

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

GRAPH THEORETIC FACILITY LAYOUT DESIGN
AND EVALUATION: THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL
CONSIDERATIONS

A THESIS PRESENTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF PH.D. IN
OPERATIONS RESEARCH AT
MASSEY UNIVERSITY

Kelvin Watson

January 1996

658.23015118

Wat

Abstract

In this thesis we examine the Graph Theoretic Facility Layout Problem (GTFLP). The GTFLP is concerned with designing a building layout, with a specified number of facilities, with data relating to the facilities' areas, and proximity desirability ratings or material flows between the facilities. The objective is to design an efficient layout which incorporates these issues, by attempting to minimise the transportation cost of material flow between facilities, or maximise the desirability ratings, and designing *regularly* shaped facilities which allow effectiveness of the layout.

The GTFLP proceeds as a two phase process; the first generates a highly weighted (maximal) planar graph, called an adjacency graph, which specifies the relative spatial location of each facility, with respect to its adjacent facilities. This phase has been extensively studied, and although not a focus of this thesis, we address adjacency graph generation and provide a worst case analysis of the so-called TESSA method.

The main thrust of this thesis addresses the second phase of the GTFLP, where we examine the construction of the layout in light of the information given by the first phase. We review previous literature in this area, and extend this work by a series of enhancements to existing methods, and introduction of new techniques including: introducing the Vertex Splitting Algorithm, the Tiling Algorithm, and the SIMPLE Algorithm; analysis of previous methods, by completing the theory of the Deltahedron and Contraction Layout Algorithms for instance. Initial steps in characterising adjacency graphs, which by their structure allow the easy construction of a corresponding layout, is introduced, by providing a series of template layouts; furthermore we compare and contrast algorithms which force an overlying grid structure against those more generic methods, which do not impose this rigidity; and introduce some simple procedures for improving the regularity of a layout.

We formally define the concept of *regularity*, by presenting a series of quantifiable measures, which can be calculated to give an evaluation of the effectiveness of a layout. Thereby we attempt to quantifiably compare and rank the layout generation methods, by evaluating the regularity measures over a set of test problems. The effects of the various layout improvements, and initialisation processes will be shown within this computational process. We also examine the incorporation of a Material Handling System (MHS) within a layout. The calculation of the transportation costs involved in the implementation of each layout, via the Material Handling System, provides another mechanism for ranking the layout algorithms. Directions for future work are provided in the area of the Material Handling System. Indeed our work in this area only highlighted the importance of modelling this concept.

The final contribution of this thesis is the generation of a framework which attempts to look beyond the more theoretical GTFLP model. By invoking a three phase process, which allows the decomposition of the adjacency graph, interaction with a decision planner, and the ability to perturb the problem constraints, we can produce a range of alternative layout scenarios, since there is no *right* answer to this second phase, and indeed an infinite number of different layouts satisfy the problem constraints. This allows the design process to be directed in a more meaningful way, by exploiting structure within the adjacency graph and the working knowledge of a decision planner, providing a basis whereby the GTFLP can be effectively used within any building design process.

We conclude that the GTFLP model is an important concept within the more general Facility Layout Problem. We provide evidence that the standard Graph Theoretic model is perhaps overly restrictive. Indeed we shall see that the generation of a good adjacency graph does not in general correspond to obtaining a practical layout. With this in mind, we have identified the strengths and weaknesses of the various concepts and ideas used within Graph Theoretic Facility Layout Design, and consequently have created an integration of the adjacency graph and layout phases of this problem. This has provided a unification of the GTFLP into a more malleable form, which provides enough flexibility to accurately model the mechanics behind the design process.

Acknowledgements

This work would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of a number of people. Firstly I would like to thank my Lord Jesus, who saved me, and gave my life direction and vision. I am indebted to my supervisor, Dr John Giffin (who probably stopped reading after the previous sentence), who has taught me everything I know about Operations Research and in particular the Graph Theoretic Facility Layout Problem. He has doubled as my English teacher, correcting many grammatical errors and replacing my *fluffisms* with what I really meant. My wife, Veronica has been a constant source of love and encouragement, and I would like to thank her not only for this, but also for her perserverence and understanding. I would like to thank Mum and Dad for their support, and for fostering my interest in learning in my early years. Many thanks to Mark Johnston and Richard Rayner who managed to teach me enough about computers to make me dangerous. I would also like to acknowledge the support of John and Sandra Griffin through prayer, and finally thanks go to Placemakers without whom I could never have learnt the *practical aspects of facility layout*.

Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vii
List of Figures	xvi
List of Tables	xx
List of Algorithms	xxi
1 Introduction	1
2 Problem Description	3
2.1 Nomenclature and Definitions	3
2.2 Formulations of the Facility Layout Problem	10
2.3 Justification of the Graph Theoretic Approach	12
2.4 Related Work in Classical Layout	13
2.5 Regularity	15
3 Obtaining the Adjacency Graph	19
3.1 Heuristic Methods that Require Planarity Testing	20
3.2 Heuristic Methods Avoiding Planarity Testing	21
3.2.1 Deltahedron	22
3.2.2 Deltahedron Extensions	25
3.2.3 TESSA	30
3.3 Improvement Procedures	36

4	Obtaining the Block Plan	43
4.1	Deltahedron	43
4.1.1	The Deltahedron Layout Algorithm	44
4.1.2	An Illustrative Example	52
4.1.3	Obtaining an Initial Tetrahedron containing the Exterior .	53
4.1.4	The Extended Deltahedron Layout Algorithm	58
4.2	Grid Approaches	62
4.3	The Contraction Algorithm	68
4.3.1	The Contraction Process	68
4.3.2	The Orthogonal Division Algorithm	70
4.3.3	An Illustrative Example	76
4.3.4	A Pathological Counter-Example	80
4.3.5	Notes on the implementation of the ODA	82
4.4	SIMPLE	84
4.4.1	The SIMPLE Algorithm	85
4.4.2	Proof of the Correctness of SIMPLE	86
4.4.3	Application of the SIMPLE Insertion Order to the ODA .	87
4.4.4	Properties of ∂G_p	87
4.4.5	An Illustrative Example	89
4.5	The Vertex Splitting Algorithm	90
4.5.1	MPGs with Concentric Distance Classes	90
4.5.2	Transforming an Arbitrary MPG to one with Concentric Dis- tance Classes	95
4.5.3	An Illustrative Example	100
4.5.4	Upper Bound on the Number of Pseudo Vertices Required	103
4.5.5	Layout Enhancements	105
4.6	<i>Quasi</i> Graph Theoretic Techniques	106
4.6.1	The Spiral Algorithm	107
4.6.2	Matching Based Layout Algorithm	107
4.6.3	The Spanning Tree Algorithm	108
4.6.4	The Tiling Algorithm	111
4.7	Special Classes of MPGs	119
4.7.1	All Vertices Adjacent to the Exterior Vertex	119
4.7.2	One Vertex is Not Adjacent to the Exterior	122

4.7.3	Two Mutually Adjacent Vertices Not Adjacent to the Exterior	124
4.7.4	m Distinct Vertices Not Adjacent to the Exterior	124
4.7.5	Small Problems	126
4.7.6	Others	126
5	Layout Improvement Procedures	129
5.1	Rectilinear Segment Reduction	129
5.2	Linear Transformation	133
6	Computer Implementation	137
6.1	Generation of Test Problems	137
6.2	Existence	139
6.3	Starting Points	140
6.4	Improvement vs Non-Improvement Experiment	147
6.5	Comparison of Layout Methods for Arbitrary MPGs	156
6.6	Regularity vs Adjacency Experiment	160
6.6.1	Average Performance	164
6.6.2	Worst Performance	171
6.6.3	Problem-by-Problem Performance	179
7	Biased Examples	181
7.1	Deltahedron	182
7.2	The Vertex Splitting Algorithm	185
7.3	The Contraction Algorithm	188
7.4	SIMPLE	190
7.5	The Tiling Algorithm	193
7.6	Spanning Tree	195
8	Perturbation of Problem Constraints	201
8.1	Area Perturbation	201
8.1.1	Effect of Area on the Layout	202
8.1.2	Floorplanning and the Graph Theoretic Facility Layout Problem	203
8.1.3	Methods for Perturbation of Facility Areas	205
8.2	Adjacency Perturbation	214

8.2.1	The Non-Triviality of Adjacency Perturbation	214
8.2.2	Methods for Perturbation of Adjacencies	216
8.2.3	The Validity of the Maximal Planarity Assumption	222
9	Interaction and Decomposition	229
9.1	Decomposition	229
9.1.1	Decomposition via Separating Triangles	230
9.1.2	Forcing Decomposition	241
9.2	Interaction	247
10	The role of Material Handling Systems in Evaluating Layouts	253
10.1	Previous Work on Near Adjacency	253
10.2	Previous Work on the MHS	254
10.3	Considering the MHS as a Facility	257
10.4	Considering the MHS as a Post Construction Phase	258
10.5	MHS Computational Experiments	267
11	Putting It All Together - A Tutorial	279
11.1	Case Study 1: A Manufacturing Plant	279
11.2	Case Study 2: A Small Job Shop	298
12	Conclusions and Areas for Further Study	317
	Bibliography	323
A	Small MPGs and their layouts	333

List of Figures

2.1	The Tetrahedron	6
2.2	The Regular Octahedron	7
2.3	The Regular Dodecahedron	7
2.4	An Example of a Faultline	8
2.5	A 3-joint showing Top, Left, and Right Facilities	9
3.1	The Deltahedron Insertion Operation	23
3.2	Bowen and Fisk Sufficiency Operations	27
3.3	The Wheel Expansion Operation	28
3.4	The Additional Operation for Extended Deltahedron	29
3.5	The TESSA Operations	31
3.6	Partial Solution to a Pathological Problem Exhibiting TESSA's Worst Case Performance	34
3.7	Later Partial Solution to a Pathological Problem Exhibiting TESSA's Worst Case Performance	35
3.8	The Diagonal Swap Operation	36
3.9	The Second Case of the α -Operation	37
3.10	The Beta Operation	37
3.11	The Second Case of the Γ -Operation	38
3.12	The Third Case of the Γ -Operation	39
4.1	The Initial Deltahedron Layout	44
4.2	Initial Deltahedron Placement Options	46
4.3	A Forbidden Deltahedron Placement	47
4.4	Deltahedron Placement Operation PO1	47
4.5	Deltahedron Placement Operation PO2	48
4.6	Dimensioning of L-shaped Facilities	50
4.7	Dimensioning of T-shaped Facilities	51

4.8	Deltahedron Illustrative Example	52
4.9	The Deltahedron Layout for the Illustrative Example	53
4.10	Initial layouts for the Regular Octahedron	59
4.11	Extended Deltahedron Placement Operation PO3	60
4.12	Extended Deltahedron Placement Operation PO4	61
4.13	Dimensioning of X-shaped facilities	61
4.14	Hassan and Hogg Illustrative Example	64
4.15	Partial Hassan and Hogg Layout for the Illustrative Example . .	65
4.16	Example of Grid Splitting	67
4.17	Initial Division of a Facility in the ODA	72
4.18	Division of the Rectanguloid q in the ODA	72
4.19	Identification of a Rectangle to Transfer in the ODA	73
4.20	Transferring Only a Part of an Identified Rectangle in the ODA .	73
4.21	An Example Division of a Facility using the ODA	76
4.22	Contraction Algorithm Illustrative Example	77
4.23	Partial Contraction of the MPG for the Contraction Algorithm Example Problem	78
4.24	Layout of the Transformed MPG for the Contraction Algorithm Example Problem	78
4.25	Partially Constructed Contraction Algorithm Layout for the Illus- trative Example	79
4.26	Final Contraction Algorithm Layout for the Illustrative Example	79
4.27	A Pathological Problem for the Contraction Algorithm	80
4.28	Partial Contraction of the MPG for the Pathological Contraction Algorithm Problem	81
4.29	A Modified Dissection of a Facility using the ODA	83
4.30	The Empty Space of Partial SIMPLE Layouts	88
4.31	SIMPLE Illustrative Example	89
4.32	The SIMPLE Layout for the Illustrative Example	90
4.33	Placement Regions for the VSA Version of the ODA	91
4.34	Facility placement using the ODA variant derived for the VSA .	92
4.35	Deletion of a shortcut edge	96
4.36	Expansion of a cut vertex	97
4.37	VSA Illustrative Example	100

4.38	The Transformed VSA MPG for the Illustrative Example	101
4.39	The Partial VSA Layout for the Illustrative Example	102
4.40	The Final VSA Layout for the Illustrative Example	103
4.41	Allowance of 4-joints in VSA Layouts	105
4.42	Spanning Tree Illustrative Example	110
4.43	Spanning Tree Layout for the Illustrative Example	110
4.44	Tiling Algorithm Layout for the Illustrative Example	117
4.45	Example of placing a facility twice into a Tiling Algorithm Layout	118
4.46	Example of a Wheel for a Centre Vertex	120
4.47	Placement of a face not adjacent to a centre vertex	121
4.48	The Layout of a MPG having conditions $ D_1 = n - 2, D_2 = 1$, and $d_x = n - 2, x \in D_2$	123
4.49	The Layout of a MPG having conditions $ D_1 = n - 3$, and $D_2 =$ $\{x, y\}, (x, y) \in E$	124
4.50	The Layout of an MPG having structural condition $ D_2 = m, \forall \{x, y\} \in$ $D_2, (x, y) \notin E$	125
5.1	Rectilinear Segment Reduction - Simple Example	129
5.2	Rectilinear Segment Reduction - Conditions of Use	130
5.3	Example of RSR	132
5.4	An example where there are no immediate RSR reductions, but iterative reduction may be successful	133
5.5	Behaviour of Regularity Measures under the LT	134
5.6	An example where maximising the average perimeter ratio will re- sult in an impractical layout	135
6.1	Graphs of the percentage difference between the Rinsma and Delta- hedron starting points	148
6.2	Graphs of the percentage difference between the Improved and Non- Improved versions	155
6.3	Graphs of the percentage difference between the VSA and Contrac- tion Algorithm	159
7.1	Biased Deltahedron Example	184
7.2	Biased Vertex Splitting Algorithm Example	187
7.3	Biased Contraction Algorithm Example	189

7.4	Biased SIMPLE Example	192
7.5	Biased Tiling Algorithm Example	194
7.6	Biased Spanning Tree Example	196
8.1	Example to show how area perturbation can create infeasibility .	202
8.2	Example to Illustrate Area Perturbation within a Dimensional- isable Layout	209
8.3	Graph of $a = wl$, and its piecewise approximation	211
8.4	Example to Illustrate Area Perturbation within an Undimension- alisable Layout	213
8.5	First example of the non-trivial process of adjacency perturbation	215
8.6	Second example of the non-trivial process of adjacency perturbation	215
8.7	Fundamental Operation for Adjacency Perturbation	218
8.8	An example of the performance of multiple layout adjacency swaps	219
8.9	A second example of the performance of multiple layout adjacency swaps	220
8.10	Family of Adjacency Swap Operations for Dimensionalisable Lay- outs	221
8.11	A sequence of operations applied to a dimensionalisable layout .	223
8.12	An example of a non maximal planar graph, and two possible lay- outs	225
9.1	A typical layout consisting of a separating triangle	230
9.2	Example of the Decomposition of an MPG	232
9.3	Example of the nesting of subproblems via a decomposition tree	233
9.4	Decomposition Illustrative Example	237
9.5	Decomposition of the Illustrative Example	238
9.6	Subproblem Layouts for the Decomposition Illustrative Example	239
9.7	Final Decomposition Layout for the Illustrative Example	240
9.8	Example of Forcing Decomposition	244
9.9	Example of forcing decomposition, followed by application of adja- cency perturbation to obtain layout dual to original MPG	246
9.10	Interaction Illustrative Example	248
10.1	MHS Illustrative Example	265
10.2	Initial MHS design for the Illustrative Example	266

10.3	Final MHS design for the Illustrative Example	267
11.1	MPG generated by TESSA for the Manufacturing Plant Problem	281
11.2	Deltahedron Layout for the Manufacturing Plant Problem	284
11.3	Tiling Algorithm(T) Layout for the Manufacturing Plant Problem	285
11.4	Tiling Algorithm(I) Layout for the Manufacturing Plant Problem	286
11.5	Spanning Tree Layout for the Manufacturing Plant Problem . . .	287
11.6	Decomposition Tree of the MPG for the Manufacturing Plant . .	288
11.7	First Decomposition Layout for the Manufacturing Plant Problem	289
11.8	Second Decomposition Layout for the Manufacturing Plant Problem	290
11.9	Modified Tiling Algorithm Layout for the Manufacturing Plant Problem	295
11.10	Modified Spanning Tree Layout for the Manufacturing Plant Problem	296
11.11	Modified Decomposition Layout for the Manufacturing Plant Problem	297
11.12	MPG generated by TESSA for the Small Job Shop Problem . . .	301
11.13	MPG generated by Deltahedron for the Small Job Shop Problem	302
11.14	VSA Layout for the Small Job Shop Problem	304
11.15	Contraction Algorithm Layout for the Small Job Shop Problem .	305
11.16	SIMPLE Layout for the Small Job Shop Problem	306
11.17	Deltahedron Layout for the Small Job Shop Problem	307
11.18	Tiling Algorithm(I) Layout for the Small Job Shop Problem . . .	308
11.19	Tiling Algorithm(T) Layout for the Small Job Shop Problem . .	309
11.20	Spanning Tree Layout for the Small Job Shop Problem	310
11.21	Modified Spanning Tree Layout for the Small Job Shop Problem	312
11.22	Modified Tiling Algorithm Layout for the Small Job Shop Problem	315
A.1	Template 3^4	334
A.2	Template 3^24^3	334
A.3	Template 4^6	335
A.4	Template $3^24^25^2$	335
A.5	Template $3^14^35^3$	336
A.6	Template $3^24^36^2$	336

A.7	Template $4^5 5^2$	337
A.8	Template $3^2 4^2 5^2 6^1$	338
A.9	Template $3^3 5^3 6^1$	338
A.10	Template $3^2 4^1 5^4 6^1$	339
A.11	Template $3^1 4^4 5^1 6^2$	339
A.12	Template $3^2 4^2 5^2 6^2$	340
A.13	Template $3^2 5^6$	341
A.14	Template $3^2 4^3 5^1 6^1 7^1$	341
A.15	Template $3^1 4^3 5^3 6^1$	342
A.16	Template $4^4 5^4$	343
A.17	Template $4^6 6^2$	344
A.18	Template $3^4 6^4$	345
A.19	Template $3^2 4^4 7^2$	345
A.20	Template $3^3 4^1 5^1 6^3$	346
A.21	Template $3^2 4^2 5^3 7^1$	346
A.22	Template $3^3 4^1 5^2 6^1 7^1$	347

List of Tables

2.1	The AEIOUX Scheme	4
2.2	Possible nominal scales for facility regularity	18
3.1	Relationship Chart of a Pathological Problem exhibiting TESSA's Worst Case Performance	34
4.1	Area specifications for the Deltahedron Illustrative Example . . .	52
4.2	Placement Operations for the Deltahedron Illustrative Example .	53
4.3	Area Specifications for the Hassan and Hogg Illustrative Example	64
4.4	Insertion Processes for the Hassan and Hogg Illustrative Example	64
4.5	Area specifications for the Contraction Algorithm Illustrative Example	77
4.6	Areas Specifications for the SIMPLE Illustrative Example	89
4.7	Areas specifications for the VSA Illustrative Example	100
4.8	Areas Specifications for Spanning Tree Illustrative Example . . .	109
4.9	Tiling Algorithm Illustrative Example	116
4.10	Area specifications for the Tiling Algorithm Illustrative Example	116
5.1	Changes in Regularity Values after performing RSR	132
5.2	Changes in Regularity Values after performing LT	136
6.1	Commonly Used Abbreviations	137
6.2	Generation of arbitrary MPGs	139
6.3	Existence of Solutions to Test Problems	139
6.4	Performance of Starting Points for $n = 10$	142
6.5	Performance of Starting Points for $n = 15$	143
6.6	Performance of Starting Points for $n = 20$	144
6.7	Performance of Starting Points for $n = 25$	145
6.8	Performance of Starting Points for $n = 30$	146

6.9	Performance of Improvements for $n = 10$	150
6.10	Performance of Improvements for $n = 15$	151
6.11	Performance of Improvements for $n = 20$	152
6.12	Performance of Improvements for $n = 25$	153
6.13	Performance of Improvements for $n = 30$	154
6.14	Performance of VSA vs Contraction Algorithm for $n = 10$	157
6.15	Performance of VSA vs Contraction Algorithm for $n = 15$	157
6.16	Performance of VSA vs Contraction Algorithm for $n = 20$	158
6.17	Performance of VSA vs Contraction Algorithm for $n = 25$	158
6.18	Performance of VSA vs Contraction Algorithm for $n = 30$	158
6.19	Comparison table for two layouts	162
6.20	Regularity vs Adjacency for $n = 10$	165
6.21	Regularity vs Adjacency for $n = 15$	166
6.22	Regularity vs Adjacency for $n = 20$	167
6.23	Regularity vs Adjacency for $n = 25$	168
6.24	Regularity vs Adjacency for $n = 30$	169
6.25	Worst Case Regularity vs Adjacency for $n = 10$	173
6.26	Worst Case Regularity vs Adjacency for $n = 15$	174
6.27	Worst Case Regularity vs Adjacency for $n = 20$	175
6.28	Worst Case Regularity vs Adjacency for $n = 25$	176
6.29	Worst Case Regularity vs Adjacency for $n = 30$	177
6.30	Problem-by-Problem Regularity	179
7.1	Area Specifications and Regularity Values for the Biased Deltahe- dron Example	183
7.2	Area Specifications and Regularity Values for the Biased VSA Ex- ample	186
7.3	Area Specifications and Regularity Values for Biased Contraction Algorithm Example	190
7.4	Area Specifications and Regularity Values for Biased SIMPLE Ex- ample	192
7.5	Area Specifications and Regularity Values for Biased Tiling Algo- rithm Example	194
7.6	Area Specifications and Regularity Values for Biased Spanning Tree Example	197

9.1	Areas Specifications for the Decomposition Illustrative Example .	237
9.2	Decomposition as applied to the test problem set	241
9.3	Generation of 8- and 10-Decomposable MPG's on test problems .	242
10.1	Flow data for the MHS Illustrative Example	265
10.2	Inter-facility distances for teh MHS Illustartive Example	265
10.3	Inter-facility flows per unit distance for the MHS Illustrative Ex- ample	266
10.4	MHS Cost and Length for $n = 10$	269
10.5	MHS Cost and Length for $n = 15$	270
10.6	MHS Cost and Length for $n = 20$	271
10.7	MHS Cost and Length for $n = 25$	272
10.8	MHS Cost and Length for $n = 30$	273
10.9	Deltahedron results under Adjacency Benefit and Transportation Cost Objectives for $n = 10$	274
10.10	Deltahedron results under Adjacency Benefit and Transportation Cost Objectives for $n = 15$	274
10.11	Deltahedron results under Adjacency Benefit and Transportation Cost Objectives for $n = 20$	275
10.12	Deltahedron results under Adjacency Benefit and Transportation Cost Objectives for $n = 25$	275
10.13	Deltahedron results under Adjacency Benefit and Transportation Cost Objectives for $n = 30$	275
11.1	Adjacency Benefits for the Manufacturing Plant Problem	280
11.2	Function and Area of Facilities for the Manufacturing Plant Prob- lem	280
11.3	Adjacency, Regularity and Transportation Data of the Layouts gen- erated for the Manufacturing Plant Problem	282
11.4	Adjacency, Regularity and Transportation Data of the Layouts gen- erated by Decomposition for the Manufacturing Plant Problem .	283
11.5	Considerations for the modification of the Tiling Algorithm Layout	291
11.6	Considerations for the modification of the Spanning Tree layout .	293
11.7	Considerations for the modification of the Decomposition layout	294

11.8 Adjacency, Regularity and Transportation Data of the Modified
Layouts for the Manufacturing Plant Problem 294

11.9 Adjacency Benefits for Small Job Shop Problem 299

11.10 Function and Area of Facilities for the Small Job Shop 299

11.11 Benefit Scores for the Small Job Shop Problem 300

11.12 Adjacency, Regularity and Transportation Data of the Layouts gen-
erated for the Small Job Shop Problem 303

11.13 Adjacency, Regularity and Transportation Data of the Modified ST
Layout generated for the Small Job Shop Problem 313

11.14 Adjacency, Regularity and Transportation Data of the Modified TA
Layout generated for the Small Job Shop Problem 314

List of Algorithms

3.1	Deltahedron	22
3.2	TESSA	32
4.1	The Deltahedron Layout Algorithm	51
4.2	Exterior to Tetrahedron Algorithm 1	54
4.3	Exterior to Tetrahedron Algorithm 2	56
4.4	The Contraction Operation($j \rightarrow i$)	69
4.5	The Contraction Algorithm	70
4.6	The Orthogonal Division Algorithm($x \rightarrow (x, w)$)	74
4.7	Generation of the SIMPLE Placement Order	85
4.8	Concentric Layout (i)	94
4.9	Shortcut Eliminate (i, j)	96
4.10	Cut Vertex Expand (i)	97
4.11	The Vertex Splitting Algorithm	98
4.12	The Spanning Tree Layout Algorithm	108
4.13	The Tiling Algorithm	114
9.1	Decomposition Subproblem Identification	234
9.2	Layout Construction via Decomposition/Recomposition	236
10.1	MHS Construction	264