Pattern based diving heuristics for a two-dimensional guillotine cutting stock problem with leftovers

François Clautiaux, Ruslan Sadykov, François Vanderbeck, Quentin Viaud

Pattern based diving heuristics for a two-dimensional guillotine cutting stock problem with leftovers

François Clautiaux[2,1] **Ruslan Sadykov**[1,2]
François Vanderbeck[2,1] Quentin Viaud[1,2]

[1] Inria Bordeaux, France

[2] Université Bordeaux, France

Matheuristics 2018, Tours, France, June 19

Contents

Context: production of windows

1.Initial storage



2.Cutting table



3.Intermediate storage



4. Assembly of windows



Specific industrial constraints

- 4-stage guillotine-cut process
- Restricted cuts (size of the cut part coincides with the width or height of a piece)
- Daily production is decomposed into independent batches (fitting to the intermediate storage)
- The order of batches is fixed because of the due dates of the customer orders
- The leftover of only the last bin of a batch can be reused for the next batch due to the organisational costs



One-batch problem : 2D guillotine cutting stock with leftovers

- Unlimited set of identical rectangular bins of size $W \times H$
- Additional leftover bin of size $\bar{W} \times H$, $\bar{W} < W$.
- Set $\mathcal{I}$ of items with fixed demand d_i (number of pieces to cut) and size $w_i \times h_i$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$
- Each item copy can be rotated by 90°
- Each item copy should be cut in at most 4 stages
- Each cut is restricted and guillotine (from one side to the opposite side)
- The objective function is to minimize the total width of used bins and the width of the used part of the last bin.

Example of a feasible cutting pattern



Example of a feasible cutting pattern



Example of a feasible cutting pattern



Example of a feasible cutting pattern



Example of a feasible cutting pattern



Example of a valid solution



Solution value = $W + w$

2D guillotine cutting stock : literature review

- Column generation + rounding (3 stages) [Vanderbeck, 2001]
- Branch and price (3 stages) [Puchinger and Raidl, 2007]
- Column generation + heuristics for the residual problem after the rounding [Cintra et al., 2008]
- Arc-flow MIP formulation (3 stages) [Silva et al., 2010]
- Column generation + diving (2 stages) [Furini et al., 2012]
- Dynamic MIP formulation [Furini et al., 2016]
- With leftovers (2 and 3 stages) [Puchinger et al., 2004] [Dusberger and Raidl, 2014] [Dusberger and Raidl, 2015] [Andrade et al., 2016]

Remarks

- Small instances $(W, H) = (300, 300) \Rightarrow$ Exact methods
- Large instances $(W, H) = (1000, 1000) \Rightarrow$ Heuristics
- Our one-batch instances $(W, H) = (6000, 3000)$, up to 150 items and ≈ 400 pieces to cut

Contents

Extended (pattern-based) formulation

- 3 bin types : leftover bin ($W' \times H$), normal bin ($W \times H$), last bin ($W \times H$)
- $\mathcal{P}_t$ — set of valid cutting patterns for a bin of type $t = 1, 2, 3$
- a_i^p — number of pieces of item i cut in pattern p
- w^p — width of pattern p

$$\min \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_1} W' \lambda_p + \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_2} W \lambda_p + \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_3} w^p \lambda_p$$

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_1 \cup \mathcal{P}_2 \cup \mathcal{P}_3} a_i^p \lambda_p = d_i, \qquad \forall i \in \mathcal{I},$$

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_t} \lambda_p = 1, \qquad \forall t \in \{1, 3\},$$

$$\lambda_p \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \qquad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}_2,$$

$$\lambda_p \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}_t, t \in \{1, 3\}.$$

Pricing problem

- $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ — dual values for the demand constraints
- $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ — dual values for the bin number constraints
- Reduced cost of a pattern p:

$$\bar{c}_p = -\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} a_i^p \pi_i + \begin{cases} W' - \mu_1, & p \in \mathcal{P}_1, \\ W, & p \in \mathcal{P}_2, \\ w^p - \mu_3, & p \in \mathcal{P}_3. \end{cases}$$

- The pricing problem decomposes into three 2D guillotine integer knapsack problems, one for each bin type
- Can be solved by
  - a branch-and-bound [Puchinger and Raidl, 2007]
  - a MIP [Furini et al., 2012]
  - a dynamic program with bounds [Dolatabadi et al., 2012]
  - a labelling algorithm [Clautiaux et al., 2018]

Standard diving heuristic [Furini et al., 2012] [Sadykov et al., 2018]

- use Depth-First Search
- at each node of the tree
  - solve the master LP by column generation
  - select a pattern $p \in \mathcal{P}$ with its value $\bar{\lambda}_p$ closest to a non-zero integer $\lceil \bar{\lambda}_p \rfloor$
  - add $\lceil \bar{\lambda}_p \rfloor$ to the partial solution
  - update the master LP:
    - update demands d of the items
    - remove "non-proper" patterns p ($\exists i \in \mathcal{I} : a_i^p > d_i$)
- repeat until a complete solution is obtained



The heuristic assumes that the pricing generates proper patterns ($a_i^p \leq d_i, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$)!

Diving with LDS [Sadykov et al., 2018]

Idea: add some diversification through limited backtracking (Limited Discrepancy Search by [Harvey and Ginsberg, 1995])



MaxDiscrepancy = 2, MaxDepth = 3

At each node, we have a tabu list of columns forbidden to be added to the partial solution.

Contents

“Proper” vs. “non-proper” pricing

Proper case (item bounds are imposed in the pricing)

- \+ Standard diving heuristic can be applied
- – Exact pricing is expensive
- – Heuristic pricing makes diving less efficient

Non-proper case (unbounded pricing)

- \+ Exact pricing by dynamic programming is relatively efficient
- \+ Column generation dual bound is almost as tight [Cintra et al., 2008]
- – One needs to adapt the diving heuristic

Diving heuristic adaptations for the “non-proper” case

- If there are not enough proper columns in the master solution, then choose ones with the smallest reduced cost
  - among all proper column in the restricted master
  - and proper columns generated with a heuristic pricing
- Never fix patterns of type 3 (for the last bin)
- When all remaining pieces fit into one bin, heuristically generate a cutting pattern minimizing its width
- Every time a partial solution is augmented, complete it heuristically (hybridization with the evolutionary heuristic)

“Non-proper” diving heuristic for our problem



Contents

Unbounded 2D guillotine knapsack: dynamic program

- Application of [Beasley, 1985] and [Russo et al., 2014]
- $\mathcal{W}(w,h)$, $\mathcal{H}(w,h)$ — set of all possible widths and heights
- $U(w,h,s)$ ($U(\overline{w,h,s})$) — max. value of a pattern of size $w \times h$ cut at stage s (next cut should cut a piece)

$$U(w,h,1) = \max\left\{0, \max_{w' \in \mathcal{W}(w,h)} \left\{U(\overline{w',h,2}) + U(w-w',h,1)\right\}\right\}$$

$$U(w,h,2) = \max\left\{0, \max_{h' \in \mathcal{H}(w,h)} \left\{U(\overline{w,h',3}) + U(w,h-h',2)\right\}\right\}$$

$$U(w,h,3) = \max\left\{0, \max_{w' \in \mathcal{W}(w,h)} \left\{U(\overline{w',h,4}) + U(w-w',h,3)\right\}\right\}$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,2}) = \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}:\ w_i = w, h_i \le h} \left\{\pi_i + U(w,h-h_i,2)\right\}$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,3}) = \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}:\ h_i = h, w_i \le w} \left\{\pi_i + U(w-w_i,h,3)\right\}$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,4}) = \max\left\{0, \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}:\ w_i = w, h_i \le h} \left\{\pi_i + U(\overline{w,h-h_i,4})\right\}\right\}$$

Dynamic program: example

$$U(w,h,1) = \max\{0, \max_{w' \in \mathcal{W}(w,h)} \{U(\overline{w',h,2}) + U(w-w',h,1)\}\}$$



Bin $(W,H) = (6,4)$ and an item $a = (4,3)$

Dynamic program: example

$$U(w,h,1) = \max\{0, \max_{w' \in \mathcal{W}(w,h)} \{U(\overline{w',h,2}) + U(w-w',h,1)\}\}$$



Bin $(W,H) = (6,4)$ and an item $a = (4,3)$

Dynamic program: example

$$U(\overline{w, h, 2}) = \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}:\ w_i = w, h_i \leq h} \{\pi_i + U(w, h - h_i, 2)\}$$



Bin $(W, H) = (6, 4)$ and an item $a = (4, 3)$

Dynamic program: example

$$U(\overline{w, h, 2}) = \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}:\ w_i = w, h_i \leq h} \{\pi_i + U(w, h - h_i, 2)\}$$



Bin $(W, H) = (6, 4)$ and an item $a = (4, 3)$

Constructive and evolutionary heuristics

Bounded 2D guillotine knapsack

- Heuristic modification of the dynamic program
  - State $U(w, h, s)$ is associated with its best partial solution
  - In the DP, we combine only the states which together satisfy the item bounds
  - Heuristic is embedded in a local search (a cut in the solution is replaced by another one)
- Evolutionary algorithm, based on [Hadjiconstantinou and Iori, 2007]
  - Every individual is a sequence of glass pieces
  - First-Fit heuristic is used to produce a complete solution
  - Two-point crossover operator

2D guillotine cutting-stock

- Iteratively call above evolutionary algorithm for every bin
- List heuristics: Next-Fit, Best-Fit, First-Fit, Bottom-Fit
- List heuristics to create the vertical strips + list heuristics for the 1D bin-packing

Contents

Making the pricing more “proper” : partial enumeration

- Often, only “non-proper” cutting patterns in the master solution, especially deep in the dive
  $\Rightarrow$ last fixing decisions may be bad
- Our idea is to parly take into account the item bounds and to modify accordingly the dynamic program
- Implementation is done using so-called meta-items representing stacks of item pieces satisfying item bounds
- $\mathcal{M}(w, h)$ — set of vertical meta-items containing items $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $w - \delta < w_i \leq w$, $h_i \leq h$, where $\delta = \min_{i \in \mathcal{I}} w_i$,
  similar definition for set $\mathcal{M}(h, w)$ of horizontal meta-items
- Sets of meta-items are generated by enumeration
- In practice, the size of $\mathcal{M}(w, h)$ is limited

Example of meta-items



All vertical meta-items different from a single item piece



Modified dynamic program

$$U(\overline{w,h,2}) = \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(w,h):\ \bar{h}_m\le h} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m + U(w, h-\bar{h}_m, 2)\right\},$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,3}) = \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(h,w-\delta):\ \bar{w}_m\le w} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m + U(w-\bar{w}_m, h, 3)\right\},$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,4}) = \max\left\{0, \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(w,h-\delta):\ \bar{w}_m=w} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m\right\}\right\}.$$

Example



Modified dynamic program

$$U(\overline{w,h,2}) = \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(w,h):\ \bar{h}_m\le h} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m + U(w, h-\bar{h}_m, 2)\right\},$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,3}) = \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(h,w-\delta):\ \bar{w}_m\le w} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m + U(w-\bar{w}_m, h, 3)\right\},$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,4}) = \max\left\{0, \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(w,h-\delta):\ \bar{w}_m=w} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m\right\}\right\}.$$

Example



Modified dynamic program

$$U(\overline{w,h,2}) = \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(w,h):\ \bar{h}_m\le h} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m + U(w, h-\bar{h}_m, 2)\right\},$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,3}) = \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(h,w-\delta):\ \bar{w}_m\le w} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m + U(w-\bar{w}_m, h, 3)\right\},$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,4}) = \max\left\{0, \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(w,h-\delta):\ \bar{w}_m=w} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m\right\}\right\}.$$

Example



Modified dynamic program

$$U(\overline{w,h,2}) = \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(w,h):\ \bar{h}_m\le h} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m + U(w, h-\bar{h}_m, 2)\right\},$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,3}) = \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(h,w-\delta):\ \bar{w}_m\le w} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m + U(w-\bar{w}_m, h, 3)\right\},$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,4}) = \max\left\{0, \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(w,h-\delta):\ \bar{w}_m=w} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m\right\}\right\}.$$

Example



Modified dynamic program

$$U(\overline{w,h,2}) = \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(w,h):\ \bar{h}_m\le h} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m + U(w, h-\bar{h}_m, 2)\right\},$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,3}) = \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(h,w-\delta):\ \bar{w}_m\le w} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m + U(w-\bar{w}_m, h, 3)\right\},$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,4}) = \max\left\{0, \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(w,h-\delta):\ \bar{w}_m=w} \{\bar{\pi}_m\}\right\}.$$

Example



Modified dynamic program

$$U(\overline{w,h,2}) = \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(w,h):\ \bar{h}_m\le h} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m + U(w, h-\bar{h}_m, 2)\right\},$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,3}) = \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(h,w-\delta):\ \bar{w}_m\le w} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m + U(w-\bar{w}_m, h, 3)\right\},$$

$$U(\overline{w,h,4}) = \max\left\{0, \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}(w,h-\delta):\ \bar{w}_m=w} \left\{\bar{\pi}_m\right\}\right\}.$$

Example



Fractional solution with standard dynamic program

$d_1 = d_2 = 2, d_3 = d_4 = d_5 = 1$



Objective function : 13.046

Fractional solution with partial enumeration

$d_1 = d_2 = 2, d_3 = d_4 = d_5 = 1$



Objective function : 14.333

66% of the gap is closed

Contents

Instances

Academic bin-packing instances

- $\mathcal{I} \in \{20, 40, 60, 80, 100\}$
- Six classes by [Berkey and Wang, 1987]
  - $W = H \in \{10, 30, 40, 100, 300\}$
  - average piece/bin area ratio $\in \{3\%, 4\%, 20\%, 25\%\}$
- Four classes by [Martello and Vigo, 1998]
  - $W = H = 100$
  - 70% of long/wide/small/large items, 10% of each other type
  - average piece/bin area ratio $\in \{6\%, 22\%, 56\%\}$

Industrial cutting-stock instances

- $\mathcal{I} \in \{25, 50, 100\}$
- average demand ≈ 2.5
- $W \times H \in \{100 \times 50, 1000 \times 500, 6000 \times 3000\}$
- average piece/bin area ratio is 4.5%

Impact of partial enumeration technique

Dynamic program size, in thousands

Instances	# of states		# of transitions	
	stand.	p.enum.	stand.	p.enum.
Academ	2.6	3.5	25.2	29.6
Indust	8.3	10.4	123.9	162.0

Column generation gap, % from the BKS

Instances	$gap_{p.enum.}$	$gap_{stand.}$	$t_{p.enum.}$	$t_{stand.}$
Academ	1.88%	2.22%	3.9s	3.8s
Indust	1.14%	1.30%	11.2s	10.8s

Comparison with the proper bound

Instances	#conv.	t_{proper}	gap_{proper}	$gap_{p.enum.}$	$gap_{stand.}$
Academ	170/500	12m	1.29%	1.82%	2.27%
Indust	24/135	26m	0.65%	0.70%	0.90%

Comparison of heuristics (gap in % from the BKS)

evol — evolutionary algorithm

evlist — evolutionary + list heuristics

divStand — diving with standard dynamic program

divPE — diving with DPPE (dynamic program with partial enumeration)

divE — hybrid diving with DPPE \ evolutionary algorithm

divLDS — diving with DPPE and LDS

divELDS — hybrid diving with DPPE and LDS \ evolutionary algorithm

	evol		evlist		divStand		divPE		divE		divLDS		divELDS	
Inst.	*gap*	*t*	*gap*	*t*	*gap*	*t*	*gap*	*t*	*gap*	*t*	*gap*	*t*	*gap*	*t*
Acad.	3.88	2	1.90	23	1.31	5	1.22	5	0.79	14	0.60	12	0.46	57
Indst.	2.03	4	1.92	65	1.12	20	0.75	23	0.56	59	0.38	143	0.26	448
Large	3.55	5	1.69	99	0.71	22	0.48	24	0.28	73	0.13	134	0.01	497

One-day instances (several batches)

			Solution, # glass plates				Time, minutes			
$\|\mathcal{B}\|$	$\|\mathcal{I}\|$	*LB*	evol	evlist	divPE	divE	evol	evlist	divPE	divE
10	100	123.3	126.5	126.4	124.4	124.4	1	32	24	48
10	150	191.5	195.5	195.3	192.8	192.5	4	144	83	194
15	100	191.7	196.4	196.2	193.5	193.2	2	50	36	72
15	150	277.3	283.3	282.9	279.2	279.0	6	208	126	291

- *divPE* saves up 1.4% of plates in comparison with the evolutionary heuristic
- The gap of *divPE* with the lower bound is at most 0.9%

Conclusions

- An industrial variant of the 2D guillotine cutting-stock problem is considered
- Very large practical instances (available online)
- Column generation-based “non-proper” diving heuristic is proposed
- Partial enumeration technique for the pricing DP allows us to improve the heuristic quality at virtually no cost
- Significant raw material savings due to the diving heuristic in comparison with the evolutionary one

References I

Andrade, R., Birgin, E., and Morabito, R. (2016).

Two-stage two-dimensional guillotine cutting stock problems with usable leftover.

International Transactions in Operational Research, 23(1-2):121–145.

Beasley, J. E. (1985).

Algorithms for unconstrained two-dimensional guillotine cutting.

Journal of the Operational Research Society, 36(4):297–306.

Berkey, J. O. and Wang, P. Y. (1987).

Two-dimensional finite bin-packing algorithms.

Journal of the Operational Research Society, 38(5):423–429.

Cintra, G., Miyazawa, F., Wakabayashi, Y., and Xavier, E. (2008).

Algorithms for two-dimensional cutting stock and strip packing problems using dynamic programming and column generation.

European Journal of Operational Research, 191(1):61 – 85.

References II

Clautiaux, F., Sadykov, R., Vanderbeck, F., and Viaud, Q. (2018).

Combining dynamic programming with filtering to solve a four-stage two-dimensional guillotine-cut bounded knapsack problem.

Discrete Optimization, (In Press).

Dolatabadi, M., Lodi, A., and Monaci, M. (2012).

Exact algorithms for the two-dimensional guillotine knapsack.

Computers & Operations Research, 39(1):48–53.

Dusberger, F. and Raidl, G. R. (2014).

A Variable Neighborhood Search Using Very Large Neighborhood Structures for the 3-Staged 2-Dimensional Cutting Stock Problem, pages 85–99.

Springer International Publishing, Cham.

Dusberger, F. and Raidl, G. R. (2015).

Solving the 3-staged 2-dimensional cutting stock problem by dynamic programming and variable neighborhood search.

Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics, 47:133 – 140.

References III

Furini, F., Malaguti, E., DurÃ¡n, R. M., Persiani, A., and Toth, P. (2012).

A column generation heuristic for the two-dimensional two-staged guillotine cutting stock problem with multiple stock size.

European Journal of Operational Research, 218(1):251 – 260.

Furini, F., Malaguti, E., and Thomopulos, D. (2016).

Modeling two-dimensional guillotine cutting problems via integer programming.

INFORMS Journal on Computing, 28(4):736–751.

Hadjiconstantinou, E. and Iori, M. (2007).

A hybrid genetic algorithm for the two-dimensional single large object placement problem.

European Journal of Operational Research, 183(3):1150 – 1166.

Harvey, W. D. and Ginsberg, M. L. (1995).

Limited discrepancy search.

In *Proceedings of the 14th international joint conference on Artificial intelligence (IJCAI'95)*, volume 1, pages 607–615, San Francisco, CA, USA. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.

References IV


Martello, S. and Vigo, D. (1998).
Exact solution of the two-dimensional finite bin packing problem.
Management Science, 44(3):388–399.


Puchinger, J. and Raidl, G. R. (2007).
Models and algorithms for three-stage two-dimensional bin packing.
European Journal of Operational Research, 183(3):1304–1327.


Puchinger, J., Raidl, G. R., and Koller, G. (2004).
Solving a Real-World Glass Cutting Problem, pages 165–176.
Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.


Russo, M., Sforza, A., and Sterle, C. (2014).
An exact dynamic programming algorithm for large-scale unconstrained two-dimensional guillotine cutting problems.
Computers & Operations Research, 50:97 – 114.

References V

Sadykov, R., Vanderbeck, F., Pessoa, A., Tahiri, I., and Uchoa, E. (2018).

Primal heuristics for branch-and-price: the assets of diving methods.

INFORMS Journal on Computing, (Forthcoming).

Silva, E., Alvelos, F., and Valério de Carvalho, J. M. (2010).

An integer programming model for two-and three-stage two-dimensional cutting stock problems.

European Journal of Operational Research, 205(3):699–708.

Vanderbeck, F. (2001).

A nested decomposition approach to a three-stage, two-dimensional cutting-stock problem.

Management Science, 47(6):864–879.