Modeling of Manufacturing Complexity in Mixed-Model Assembly Lines

Xiaowei Zhu

S. Jack Hu

Yoram Koren

Department of Mechanical Engineering,
University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Samuel P. Marin

Manufacturing Systems Research Lab,
General Motors R&D Center,
Warren, MI 48090

Mixed-model assembly lines have been recognized as a major enabler to handle product variety. However, the assembly process becomes very complex when the number of product variants is high, which, in turn, may impact the system performance in terms of quality and productivity. This paper considers the variety induced manufacturing complexity in manual mixed-model assembly lines where operators have to make choices for various assembly activities. A complexity measure called "operator choice complexity" (OCC) is proposed to quantify human performance in making choices. The OCC takes an analytical form as an information-theoretic entropy measure of the average randomness in a choice process. Meanwhile, empirical evidences are provided to support the proposed complexity measure. Based on the OCC, models are developed to evaluate the complexity at each station and for the entire assembly line. Consequently, complexity can be minimized by making system design and operation decisions, such as error-proof strategies and assembly sequence planning. [DOI: 10.1115/1.2953076]

1 Introduction

Traditional mass production was based on dedicated assembly lines where only one product model was produced in large quantities. Such systems can achieve high productivity by using principles of economies of scale and work division among assembly stations. However, in today's marketplace, where customers demand high product variety and short lead times, mass customization has been recognized as a new paradigm for manufacturing [1,2]. Mass customization promises individualized products at mass production cost. As a result of such paradigm change, assembly systems must be designed to be responsive to customer needs while at the same time achieving mass production quality and productivity. Mixed-model assembly lines (MMALs) have been recognized as a major enabler to handle increased variety. A MMAL typically takes the form of a flow line. The topics of effectively assigning tasks to stations and balancing the lines for multiple product types have been active research areas for MMAL in recent years [3].

Various industries are practicing MMALs. The variety of products offered in these lines has increased dramatically over the past decade. For example, in a typical automobile assembly plant, the number of different vehicles being assembled can reach tens of thousands in terms of the possible build combinations of options. In fact, BMW claims that "Every vehicle that rolls off the belt is unique" and the number of possible automobile variations in the BMW 7 Series alone could reach 10^{17}.

Such an astronomical number of build combinations undoubtedly presents enormous difficulties in the design and operation of the assembly systems. We still take automobile assembly as the example. It has been shown by both empirical and simulation results [4–6] that increased vehicle product variety has a significant negative impact on the performance of the mixed-model assembly process, for example, on quality and productivity. Such impact can result from assembly system design as well as people performance under high variety. The effect from the latter persists since only limited automation can be implemented in the automobile final assembly [7,8]. Thus the questions presented here are twofold: how variety impacts people and system performance, and how to design assembly systems and organize production to allow high product variety without sacrificing quality and productivity.

One of the possible approaches to assessing the impact of product variety on manufacturing system performance is to investigate how product variety *complicates* the mixed-model assembly process. However, only limited research has been done on defining manufacturing system complexity. For example, MacDuffie et al. [5] established an *empirical* relationship between complexity and manufacturing system performance. They defined product mix complexity by looking at product variety (product mix and its structure) in assembly plants. According to the differences in the levels of product variety, three types of product mix complexity were defined in terms of empirical scores: model mix complexity, part complexity, and option complexity. By statistical analysis, a significant negative correlation between the complexity measures and the manufacturing performance was found. The result was based on the data from 70 assembly plants worldwide that participated in the International Motor Vehicle Program at MIT.

Besides empirical studies, attempts have also been made to *analytically* define complexity in manufacturing. For instance, complexity has once been associated with the amount of effort needed to make a part. The effort was quantified by a logarithmic function of the probability of achieving a certain geometric precision and surface quality in *machining* [9]. The function is widely known as Shannon's information entropy [10]. Similarly, Fujimoto and Ahmed [11] defined a complexity index for *assembling*. The index takes the form of entropy to evaluate the assemblability of a product. The assemblability was defined as the uncertainty of gripping, positioning, and inserting parts in an assembly process. Also, complexity has been extended as a measure of uncertainty in achieving the specified functional requirements in an axiomatic design [12].

Recently, complexity has been defined in an analytical form for manufacturing systems as a measure of how product variety complicates the process. Fujimoto et al. [13] introduced a complexity measure based on product structure using information entropy in different assembly process planning stages. By reducing the complexity, they claimed that the impact of product variety on manufacturing systems could be reduced. However, the complexity measure does not incorporate the manufacturing system characteristics into the analysis. Deshmukh et al. [14] defined an entropic complexity measure for part mix in job shop scheduling. The

Fig. 1 An illustration of a PFA and its MMAL

complexity quantifies the difficulty associated with making scheduling decisions for the job shop, in which several types of products are manufactured simultaneously. An information-theoretic entropy measure of complexity is derived for a given combination and ratio of the part types. However, the complexity analysis is not applicable for a mixed-model assembly, which has a flow line or various hybrid configurations.

In summary, there is a general agreement that (i) product variety does increase the complexity in manufacturing systems and (ii) information entropy is an effective measure of complexity. However, in order to analyze the impact of variety on manufacturing complexity in mixed-model assembly systems, one has to take into consideration the characteristics of the assembly system, such as system configuration, task to station assignment, and assembly sequences. In addition, there is a lack of understanding on the mechanisms through which variety impacts manufacturing.

To address the above issues, this paper defines a new measure of complexity that integrates both product variety and assembly process information and then develops models for evaluating complexity in multistage mixed-model assembly systems. This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 defines the measure of operator choice complexity, which results from the analysis of choices and choice process in mixed-model assembly operations. Moreover, the section also provides both theoretic and empirical justifications for the viability of the measure. Section 3 presents the modeling of complexity for MMALs, where models at the station and system levels are both investigated. Additionally, the influence of process flexibility is analyzed using numerical examples. Then potential applications for assembly system design by using the model are suggested in Sec. 4. Finally Sec. 5 concludes this paper and proposes future work.

2 Measure of Operator Choice Complexity

This section begins with a brief introduction to MMALs. Then it describes the choices and choice processes on the line to help theoretically define the measure of choice complexity. The measure is then justified by results from the cognitive ergonomics studies.

2.1 Mixed-Model Assembly Line. Figure 1 illustrates an example of a product structure and its corresponding MMAL. The product has three features (F_i); each feature has several variants (e.g., V_{ij} is the jth variant of F_i). The product structure is represented by a product family architecture (PFA) [15].

The PFA illustrates all the possible build combinations of the customized products by combining the variants of features. For example, in Fig. 1, the maximal number of different end products is 24 (i.e., $3 \times 2 \times 4$). Moreover, we represent the product mix information by a matrix **P**, where p_{ij} is the demand (in percentage) of the jth variant of the ith feature. For instance, the **P** matrix for the product in Fig. 1 is the following:

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} p_{11} & p_{12} & p_{13} & 0 \\ p_{21} & p_{22} & 0 & 0 \\ p_{31} & p_{32} & p_{33} & p_{34} \end{bmatrix} \qquad (1)$$

Each row corresponds to the demand (in terms of mix ratio) of one feature, satisfying $\sum_j p_{ij} = 1, \forall i$.

In the mixed-model assembly process, one of the variants from every feature is selected and assembled sequentially along the flow of the assembly line. For example, as depicted in Fig. 1, V_{11} is chosen for F_1, V_{22} for F_2, and V_{32} for F_3. Quite often, this assembly process is accomplished manually. Operators at every station must make correct choices among a number of alternatives. The choices include choosing the right part, tool, fixture, and assembly procedure for the variant.

2.2 Choices and Choice Processes. At each assembly station, the operator must choose the correct part from all possible variants according to the customers' order. The specification of the order is usually written on a production tag/manifest attached on the partially completed assemblage. This process of selecting the right part continues throughout the day. To better understand the process, we call it the *choice process*.

The choice process consists of a sequence of choices with respect to time. It can be modeled as a sequence of random variables, each of which represents choosing one of the possible alternatives. Mathematically, it can be considered as a discrete time discrete state stochastic process $\{X_t, t = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ on the state space (the choice set) $X_t \in \{1, 2, \ldots, M\}$, where t is the index of discrete time period and M is the total number of possible alternatives (parts) that could be chosen during each period. More specifically, $X_t = m, m \in \{1, 2, \ldots, M\}$ is the event of choosing the mth alternative during period t.

In the simplest case, if the choice process is independent and identically distributed (iid), we then use a single random variable X (instead of X_t's) to describe the outcome of a choice. Furthermore, we know all the alternatives of X and their probabilities; i.e., the probability of a choice taking the mth outcome is known as $p_m \triangleq \mathbf{P}(X = m)$, for $m = 1, 2, \ldots, M$. In the following discussions, we limit ourselves by assuming iid sequences.

2.3 Operator Choice Complexity. To characterize the operator performance in making choices, we define the term *operator choice complexity* (or choice complexity) as follows.

DEFINITION. *Choice complexity is the average uncertainty or randomness in a choice process, which can be described by a function H in the following form:*

$$H(X) = H(p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_M) = -C \sum_{m=1}^{M} p_m \log p_m \qquad (2)$$

where C is a constant depending on the base of the logarithm function chosen. If $\log_2$ is selected, $C = 1$ and the unit of complexity is bit.

Theoretical properties. The following seven properties of the function H as described in Ref. [10] make it suitable as a measure of choice complexity.

(1) H is continuous in p_m; i.e., small changes in p_m should result in only small changes in choice complexity.
(2) If p_m's are brought closer to each other, H would increase. Put alternatively, any change toward equalization of $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_M$ should increase H. For a given M, H is a maximum and equal to $\log M$ when all p_i's are equal (i.e., $1/M$). In this case, H is an increasing function of M. This case is also intuitively the most uncertain situation to make a choice since the operator is considered to be *noninformative* [16].
(3) If a choice process is broken down into two successive stages, the original H is the weighted sum of the individual

Fig. 2 Mean choice RT as (*a*) a nonlinear function of the number of stimulus-response alternatives [17] and (*b*) a linear function of stimulus information, or $\log_2$ of the number of alternatives [18], reprinted from Ref. [22]

values of H. For example, $H(1/2,1/3,1/6)=H(1/2,1/2)+1/2H(2/3,1/3)$.

(4) $H=0$ if and only if all the p_m's but one are zero, this one has the value of unity, i.e., $H(1,0,\ldots,0)=H(0,1,\ldots,0)=H(0,0,\ldots,1)=0$. Thus only when we are certain of the outcome does H vanish, and there exists no choice complexity. Otherwise H is positive.

(5) H does not change when an additional alternative with no chance to happen is added into the original system.

(6) H is a symmetrical function of $p_1,p_2,\ldots,p_M$; i.e., if the probabilities of choices are permuted among the alternatives, choice complexity does not change.

(7) H is a sum of surprisal functions weighted by probability p_m's [16]. A surprisal function $\log 1/p_m$ is defined to quantify how much surprise (uncertainty) is incurred for an individual choice. The higher the probability of the incoming alternative is, the less surprisal is incurred, and vice versa. Thus, by weighting the surprisal with probabilities for the choice process, we obtain the entropy that characterizes the *average* randomness in the sequence. Therefore the entropy function H possesses most of the desirable properties to be one of the possible measures of choice complexity.

2.4 Justifications for Choice Complexity Measure. There is a close similarity and connection between the theoretical properties of the complexity measure and the experimental results found in human cognitive studies. The experiments were conducted to assess human performance when making choices. Coincidentally, information entropy was found to be one of the effective measures. The performance of human choice-making activities was investigated by measuring average reaction times (RTs), i.e., how quickly a person can make a choice in response to a stimulus. One of the earliest studies was done by Merkei in 1885, described by Woodworth [17]. In the experiment, digits 1–5 were assigned to the fingers of the right hand and the Roman numbers I–V were assigned to the fingers of the left hand. On any given set of trials, the subject knew which of the set of stimuli would be possible (e.g., if there were three possible stimuli, they might be 3, 5, and V). Merkel studied the relationship between the number of possible stimuli and the choice RT. His basic findings are presented in Fig. 2(*a*), where the relationship between choice RT and the number of alternatives was not linear.

This relationship in Fig. 2(*a*) has been further studied by a number of researchers since Merkel's original observations. Among them, the most widely known one was Hick [18]. He discovered that the choice RT is linearly proportional to the logarithm of the number of stimulus alternatives if all the alternatives are equal (see Fig. 2(*b*)), i.e.,

$$\text{Mean choice RT} = a + b[\log_2 n] \qquad (3)$$

where n is the number of stimulus-response alternatives, and a and b are constants, which can be determined empirically by fitting a line to the measured data. This relation came to be known as *Hick's law*, which was regarded as one major milestone in the area of cognitive ergonomics.

Coincidentally, the term $[\log_2 n]$ is exactly the information entropy calculated in Eq. (2) if all the p_m's are equal, which follows from the experiment setting that the choice process is iid and all the alternatives likely occur equally. The above analogy was first discovered by Hyman [19], where he concluded that "the reaction time seems to behave, under certain conditions, in a manner analogous to the definition of information."

Hyman [19] also realized that, according to Shannon's definition of information entropy, he could change information content in the experiment by other means. Thus, in addition to varying the number of stimuli and letting each one of them occur in Hick's [18] experiment, he altered stimulus information content simply by (i) changing the probability of occurrence of particular choices and (ii) introducing sequential dependencies between successive choices of alternatives (see Fig. 3). Thus, naturally enough, we can use H to replace the $[\log_2 n]$ term; Eq. (3) becomes

$$\text{Mean choice RT} = a + bH \qquad (4)$$

Because of the significance of this generalization, Hick's law is also referred to as the Hick–Hyman law.

The H term in Eq. (4) is one of the variants of Shannon's information entropy [10] in the communication systems study. Thus, a fundamental assumption behind this analog is that the mental process of a human being is modeled as an information transmission process. In fact, this assumption is confirmed by the recent research in cognitive ergonomics on the queuing network modeling of an elementary mental process. Liu [20] suggested that at the level of mean RTs, a continuous-transmission fork-join network demonstrates the same logarithmic behavior as that of the experimental results in the Hick–Hyman law. Hence, the legitimacy of applying Eq. (4) is limited to situations where individuals are asked to responsed promptly to a stimulus, and the decision to be made is very simple, requiring little conscious thought. When analyzing the mixed-model assembly process, we observe the

Fig. 3 Choice RT for three different ways of manipulating the stimulus information *H*, reprinted from Ref. [21], using data from Ref. [19]

very similar situation that the line operators are asked to handle variety in a very tight cycle time without time for deliberating over the decisions. However, if the subjects are given more time, the thinking process will not be as simple as merely an information transmission. Liu [20] also reviewed a class of more sophisticated queuing network models for RT.

Moreover, it was suggested in Welford [22] that the information measure is adequate to assess human performance since it provides a valuable means of combining RT and *errors* (i.e., speed and accuracy) into a single score.

Practitioners in various fields have found the information entropic measure of human performance useful. One of the examples using the Hick–Hyman law in an assembly operation analysis comes from Bishu and Drury [23]. They used the amount of information, measured in bits, contained in a wiring assembly task to predict task completion time. The amount of information is a function of both the number of wires to choose from and the number of terminals to be wired. They found that task completion time was linearly related to the amount of information contained in the task. Additionally, they also found that the more the information gain was, the more likely would errors occur. That is, the total information content increases both the task completion time and errors. Gatchell [24] used the choice RT technique and experimentally studied operator performance on part choices under part proliferation. Her findings suggest that an operator with more part

choices made more errors and needed more decision time.

According to both theoretical properties and empirical results, the entropy-based quantity *H* is suitable to measure operator choice complexity. Therefore, we propose to use the following form to quantify the value of choice complexity:

$$\text{Choice complexity} = \alpha(a + bH), \quad \alpha > 0 \qquad (5)$$

The form is similar to that of the Hick–Hyman law. It only differs in a positive scalar α, served as a weight to a specific choice process. In other words, the choice complexity is positive monotonic to the amount of uncertainty embedded in the choice process. Since Eq. (5) takes a simple linear form with constants α, a, and b, the only remaining part to be determined is the value of H when evaluating complexity. By incorporating information from product design, line design, and operation, one can develop models and methodologies to quantify the information content in terms of the various operator choices in a mixed-model assembly process.

3 Models of Complexity for Mixed-Model Assembly Lines

This section defines the operator choice complexity in the station level by simply extending the previous definition for a single assembly activity. Then complexity in the system level is examined after a unique propagation behavior of complexity is found. Moreover, process flexibility and commonality are taken into account when analyzing complexity. Finally a complexity model is proposed for multistage assembly systems.

3.1 Station Level Complexity Model. On a station, in addition to the part choice mentioned in Sec. 2, the operator may perform other assembly activities as well in a sequential manner, and some examples of the corresponding choices are briefly described as follows (see Fig. 4).

1. Fixture choice: choose the right fixture according to the base part (i.e., the partially completed assemblage) to be mounted on as well as the added part to be assembled.
2. Tool choice: choose the right tool according to the added part to be assembled as well as the base part to be mounted on.
3. Procedure choice: choose the right procedure, e.g., part orientation, approach angle, or temporary unload of certain parts due to geometric conflicts/subassembly stabilities.

According to Eq. (5), we define the associated complexity at the station as part choice complexity, fixture choice complexity, tool choice complexity, and assembly procedure choice complexity. All these choices contribute to the operator choice complexity.

Without loss of generality, we number the sequential assembly

**Fig. 4 Choices in sequential assembly activities at one station**

Fig. 5 Complexity propagation scheme

activities in Fig. 4 from 1 to K and denote C_j as the total complexity of station j, which is a weighted sum of the various types of choice complexity at the station,

$$C_j = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \alpha_j^k (a_j^k + b_j^k H_j^k), \quad \alpha_j^k > 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, K \quad (6)$$

where α_j^k are the weights related to the task difficulty of the kth assembly activity at station j, a_j^k's and b_j^k's are empirical constants depending on the nominal human performance similar to that of the choice RT experiments, and H_j^k is the entropy computed from the variant mix ratio relevant to the kth activity at station j. For simplicity, we assume that $a_j^k = 0$ and $b_j^k = 1, \forall j, k$. Then Eq. (6) reduces to

$$C_j = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \alpha_j^k H_j^k, \quad \alpha_j^k > 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, K \quad (7)$$

3.2 Propagation of Complexity. By Eq. (7), the complexity on individual stations is considered as a weighted sum of complexities associated with every assembly activity. Among them, some activities are caused only by the feature variants at the current station, such as picking up a part, or making choices on tools for the selected part. The complexity associated with such assembly activity is called *feed complexity*. However, the choice of fixtures, tools, or assembly procedures at the current station may depend on the feature variant that has been added at an upstream station. This particular component of complexity is termed as *transfer complexity*.

A formal definition of the two types of complexity is given below. Assume a current station j:

1. feed complexity: choice complexity caused by the feature variants added at station j
2. transfer complexity: choice complexity caused by the feature variants added at an upstream station, i.e., station i (i precedes j, denoted as $i < j$)

Transfer complexity exists because the feature variants added on the previous station i may affect the process of realizing the feature at station j, causing tool changeovers, fixture conversions, or procedure changes.

The propagation behavior of the two types of complexity is depicted in Fig. 5, where for station j, the feed complexity is denoted as C_{jj} (with two identical subscripts) and the transfer complexity is denoted as C_{ij} (with two distinct subscripts to represent the complexity of station j caused by an upstream station i). Thus the transfer complexity can flow from upstream to downstream, but not in the opposite direction. In contrast, the feed complexity can only be added at the current station with no flowing or transferring behavior.

Hence the total complexity at a station is simply the sum of the feed complexity at the station and the transfer complexity from all the upstream ones, i.e., for station j,

$$C_j = C_{jj} + \sum_{\forall i : i < j} C_{ij} \quad (8)$$

Compared with Eq. (7), we may find equivalence relationships term by term between the two sets of equations. We illustrate this in the following section with examples.

3.3 Examples of Complexity Calculation. In this section, by continuing the example in Fig. 1, which is redrawn in Fig. 6, we demonstrate the procedures of calculating complexity at a station. More specifically, we will consider examples with or without process flexibility.

3.3.1 Example Without Process Flexibility. In Fig. 6, four sequential assembly activities are identified at station 3. Complexity is expressed according to Eq. (7) by assigning superscripts 1–4 as part choice complexity, fixture choice complexity, tool choice complexity, and assembly procedure choice complexity, respectively. Thus, according to the station level model, we have the following equation for station 3:

$$C_3 = \alpha_3^1 H_3^1 + \alpha_3^2 H_3^2 + \alpha_3^3 H_3^3 + \alpha_3^4 H_3^4 \quad (9)$$

At the station, we also know the process requirement as follows.

1. One of the four parts, i.e., variants of F_3, is chosen according to customer order.
2. One of the four distinct tools is chosen according to the chosen variant of F_3.
3. One of the two distinct fixtures is chosen according to the variant of F_2 installed at station 2.
4. One of the three distinct assembly procedures is chosen according to the variant of F_1 installed at station 1.

On the other hand, the propagation scheme at the system level can be determined from the viewpoint of feed complexity (C_{33}) and transfer complexity (C_{13} and C_{23}), which is expressed according to Eq. (8) as follows:

$$C_3 = C_{33} + C_{13} + C_{23} \quad (10)$$

There exists an agreement between Eqs. (9) and (10) or equivalently, Eqs. (7) and (8), which is shown below.

Given process information, we identify the types of choice complexity in Eq. (10) as follows:

- part choice complexity: $\alpha_3^1 H_3^1$
- tool choice complexity: $\alpha_3^3 H_3^3$
- fixture choice complexity: $\alpha_3^2 H_3^2$

Fig. 6 Complexity propagation of the example in Fig. 1

- procedure choice complexity: $\alpha_3^4 H_3^4$

By complexity propagation, we have

- feed complexity: $C_{33} = \alpha_3^1 H_3^1 + \alpha_3^3 H_3^3$
- transfer complexity: $C_{23} = \alpha_3^2 H_3^2$ and $C_{13} = \alpha_3^4 H_3^4$

From the agreement, the sources of complexity can be identified and the H terms are now easily calculated. That is, if an H term corresponds to the feed complexity, it is a function of the mix ratio of the current station; however, if an H corresponds to the transfer complexity, it is a function of the mix ratio of the station, which is specified in the first subscript of its corresponding C_{ij}, i.e., station i. As a result, $H_3^1 = H_3^3 = H_3$, where H_3 is the entropy of the variants added at station 3; similarly, $H_3^2 = H_2$, $H_3^4 = H_1$.

Now, let us consider numerical values for the example. Assume that the **P** matrix in Eq. (1) takes the following values:

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0.2 & 0.3 & 0 \\ 0.5 & 0.5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.3 & 0.3 & 0.2 & 0.2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then,

$$H_3^1 = H_3^3 = H_3 = H(0.3, 0.3, 0.2, 0.2) = 1.971 \text{ bits}$$

$$H_3^2 = H_2 = H(0.5, 0.5) = 1 \text{ bit}$$

$$H_3^4 = H_1 = H(0.5, 0.2, 0.3) = 1.485 \text{ bits} \tag{11}$$

and

$$C_3 = C_{33} + C_{13} + C_{23} = 1.971\alpha_3^1 + 1.971\alpha_3^3 + \alpha_3^2 + 1.485\alpha_3^4 \tag{12}$$

For simplicity, assuming $\alpha_3^1 = \alpha_3^2 = \alpha_3^3 = \alpha_3^4 = 1$, we finally obtain the total complexity at station 3,

$$C_3 = 1.971 + 1.971 + 1 + 1.485 = 6.427 \text{ bits} \tag{13}$$

3.3.2 Influence of Process Flexibility. So far, we have illustrated in Eqs. (11)–(13) an example of calculating choice complexity with no flexibility in the manual assembly process. However, flexibility is usually built into assembly systems such that common tools or fixtures can be used for different variants so as to simplify the process. That is, flexible tools, common fixtures, or shared assembly procedures are adopted to treat a set of variants so that choices (of the tools, fixtures, and assembly procedures) are eliminated. Since fewer choices are needed, complexity reduces. However, not all the assembly processes can be simplified by flexibility strategies. Sometimes, flexible tools, common fixtures, or shared assembly procedures may require significant changes or compromises in product design and process planning, which are usually costly if not impossible. To characterize the impact of flexibility, i.e., to establish the relationship between product feature variants and process requirements, a *product-process association matrix* (denoted as Δ-matrix) is defined in the following discussion.

We again use the example in Fig. 6. At station 3, we consider fixture changeover, and it is denoted as the kth assembly activity. Which fixture should be used in assembling F_3 at station 3 is determined by the variant of F_2 assembled previously at station 2. If no flexibility is present, fixture choice is needed at station 3 by observing feature F_2 according to the following rules:

- Use fixture 1 if V_{21} is present.
- Use fixture 2 if V_{22} is present.

Thus there are two states in the fixture choice process; the mapping relationship can be expressed in a Δ-matrix as follows:

$$\Delta_{23}^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{14}$$

where Δ_{23}^2 denotes the Δ-matrix for the second activity at station 3 associated with the variants added at station 2; the columns are the states of the second activity at station 3 and the rows are the variants of the feature F_2 affecting the activity. The ones in the cells establish associations between the state in the column and the variant in the row.

A general definition of the Δ-matrix for the kth assembly activity at station j due to variety added at station i is given as follows:

$$\Delta_{ij}^k = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_{1,1} & \delta_{1,2} & \cdots & \delta_{1,m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \delta_{n,1} & \delta_{n,2} & \cdots & \delta_{n,m} \end{bmatrix} \tag{15}$$

where

$$\delta_{s,t} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{variant } s \text{ at station } i \text{ requires the } k\text{th activity} \\ & \text{to be in state } t \text{ at station } j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

m and n are the cardinality of states and variants, respectively.

By definition, the Δ-matrix satisfies the following properties:

1. $\sum_{t=1}^m \delta_{s,t} = 1$, for $s = 1, 2, \ldots, n$
2. $\sum_{s=1}^n \delta_{s,t} \geq 1$, for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, m$
3. $n \geq m$

Property 1 holds because one variant can lead to one and only one state. Property 2 holds because each state must be associated with at least one variant; otherwise, the column associated with the empty state can be eliminated and the size of the matrix shrinks by 1. Lastly, property 3 holds because the maximal number of states cannot exceed the total number of variants. That is, in the extreme case of nonflexibility, each variant requires the characteristic to be in a distinct state, and the Δ-matrix becomes a unit matrix of dimension of the number of variants.

Consider the example in Fig. 6 again. However, if a common fixture is adopted, the same fixture can be used whether V_{21} or V_{22} is mounted on station 2. Thus, by definition, the Δ-matrix becomes simply

$$\Delta_{23}^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

which could be reduced to

$$\Delta_{23}^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{16}$$

By using the Δ-matrix, we are now capable of calculating the H terms when flexibility is present in the process. Define a vector $\mathbf{q}_{ij}^k = [q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_m]$, where $q_t, t \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ is the probability of the kth activity being in state t at station j due to the variants added at station i, satisfying $\sum_{s=1}^m q_s = 1$. By the definition of the product mix matrix **P** in Eq. (1) and the Δ-matrix in Eq. (15), the following relationship holds:

$$\mathbf{q}_{ij}^k = [q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_m] = \mathbf{P}_{i \cdot} \times \Delta_{ij}^k \tag{17}$$

where $\mathbf{P}_{i \cdot}$ is the ith row of matrix **P**, representing the mix ratio of the feature (i.e., F_2 in the example) assembled on station i. Thus, the corresponding H term is

$$H_j^k = H(\mathbf{q}_{ij}^k) = -\sum_{t=1}^m q_t \log_2 q_t \tag{18}$$

Revisit the example in Fig. 6. When calculating the H term (H_3^2) corresponding to the fixture choice complexity at station 3, we have the following results:

Table 1 Numerical example of complexity calculation

No.	Activity	Δ-matrix	$\mathbf{q}$-vector	H-term
1	Part pick-up	$\Delta_{33}^1=\begin{bmatrix}1&0&0&0\\0&1&0&0\\0&0&1&0\\0&0&0&1\end{bmatrix}$	$\mathbf{q}_{33}^1=\begin{bmatrix}0.3\\0.3\\0.2\\0.2\end{bmatrix}^T$	$H_3^1=1.971$
2	Fixture conversion	$\Delta_{23}^2=\begin{bmatrix}1\\1\end{bmatrix}$	$\mathbf{q}_{23}^2=[1]^T$	$H_3^2=0$
3	Tool changeover	$\Delta_{33}^3=\begin{bmatrix}1&0\\1&0\\0&1\\0&1\end{bmatrix}$	$\mathbf{q}_{33}^3=\begin{bmatrix}0.6\\0.4\end{bmatrix}^T$	$H_3^3=0.971$
4	Assembly procedure change	$\Delta_{13}^4=\begin{bmatrix}1&0\\0&1\\1&0\end{bmatrix}$	$\mathbf{q}_{13}^4=\begin{bmatrix}0.8\\0.2\end{bmatrix}^T$	$H_3^4=0.722$
	Total complexity at station 3 with equal weights			3.664

Case 1. Use dedicated fixtures, i.e., a different fixture for each variant. By the Δ-matrix in Eq. (14), we have

$$\mathbf{q}_{23}^2=\begin{bmatrix}q_1 & q_2\end{bmatrix}=\mathbf{P}_{2.}\times\Delta_{23}^2=\begin{bmatrix}0.5 & 0.5\end{bmatrix}\times\begin{bmatrix}1&0\\0&1\end{bmatrix}=\begin{bmatrix}0.5 & 0.5\end{bmatrix}$$

$$\Rightarrow H_3^2=\sum_{t=1}^{2}q_t\log_2 1/q_t=2\times 0.5\log_2 1/0.5=1\text{ bit}$$

which duplicates exactly the result in Eq. (11).

Case 2. A common fixture is used. By the Δ-matrix in Eq. (16), we have

$$\mathbf{q}_{23}^2=\begin{bmatrix}q_1 & q_2\end{bmatrix}=\begin{bmatrix}0.5 & 0.5\end{bmatrix}\times\begin{bmatrix}1\\1\end{bmatrix}=[1]\Rightarrow H_3^2=\sum_{t=1}^{1}q_t\log_2 1/q_t$$

$$=1\log_2 1/1=0\text{ bit}$$

Since fixture is common to the process of assembling F_3 with variants of F_2, no choice is needed.

Assume that we have flexibility or commonality in fixture, tool, and assembly procedures, which is expressed by the Δ-matrices in Table 1. As a summary, the table also demonstrates a detailed numerical example to calculate complexity at station 3. The results show a reduced value of choice complexity compared with Eq. (13) because of the additional process flexibility.

3.4 System Level Complexity Model. In general, consider an assembly line with n workstations, numbered $1-n$ sequentially (see Fig. 7). The mix ratio defined in Eq. (1) is known. Using Eq. (2), we can obtain the entropy H for the variants at each station

according to their mix ratios.

The propagation of complexity in a multistage system can be analyzed by considering how the complexity of assembly operations (choices) at a station is influenced by the variety added at its upstream stations (*incoming complexity*), as well as how variants added at the station impact the downstream stations (*outgoing complexity*). The incoming complexity at station j, C_j^{in}, is the amount of complexity flowing into the station from its upstream stations, which can be calculated in the following way:

Station 1: $C_1^{\text{in}}=C_{01}=a_{01}H_0$

Station 2: $C_2^{\text{in}}=C_{02}+C_{12}=a_{02}H_0+a_{12}H_1$

…

Station j: $C_j^{\text{in}}=C_{0j}+C_{1j}+C_{2j}+\cdots+C_{j-1,j}=a_{0j}H_0+a_{1j}H_1$
$$+a_{2j}H_2+\cdots+a_{j-1,j}H_{j-1}$$

…

Station n: $C_n^{\text{in}}=C_{0n}+C_{1n}+C_{2n}+\cdots+C_{n-1,n}=a_{0n}H_0+a_{1n}H_1$
$$+a_{2n}H_2+\cdots+a_{n-1,n}H_{n-1}$$

where C_j^{in} is the incoming complexity of station j, $j=1-n$, H_j is the entropy of variants added at station j, H_0 is the entropy of variants due to the base part, a_{ij} is the cofficient of complexity impact on station j due to variety added at station i, i.e.,

$$a_{ij}=\begin{cases}\alpha_j^k & \text{variants added at station } i \text{ have an impact on the}\\ & k\text{th assembly activity at station } j, \text{ and } i<j\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}$$

Or, equivalently, by using a matrix representation, a comprehensive model can be obtained as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix}C_1\\C_2\\\vdots\\C_n\end{bmatrix}^{\text{in}}=\begin{bmatrix}a_{01}&0&\dots&0\\a_{02}&a_{12}&\dots&0\\\vdots&\vdots&\ddots&0\\a_{0n}&a_{1n}&\dots&a_{n-1,n}\end{bmatrix}\times\begin{bmatrix}H_0\\H_1\\\vdots\\H_{n-1}\end{bmatrix} \qquad (19)$$

In short,

$$\mathbf{C}^{\text{in}}=\mathbf{A}^T\times\mathbf{H} \qquad (20)$$

where $\mathbf{C}^{\text{in}}$ is the incoming complexity vector of size n for the system, with its ith entry being the incoming complexity at station i, for $i=1,2,\dots,n$; $\mathbf{A}$ is the characteristic matrix of size $n\times n$, which characterizes the interactions between stations (due to the feature variants added on the stations) in terms of choice complexity; and $\mathbf{H}$ encapsulates product variety information, including the number of variants and their distributions.

The outgoing complexity at station j, C_j^{out}, is the amount of complexity flowing out of the station. It is the amount of choice


Fig. 7 Propagation of complexity at the system level in a multistage assembly system

complexity caused by the variants added at the station, affecting the operations on the other stations downstream. Similarly, we have the following equations:

Station 1: $C_1^{\text{out}} = C_{12} + \cdots + C_{1n} = (a_{12} + \cdots + a_{1n})H_1$

Station 2: $C_2^{\text{out}} = C_{23} + \cdots + C_{2n} = (a_{23} + \cdots + a_{2n})H_2$

$$\ldots$$

Station j: $C_j^{\text{out}} = C_{j,j+1} + \cdots + C_{jn} = (a_{j,j+1} + \cdots + a_{jn})H_j$

$$\ldots$$

Station n: $C_{n-1}^{\text{out}} = C_{n-1,n} = a_{n-1,n}H_n$

where C_j^{out} is the outgoing complexity of station j, $j = 1 - n$. In fact, by definition $C_n^{\text{out}} = 0$.

Additionally, since the variety of the base part incurs transfer complexity as well, we denote it as C_0^{out}, i.e.,

Base part: $C_0^{\text{out}} = C_{01} + C_{02} + \cdots + C_{0n} = (a_{01} + a_{02} + \cdots + a_{0n})H_0$

Using the matrix form again, we obtain a comprehensive model for outgoing complexity as follows:

$$
\begin{bmatrix} C_0 \\ C_1 \\ \vdots \\ C_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}^{\text{out}} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a_{01} & a_{02} & \ldots & a_{0n} \\ 0 & a_{12} & \ldots & a_{1n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & a_{n-1,n} \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}
$$
$$
.* [H_0, H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1}]^T \tag{21}
$$

In short,

$$\mathbf{C}^{\text{out}} = [\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{1}] .* \mathbf{H} \tag{22}$$

where $\mathbf{C}^{\text{out}}$ is the outgoing complexity vector of size n for the system, with its jth entry being the outgoing complexity from station $j-1$, for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$; $\mathbf{1}$ is a column vector of ones with size n; and .* denotes the entry-by-entry product of two vectors with identical sizes.

3.5 Extension of the Model. The system level complexity model can also be extended to incorporate the influence of process flexibility and commonality. In Sec. 3.3.2, we have demonstrated the use of product-process association matrix (i.e., the Δ-matrix) to deal with the situation where a common fixture was utilized for two different variants. Since the fixture helped to eliminate choices, the associated choice complexity was expected to decrease as well.

By the definition of Δ-matrix in Eq. (15), we safely drop k in the notation for convenience, and we rewrite Eq. (17) as follows:

$$\mathbf{q}_{ij} = \mathbf{P}_i \times \Delta_{ij} \tag{23}$$

In fact, the Δ-matrix in the above equations acts as a mathematical operator on the entropy of variants added at station i. We denote the operator in the form of a function.

$$\Delta_{ij}(H_i) \triangleq H(\mathbf{q}_{ij}) \tag{24}$$

Basically, what the operator does is to calculate the entropy value by incorporating the information of process flexibility (which may help eliminate choices) in the assembly process at station j regarding the variants assembled at station i.

By using Δ-matrices for every flow of transfer complexity in the system, we have Eqs. (19) and (20) extended,

Fig. 8 Incoming and outgoing complexity charts

$$
\begin{bmatrix} C_1 \\ C_2 \\ \vdots \\ C_n \end{bmatrix}^{\text{in}} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{01}\Delta_{01} & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ a_{02}\Delta_{02} & a_{12}\Delta_{12} & \ldots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 \\ a_{0n}\Delta_{0n} & a_{1n}\Delta_{1n} & \ldots & a_{n-1,n}\Delta_{n-1,n} \end{bmatrix}
$$
$$
\times [H_0, H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1}]^T
$$

In short,

$$\mathbf{C}^{\text{in}} = (\mathbf{A} \cdot \Delta)^T \times \mathbf{H} \tag{25}$$

The matrix multiplication requires the entry-by-entry computation,

$$a_{ij}\Delta_{ij}H_i = a_{ij}\Delta_{ij}(H_i) = a_{ij} \cdot H(\mathbf{q}_{ij})$$

Similarly, the extended versions of Eqs. (21) and (22) for outgoing complexity are as follows:

$$
\{[C_0, C_1, \ldots, C_{n-1}]^T\}^{\text{out}} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a_{01}\Delta_{01} & a_{02}\Delta_{02} & \ldots & a_{0n}\Delta_{0n} \\ 0 & a_{12}\Delta_{12} & \ldots & a_{1n}\Delta_{1n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & a_{n-1,n}\Delta_{n-1,n} \end{bmatrix} \right.
$$
$$
\left. \times \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\} .* [H_0, H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1}]^T
$$

In short,

$$\mathbf{C}^{\text{out}} = [(\mathbf{A} \cdot \Delta) \times \mathbf{1}] .* \mathbf{H} \tag{26}$$

Therefore, the extended system level complexity model comprehensively incorporates both product (such as product architecture and mix) and process (such as system configuration, tooling, task to station assignment, and flexibility) information.

4 Potential Applications

Once the propagation of complexity is understood and models developed, they can be applied to the design of mixed-model assembly systems. Several potential applications are described below.

4.1 Performance Evaluation and Root Cause Identification Using Complexity Charts. Following the procedures in Sec. 3.4, we can analyze the incoming and outgoing complexity for each station and plot them against the station position in a multistage assembly system (see Fig. 8). As a result, the stations with high incoming complexity are the potential stations where error-proofing strategies need to be provided to mitigate the impact of variety induced complexity on operator and system performance.

In Fig. 8, the outgoing complexity also shows how much influence the variants at one particular station have on its downstream operations. As a result, the outgoing complexity implies the root cause of the choice complexity in the system. Thus decisions from product design, such as process commonality strategies and option bundling policies, need to be considered to moderate outgoing complexity.

Fig. 9 Possible configurations for mixed-model assembly systems. M_i's are machines in the system [27].

Fig. 10 Differences in transfer complexity values for different assembly sequences: (*a*) Task *i* precedes *j*, which results in C_{ij}; (*b*) task *j* precedes *i*, which results in C_{ji}, while C_{ij} and C_{ji} are not equal

4.2 Influence Index and Configuration Design. For any station j, once the values of incoming and outgoing complexities are found, we may define an index, called influence index, as follows:

$$I_j = \frac{C_j^{\text{out}}}{C_j^{\text{in}}} \qquad (27)$$

The index quantifies how much relative influence the variants added at station j have on the operations of the other stations. To illustrate, in Fig. 7, if every complexity stream has one unit of complexity, we can calculate the influence index for station j, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, by simply counting the number of streams,

$$I_j = \frac{\text{No. of outgoing complexity streams}}{\text{No. of incoming complexity streams}} = \frac{n - j}{j} \qquad (28)$$

Obviously,

- $I_1 = n - 1$, the first station *potentially* has the maximal influence on the others;
- $I_n = 0$, the last station has no influence on the others.

Thus, in such a sequential manufacturing process, the influence index monotonically decreases with respect to j. Hence we can conclude that operations at the later stations become vulnerable and are affected by the variants assembled at the previous ones. Therefore, by wisely assigning assembly tasks (i.e., the functional features) onto stations, it is possible to prevent complexity streams from propagating. One of the intuitive approaches is to assign features with more variants to the stations of smaller influence indices (downstream stations), and vice versa. In this aspect, the proposed complexity model implies the principle of "delayed differentiation," which has already become a common practice in industry [25].

However, by Eq. (27), our model suggests that it is not sufficient to look at the number of variants and the position where they are deployed according to the delayed differentiation principle. The evaluation of the impact of product variety on manufacturing complexity should also take into account the process flexibility built in the system. For instance, if all the variants from the upstream could be treated by the same flexible tools, common fixture, and shared assembly procedures in the downstream, variants can be introduced in the upstream without increasing system complexity. In this case, all the Δ-matrices for transfer complexity become column vectors with all 1's in the column, indicating common process requirements for the feature variants in the product family. As a result, the transfer complexity vanishes.

Since different configurations have a profound impact on the performance of the system [26], selecting an assembly system configuration other than a pure serial line may help reduce complexity. For instance, using parallel workstations at the later stages of a mixed-model assembly process reduces the number of choices on these stations if we can wisely route the variants at the joint of the ramified paths (see Fig. 9). However, balancing these types of manufacturing systems will be a challenge since the system configuration is no longer serial [27]. A novel method for task-machine assignment and system balancing needs to be developed to minimize complexity while maintaining manufacturing system efficiency.

4.3 Assembly Sequence Planning to Minimize Complexity. Assembly sequence planning is an important task in assembly system design. Since the assembly sequence determines the directions in which complexity flows (see Fig. 10), proper assembly sequence planning can reduce complexity.

Generally, suppose we have a product with n assembly tasks, and the tasks are to be carried out sequentially in an order subject to precedence constraints. By applying the complexity model, we assume that the transfer complexity can be found between every two assembly tasks. Since only one of the two transfer complexity values in Fig. 10 is effective (because only the upstream task/station has influence on the downstream ones) for one particular assembly sequence, an optimization problem can be formulated to minimize the system complexity by finding an optimal assembly sequence while satisfying the precedence constraints.

5 Conclusions and Future Work

This paper proposes a measure of complexity based on the choices that the operator has to make at the station level. The measure incorporates both product mix and process information. Moreover, models are developed for the propagation of complexity at the system level. The significance of this research includes (i) mathematical models that reveal the mechanisms that contribute to complexity and its propagation in multistage mixed-model assembly systems, (ii) understanding of the impact of manufacturing system complexity on performance, and (iii) guidelines for managing complexity in designing mixed-model assembly systems to optimize performance. Our future work will focus on the validation and applications of such model in assembly system design and operations.

References

[1] Pine, B. J., 1993, *Mass Customization: The New Frontier in Business Competition*, Harvard Business School, Boston.
[2] Koren, Y., 2006, "The Global Manufacturing Revolution: Product-Process-Business Integration and Reconfigurable Systems," University of Michigan, ME/MFG 587 course pack.
[3] Rekiek, B., Lit, P. D., and Delchambre, A., 2000, "Designing Mixed-Product Assembly Lines," IEEE Trans. Rob. Autom., **16**(3), pp. 268–280.
[4] Fisher, M. L., Jain, A., and Macduffie, J. P., 1995, "Strategies for Product Variety: Lessons From the Auto Industry," *Redesigning the Firm*, E. H. Bowman and B. M. Kogut, eds., Oxford University Press, New York, Chap. 6.
[5] MacDuffie, J. P., Sethuraman, K., and Fisher, M. L., 1996, "Product Variety and Manufacturing Performance: Evidence From the International Automotive Assembly Plant Study," Manage. Sci., **42**(3), pp. 350–369.
[6] Fisher, M. L., and Ittner, C. D., 1999, "The Impact of Product Variety on Automobile Assembly Operations: Empirical Evidence and Simulation," Manage. Sci., **45**(6), pp. 771–786.
[7] Niimi, A., and Matsudaira, Y., 1997, "Development of a Vehicle Assembly Line at Toyota: Worker-Orientated, Autonomous, New Assembly System," *Transforming Automobile Assembly: Experience in Automation and Work Organization*, K. Shimokawa, U. Jurgens, and T. Fujimoto, eds., Springer, Berlin.
[8] Benders, J., and Morita, M., 2004, "Changes in Toyota Motors' Operations

Management," Int. J. Prod. Res., **42**(3), pp. 433–444.

[9] Nakazawa, H., and Suh, N. P., 1984, "Process Planning Based on Information Concept," Rob. Comput.-Integr. Manufact., **1**(1), pp. 115–123.

[10] Shannon, C. E., 1948, "A Mathematical Theory of Communication," Bell Syst. Tech. J., **27**, pp. 379–423.

[11] Fujimoto, H., and Ahmed, A., 2001, "Entropic Evaluation of Assemblability in Concurrent Approach to Assembly Planning," *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Assembly and Task Planning*, pp. 306–311.

[12] Suh, N. P., 1990, *The Principles of Design*, Oxford University Press, New York.

[13] Fujimoto, H., Ahmed, A., Iida, Y., and Hanai, M., 2003, "Assembly Process Design for Managing Manufacturing Complexities Because of Product Varieties," International Journal of Flexible Manufacturing Systems, **15**(4), pp. 283–307.

[14] Deshmukh, A. V., Talavage, J. J., and Barash, M. M., 1998, "Complexity in Manufacturing Systems, Part 1: Analysis of Static Complexity," IIE Trans., **30**(7), pp. 645–655.

[15] Tseng, M. M., and Jiao, J., 1996, "Design for Mass Customization," CIRP Ann., **45**(1), pp. 153–156.

[16] Jessop, A., 1995, *Informed Assessments: An Introduction to Information, Entropy, and Statistics*, Ellis Horwood, New York.

[17] Woodworth, R. S., 1938, *Experimental Psychology*, Holt, New York.

[18] Hick, W. E., 1952, "On the Rate of Gain of Information," J. Exp. Psychol., **4**, pp. 11–26.

[19] Hyman, R., 1953, "Stimulus Information as a Determinant of Reaction Time," J. Exp. Psychol., **45**, pp. 188–196.

[20] Liu, Y., 1996, "Queueing Network Modeling of Elementary Mental Processes," Psychol. Rev., **103**(1), pp. 116–136.

[21] Card, S. K., Moran, T. P., and Newell, A., 1983, *The Psychology of Human-Computer Interaction*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.

[22] Welford, A. T., 1968, *Fundamentals of Skill*, Methuen, London.

[23] Bishu, R. R., and Drury, C. G., 2003, "Information Processing in Assembly Tasks: A Case Study," Appl. Ergon, **19**(2), pp. 90–98.

[24] Gatchell, S. M., 1979, "The Effect of Part Proliferation on Assembly Line Operators' Decision Making Capabilities," *Proceedings of the Human Factors Society, 23rd Annual Meeting*, The Human Factors Society, Santa Monica, CA.

[25] Lee, H. L., and Tang, C. S., 1997, "Modeling the Costs and Benefits of Delayed Product Differentiation," Manage. Sci., **43**(1), pp. 40–53.

[26] Koren, Y., Hu, S. J., and Weber, T. W., 1998, "Impact of Manufacturing System Configurations on Performance," CIRP Ann., **47**(1), pp. 369–372.

[27] Ko, J., and Hu, S. J., 2008, "Balancing of Manufacturing Systems With Complex Configurations for Delayed Product Differentiation," Int. J. Prod. Res., **46**(15), pp. 4285–4308.