

# Accelerated Benders Decomposition for Variable-Height Transport Packaging Optimisation

Alain Lehmann<sup>§</sup>, Wilhelm Kleiminger  
 Ergon Informatik AG  
 Merkurstrasse 43, CH-8032 Zurich  
 {alain.lehmann, wilhelm.kleiminger}@ergon.ch

Hakim Invernizzi, Aurel Gautschi  
 Digitec Galaxus AG  
 Pfingstweidstrasse 60b, CH-8005 Zürich  
 {Hakim.Invernizzi, Aurel.Gautschi}@digitecgalaxus.ch

**Abstract**—This paper tackles the problem of finding optimal variable-height transport packaging. The goal is to reduce the empty space left in a box when shipping goods to customers, thereby saving on filler and reducing waste. We cast this problem as a large-scale mixed integer problem (with over seven billion variables) and demonstrate various acceleration techniques to solve it efficiently in about three hours on a laptop. We present a KD-Tree algorithm to avoid exhaustive grid evaluation of the 3D-bin-packing, provide analytical transformations to accelerate the Benders decomposition, and an efficient implementation of the Benders sub problem for significant memory savings and a three order of magnitude runtime speedup.

**Index Terms**—Mixed Integer Linear Programming, Bender Decomposition, 3D Bin Packing, KD-Tree

## I. INTRODUCTION

Online retailers use transport packaging to safely ship products from their logistics centres to their customers. The right choice of transport packaging ranges from none at all (if the product is already well protected by its factory packaging) over padded envelopes to boxes made from heavy carton stuffed with filler material for additional protection [8].

Choosing the right packaging is important as the environmental footprint of the transport packaging alone can range from 4.1% to 26% of the order process [15], [16]. There is also an economic incentive – lower shipping costs [10]. The ratio of product to air in a box is a major factor to account for. More air means more packaging and filler material. Thus a greater environmental footprint and higher operational costs.

However, having a myriad of box sizes to fit each combination of products is impractical as the space at the packers’ workstations is limited. Instead, a fixed set of variable-height boxes is used with carton dimensions optimised for the expected deliveries<sup>1</sup>.

Optimising variable-height transport packaging can be formulated as a mixed integer program (MIP) similar to the facility location problem. The caveat is that the number of possible box sizes and the expected deliveries sample make this a very large-scale optimisation problem. We show various acceleration techniques to make the problem tractable. Specifically, we make the following contributions (c.f. Table I):




Fig. 1. Overview of the carton box optimisation model (c.f. Section II). The goal is to find optimal variable-height boxes to transport packing units with minimal empty space. (bottom): Illustration of cartons and boxes with “selected” ones coloured green. Lines connecting cartons and boxes express the variable-height box relationship. (top-right): Illustration of the “fitting matrix”  $F$  (shape) and the packing variables  $x$  (color): Green coloured boxes indicate that a box  $b$  is available for packing ( $y_b = 1$ ), while black ones are not available. Closed boxes indicate packing unit  $p$  does fit into a box ( $F_{pb} = 1$ ), while open ones do not. Closed, dark green boxes are assumed for shipping  $x_{pb} = 1$  and contribute to the overall objective value.

- 1) model variable-height transport packaging as a mixed integer problem,
- 2) accelerate its Benders decomposition using analytic transformations for a 42-fold speedup,
- 3) implement the Benders sub program efficiently with 1000-fold speedup and 64-fold memory reduction,
- 4) propose an adaptive KD-Tree algorithm to bin pack every combination of packing unit to box with a 29 fold speedup.

This paper is structured as follows: Section II presents our model and discusses related work. Section III revisits the Benders decomposition for our concrete model and shows how

<sup>§</sup>Main author

<sup>1</sup>Automated packing system that fit transport packing to products are not applicable for bulky goods and scalable during peak season.

TABLE I  
CONTRIBUTION SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENTS

Improvement	Section	Before	After	Speedup
Bender Overall Optimisation	III	8356s	199s	42
- Runtime Sub Problem	IV-C	7s	0.007s	1000
- Memory Sub Problem	IV-B	60GB	< 1GB	64
KD-Tree Bin Packing	V			
- CPU-Time (i.e. 1-core)		535.76h	18.40h	29
- On M1 Pro/10-cores		74h17m	2h59	25





Fig. 2. (left) Crease lines quadruple the number of box formats possible given a single carton. With a few small cuts, more box formats are available without more space requirements. (right) Statistics of cartons and boxes. The 1cm discretisation yields 71790 boxes. The 43256 cartons are derived from boxes: Every box yields a carton unless that carton (with its crease lines) is already covered by a bigger carton. Encoding the carton box relationship is a table of 122787 entries.

to handle variable-height boxes efficiently. Section IV derives the analytical solution of the Benders sub program and outlines an efficient implementation. Section V discusses an adaptive KD-Tree algorithm to compute the 3D-bin-packing matrix. Finally, Section VI evaluates the proposed contributions on a large scale dataset, followed by future work and conclusion in Section VII.

## II. PROBLEM STATEMENT: CARTON BOX OPTIMISATION

This section presents the model (c.f. Figure 1) for finding optimal variable-height transport packing, i.e. cartons with crease lines (c.f. Figure 2) that allow for multiple boxes given a single carton. Overall, the goal is to find a set of cartons that minimise the empty space when shipping a packing unit in a box built from one of the optimal cartons.

The main input is a fitting matrix  $F_{pb}$  that indicates if (the items of) packing unit  $p = 1 \dots P$  fit into box  $b = 1 \dots B$ . This assumes a discretisation of the set of possible boxes. Note that the actual shape of the box and packing unit items is only relevant for computing the boolean matrix  $F_{pb}$  which will be discussed in Section V. For the optimisation, only the free space  $C_{pb} = V_b - V_p$  left after packing all items with combined volume  $V_p$  into the box with volume  $V_b$  is relevant.

Minimising the overall empty space to reduce the need for filler, can thus be formulated as a mixed integer program (MIP)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \min_{x,y,z} \sum_p \sum_b C_{pb} x_{pb} && \text{subject to (1a)} \\
 & \forall p \quad \sum_b F_{pb} x_{pb} = 1 && \text{packing unit shippable (1b)} \\
 & \forall (p, b) \quad x_{pb} \leq y_b && \text{box available (1c)} \\
 & \forall (z_k, y_b) \in REL \quad z_k \leq y_b && \text{carton implies boxes (1d)} \\
 & \forall b \quad \sum_{(z_k, y_b) \in REL} z_k \geq y_b && \text{box requires carton (1e)} \\
 & \sum_k z_k = M && \text{limited cartons (1f)} \\
 & \forall b \in \mathcal{F} \quad y_b = 1 && \text{fixed boxes (1g)}
 \end{aligned}$$

whose variables  $x, y, z$ , additional inputs  $M, REL, \mathcal{F}$  and related constraints are detailed in the sequel while a summary is provided in Table II.

The *box variables*  $y_b \in \{0, 1\}$  and *carton variables*  $z_i \in \{0, 1\}$  indicate whether a box  $b$  and carton  $i$  are selected for the optimal solution, while the *packing variable*  $x_{pb} \in \{0, 1\}$  defines the box assumed for shipping packing unit  $p$ .

The constraints (1b) ensure that every packing unit is shippable, i.e., there is exactly one non-zero packing  $x_{pb} = 1$  per packing unit  $p$  and its items fit into that specific box  $F_{pb} = 1$ . This further implies that the objective (1a) has  $P$  non-zero terms that provide the total empty space for a given solution. Constraints (1c) enforce that only boxes selected in the optimal solution are used for shipping.

Constraint (1f) allows exactly  $M$  cartons in the final solution. Obviously, better solutions (with less empty space) can be found when allowing more cartons. But the packers' workspace imposes physical restrictions on what is possible.

Variable-height boxes are an important tool to better leverage the available space. They quadruple the number of box sizes that can be stored in the same space. We model variable-height boxes with crease lines by defining a relationship between carton and boxes, i.e. a table  $REL = [(y_b, z_k)]$  that defines which boxes  $y_b$  can be constructed from carton  $z_k$ . This list of pairs is provided as input to the optimisation problem and is derived from a custom logic. Figure 2 provides some statistics about our concrete choice. Constraints (1d) then define that a box is part of the optimal solution whenever a related carton is, while (1e) ensures that at least one related carton is part of the solution whenever a box is.

Finally, constraint (1g) defines explicit business requirements to include a set  $\mathcal{F}$  of certain boxes in the final solution. For example, some boxes still fit into a "Milchkästli"<sup>2</sup> or benefit from special shipping fees. Moreover, we require the largest box to always be selected.

Modelling the optimisation problem is straightforward, but solving it is challenging due to the huge number of optimisation variables. Specifically, the packing variable  $x$  scales with the number of packing units  $P$  and the number of boxes  $B$ ,

<sup>2</sup><https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Milchkasten>

TABLE II  
NOTATION

$B$	Total number of boxes
$P$	Total number of packing units
$K$	Total number of cartons
$b$	Index variable used for boxes
$p$	Index variable used for packing units
$k, l$	Index variables used for cartons
$Volume(b)$	Volume of a box
$Volume(p)$	Volume of a packing unit (sum of item volumes)
$F_{pb}$	Does packing unit $p$ fit into box $b$
$C_{pb}$	Cost when fitting packing unit $p$ into box $b$
$M$	Maximal allowed number of cartons
$x_{pb}$	Is packing unit $p$ packed into box $b$
$y_b$	Is box $b$ selected for production
$z_k$	Is carton $k$ selected for production
$REL$	Table encoding box-carton relationship
$\pi_p, \mu_{pb}$	Dual variables related to packing constraints
$\pi_p^i, \mu_{pb}^i$	Dual variables for box selection $y^i$
$s^i, w^i$	Bender cuts generated in iteration $i$

which alone is about  $B \times P = 70k \times 110k = 7700M$ . Solving this large scale problem is the key contribution of this paper.

### A. Related Work

Benders decomposition [2] is a technique for large scale mixed integer programs that has gained increased interest in recent years [11]. Extensions like Multi-Cut aggregations [14] have been proposed to improve efficiency in general, while this paper shows that problem-specific optimisation can have a tremendous performance impact.

The proposed model is closely related to the well-studied factory location problem [6]. In that context, packing units relate to customers and boxes are the factory locations. Our model differs due to the additional ‘‘cartons’’ that represent variable-height boxes and the ‘‘separable’’ structure of the cost coefficients. This paper demonstrates optimisation for this specific case.

Modern MIP solvers even include automatic Benders decomposition [3]. This is generally helpful, but it may not exploit all the structures of a concrete problem. Specifically, analytic solutions, or bit-packed representation for memory efficiency that we use are not to be expected.

## III. BENDERS DECOMPOSITION

Benders decomposition [2] is a technique to solve large scale mixed integer programs. On a conception level, Benders decomposition replaces continuous variables of a mixed integer program by a single continuous variable, at the expense of additional constraints. This reduces the number of optimisation variables which is key to make a problem tractable. While the set of additional constraints is huge, most are inactive for the optimal solution. Hence, Bender proposed to iteratively find violated constraints instead of enumerating them all.

Consequently, Benders decomposition is an iterative algorithm that alternately solves a mixed integer master program and a continuous linear sub program. The master program is a relaxed version of the original problem. It approximates the objective function and generates solution candidates. The

sub program scores the candidates and provides violated constraints to improve the master program’s approximation.

This section is specialised to our concrete mixed integer program (1) from Section II, while we refer to the survey [11] for a more general description. Section III-A derives the Benders decomposition that eliminates the packing variables  $x$  from the mixed integer program. Section III-B builds on that result and also moves the box variables  $y$  into the sub program, leaving only the carton variables  $z$  in the master program.

### A. Benders decomposition on packing variables

Using Benders decomposition requires a set of continuous variables, but the problem statement in Section II assumed all variables to be binary. It’s thus worth noting that the *optimal* solution of (1) will have binary values for the packing variable  $x$ , even if the variable is relaxed to be continuous.<sup>3</sup> Benders decomposition transforms the original program into

$$\min_{y,z} f_{primal}(y) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \Gamma(y, z) \quad (2a)$$

where  $\Gamma(y, z)$  collects all constraints (1d, 1e, 1f, 1g) not involving  $x$ , and the objective is a linear program

$$f_{primal}(y) = \min_x \sum_{pb} c_{pb} x_{pb} \quad \text{subject to} \quad (3a)$$

$$x_{pb} \leq y_b \quad \forall(p, b) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_b F_{pb} x_{pb} = 1 \quad \forall p \quad (3b)$$

that includes all constraints (1b, 1c) involving  $x$ . This sub program is non-linear in  $y$  making (2) a more complicated non-linear integer program. However, its dual

$$f_{dual}(y) = \max_{\pi, \mu \leq 0} \sum_p \pi_p + \sum_p \sum_b y_b \mu_{pb} \quad (4)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \mu_{pb} \leq c_{pb} - F_{pb} \pi_p \quad \forall(p, b)$$

with dual variables  $\mu \in \mathcal{R}^{P \times B}$  and  $\pi \in \mathcal{R}^P$  reveals that it is convex in  $y$ , because the feasible region does not depend on  $y$  and the objective is a maximum of linear functions. This allows to lower bound  $f$  by hyperplanes

$$f(y) \geq f(y^i) + \left( \frac{df}{dy}(y^i) \right)' (y - y^i) = s^t + (w^i)' y \quad (5)$$

$$\text{with } w_b^i := \frac{df}{dy_b}(y^i) = \sum_p \mu_{pb}, \quad s^i := f(y^i) - (w^i)' y^i$$

for every feasible solution  $y^i$  and  $'$  denotes transposition. Benders decomposition introduces a continuous variable  $\theta \in \mathcal{R}$  to replace the non-linear objective to obtain the integer linear master program

$$\min_{y,z,\theta} \theta \quad \text{subject to} \quad (6)$$

$$\Gamma(y, z) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta \geq s + w' y \quad \forall(s, w) \in OC$$

with optimality cuts  $OC$  defined by (5) that bound the objective  $\theta$  from below. In general (c.f. [11]), the Benders decomposition includes feasibility cuts (of the form  $0 \leq s + w' y$ )

<sup>3</sup>A fractional result would imply to not put everything in the smallest available box, which would only worsens the objective value.

derived from extreme rays of infeasible dual sub problems. In our concrete setting, the business requirement (c.f. (1g)) to always include the largest box  $y_{b_{\max}} = 1$  implies that all sub problems are always feasible, and no further feasibility cuts are necessary.

Noting that  $s^i = f(y^i) - (w^i)'y^i = \sum_p \pi_p^i$ , the Bender master program without packing variable  $x$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{y,z,\theta} \theta \quad & \text{subject to} \\ & \Gamma(y,z) \text{ and } y_{b_{\max}} = 1 \text{ and} \\ & \theta \geq \sum_p \pi_p^i + \sum_{pb} y_b \mu_{pb}^i \quad \forall i \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

with  $\pi^i, \mu^i$  the optimal dual variables obtained by validating the best master solution  $y^i$  in iteration  $i$  with the sub program. This mixed integer program is much smaller than the original one (1) as the number of variables no longer scales with the number of packing units (c.f. Table III). However, it still has many constraints which we will address in the next section.

### B. Benders decomposition on packing and box variables

This section extends the Benders decomposition to move both the packing variables  $x$  and the box variables  $y$  to the sub program. This leaves only the carton variables  $z$  in the master program and also reduces the number of constraints. This provides significant advantages to the master program:

- Less than half the number of variables (there are more boxes than cartons)
- No more carton-box relationship constraints (1d, 1e) which eliminates  $\mathcal{O}(B + K)$  constraints.

Remember that moving variables to the sub problem requires them to be continuous. The “bi-directional” implication defined by the crease line constraints (1d, 1e) define a rigid coupling where selected cartons imply selected boxes and vice versa. This allows to relax the box variables to be continuous while an optimal solution remains binary. In fact, the constraints imply the analytic relation

$$y_b(z) = 1 - \prod_{(z_k, y_b) \in REL} (1 - z_k) \quad (8)$$

which makes an optimal  $y$  binary whenever  $z$  is. Moreover, the previous sub program (4) can be used to express the new one as  $g(z) = f(y(z))$ . Consequently, the lower bound approximation (5) requires the chain-rule for partial derivatives

$$\begin{aligned} g(z) &\geq s^i + (w^i)'z \quad s^i = f(y(z^i)) - (w^i)'z^i \\ w^i &:= \frac{dg}{dz}(z^i) = \left[ \frac{df}{dy}(y(z^i)) \right] \left[ \frac{dy}{dz}(z^i) \right] = \mu^i J^i \\ J_{bk}^i &:= \frac{dy_b}{dz_k}(z^i) = \prod_{\substack{(z_l, y_b) \in REL \\ l \neq k}} (1 - z_l^i) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and builds on the optimal solution  $f(y(z^i))$  of (4) corresponding to  $y(z^i)$ , with its optimal dual variables  $\mu^i$ , and the Jacobian  $J_{bk}^i$  of (8) at  $z^i$ . In other words, solving for  $y$  is




Fig. 3. Benders iteration with intermediate variable pre-/post-transformations: (1) Solving the master program proposes carton candidates  $z^i$ . (2) They are translated by (8) to box candidates and validated with the sub program. (3) The dual optimal  $\mu$  (with respect to boxes) are transformed back by (9) to add new optimality cut (with respect to cartons) in the master program. (4) This loop is repeated until convergence.

TABLE III  
BENDERS DECOMPOSITION PROGRAM SIZE COMPARISON

Method	MIP Variables	MIP Constraints	LP Size
No-Bender II	$\mathcal{O}(BP + K)$	$\mathcal{O}(BP + K)$	-
Bender-x III-A	$\mathcal{O}(B + K + 1)$	$\mathcal{O}(B + K + I)$	$\mathcal{O}(BP)$
Bender-xy III-B	$\mathcal{O}(K + 1)$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + I)$	$\mathcal{O}(BP)$

( $B \approx 70k$ ,  $K \approx 40k$ ,  $P \approx 110k$ , Bender Iterations  $I \leq 100$ )

done “in-between” the master and sub problem by a pre-/post-transformation of variables (c.f. Figure 3).

Last but not least, the remaining constraints (1g) have to be reformulated in terms of carton variables. This finally leads to the new master problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{z,\theta} \theta \quad & \text{subject to} \\ & \theta \geq \sum_p s^i + (w^i)'z \quad \forall i \\ & \sum_i z_k = M \text{ and } \sum_{(z_k, y_b) \in REL} z_k \geq 1 \quad \forall b \in \mathcal{F} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $s^i, w^i$  are computed via (9). In summary, the analytic transformation eliminates complexity in the master program with simple transformation of the dual optimal solution. The new master problem depends only on  $z, \theta$  and a tiny number of constraints – both favourable properties (c.f. Table III).

## IV. EFFICIENT BENDERS SUB PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Optimising the Benders sub program is essential for good performance. The linear program is simpler than a mixed integer program, but its scale makes it demanding, especially in terms of memory. The next section shows that the Benders sub program has a closed-form, analytical solution that provides a linear time algorithm. The following sections then exploits the structure of the objective function to significantly reduce the memory requirements and accelerate the evaluation.

### A. Analytical Benders sub problem

The Benders sub problem (4) is a linear program. This is much simpler than a mixed integer program, but its challenging due to its scale ( $P \times B$ ). Note that the sub problem decomposes further since optimisation over packing units are independent. This results in  $P$  optimisations with each

only  $B$  variables. In fact, those optimisations can be solved analytically (assuming  $C_{pb} = \infty$  when  $F_{pb} = 0$ )

$$\pi_p = \min\{c_{pb} | F_{pb} = 1, y_b = 1\} \quad (11a)$$

$$\mu_{pb} = \min(0, c_{pb} - F_{pb}\pi_p) \quad (11b)$$

which the remainder of this section will show. As a result, solving the Benders sub problem does not require an LP solver and runs in linear time.

Analysing one single packing unit  $p$  in isolation yields

$$\begin{aligned} f_{primal}^p(y) = \min_x \sum_b c_{pb}x_b \quad \text{subject to} \\ \forall b \quad x_b \leq y_b \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_b F_{pb}x_b = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The primal optimal solution is to choose *the* best fitting box ( $F_{pb} = 1$ ) among the available ones ( $y_b = 1$ ). Note that this is what happens on a daily basis when shipping a packing unit for real. This is a simple search for the smallest value in the subset as defined in (11a). Solving the dual

$$\begin{aligned} f_{dual}^p(y) = \max_{\pi, \mu \leq 0} \pi + \sum_b \overbrace{y_b \mu_b}^{\leq 0} \\ \text{subject to} \quad \mu_b \leq c_{pb} - F_{pb}\pi \quad \forall b \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

is more challenging. The key observation is that the second term is zero for unselected boxes  $y_b = 0$  and never positive  $\mu_b \leq \min(0, c_{pb} - F_{pb}\pi_p)$  for selected boxes  $y_b = 1$ . By choosing the best fitting and available box (11a), the second term is always zero and  $\pi$  matches the primal optimum. The  $\mu_b$  corresponding  $y_b = 0$  are not fully constrained, but choosing the largest possible value (11b) yields the tightest lower bound in (5).

### B. Memory Efficient Implementation

A naive implementation of (11) is to directly use the cost  $C_{pb}$ . The problem is that explicitly “materialising” this cost matrix requires a lot of memory. Without the analytical solution a solver would likely use double precision floating point (as typical for numerical stability of a solver), which would require about  $60GB$  (for our dataset with  $70k$  boxes and  $110k$  packing units). This is just the input data, let alone a solver’s working data.

The analytical solution (11) allows for a more memory efficient representation. We exploit the definition  $C_{pb} = \text{Volume}(b) - \text{Volume}(p)$  to compute the cost matrix on-the-fly based on the “fitting matrix”  $F_{pb}$  and volumes. The volume vectors are negligible  $8 \cdot (70k + 110k) \approx 1.5MB$ , while the boolean matrix  $F$  can be bit-packed to require only  $70k \cdot 110k \cdot 1\text{bit} \approx 1GB$ . This memory saving is paramount to work on typical commodity hardware with  $64GB$  of RAM.

### C. Runtime Efficient Implementation

Bit-packing also has positive impact on the runtime. First of all, loading less data reduces I/O and is likely beneficial for CPU caches. Assuming a 64 bit architecture, bit-packing

---

### Algorithm 1 FastDual( $y$ )

---

**Require:** box indices  $b$  ordered by volume  $V(b)$

**Require:** packing  $F_{pb}$  packed into 64bit words

**Require:**  $\pi_p, \mu_{pb}$  initialized to zero

**for all**  $p$  **do**

$bestBox := \arg \min_b \{V_b | y_b = 1, F_{pb} = 1\}$

$\pi_p += V(bestBox) - V(p)$

$wordIdx, bitIdx := \text{divmod}(bestBox, 64)$

$word = load(F, p, wordIdx) \ \& \ (1 \ll (63 - bitIdx) - 1)$

**while**  $wordIdx > 0 \ \&\& \ word > 0$  **do**

**while**  $word > 0$  **do**

$bitIdx := \text{ctzll}(word)$

$b := 64 \cdot wordIdx + (63 - bitIdx)$

$\mu_{pb} += V(b) - V(bestBox)$

$word := word \ \& \ (\sim(1 \ll bitIdx))$

**end while**

$wordIdx := wordIdx - 1$

$word := load(F, p, wordIdx)$  (unless  $wordIdx < 0$ )

**end while**

**end for**

---

allows to load 64 values of  $F$  with a single CPU load instruction. Dedicated CPU instructions of today’s hardware also allow to efficiently identify the non-zero bits  $F_{pb} = 1$ . These are the only elements resulting in a non-zero contribution to the overall result. The CPU instruction *count trailing zeros* (`ctz`)<sup>4</sup> returns the number of trailing 0-bits, starting at the least significant bit position. This corresponds to an  $F_{pb} = 1$  which allows for computing  $C_{pb}$  given the indices. This bit can be cleared with simple bit operation after computing the score contribution. The next 64 bits are loaded whenever the in-memory word becomes zero. Note that this loop loads the full data matrix, but the actual computation is only on non-zero elements (c.f. Algorithm 1).

Furthermore, the boxes can be ordered such that the cost  $C_{pb}$  is always monotonic (in  $b$ ). Consequently, finding  $\pi_p$  does not always require a full scan over all boxes, and all non-zero score contribution  $\mu_{pb}$  for a given packing unit  $p$  have a smaller index than the best matching box. Hence, the algorithm does not even process all boxes, and avoids the  $\min(0, \cdot)$  in (11b).

Last but not least, all packing units can be processed in parallel. We leverage OpenMP [4] in our implementation to get parallelisation with only minor code annotations.

## V. KD-TREE FOR 3D BIN PACKING EVALUATION

The mixed integer program relies on the fitting matrix  $F_{pb}$  which indicates whether a packing unit  $p$  fits into a box  $b$ . So far, we assumed this matrix is given, while this section details its computation.

Computing a single entry  $F_{pb}$  is known as the 3D bin packing problem [9]. The aim of this problem is to decide if a set of rectangular items fits into a rectangular box. This problem is NP-hard [1]. In general, it is also relevant how to fit the items into the box, but we only require the boolean

<sup>4</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Find\\_first\\_set](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Find_first_set)




Fig. 4. Illustration of the KD-tree partitioning scheme – in 2D instead of 3D for simplicity. Every small black dot represents a box: the smallest box is bottom-left and the largest one is top-right. Bounding boxes (rectangle with rounded corner) represent a set of boxes. Binary search along the diagonal identifies a splitting point (blue circle) to recursively partition a set of boxes into quadrants (octants in 3D). All boxes in the upper-right (green) are large enough to fit a packing unit while boxes in the lower-left (red) are too small. All other (white) have to be partitioned recursively.

decision. We solve a single  $F_{pb}$  with an open source C# implementation [5].

Our challenge is that the 3D bin packing problem needs to be solved not only once, but for every pair of box and packing unit. In our experiment, that is  $B \times P \approx 7700M$  pairs. Even a single bin packing may be slow due to the combinatorial growth of possibilities, especially when a packing unit consists of many items. Hence, exhaustive evaluation is costly.

Many evaluations of the 3D bin packing can be deduced from others when making the assumption that “if a packing unit fits into a small box, it also fits into larger ones”.<sup>5</sup> We exploit this assumption using an adaptive KD-Tree partitioning.

The KD-Tree based evaluation represents a set of boxes by their bounding box (c.f. Figure 4). Every point within this bounding box represents a physical box. The evaluation searches along the bounding box diagonal for the smallest box that still fits all items. This point/box can be found with binary search. This partitions the entire bounding box into octants, one of which contains strictly larger boxes, one contains strictly smaller boxes, and six octants that have some dimensions larger and others smaller. The binary decision  $F_{pb}$  for the former two octants is clear, while the latter six octants need to be partitioned recursively. When an octant is small enough (e.g. less 30 boxes), all contained boxes are directly evaluated with the 3D bin packer.

This KD-tree partitioning asymptotically requires only  $\mathcal{O}(n^{2.58})$  bin packing evaluation when the bounding box is a cube with side length  $n$ . This seems a small improvement over the exhaustive grid evaluation with  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ , but results in about an order of magnitude speedup (c.f. Figure 5).

<sup>5</sup>larger in all dimensions, not by volume




Fig. 5. Asymptotic worst-case runtime of the KD-Tree evaluation  $\mathcal{O}(n^{2.58})$  compared to exhaustive grid evaluation  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ . Discretisation of boxes of 1m to 1cm precision is about  $n \approx 100$  which suggests about a factor 5 speedup.

The runtime follows from telescoping<sup>6</sup>

$$T(n) = \overbrace{\log(n)}^{\text{binary search}} + 6 \overbrace{T(n/2)}^{\text{recursion}} \quad (14a)$$

$$= \log(n) + 6 \log(n/2) + 6^2 T(n/4) + \dots \quad (14b)$$

$$= \frac{31}{25} n^{\log_2(6)} - \frac{1}{5} \log_2(n) - \frac{6}{25} \quad (14c)$$

$$\approx \mathcal{O}(n^{\log_2 6}) \approx \mathcal{O}(n^{2.58496}) \quad (14d)$$

with  $\log_2$  the binary logarithm. This is a worst case analysis when the splitting point is exactly half way, i.e. all octants have equal volume and 6 of 8 have to be partitioned recursively. If the split is off-center, the octants to be recurred on make up less than  $\frac{6}{8}$  of the bounding box volume, resulting in more speedup.

## VI. RESULTS

### A. Data Set and Evaluation Metrics

All experiments were done with a real world data set. The data set consists of 112'696 packing units with 410'084 items overall, i.e. about 4 items per packing unit on average. The goal of the concrete optimisation is to find  $M = 8$  cartons that minimise the empty space per packing. Additionally, three boxes (the largest possible and two with reduced postage fee) where explicitly constrained to be part of the solution.

The largest box allowed by the Swiss postal service is  $100 \times 60 \times 60\text{cm}^7$ . Accounting for the carton thickness and the package label as a minimal size, we consider all boxes between  $15.5 \times 15.5 \times 10.5\text{cm}$  and  $99.5 \times 59.5 \times 59.5\text{cm}$  at steps of 1cm. Furthermore, we assume  $\text{length} \geq \text{width} \geq \text{height}$  to avoid symmetries, which results in a total of  $B = 71'790$  possible boxes.

The reported performance numbers are the objective value (empty space in all packing units) normalised by the total volume of packing units, which provides a more comparable score independent of the sample size. The non-linear transformation  $\text{score}/(1 + \text{score})$  then yields average empty volume per box volume, which was the business' key performance indicator.

The following experiments were all done on a MacBook Pro (14-inch, 2021) with “M1 Max” with 64 GB of RAM

<sup>6</sup>See [https://www.wolframalpha.com/input?i=T\(n\)=log\\_2\(n\)%2B6T\(n/2\)andT\(1\)=1](https://www.wolframalpha.com/input?i=T(n)=log_2(n)%2B6T(n/2)andT(1)=1)

<sup>7</sup><https://www.post.ch/de/pakete-versenden/pakete-schweiz/postpac-economy#wichtig-zu-wissen>






Fig. 6. Objective value and the theoretical lower bound for both variants of the Benders decomposition discussed in Section III. Both variants yield comparable results and lower bounds. However, the variant Section III-B with fewer variables and constraints (blue) converges in less than 200s and is much faster, roughly by a factor 42.

and 10 CPU cores. Our implementation uses the open source *Coin-or Branch and Cut (CBC)* solver [7] and *python-mip* [13] wrapper to solve mixed integer programs.

### B. Evaluation of variable-height packaging optimisation

Figure 6 reports the optimisation result along with the lower bound provided by the Benders decomposition. The lower bound provides a theoretical guarantee that no solution can be better and a solution is globally optimal when the bound matches the score of the best found solution. Unfortunately, the optimisation did not find the global optimum and a relative gap of about 21% remained. This gap indicates that the optimal “empty space” is in the range of [39.5% . . . 45.5%]. The lower bound is a theoretical value, though, and the optimum is more likely in between the two, making the gap smaller than it may appear.

We suspect the structure of the carton variable  $z$  to be the reason for stagnation. Recall that it forms a  $43 \times 256$  dimensional hypercube of which  $M = 8$  cartons can be activated. Also, most cartons have 8 neighbours (smaller/bigger in all 3 dimensions) resulting  $8^8 \approx 16M$  neighbouring solutions. This likely requires many Benders optimality cuts to eliminate all near optimal solutions, resulting in the stagnation.

Figure 6 also reports the benefit of moving most optimisation variables into the Benders sub program. The chart shows that having only the carton variables  $z$  in the master program outperforms the alternative significantly. Keeping the box variables  $y$  in the master program increases the number of optimisation variables and adds many complicating constraints, which massively slows down the convergence measured in terms of time.

In summary, simplifying the master program as much as possible is key. Moving the box variables  $y$  to the sub program is cheap, it only requires a simple transformation

from and to the carton variable, i.e. (8) and (9). This results in computational savings from  $8 \times 356s$  to 199s, i.e. a speedup of two orders of magnitude, without loss of accuracy.

### C. KD-Tree versus exhaustive grid bin packing evaluation

The mixed integer optimisation requires the bin packing matrix  $F_{pb}$  as input. This boolean matrix is computed prior to the mixed integer program and is currently the key performance bottleneck. Table IV compares the exhaustive grid evaluation to our adaptive KD-Tree evaluation.

TABLE IV  
COMPARING EXHAUSTIVE GRID AND KD-TREE EVALUATION FOR  $F_{pb}$

	Exhaustive Grid	Adaptive KDTree
CPU-time	535.76h	18.40h
Elapsed (10 core)	74h17m	2h59m
Empty Volume	45.3%	45.5%
Best Score	0.829	0.836
Lower Bound	0.655	0.657

The KD-Tree provides a speedup of 29 in terms of CPU-time with comparable result.

The runtime was measured with UNIX `time` utility showing the CPU-time (as if run on a single core) and overall elapsed time. The latter is not a good performance measure, as the evaluations were run as a background process with low “nice” value. But it provides a rough estimate of how long it runs, while CPU-time is the more robust performance metric.

Overall, the KD-Tree runs only about 3 hours instead of multiple days. Looking at the CPU-time, we observe more than an order of magnitude speedup. The evaluation of packing matrix  $F$  is the most expensive part and having a speedup of 29 is very important for end-to-end runtime.

### D. Optimised Benders sub program performance

Table V reports the performance of the Bender sub program optimisation (Section IV). Overall, the implementation yields an improvement of 3 orders of magnitude. The speedup builds on three complementary aspects:

- 6 fold speedup: bit-packed data representation using C instead of Python implementation
- 40 fold speedup: loading 64 bit words and processing only non-zero bits using dedicated `ctzll` CPU instruction
- 4 fold speedup: parallelisation using OpenMP [4]

TABLE V  
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF EFFICIENT DUAL IMPLEMENTATION

P	Cores	Fast-C	Naive-C	Python
10000	1	0.0302s	1.2065s	7.1931s
10000	10	0.0069s	0.1769s	-
112696	10	0.0618s	1.9398s	out-of-mem

(upper) Comparison with a non-bit optimised Python implementation is done on a  $P = 10k$  subset to avoid unnecessary memory pressure, and timing is averaged over 10 runs. A naive bit-packed C implementation (without `ctz`) yields a 6 fold speed over Python, while exploiting bit-optimised CPU instructions yields another 40 fold speedup. OpenMP parallelisation yields another 4 fold improvement on a 10 core M1 Max. In total, the bit-optimised, multi-core implementation is 3 orders of magnitude faster  $7.2/0.007 = 1029$ . (lower) Performance on full data set (averaged over 100 runs) runs in less than 70ms, making the sub program essentially “cost-free”.

The bit-packed representation is absolutely crucial, not only for performance, but to reduce memory usage by a factor 64, i.e. about 1GB instead of 64GB. This is key to run the optimisation on commodity hardware. Moreover, using dedicated CPU instructions shows significantly more speedup over “just” parallelising on multiple cores. In fact, processing only non-zero bits exploits the sparsity of  $F_{pb}$  which explains the tremendous speedup.<sup>8</sup>

All optimisations combined make solving the Benders sub program almost cost-free. This is a major performance improvement over a naïve implementation and make experiments on an ultra portable laptop possible.

Also recall that the memory usage and runtime of the sub program are linear in the number of packing units  $P$  and that the master program’s runtime does not depend on  $P$ . This is beneficial as using a larger data sample will have little impact on the overall optimisation and allows for experimenting with larger data sets in the future.

## VII. FUTURE WORK & CONCLUSION

### A. Future Work

The presented carton optimisation model focuses on reducing the overall empty space per packing unit. There are however additional metrics worth looking at.

While crease lines allow for making multiple (smaller) boxes out of a carton, it still requires the packer to make small cuts into the carton. This costs additional time compared to only folding the carton into the largest box. This cost could be incorporating into the objective in the future.

Overall, the performance optimisation presented in this work provides a solid basis for further investigation of the above topics. Concerning the Benders decomposition it might be interesting to build on solver callbacks for further improvements [12]. This allows to interleave solving the sub program and the master program to avoid recomputing the master program over and over again.

### B. Conclusion

This paper tackles the problem of finding optimal variable-height transport packaging. This is a challenge faced by online retailers when optimising their shipment process.

We present a mixed integer formulation that models cartons with crease lines. It aims for optimal boxes to ship goods with the least amount of empty space. Minimising empty space is crucial to save on filler, reduce packing time, and improve customer satisfactions.

The key contributions of this paper are problem-specific optimisations to solve that mixed integer program efficiently. The resulting model had over seven billion variables initially and solving it requires optimisations on many different levels.

*Mathematically*, the Benders decomposition is what makes all possible. Our contribution is how to incorporate the crease lines into the Bender decomposition to achieve a 42-fold speedup, with simple transformation of variables.

<sup>8</sup>A sparse matrix representation would probably be less effective due to more irregular memory access and computation overhead.

*Algorithmically*, our KD-Tree based evaluation of the 3D bin packing showed a 29-fold speedup. Bin-packing is currently the bottleneck and this optimisation reduces the overall optimisation to only about three hours on a laptop.

*Computationally*, we show an astonishing speedup of 3 orders of magnitude for evaluating the Benders sub program. This optimisation built on the analytical solution of the linear program and used algorithmic improvement as well as specialised CPU instruction of modern hardware. This makes the sub program almost free of charge and allows for larger data sample in the future.

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. Baltacioglu, “The distributor’s three-dimensional pallet-packing problem: A human intelligence-based heuristic approach,” Master’s thesis, Air Force Institute of Technology, 2001. [Online]. Available: <https://scholar.afit.edu/etd/4563>
- [2] J. F. Benders, “Partitioning procedures for solving mixed-variables programming problems ‘,’” *Numerische mathematik*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 238–252, 1962.
- [3] P. Bonami, D. Salvagnin, and A. Tramontani, “Implementing automatic benders decomposition in a modern mip solver,” in *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, D. Bienstock and G. Zambelli, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 78–90.
- [4] R. Chandra, L. Dagum, D. Kohr, R. Menon, D. Maydan, and J. McDonald, *Parallel programming in OpenMP*. Morgan kaufmann, 2001.
- [5] D. Chapman, “3dcontainerpacking,” <https://github.com/davidmchapman/3DContainerPacking>, 2021.
- [6] M. Fischetti, I. Ljubić, and M. Sinnl, “Redesigning Benders Decomposition for Large-Scale Facility Location,” *Management Science*, vol. 63, no. 7, pp. 2146–2162, July 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://ideas.repec.org/a/inm/ormnsc/v63y2017i7p2146-2162.html>
- [7] J. Forrest, T. Ralphs, H. G. Santos, S. Vigerske, J. Forrest, L. Hafer, B. Kristjansson, jpfasano, EdwinStraver, M. Lubin, rlougee, jpgoncall, Jan-Willem, h-i gassmann, S. Brito, Cristina, M. Saltzman, tostost, B. Pitrus, F. MATSUSHIMA, and to st, “coin-or/cbc: Release releases/2.10.8,” May 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6522795>
- [8] K. S. Gurumoorthy, S. Sanyal, and V. Chaoji, “Think out of the package: Recommending package types for e-commerce shipments,” in *ECML-PKDD 2020*, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.amazon.science/publications/think-out-of-the-package-recommending-package-types-for-e-commerce-shipments>
- [9] S. Martello, D. Pisinger, and D. Vigo, “The three-dimensional bin packing problem,” *Operations Research*, vol. 48, 02 1998.
- [10] B. Miller, “Analyzing dimensional weight pricing and load optimization,” Ortec, Tech. Rep., 2015.
- [11] R. Rahmani, T. G. Crainic, M. Gendreau, and W. Rei, “The benders decomposition algorithm: A literature review,” *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 259, no. 3, pp. 801–817, 2017.
- [12] P. A. Rubin, “Benders decomposition then and now,” Oct. 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://orinanobworld.blogspot.com/2011/10/benders-decomposition-then-and-now.html>
- [13] T. A. M. Toffolo and H. G. Santos, “python-mip: Release releases/2.10.8,” Dec. 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://python-mip.com>
- [14] S. Trukhanov, L. Ntairo, and A. Schaefer, “Adaptive multicut aggregation for two-stage stochastic linear programs with recourse,” *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 206, no. 2, pp. 395–406, 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221710001566>
- [15] P. van Loon, L. Deketele, J. Dewaele, A. McKinnon, and C. Rutherford, “A comparative analysis of carbon emissions from online retailing of fast moving consumer goods,” *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 106, pp. 478–486, 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652614006489>
- [16] C. Weber, C. Hendrickson, P. Jaramillo, S. Matthews, A. Nagengast, and R. Nealer, “Life cycle comparison of traditional retail and e-commerce logistics for electronic products: A case study of buy.com,” Carnegie Mellon University, Tech. Rep., 2008.