

# Integrated Planning and Machine-Level Scheduling for High-Mix Discrete Manufacturing: A Profit-Driven Heuristic Framework

Runhao Liu<sup>1,\*</sup>, Ziming Chen<sup>2,\*</sup>, You Li<sup>3,\*</sup>, Zequn Xie<sup>1</sup>, Peng Zhang<sup>4,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Polytechnic Institute, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310015, China

<sup>2</sup>School of Social and Public Administration, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai 200237, China

<sup>3</sup>School of Data Science and Engineering, Guangdong Polytechnic Normal University, Guangzhou, Guangdong 510665, China

<sup>4</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310058, China

runhaoliu@zju.edu.cn (R. Liu), pengz@zju.edu.cn (P. Zhang)

## Abstract

Modern manufacturing enterprises struggle to create efficient and reliable production schedules under multi-variety, small-batch, and rush-order conditions. High-mix discrete manufacturing systems require jointly optimizing mid-term production planning and machine-level scheduling under heterogeneous resources and stringent delivery commitments. We address this problem with a profit-driven integrated framework that couples a mixed-integer planning model with a machine-level scheduling heuristic. The planning layer allocates production, accessory co-production, and outsourcing under aggregate economic and capacity constraints, while the scheduling layer refines these allocations using a structure-aware procedure that enforces execution feasibility and stabilizes daily machine behavior. This hierarchical design preserves the tractability of aggregated optimization while capturing detailed operational restrictions. Evaluations are conducted on real industrial scenario. A flexible machine-level execution scheme yields 73.3% on-time completion and significant outsourcing demand, revealing bottleneck congestion. In contrast, a stability-enforcing execution policy achieves 100% on-time completion, eliminates all outsourcing, and maintains balanced machine utilization with only 1.9–4.6% capacity loss from changeovers. These results show that aligning planning decisions with stability-oriented execution rules enables practical and interpretable profit-maximizing decisions in complex manufacturing environments.

**Keywords:** Integrated Planning and Scheduling, High-Mix Manufacturing, Heuristic Optimization, Profit-Oriented Decision Making, Industrial Production Systems

## Introduction and Related Work

Modern manufacturing enterprises are undergoing a digital transformation, yet high-mix production planning remains largely manual due to the complexity of interdependent capacity and setup constraints (Villalonga et al. 2021; Serrano-Ruiz, Mula, and Poler 2021; Penchev,

Vitliemov, and Georgiev 2023). Although enterprises often deploy ERP or APS tools (Guzman, Andrés, and Escoto 2021; Rossit, Tohmé, and Frutos 2019), these systems frequently rely on simplistic logic that ignores critical operational restrictions like sequence-dependent changeovers, leading to non-executable schedules (Moeuf et al. 2018; Arica and Powell 2014). To address this, we focus on a profit-oriented integrated planning and scheduling problem in multi-product, multi-machine environments. The proposed approach jointly determines order allocation, outsourcing, and detailed sequencing while respecting heterogeneous machine compatibility, setup capacity losses, and accessory synchronization constraints. Unlike traditional models that minimize makespan, our objective is to maximize economic performance by balancing revenue against production, setup, outsourcing, and delay costs.

Extensive research in Production Planning and Scheduling (PPS) employs methods ranging from Mixed-Integer Linear Programming (MILP) and metaheuristics to multi-site coordination models (Yiğit et al. 2024; Haro et al. 2024; Lohmer and Lasch 2020; Yuan et al. 2024). Despite these advances, many studies rely on small-scale benchmarks or simplify critical constraints like sequence-dependent changeovers, hindering industrial applicability (Mitić et al. 2023). While integrated MILP formulations successfully couple lot-sizing with scheduling using advanced decomposition techniques (Muñoz and Ulloa-Navarro 2025; Mohammadi, Esmaelian, and Atighehchian 2020; Rohaninejad et al. 2023; Furlan et al. 2024), they face severe scalability challenges. To remain tractable, these models often resort to abstractions that obscure fine-grained compatibility and synchronization details required in high-mix environments (Oujana et al. 2023; Popović et al. 2023; Çağrı Sel, Gurkan, and Hamzadayı 2024). Conversely, data-driven approaches like Deep Reinforcement Learning offer promising generalization capabilities (Song et al. 2023; Pan et al. 2023). However, their "black-box" nature, limited transferability across varying factory configurations, and high deployment costs present significant barriers to

\*These authors contributed equally.

†Corresponding Author

practical adoption (Sunday et al. 2025; Luo et al. 2023; Hua, Liu, and Pan 2025).

To bridge the disconnect between aggregate planning and shop-floor executability, where conventional plans often neglect critical constraints like sequence-dependent changeovers and multi-stage accessory synchronization, we propose a profit-oriented integrated planning and scheduling framework implemented as an end-to-end APS prototype. This model explicitly maximizes profit by trading off revenue against production, setup, outsourcing, and delay costs, while capturing complex constraints such as machine–tool compatibility, sequence-dependent changeovers, and accessory coordination. To ensure scalability, we employ a hierarchical two-level heuristic: a rolling-horizon planning layer first allocates orders under aggregate constraints, followed by a scheduling layer that refines these into executable machine-level sequences. Our specific contributions are:

- We formulate a **profit-driven MILP model** that explicitly optimizes the “Make-or-Buy” boundary by balancing revenue against multi-dimensional costs. Uniquely, this formulation captures the **multi-stage synchronization** between shell molding and accessory machining under strict **mold-machine compatibility constraints**.
- A **hierarchical planning-scheduling framework** is proposed to bridge aggregate optimization and detailed executability. We introduce a rolling-horizon layer to generate feasible **production envelopes**, coupled with a structure-aware heuristic that enforces a **single-mold-per-day** stability policy to minimize changeover fragmentation under capacity limits.
- The approach is implemented as an end-to-end **APS prototype** and validated in a real-world **high-mix smartphone case manufacturing plant**. Experiments in real scenario demonstrate that the system achieves **100% on-time delivery** (up from 73.3%) and **eliminates outsourcing costs** by effectively identifying and utilizing bottleneck capacities.

## Preliminaries

We study a production-planning problem arising in discrete manufacturing systems where products require mold-dependent processing on heterogeneous machines. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  denote the set of machines and  $\mathcal{K}$  the set of molds, where each mold is compatible only with a subset of machines. Production proceeds over a finite horizon  $\mathcal{D} = \{1, \dots, H\}$  divided into daily periods, and each machine may operate with at most one mold per day once the mold is installed. Changing a mold incurs substantial setup losses, motivating stable mold assignments across consecutive days.

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  denote the set of products and  $\mathcal{O}$  the set of orders. Each order  $o \in \mathcal{O}$  specifies a required quantity  $Q_o$  and a delivery window  $[r_o, \ell_o]$ , and partial fulfillment across days is allowed. Products require accessory items whose consumption is proportional to output. Accessory items may be co-produced or sourced from inventory, generating material-balance relations across days.

Economic performance is determined by the revenue  $R_o$  obtained from fulfilled orders, the unit production cost  $c_f$ , penalties  $\pi_o$  for delayed or unmet demand, and optional outsourcing at cost  $\gamma_o$  per unit. The aggregate economic objective of the planning layer can be expressed as

$$\max \left( \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} R_o q_o - \sum_f c_f y_f - \sum_o \pi_o u_o^{\text{delay}} - \sum_o \gamma_o u_o^{\text{out}} \right) \quad (1)$$

where  $q_o$  denotes total fulfilled quantity of order  $o$ ,  $y_f$  total production of product  $f$ ,  $u_o^{\text{delay}}$  delayed quantity, and  $u_o^{\text{out}}$  outsourced quantity. Equation (1) captures the economic focus of the planning problem without specifying feasibility constraints.

## Proposed Method

### Overview

Building on the limitations of existing scheduling approaches aforementioned, we develop a hierarchical planning–scheduling method that combines the structural rigor of optimization models with the flexibility of heuristic decision procedures as shown in Figure 1. The method treats the production system as a heterogeneous machine environment with mould-dependent processing capabilities, accessory co-production requirements, and profit-oriented performance metrics. Within this framework, the upper-level planning module determines feasible order allocations and resource commitments across the planning horizon, capturing capacity constraints, mould-machine compatibility, delivery windows and economic trade-offs. The lower-level scheduling module transforms these allocations into operational daily sequences by jointly considering changeover costs, mould stability, machine workload balance and lateness risks, thereby ensuring that the generated schedules remain executable and economically efficient.




Figure 1: Overview of proposed method.

### Mid-Term Planning Model

Instead of treating production planning as a static constraint satisfaction problem, we formulate the mid-term planning

as a profit-driven rolling horizon process. This approach dynamically constructs a decision space where revenue generation is balanced against multi-stage synchronization costs. As outlined in Algorithm 1, the procedure actively identifies the optimal Make-or-Buy boundary by evaluating outsourcing trade-offs and rigorously enforcing the coupling between shell molding and accessory production. This ensures that the generated production targets form a theoretically profitable and physically synchronized envelope for the subsequent scheduling layer.

---

**Algorithm 1: Profit-Driven Rolling Horizon Planning.**

---

**Input:** Rolling state ( $\mathcal{I}_0$ ), Order stream  $\mathcal{O}$ , Cost parameters

**Output:** Feasible Production Envelopes  $\mathcal{Y}^*$  and Inventory Plan  $\mathcal{I}^*$

---

- 1: **State Update:** Inherit accessory inventory  $I_{f,0}$  from the previous horizon end-state.
  - 2: **Economic Mapping:** Construct the profit surface by mapping Revenue  $R_o$  against Delay  $\pi_o$  and Outsourcing  $\gamma_o$  costs (Eq. 4).
  - 3: **Constraint Injection:**
  - 4:   Inject machine-mold compatibility and capacity loss constraints.
  - 5:   Enforce *Multi-Stage Synchronization* to couple shell production  $y_{m,f,d}$  with accessory inventory  $I_{f,d}$ .
  - 6: **Optimization:** Solve the Profit-Maximization MILP to determine the optimal "Make-or-Buy" partition ( $u_o^*$  vs  $q_{o,d}^*$ ).
  - 7: **Envelope Generation:**
  - 8:   Extract daily production quotas  $y_{m,f,d}^*$  to define the search space for the scheduling layer.
  - 9: **return** Production Targets  $y_{m,f,d}^*$  and Target Inventory  $I_{f,d}^*$ .
- 

**Decision Variables** The mid-term planning model uses several groups of decision variables to describe daily production quantities, order fulfillment, material flows, and mold assignments. Table 1 summarizes their definitions.

Variable	Description
$y_{m,f,d} \geq 0$	Quantity of product $f$ produced on machine $m$ on day $d$ .
$q_{o,d} \geq 0$	Quantity of order $o$ fulfilled on day $d$ .
$p_{f,d} \geq 0$	Accessory production for product $f$ on day $d$ .
$I_{f,d} \geq 0$	End-of-day inventory of accessory items for product $f$ .
$u_o \geq 0$	Outsourced quantity for order $o$ .
$x_{m,k,d} \in \{0, 1\}$	Binary indicator: 1 if mold $k$ is installed on machine $m$ on day $d$ .

---

Table 1: Decision variables in the mid-term planning model.

**Model Constraints** We define the effective daily capacity as  $C_{m,d}^{\text{eff}} = C_m - \Delta_{m,d}h_m$ , where  $\Delta_{m,d} = 1$  if a mold

change occurs. Feasibility is enforced through resource, compatibility, and material flow constraints.

First, regarding machine resources, we enforce daily mold exclusivity and capacity limits. Eq. (2) ensures each machine hosts at most one mold and production fits within effective capacity:

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} x_{m,k,d} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_f y_{m,f,d} t_{m,f} \leq C_{m,d}^{\text{eff}}, \quad \forall m, d \quad (2)$$

Additionally, production is permitted only if the installed mold supports the product, enforced by the Big-M constraint:  $y_{m,f,d} \leq U_f \sum_k x_{m,k,d} a_{f,k} b_{m,k}$ .

Second, regarding material flows, we couple accessory inventory, order fulfillment, and production. The accessory inventory evolves as  $I_{f,d} = I_{f,d-1} + p_{f,d} - \sum_o q_{o,d} h_f$  subject to  $I_{f,d} \geq 0$ . Finally, demand satisfaction and production consistency are guaranteed by:

$$\sum_{d=r_o}^{\ell_o} q_{o,d} + u_o \geq Q_o, \quad \forall o; \quad \sum_m y_{m,f,d} \geq \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}_f} q_{o,d}, \quad \forall f, d \quad (3)$$

These constraints jointly define the feasible polyhedron for the profit-maximization objective.

**Objective Function** The mid-term planning objective maximizes economic performance, combining revenue, production costs, labor and material costs, delay penalties, and outsourcing costs. Using the profit structure defined in Eq. (1), the planning objective is:

$$\begin{aligned} \max Z = & \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} R_o \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} q_{o,d} - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} c_f y_{m,f,d} \\ & - \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \pi_o \left( Q_o - \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} q_{o,d} \right) - \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \gamma_o u_o. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Finally, the model above is solved using a mixed-integer linear programming solver.

### Daily Scheduling Model

Given the production commitments obtained from the mid-term planning layer, the daily scheduling layer constructs executable machine-level schedules that respect mold assignments, machine capacities, and product–mold compatibility while translating the aggregate quantities  $y_{m,f,d}^*$  and  $q_{o,d}^*$  into implementable task allocations. Unlike the planning model, which optimizes multi-day production quantities, the scheduling layer determines how each machine executes its assigned workload on each day under the unit-capacity mold occupation per period operating regime. The whole workflow of proposed daily scheduling model is summarized as Algorithm 2.

---

**Algorithm 2: Daily Scheduling Heuristic.**

---

**Input:** Planned quantities  $y_{m,f,d}^*$ , order fulfillments  $q_{o,d}^*$ , mold assignments  $x_{m,k,d}^*$ , processing times  $t_{m,f}$ , effective capacities  $C_{m,d}^{\text{eff}}$

**Output:** Machine-level schedule  $\{z_{o,m,d}\}$

```

1: for each day  $d \in \mathcal{D}$  do
2:   Build the set of active orders  $\mathcal{Q}_d = \{o : q_{o,d}^* > 0\}$ .
3:   For each  $o \in \mathcal{Q}_d$ , compute a priority score  $\text{prio}(o)$ 
      using earliest due date and slack:  $\text{prio}(o) = (\ell_o, \ell_o - d, \pi_o)$ .
4:   Sort  $\mathcal{Q}_d$  in ascending lexicographic order of  $\text{prio}(o)$ .
5:   for each machine  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  do
6:     Identify the installed mold  $k$  with  $x_{m,k,d}^* = 1$ .
7:     Initialize remaining effective capacity  $C_m \leftarrow C_{m,d}^{\text{eff}}$ .
8:     Initialize residual planned production  $y_{m,f,d} \leftarrow y_{m,f,d}^*$  for all  $f$ .
9:   end for
10:  for each order  $o \in \mathcal{Q}_d$  in sorted order do
11:    while  $q_{o,d}^* > 0$  do
12:      Let  $f(o)$  be the product of order  $o$ .
13:      Build the set of candidate machines.
14:      if  $\mathcal{M}_o = \emptyset$  then
15:        break {no more capacity for this order on day  $d$ }
16:      end if
17:      Partition  $\mathcal{M}_o$  into  $\mathcal{M}_o^{\text{stable}}$  (machines whose mold  $k$  already processed  $f(o)$  on day  $d-1$ ) and the rest.
18:      if  $\mathcal{M}_o^{\text{stable}} \neq \emptyset$  then
19:        Select  $m^* \in \mathcal{M}_o^{\text{stable}}$  with maximal remaining capacity  $C_{m^*}$ .
20:      else
21:        Select  $m^* \in \mathcal{M}_o$  with maximal remaining capacity  $C_{m^*}$ .
22:      end if
23:      Compute the maximum assignable quantity
        
$$u \leftarrow \min(q_{o,d}^*, y_{m^*,f(o),d}, C_{m^*}/t_{m^*,f(o)}).$$

24:      if  $u = 0$  then
25:        Remove  $m^*$  from  $\mathcal{M}_o$  and continue.
26:      end if
27:      Assign  $z_{o,m^*,d} \leftarrow z_{o,m^*,d} + u$ .
28:      Update  $q_{o,d}^* \leftarrow q_{o,d}^* - u$ .
29:      Update  $y_{m^*,f(o),d} \leftarrow y_{m^*,f(o),d} - u$ .
30:      Update  $C_{m^*} \leftarrow C_{m^*} - u \cdot t_{m^*,f(o)}$ .
31:    end while
32:  end for
33: end for
34: return  $\{z_{o,m,d}\}$ 

```

To refine the planned quantities, we introduce allocation variables

$$z_{o,m,d} \geq 0, \quad \forall o \in \mathcal{O}, m \in \mathcal{M}, d \in \mathcal{D} \quad (5)$$

where  $z_{o,m,d}$  denotes the quantity of order  $o$  processed on machine  $m$  on day  $d$ . These variables disaggregate the planned fulfillment  $q_{o,d}^*$  into machine-level assignments. Accordingly, for each order and day, (6) ensures consistency with the planning-layer decisions.

$$\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} z_{o,m,d} = q_{o,d}^*, \quad \forall o, d \quad (6)$$

Similarly, for each product, machine, and day, the aggregated assigned quantities must not exceed the planned production:

$$\sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}_f} z_{o,m,d} \leq y_{m,f,d}^*, \quad \forall f, m, d \quad (7)$$

Machine capacity feasibility is enforced at the scheduling layer using the same effective capacities  $C_{m,d}^{\text{eff}}$  employed by the planning layer. Let  $f(o)$  denote the product associated with order  $o$ . The total processing time assigned to machine  $m$  on day  $d$  satisfies (8), which guarantees that the scheduled workload remains executable given mold changeover losses.

$$\sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} z_{o,m,d} t_{m,f(o)} \leq C_{m,d}^{\text{eff}}, \quad \forall m, d \quad (8)$$

Because each machine uses exactly one mold per day as determined by  $x_{m,k,d}^*$ , scheduling must respect product–mold compatibility. Every nonzero assignment satisfies (9). This ensures that the chosen mold for machine  $m$  on day  $d$  is capable of producing product  $f(o)$ .

$$z_{o,m,d} > 0 \Rightarrow \exists k \in \mathcal{K} : x_{m,k,d}^* = 1, a_{f(o),k} = 1, b_{m,k} = 1 \quad (9)$$

To incorporate mold stability and workload balancing considerations, we capture daily mold changes via the binary variation measure:

$$\Delta_{m,d} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} |x_{m,k,d}^* - x_{m,k,d-1}^*|, \quad d \geq 2 \quad (10)$$

where  $\Delta_{m,d} = 1$  indicates a mold change relative to the preceding day. Although mold changes were implicitly penalized in the planning stage through the construction of  $C_{m,d}^{\text{eff}}$ , the scheduling layer seeks to further reduce unnecessary fluctuations when multiple feasible allocations exist.

In practice, the daily schedule is generated by a lightweight heuristic that orders tasks by due-date urgency, favors mold-continuous assignments to reduce  $\Delta_{m,d}$ , and adjusts allocations to satisfy the capacity constraint (8) while remaining consistent with the mid-term production plan. This yields an executable per-machine schedule that preserves mold stability and maintains feasible daily workloads across heterogeneous machines.

## Integrated Planning–Scheduling Framework

The two-layer framework links the mid-term planning model and the daily scheduling model through a structured flow of decision variables. The planning layer first solves the mixed-integer program  $\max Z$  s.t., yielding optimal quantities  $y_{m,f,d}^*, q_{o,d}^*, x_{m,k,d}^*, p_{f,d}^*, I_{f,d}^*$  and  $u_o^*$ .

These variables define the feasible production envelope for each day  $d$ , namely  $\mathcal{V}_d = \{(m, f) : y_{m,f,d}^* > 0\}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_d = \{o : q_{o,d}^* > 0\}$ , together with the mold configuration  $\mathcal{X}_d(m) = \{k : x_{m,k,d}^* = 1\}$  satisfying  $|\mathcal{X}_d(m)| = 1$ , which encodes the unit-capacity mold occupation per period constraint.

The scheduling layer refines planning decisions by constructing order–machine allocations  $z_{o,m,d}$  satisfying

(11) to (13), together with the compatibility implication (14).

$$\sum_m z_{o,m,d} = q_{o,d}^*, \quad \forall o, d \quad (11)$$

$$\sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}_f} z_{o,m,d} \leq y_{m,f,d}^*, \quad \forall f, m, d \quad (12)$$

$$\sum_o z_{o,m,d} t_{m,f(o)} \leq C_{m,d}^{\text{eff}}, \quad \forall m, d \quad (13)$$

$$z_{o,m,d} > 0 \Rightarrow \exists k \in \mathcal{X}_d(m) : a_{f(o),k} = 1, b_{m,k} = 1 \quad (14)$$

Thus, the feasible scheduling set for day  $d$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{Z}_d = \{ z_{o,m,d} \geq 0 : (11)-(14) \} \quad (15)$$

and the daily scheduling problem becomes to find  $z_{o,m,d} \in \mathcal{Z}_d$  for all  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ .

Because  $y_{m,f,d}^*$ ,  $q_{o,d}^*$ , and  $x_{m,k,d}^*$  are fixed, the scheduling layer does not modify the planning-layer solution but selects a feasible point  $z_{o,m,d}$  consistent with all machine, mold, and capacity restrictions. This hierarchical structure separates multi-period economic optimization from per-period executability while preserving mathematical consistency between both levels.

## Experiments

### Study Case

We evaluate the proposed planning–scheduling framework in a real discrete manufacturing environment located in Jiangsu Province, China. The plant produces customized smartphone protective cases for several major global brands and operates under highly dynamic, multi-product, multi-machine conditions with strict delivery requirements. Three machine groups constitute the primary production resources: eight GT150 molding machines, four GT130 molding machines, and two CNC units for metallic accessories. Their capabilities are summarized in Table 2. GT150 machines can process silicone or TPU with a daily capacity of 4,800 units, and can also operate GT130 molds via limited adapter devices; GT130 machines process TPU-only products with a daily capacity of 3,000 units; accessories such as heat-dissipation rings or stands are produced on CNC machines with type-dependent capacities. Mold changes incur a fixed downtime of 5 hours for molding machines. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  denote the machine set,  $c_m$  the daily capacity of machine  $m$ , and  $h_m$  the mold-change duration. Mold–machine compatibility is encoded by a binary parameter  $\Gamma_{p,m}$ , indicating whether product  $p$  can be processed on machine  $m$ . For notation consistency, the compatibility constraint can be written as

$$x_{o,m,t} > 0 \Rightarrow \Gamma_{p(o),m} = 1 \quad (16)$$

where  $x_{o,m,t}$  is the assigned quantity of order  $o$  on machine  $m$  at day  $t$ .

The dataset contains 37 product types and 150 customer orders, totaling over 8.3 million units in an eight-month horizon. Each product corresponds to a unique mold and material type, with binary indicators for whether a

Machine Type	Qty	Material	Mold Type	Daily Capacity
GT150	8	Silicone/TPU	GT150; GT130	4,800
GT130	4	TPU	GT130	3,000
CNC (SK750)	2	Metal accessories	Ring/Stand	2,000–4,000

Table 2: Production Resources in the Jiangsu Case Plant

heat-dissipation ring or a stand is required. Orders follow non-splittable delivery policies and are associated with a feasible processing interval  $[s_o, d_o]$ , where  $s_o$  is the earliest start date and  $d_o$  is the latest finish date. Due-date clusters and seasonal surges lead to monthly demand fluctuating between 0.6M and 1.5M units, creating short-term capacity pressure. Accessories must be produced in synchrony with shell molding: if a product requires a ring or stand, its CNC output must satisfy

$$q_{o,t}^{\text{acc}} \geq x_{o,m,t} \quad (17)$$

ensuring component availability before final assembly. Raw materials follow a fixed three-day procurement lead time, and all initial inventories are zero, imposing additional temporal coupling between material readiness and production execution.

Human resources follow a three-shift system (0:00–8:00, 8:00–16:00, 16:00–24:00), each requiring one operator per machine. Piece-rate wages differ by shift, forming a cost set  $\{0.10, 0.12, 0.15\}$  CNY per unit, which further couples economic and operational decisions. Mold changes introduce additional time loss, represented by

$$\tau_m(k, k') = \begin{cases} h_m, & \text{if } k \neq k' \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

where  $k$  and  $k'$  are successive molds on machine  $m$ .

In this real manufacturing setting, the plant faces structural constraints including heterogeneous capacities, limited mold adapters, clustered due dates, multi-stage coupling between shell molding and accessory machining, and significant penalties for lateness. These characteristics create a hybrid parallel-machine scheduling environment with mold-dependent setup, machine heterogeneity, and multi-stage synchronization. This complex and realistic configuration serves as the experimental testbed for assessing the performance of the proposed integrated planning and scheduling framework.

### Evaluation Metrics

To assess the performance, we employ standard metrics including **On-Time Delivery (OTD)**, **Mean Lateness**, and **Machine Utilization**. Resource efficiency is further evaluated by the Changeover Ratio (COR), representing the proportion of capacity lost to mold setups.

Crucially, to quantify the coordination between multi-stage operations (e.g., shell molding and CNC

machining), we introduce a specialized metric, **Accessory Synchronization (SyncAcc)**. It measures the extent to which accessory production matches the daily requirements of main items, defined as:

$$\text{SyncAcc} = \frac{\sum_t \min(\text{acc\_prod}_t, \text{acc\_need}_t)}{\sum_t \text{acc\_need}_t} \quad (19)$$

where  $\text{acc\_prod}_t$  and  $\text{acc\_need}_t$  denote the produced and required accessory quantities on day  $t$ , respectively. As shown in Eq. 19, a value of 1.0 indicates perfect synchronization without material shortages, while lower values imply bottlenecks.

Finally, economic performance is evaluated via the **Profit Rate**, calculated as the total profit. In this definition, revenue minus material, labor, outsourcing, and delay-penalty costs is included and divided by total revenue.

## Experimental Results

**Overall Comparison Across Scheduling Schemes** We evaluate the proposed planning–scheduling framework by executing three alternative configurations of the shop-floor scheduler on the same industrial dataset. The first configuration (Scheme A) performs daily allocation at the machine-type level. The second configuration (Scheme B) resolves production at the machine level with explicit mold changeover modeling. The third configuration (Scheme C) imposes a **machine-level daily mold dedication constraint**, under which each machine is assigned exactly one mold per day to enhance execution stability and interpretability. These three configurations introduce increasingly realistic operational constraints, allowing us to examine how modeling granularity affects feasibility and throughput.

Across all schemes, the resulting differences are substantial. Scheme A yields a fully feasible schedule with **100% on-time completion** and no outsourcing, but it masks the actual machine-level capacity interactions. Once detailed changeovers and per-machine capacities are enforced in Scheme B, the dominant capacity constraint of the system becomes visible: the most heavily demanded machine class saturates early, causing **40 late orders** and reducing the on-time completion rate to **73.3%** under internal capacity. Reintroducing execution stability through the daily mold dedication constraint in Scheme C restores feasibility entirely. Despite imposing the strongest operational restriction, Scheme C again achieves **100% on-time completion**, requires no outsourcing, and maintains high utilization across all equipment groups. This demonstrates that stable mold dedication aligns well with the factory’s aggregate capacity structure, whereas excessive flexibility in mold sequencing (as in Scheme B) can exacerbate capacity imbalances and degrade feasibility.

Table 3 summarizes these outcomes. Scheme C inherits the economic and feasibility advantages of Scheme A while producing execution patterns that are more stable and operationally interpretable. Scheme B, in contrast, reveals the true physical bottlenecks of the system but suffers significant feasibility loss, highlighting the importance of

Metric	A	B	C
On-time completion	100%	73.3%	100%
Late orders	0	40	0
Outsourced units	0	Significant	0
Bottleneck revealed	No	Yes	Yes
Changeover loss	N/A	1.6–4.1%	1.9–4.6%
Execution stability	Medium	Medium	<b>Highest</b>

Table 3: Overall comparison of the scheduling schemes.

coordinated mid-term planning when detailed changeovers are explicitly considered.

**Machine utilization and Load Balancing** We evaluate how the three scheduling schemes distribute workload across the shop-floor equipment. Figures 2–4 present the machine-group Gantt charts for each scheme, and Table 4 summarizes their utilization metrics.

Under Scheme A, utilization appears uniformly high at the machine-type level, resulting in smooth Gantt patterns (Figure 2). This occurs because production is allocated only by machine type rather than by individual machines, which suppresses the visibility of machine-level bottlenecks.




Figure 2: Machine-group Gantt chart under Scheme A.

Scheme B introduces machine-level modeling and explicit mold changeovers, producing the most uneven utilization profile among the three configurations. As shown in Figure 3, one equipment group becomes heavily congested while others retain slack capacity, and the resulting fragmentation leads to the highest load-variance values in Table 4. This imbalance directly contributes to the infeasibility observed under Scheme B.




Figure 3: Machine-level Gantt chart under Scheme B.

Scheme C applies the machine-level daily mold dedication constraint, yielding a high-utilization yet well-balanced execution pattern. The overall Gantt chart (Figure 4) shows long continuous production intervals across all equipment groups with minimal idle time. The detailed per-group views in Figure 5 further confirm that dedicated daily mold assignment leads to stable and interpretable workload distribution across accessory



machines, Group 150 machines, and Group 130 machines. Although utilization levels remain high (95.7%, 98.0%, and 73.2%), the load variance is substantially lower than in Scheme B, indicating superior balancing performance.




Figure 4: Machine-group Gantt chart under Scheme C.

Metric	A	B	C
Avg. util. (G1)	95–98%	98–100%	95.7%
Avg. util. (G2)	95–98%	97–100%	98.0%
Avg. util. (G3)	97–98%	70–85%	73.2%
Load var.	Low	Highest	Low
Peak util.	100%	100%	100%
Idle time	Minimal	Non-critical groups	Minimal

Table 4: utilization and load-balancing metrics across the three scheduling schemes.

**Changeover Analysis** We analyze the impact of mold changeovers under the two machine-level configurations. Scheme A does not model changeovers, so we focus on Scheme B with explicit changeovers and Scheme C with machine-level daily mold dedication. Table 5 reports the total number of mold switches, average per-machine counts, changeover time, and the resulting share of productive capacity lost.

Scheme B produces more fragmented production patterns, especially for the most heavily loaded equipment group. Although its average changeover loss ranges from 1.6% to 4.1%, the fragmentation leads to uneven utilization and contributes to the congestion observed earlier. In contrast, Scheme C enforces exactly one mold per machine per day, which naturally eliminates within-day fragmentation. Despite producing slightly more total changeovers due to daily resets, the associated time loss remains comparable (1.9%–4.6%) and does not meaningfully reduce throughput. The long continuous production blocks in Figure 5 further confirm that daily mold dedication yields clean execution patterns without excessive switching overhead.

**Ablation Study** To validate the necessity of the proposed hierarchical framework, we conducted an ablation study by removing the mid-term planning layer and retaining only the daily scheduling layer. The baseline, denoted as Greedy-NoPlan, operates in a myopic manner: it prioritizes orders strictly based on the earliest due date (EDD) without global production targets.

As shown in Figure 6, the results reveal a critical performance gap. While the proposed Scheme C maintains high performance across all metrics (100% OTD), the Greedy-NoPlan baseline suffers a catastrophic drop in




Figure 5: Detailed machine-level Gantt charts under Scheme C.

Accessory Synchronization (SyncAcc), plummeting from 1.00 to 0.23. This visual evidence confirms that without the look-ahead capability of the planning layer, the system cannot effectively coordinate multi-stage production, leading to severe bottlenecks.

**Economic Analysis** Table 6 summarizes the key cost-related indicators.

Schemes A and C both achieve 100% on-time completion without requiring outsourcing. Because the economic model assigns costs solely based on completed internal production and does not distinguish between different sequencing patterns, the two schemes produce *identical* cost compositions: 52.8% material cost, 47.2% labor cost, and 0% outsourcing. Their common cost structure is shown in Figure 7. This equivalence reflects that both schemes use internal capacity exclusively and complete the same production volume, even though Scheme C enforces stricter operational constraints. Scheme B differs sharply from the other two schemes due to machine-level congestion. Its inability to complete 40 orders internally leads to significant outsourcing, which accounts for 18.2% of total

Metric	Scheme B	Scheme C
Total changeovers (Group 150)	561	763
Avg. per machine (Group 150)	70.1	95.4
Changeover time (Group 150)	140.2 h	190.8 h
Changeover loss (Group 150)	4.1%	4.6%
Total changeovers (Group 130)	156	143
Avg. per machine (Group 130)	39.0	35.8
Changeover loss (Group 130)	2.2%	2.5%
Total changeovers (ADPT)	77	70
Avg. per machine (ADPT)	38.5	35.0
Changeover loss (ADPT)	1.6%	1.9%

Table 5: Changeover metrics for machine-level scheduling schemes.




Figure 6: Ablation study results.

cost. Material and labor shares decrease accordingly, making Scheme B economically inferior despite its more detailed modeling of shop-floor operations.

## Discussion and Conclusion

This study proposed a profit-oriented integrated planning and scheduling framework to address the complexity of high-mix discrete manufacturing. Our findings demonstrate that effectively managing such environments requires not just efficient algorithms, but a careful alignment between strategic planning constraints and shop-floor execution rules.

A critical finding concerns the necessity of the hierarchical design for multi-stage coordination. Through the ablation study, we observed that removing the mid-term planning layer (*Greedy-NoPlan*) caused a catastrophic drop in Accessory Synchronization (SyncAcc) from 1.00 to 0.23. This collapse indicates that machine-level heuristics, while fast, are inherently myopic; they fail to anticipate future assembly needs, leading to material shortages. The proposed hierarchy successfully resolves this by decoupling the problem: the planning layer handles long-term resource smoothing (e.g., pre-building accessories), while the scheduling layer focuses on daily feasibility.

Furthermore, regarding operational execution, our experiments challenge the traditional assumption that

Metric	A	B	C
Material share	52.8%	47.1%	52.8%
Labor share	47.2%	34.7%	47.2%
Outsourcing share	0%	18.2%	0%
On-time completion	100%	73.3%	100%
Late orders	0	40	0
Outsourced units	0	Significant	0

Table 6: Cost-related indicators across the three scheduling schemes.




Figure 7: Cost compositions across scheduling schemes.

higher flexibility yields better optimization. In tight-capacity industrial settings, the theoretically flexible Scheme B failed to cope with sequence-dependent changeovers, resulting in fragmented schedules and a mere 73.3% on-time delivery rate. In contrast, Scheme C, by enforcing a stability constraint ("one-mold-per-day"), eliminated fragmentation and achieved 100% on-time delivery. This suggests that for automated scheduling to be practically deployable, operational rules must prioritize stability over theoretical freedom to minimize changeover losses and prevent bottleneck congestion.

Ultimately, these operational improvements translate directly into economic value. By ensuring stable and synchronized production, the integrated framework (Scheme C) eliminated the need for expensive outsourcing, which is accounted for 18.2% of total costs in the unstable scenario. Meanwhile, it also achieved a superior profit rate of 24.5%. This confirms that coupling economic objectives with rigorous operational constraints allows manufacturers to maximize financial performance without compromising delivery commitments.

In conclusion, this work bridges the gap between aggregate planning and shop-floor execution, providing a solution that is both mathematically consistent and operationally robust. Future work will extend this framework to stochastic demand scenarios and explore data-driven methods to learn adaptive stability rules for multi-factory coordination.



## References

- Arica, E.; and Powell, D. 2014. A framework for ICT-enabled real-time production planning and control. *Advances in Manufacturing*, 2: 158 – 164.
- Furlan, M.; Almada-Lobo, B.; Santos, M. O.; and Morabito, R. 2024. Matheuristic for the lot-sizing and scheduling problem in integrated pulp and paper production. *Comput. Ind. Eng.*, 192: 110183.
- Guzman, E.; Andrés, B.; and Escoto, R. P. 2021. Models and algorithms for production planning, scheduling and sequencing problems: A holistic framework and a systematic review. *J. Ind. Inf. Integr.*, 27: 100287.
- Haro, E.; Ávalos, O.; Gálvez, J.; and Camarena, O. 2024. An Integrated Process Planning and Scheduling problem solved from an adaptive multi-objective perspective. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*.
- Hua, L.; Liu, H.; and Pan, Y. 2025. Solving industrial chain job scheduling problems through a deep reinforcement learning method with decay strategy. *Inf. Sci.*, 702: 121906.
- Lohmer, J.; and Lasch, R. 2020. Production planning and scheduling in multi-factory production networks: a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Production Research*, 59: 2028 – 2054.
- Luo, Z.; Jiang, C.; Liu, L.; Zheng, X.; Ma, H.; Dong, F.; and Li, F. 2023. Deep-Reinforcement-Learning-Based Production Scheduling in Industrial Internet of Things. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 10: 19725–19739.
- Mitić, P.; Savić, S. P.; Djordjevic, A.; Erić, M.; Sukić, E.; Vidojević, D.; and Stefanovic, M. 2023. The Problem of Machine Part Operations Optimal Scheduling in the Production Industry Based on a Customer's Order. *Applied Sciences*.
- Moeuf, A.; Pellerin, R.; Lamouri, S.; Tamayo-Giraldo, S.; and Barbaray, R. 2018. The industrial management of SMEs in the era of Industry 4.0. *International Journal of Production Research*, 56: 1118 – 1136.
- Mohammadi, M.; Esmaelian, M.; and Atighehchian, A. 2020. Design of mathematical models for the integration of purchase and production lot-sizing and scheduling problems under demand uncertainty. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 84: 1–18.
- Muñoz, F. T.; and Ulloa-Navarro, J. 2025. A Make-to-Order Capacitated Lot-Sizing Model with Parallel Machines, Eligibility Constraints, Extra Shifts, and Backorders. *Mathematics*.
- Oujana, S.; Amodeo, L.; Yalaoui, F.; and Brodart, D. 2023. Mixed-Integer Linear Programming, Constraint Programming and a Novel Dedicated Heuristic for Production Scheduling in a Packaging Plant. *Applied Sciences*.
- Pan, Z.; Wang, L.; jing Wang, J.; and Lu, J. 2023. Deep Reinforcement Learning Based Optimization Algorithm for Permutation Flow-Shop Scheduling. *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence*, 7: 983–994.
- Penchev, P.; Vitliemov, P.; and Georgiev, I. 2023. Optimization model for production scheduling taking into account preventive maintenance in an uncertainty-based production system. *Heliyon*, 9.
- Popović, D.; Bjelić, N.; Vidovic, M.; and Ratković, B. 2023. Solving a Production Lot-Sizing and Scheduling Problem from an Enhanced Inventory Management Perspective. *Mathematics*.
- Rohaninejad, M.; Vahedi-Nouri, B.; Hanzálek, Z.; and Tavakkoli-Moghaddam, R. 2023. An integrated lot-sizing and scheduling problem in a reconfigurable manufacturing system under workforce constraints. *International Journal of Production Research*, 62: 3994 – 4013.
- Rossit, D.; Tohmé, F.; and Frutos, M. 2019. A data-driven scheduling approach to smart manufacturing. *J. Ind. Inf. Integr.*, 15: 69–79.
- Serrano-Ruiz, J. C.; Mula, J.; and Poler, R. 2021. Smart manufacturing scheduling: A literature review. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*.
- Song, W.; Chen, X.; Li, Q.; and Cao, Z. 2023. Flexible Job-Shop Scheduling via Graph Neural Network and Deep Reinforcement Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 19: 1600–1610.
- Sunday, A.; Emeka, U. C.; Chukwumuanya, E. O.; and Chikwendu, O. 2025. Machine Learning Applications for Production Scheduling Optimization. *Journal of Exploratory Dynamic Problems*.
- Villalonga, A.; Negri, E.; Biscardo, G.; Castaño, F.; Haber, R.; Fumagalli, L.; and Macchi, M. 2021. A decision-making framework for dynamic scheduling of cyber-physical production systems based on digital twins. *Annu. Rev. Control.*, 51: 357–373.
- Yiğit, F.; Basilio, M. P.; Basilio, M. P.; and Pereira, V. 2024. A Hybrid Approach for the Multi-Criteria-Based Optimization of Sequence-Dependent Setup-Based Flow Shop Scheduling. *Mathematics*.
- Yuan, H.; Hu, Q.; Bi, J.; Gong, G.; Zhang, J.; and Zhou, M. 2024. Machine-Level Collaborative Manufacturing and Scheduling for Heterogeneous Plants. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 11: 16591–16603.
- Çağrı Sel; Gurkan, M. E.; and Hamzadayı, A. 2024. Energy-aware production lot-sizing and parallel machine scheduling with the product-specific machining tools and power requirements. *Comput. Ind. Eng.*, 196: 110503.