of all the dispatched and received transporters for any base station must be bigger or equal to the negative of initially existing transporters of b_i that $\sigma_A[b_i] \geq -b_i(0)$.

- Another constraint related to the base stations is the capacity of the base station. Such that there is a maximum space and there can not be more than a certain number of transporters in a specific base station at any time. To respect this constraint any candidate that has $\rho^0 = b_i$ is subtracted from the capacity constraint container of b_i for an interval starting from ρ_0 to the end of the current time window (i.e., $\forall t \geq \rho_0 \cap T_w$ $sub(\sigma_c[b_i][t], \rho)$). When a transporter is received any candidate that has $\rho^{S-1} = b_i$ is added to the capacity constraint container of b_i for an interval starting from the receiving time ρ_{S-1} to the end of the time window (i.e., $\forall t \geq \rho_{S-1} \cap T_w$ $add(\sigma_c[b_i][t], \rho)$). Finally, the net number of all the dispatched and received transporters for any base station must be less or equal to the capacity of that base station $\sigma_c[b_i] \leq c(b_i)$.

The objective function defined in (1) is implemented as the summation of $(\alpha E(\rho) + \beta t_f(\rho))value(\rho)$ of all candidate schedules. After the optimization is done in each segment, jobs with candidates whose value is assigned to be 1 are deleted from their cluster, the time window slides forward and the algorithm iterates until there are no more jobs to assign. If in a segment no job is assigned the algorithm throws a warning which means that the time window is not long enough or the job needs a transporter from a base station that is empty and there is no possibility of transferring a transporter to that base station from another base station.

Algorithm 1: Job's Graph Generator

```

1 Function graph_job(j)
2   graph = Null;
3   foreach  $b_d \in Base\_dispatch$  do
4     graph.addEdge(start,  $b_d$ , 0, 0);
5     graph.addEdge( $b_d$ , j, te( $b_d$ , j), tt( $b_d$ , j));
6   foreach stage such that  $\exists stage.next()$  do
7     foreach  $n \in stage$  do
8       foreach  $m \in stage.next()$  do
9         graph.addEdge(
10          n, m, te(n, m), e, tt(n, m));
11   foreach  $b_r \in Base\_recieve$  do
12     graph.addEdge( $b_r$ , end, 0, 0);
13   return graph

```

Algorithm 2: Possible Paths

```
1 Function possible_paths(jobs,  $E_{max}$ ,  $P_{min}$ ,  $P_{max}$ )
2   paths = Null;
3   foreach job  $\in$  jobs do
4     graph_j = graph_job(job); paths_j = Null;
5     repeat
6       p = finder(graph_j, paths_j,  $E_{max}$ );
7       if p = Null then
8         warning; break;
9       paths_j.append(p);
10      until size(paths_j)  $\leq$   $P_{max}$ ;
11      paths.extend(paths_j);
12  foreach b  $\in$  base_stage do
13    foreach br  $\in$  base_stage/base do
14      p = b, b_r;
15      if  $E(p) \leq E_{max}$  then
16        paths.append(p);
17  return paths
18 Function finder(graph_j, paths_j,  $E_{max}$ )
19  foreach point  $\in$  Cartesian(paths_j) do
20    p = Dijkstra(graph_j/point, start, end);
21    if  $E(p) \leq E_{max}$  & p  $\neq$  Null then
22      return p;
23  return Null;
```

Algorithm 3: Candidate Generator

```
1 Function  $\rho$ -gen(paths,  $T_w$ )
2   foreach p  $\in$  paths do
3     for td  $\in$   $T_w$  do
4        $\rho^0 = p^0$ ;  $\rho_0 = t_d$ ;
5       foreach  $1 \leq s < S$  do
6          $\rho^s = p^s$ ;
7          $\rho_s = \rho_{s-1} + tt(\rho^{s-1}, p^s) +$ 
8            $pt(\rho^{s-1})attached(\rho^{s-1})$ ;
9       candidates.append( $\rho$ )
10  return candidates
```

It is worth mentioning that the proposed algorithm is flexible to several extensions as modifying the path-finding part and the objective function can be simply applied. As examples, consider the following remarks:

Remark 1: For jobs that need to skip a stage, say stage s , it is possible to change *stage.next()* to *stage.next().next()* when creating the job's graph in Algorithm 1 at stage $s - 1$. Therefore, candidate paths will not use machines in stage s .

Remark 2: The objective function (1) tends to minimize the average time of finishing all the jobs. If the time for accomplishing the jobs that take more time is of concern, it is possible to change the objective function in Algorithm 4 to

Algorithm 4: Solver

```
1 Function solver(candidates,  $T_w$ , schedule = Null)
2   foreach sc  $\in$  schedule do
3     solver.addConstraint(value(sc) == 1);
4   foreach  $\rho \in candidates \cup schedule$  do
5     foreach  $0 \leq s < S$  do
6       if type( $\rho^s$ ) = job then
7         add( $\sigma[\rho^s]$ ,  $\rho$ );
8       else if type( $\rho^s$ ) = machine then
9         for  $\rho_s \leq t \leq \rho_s + pt(\rho^s)$  do
10           $\sigma[\rho^s][t].add(\rho)$ ;
11       else if type( $\rho^s$ ) = base_dispatch then
12         foreach  $t > \rho_0 \cap T_w$  do
13            $\sigma_c[\rho^s][t].sub(\rho)$ ;
14            $\sigma_A[\rho^s][t].sub(\rho)$ ;
15       else if type( $\rho^s$ ) = base_recieve then
16         foreach  $t > \rho_{S-1} + pt(\rho^s) \cap T_w$  do
17            $\sigma_A[\rho^s][t].add(\rho)$ ;
18         foreach  $t > \rho_{S-1} \cap T_w$  do
19            $\sigma_c[\rho^s][t].add(\rho)$ ;
20     solver.addVar( $\rho$ )
21  foreach j  $\in$  jobs do
22    solver.addConstraint( $\sigma[j] = 1$ )
23  foreach m  $\in$  machines do
24    foreach t  $\in$   $\sigma[m].keys()$  do
25      solver.addConstraint( $\sigma[m][t] \leq c(m)$ )
26  foreach b  $\in$  bases do
27    foreach t  $\in$   $\sigma_c[b].keys()$  do
28      solver.addConstraint( $\sigma_c[b] \leq c(b)$ )
29    foreach t  $\in$   $\sigma_A[b].keys()$  do
30      solver.addConstraint( $\sigma_A[b] \geq -b(0)$ )
31  foreach  $\rho \in candidates$  do
32    solver.addObjective(( $\alpha E(\rho) +$ 
33       $\beta t_f(\rho))\rho.value$ )
34  solution = solver.minimize()
35  if  $\exists sl \in solution$  such that value(sl) = 1 then
36    foreach sl  $\in solution$  such that
37      value(sl) = 1 do
38        schedule.append(sl);
39        makespan =  $\max(makespan, sl_{S-1})$ ;
40        sl.cluster.delete(sl1)
41    else
42      Warning
43  return schedule, makespan
```

Algorithm 5: Optimizer

1 Function

```
Optimizer(jobs, Nc, τh, γ = 1, makespan =  
0, Ns, Emax, Pmin = 1, Pmax = ∞)  
2 | scheduled = Null; cluster(jobs, property, Nc);  
3 | repeat  
4 | | start_time = min(makespan - τhγ, 0);  
5 | | end_time = makespan + τh;  
6 | | Tw = [start_time, end_time];  
7 | | selected_jobs = select(Ns);  
8 | | possible_path =  
9 | | | possible_paths(selected_jobs, Emax, Pmin, Pmax);  
10 | | | candidates = ρ.gen(possible_path, Tw);  
11 | | | scheduled, makespan =  
11 | | | solve(candidates, Tw, scheduled);  
| until All jobs assigned;
```

$(\alpha E(\rho) + \beta t_f(\rho)^k) \text{value}(\rho)$, where k can be any natural number. The higher the k is chosen, the job that finishes last will be more costly. Therefore, the finish time in each segment will be minimized. Please note that this objective function is still linear concerning $\text{value}(\rho)$.

Remark 3: If a job has a predefined time of accomplishment t_{ac} , the job can be given more priority in $\text{select}(N_s)$ and in a time window whose end time is later than the assigned time of accomplishment. Then, $\zeta(\rho_1 - t_{ac})^2 \text{value}(\rho)$ could be added to the objective function to penalize the non-punctuality of accomplishing a job.

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

As an experiment, the proposed method is implemented in an automated system for water sampling along the coast of Nova Scotia using a swarm of flying robots that could be considered one of the current large-scale water sampling programs in which shellfish production is regulated by the Canadian Shellfish Sanitation Program (CSSP) and requires determination of water sanitation levels on shellfish beds by monitoring the presence of *E. Coli*. This section shows simulation results on 15 randomly generated experiments with 100 jobs, 10 drones, and 10 laboratories. The code and parameters are publicly accessible³. Figure 3.a, depicts the computation time of the proposed method as a function of the number of water samples (jobs). The complexity of the method increases linearly with the number of samples while the number of samples per segment of optimization remains constant. This demonstrates the scalability of the proposed method in handling a large number of samples. In Fig 3.b, the cost difference resulting from different choices of samples per segment of optimization is shown. Please note that in the case of one sample per segment, the method is equivalent to the greedy algorithm and as the number of samples per segment is increased it approaches optimality exponentially such that even with a small choice of samples

³https://git.mistlab.ca/kkhateri/mrs_paper

per segment the cost is reduced by a large margin while the computation time is still in orders of seconds. The computation time as shown in Fig 3.c increases with the number of samples per segment. This highlights the trade-off between the optimality of the solution and the computation time. Users can adjust this trade-off based on their specific requirements and available computation resources.




Fig. 3. 15 experiments: a) The computation time with fixed 5 jobs per segment and different numbers of jobs. b) The cost with different jobs per segment choices and a fixed 100 total jobs. c) The computation time with different choices of jobs per segment and 100 jobs

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown a method to divide the joint machine-transporter scheduling for multistage jobs into sub-problems, which provides a significant improvement in terms of solution quality over a greedy algorithm. In addition, our method has parameters to adjust the trade-off between computation time and solution quality. We show that our method's computation time grows linearly with the number of tasks, ensuring scalability.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Ruiz and J. A. Vázquez-Rodríguez, "The hybrid flow shop scheduling problem," *European journal of operational research*, vol. 205, no. 1, pp. 1–18, 2010.

- [2] T. Lee and Y. Loong, "A review of scheduling problem and resolution methods in flexible flow shop;" *International Journal of Industrial Engineering Computations*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 67–88, 2019.
- [3] H. Xiong, S. Shi, D. Ren, and J. Hu, "A survey of job shop scheduling problem: The types and models," *Computers & Operations Research*, p. 105731, 2022.
- [4] B. Cunha, A. M. Madureira, B. Fonseca, and D. Coelho, "Deep reinforcement learning as a job shop scheduling solver: A literature review," in *Hybrid Intelligent Systems: 18th International Conference on Hybrid Intelligent Systems (HIS 2018) Held in Porto, Portugal, December 13-15, 2018*. Springer, 2020, pp. 350–359.
- [5] A. M. Ibrahim and M. A. Tawhid, "An improved artificial algae algorithm integrated with differential evolution for job-shop scheduling problem," *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 1763–1778, 2023.
- [6] B. Naderi, M. Zandieh, A. K. G. Balagh, and V. Roshanaei, "An improved simulated annealing for hybrid flowshops with sequence-dependent setup and transportation times to minimize total completion time and total tardiness," *Expert systems with Applications*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 9625–9633, 2009.
- [7] T. Liang, L. Zhou, and Z. Jiang, "Integrated scheduling of production and material delivery in a make-to-order flow shop," in *2022 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management (IEEM)*, 2022, pp. 1422–1426.
- [8] A. Soukhal, A. Oulamara, and P. Martineau, "Complexity of flow shop scheduling problems with transportation constraints," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 161, no. 1, pp. 32–41, 2005, iEPM: Focus on Scheduling. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221703005320>
- [9] E. Gheisariha, M. Tavana, F. Jolai, and M. Rabiee, "A simulation–optimization model for solving flexible flow shop scheduling problems with rework and transportation," *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, vol. 180, pp. 152–178, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S037847542030286X>
- [10] W. Ren, Y. Yan, Y. Hu, and Y. Guan, "Joint optimisation for dynamic flexible job-shop scheduling problem with transportation time and resource constraints," *International Journal of Production Research*, vol. 60, no. 18, pp. 5675–5696, 2022.
- [11] C.-N. Wang, G. A. Porter, C.-C. Huang, V. T. Nguyen, and S. T. Husain, "Flow-shop scheduling with transportation capacity and time consideration," *Computers, Materials & Continua*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 3031–3048, 2022.
- [12] A. Jain and S. Meeran, "Deterministic job-shop scheduling: Past, present and future," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 113, no. 2, pp. 390–434, 1999. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221798001131>
- [13] H. Wang, "Flexible flow shop scheduling: optimum, heuristics and artificial intelligence solutions," *Expert Systems*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 78–85, 2005.
- [14] A. Amirteimoori, I. Mahdavi, M. Solimanpur, S. S. Ali, and E. B. Tirkolaee, "A parallel hybrid pso-ga algorithm for the flexible flow-shop scheduling with transportation," *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, vol. 173, p. 108672, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S036083522200660X>
- [15] J. Long, Z. Zheng, X. Gao, and P. M. Pardalos, "Scheduling a realistic hybrid flow shop with stage skipping and adjustable processing time in steel plants," *Applied Soft Computing*, vol. 64, pp. 536–549, 2018.
- [16] H.-S. Choi, J.-S. Kim, and D.-H. Lee, "Real-time scheduling for reentrant hybrid flow shops: A decision tree based mechanism and its application to a tft-lcd line," *Expert systems with Applications*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 3514–3521, 2011.
- [17] J. A. V. Rodriguez and A. Salhi, "Performance of single stage representation genetic algorithms in scheduling flexible flow shops," in *2005 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 2. IEEE, 2005, pp. 1364–1371.
- [18] R. Ruiz and J. A. Vázquez-Rodríguez, "The hybrid flow shop scheduling problem," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 205, no. 1, pp. 1–18, 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221709006390>
- [19] T. Arthanary, "An extension of two machine sequencing problem," *Opsearch*, vol. 8, pp. 10–22, 1971.
- [20] G.-C. Lee and Y.-D. Kim*, "A branch-and-bound algorithm for a two-stage hybrid flowshop scheduling problem minimizing total tardiness," *International Journal of Production Research*, vol. 42, no. 22, pp. 4731–4743, 2004.
- [21] Z.-t. Li, Q.-x. Chen, and N. Mao, "A heuristic algorithm for two-stage flexible flow shop scheduling with head group constraint," *International Journal of Production Research*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 751–771, 2013.
- [22] F. M. Defersha, "A simulated annealing with multiple-search paths and parallel computation for a comprehensive flowshop scheduling problem," *International Transactions in Operational Research*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 669–691, 2015.
- [23] O. Nejjarou, S. Aqil, and M. Lahby, "Inspired nature meta-heuristics minimizing total tardiness for manufacturing flow shop scheduling under setup time constraint," in *Digital Technologies and Applications: Proceedings of ICDTA'23, Fez, Morocco, Volume 2*. Springer, 2023, pp. 44–54.
- [24] R. Ghorbani Saber and M. Ranjbar, "Minimizing the total tardiness and the total carbon emissions in the permutation flow shop scheduling problem," *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 138, p. 105604, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305054821003245>
- [25] S. Oujana, F. Yalaoui, and L. Amodeo, "A linear programming approach for hybrid flexible flow shop with sequence-dependent setup times to minimise total tardiness." *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 1162–1167, 2021.
- [26] M. Cui *et al.*, "Introduction to the k-means clustering algorithm based on the elbow method," *Accounting, Auditing and Finance*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 5–8, 2020.