International Journal of Computer Information Systems and Industrial Management Applications
ISSN 2150-7988 Volume 18(21s) 2026 pp. 484-491
https://doi.org/10.70917/ijcisim-2026-5322
Article

Automation Decision Framework for Mid-Size Warehouses

Vivek Sander

Independent Researcher, USA

Abstract: Rising labor costs, greater service expectations, and intensifying competitive pressure throughout distribution networks have all pushed warehouse automation into a strategic priority in logistics management. Although big distribution hubs have traditionally driven automation implementation, mid-sized warehouse activities are increasingly considering automation investments as technology costs fall and solution adaptability grows. Mid-size warehouses, on the other hand, have distinct limitations that set their automation evaluation scenario apart from big facilities: smaller capital budgets, return-on-investment schedules not longer than eighteen months, multi-client service needs, and restricted disruption tolerance during technology deployment. These limitations demand a systematic approach to automation decision-making for which frameworks designed for large enterprise distribution centers, with their fixed corporate standards, are seldom an appropriate fit. Organized across five dimensions—operational readiness, financial viability, client alignment, technology flexibility, and contract stability—this paper offers an Automation Decision Framework for mid-sized warehouse environments. Before capital investment, the system provides a methodical approach to assess automation investments, thereby lowering the possibility of failed implementations limiting future technology adoption indefinitely. Process standardization, WMS feature improvement, workflow optimization, and semi-automation deployment are all discussed in the study of the readiness path mid-sized warehouses must take before they may implement sophisticated automation. Three types of automation technology fit for medium-sized warehousing settings are assessed: Autonomous Mobile Robots, Automated Storage and Retrieval Systems, and Goods-to-Person systems. As fundamental elements of automation rationale, financial metrics including depreciation, total cost of ownership, and contract alignment are discussed. The framework provides operations and logistics engineering leaders with a strict decision architecture for assessing, sequencing, and carrying out automation investments that offer long-lasting operating and financial returns in mid-size warehousing settings.

Keywords: warehouse automation, mid-size warehouse, AMR, AS/RS, Goods-to-Person, ROI, 3PL, automation readiness, decision framework

1. Introduction

Automation is reshaping the operational architecture of logistics warehouses at an accelerating pace. The convergence of declining technology costs, rising labor market pressures, and increasingly sophisticated customer service expectations has elevated automation from an aspirational investment to a competitive necessity across distribution networks of all scales [1]. For mid-size warehouse operations—typically facilities ranging from 100,000 to 500,000 square feet processing tens of thousands of orders per week—this pressure to automate is real and intensifying. Yet the pathway to successful automation in mid-size environments is substantially more constrained than in large-scale distribution operations.

The automation challenges specific to mid-size warehouses derive primarily from their financial and operational context. Capital budgets are limited and must be allocated competitively across multiple investment priorities. Customer contract terms frequently limit the time horizon over which automation investments can be amortized. Multi-client service obligations introduce operational variability that constrains the process standardization that automation systems require. And the organizational consequences of a failed automation investment—both financial and reputational—are disproportionately severe for mid-size operations that lack the capital reserves to absorb implementation failures [2].

Research and industry data consistently show that well-chosen, effectively implemented automation solutions provide obvious operating benefits in medium-sized warehouse environments. The fundamental element is the thoroughness of the decision-making process by means of which automation investments are assessed, chosen, and sequenced, rather than the technology itself. Often outracing those who use technology reactively or in response to vendor suggestions devoid of enough operational assessment [3], companies that deliberately approach automation with a structured evaluation framework often outpace others.

This article presents an Automation Decision Framework designed specifically for mid-size warehouse environments. The framework integrates operational readiness assessment, financial feasibility analysis, customer alignment requirements, technology evaluation criteria, and contract stability considerations into a coherent decision architecture. The subsequent sections examine each component of the framework in depth, with particular attention to the three automation technology categories most applicable to mid-size operations: Autonomous Mobile Robots (AMR), Automated Storage and Retrieval Systems (AS/RS), and Goods-to-Person (GTP) systems.

2. The Automation Challenge in Mid-Size Warehouse Environments

The automation landscape for mid-size warehouses is characterized by three structural constraints that do not apply with equal force to large distribution centers. The first is capital limitation. Large enterprise distribution centers typically operate within capital allocation frameworks that treat automation as a multi-year, high-value investment category. Mid-size operations must evaluate automation investments against a broader range of competing capital requirements, and the opportunity cost of committing capital to automation that fails to deliver planned returns is substantially higher [4].

The second limitation is the hope of a fast return on invested capital. Usually necessary in midsize 3PL settings, automation investments help provide a return in twelve to eighteen months. This shortened timeline greatly limits the range of financially justified technology and distribution levels. It also makes automation economics more sensitive to any departure from intended productivity gains, whether caused by implementation delays, operational disturbance, or lower-than-projected volume throughput [5]. Conversely, three operational characteristics materially accelerate ROI realization in mid-size automation deployments: high-volume throughput, which compresses the effective payback window by raising the productivity dividend per unit of capital deployed; multi-shift operating profiles, where 24×7 sites typically recover invested capital nearly three times faster than single-shift facilities owing to fuller asset utilization; and future scalability of operations, which allows the same automation footprint to absorb growing volumes without proportional incremental investment. Operations that combine these characteristics offer the most defensible automation business case under mid-size payback constraints.

The third constraint is the limited organizational tolerance for operational failure. A failed automation project in a mid-size operation does not merely represent a capital loss—it erodes organizational confidence in technology investment, may damage customer relationships if service levels are disrupted during implementation, and may effectively preclude further automation investment for years as leadership rebuilds confidence in the organization's ability to execute technology projects. This dynamic makes the quality of the automation evaluation process a risk management imperative as much as an investment optimization exercise [6].

Constraint Dimension	Large Distribution Centers	Mid-Size Warehouses (100K–500K sq ft)
Capital Allocation Approach	Multi-year, high-value investment category	Competitive allocation against multiple priorities
ROI Expectation Timeline	Multi-year payback accepted	12–18 months required

Tolerance for Implementation Failure	Capital reserves absorb losses	Disproportionately severe financial and reputational impact
Contract Amortization Horizon	Long-term, flexible	Constrained by short-term customer contracts
Organizational Recovery Post-Failure	Moderate disruption	May preclude further automation investment for years
Technology Scope	Full-facility automation viable	Targeted, phased automation preferred

Table 1: Structural Constraints Comparison — Mid-Size vs. Large Distribution Centers [2, 4]

3. Customer Alignment in 3PL Automation Projects

In third-party logistics environments, automation decisions usually involve others besides the logistics provider. Because automation typically affects the operational workflows, system interfaces, and pricing structures that govern customer service delivery, customers must be meaningfully engaged in the automation planning process before investments are committed. Customer alignment failures—situations in which automation projects proceed without adequate customer engagement and then require disruptive operational changes that affect service delivery—represent one of the most common sources of 3PL automation failure [7].

Customer alignment in automation projects encompasses several distinct dimensions. First, customers must understand and accept any changes to operational workflows that automation will introduce. If an AMR deployment changes the layout of the picking floor, the resulting changes to pick paths, slotting, and outbound staging can affect downstream compliance requirements imposed by the customer's own retail stores or distribution centers—routing guides, labeling and barcoding rules, packaging standards, pallet build specifications, and EDI or system-interface formats. Customers must therefore share these compliance implications with the 3PL provider in advance so that the AMR workflow is configured to preserve, rather than violate, their downstream service obligations. If an AS/RS implementation changes the storage and retrieval logic for customer inventory, that logic must align with each customer's prescribed storage rules—FIFO, FEFO, LIFO, batch and lot segregation, serial-number tracking, or quarantine handling—rather than defaulting to the system's native optimization heuristics. Customers must understand how the configured logic affects inventory visibility, lot control, expiration management, and special handling requirements, and any deviation from their existing storage policy must be reconciled before commissioning. Surfacing these implications early and securing customer agreement before implementation avoids the operational friction that mid-project change negotiations invariably create [8].

Second, customers must be aligned on the financial implications of automation investments. In 3PL environments, the productivity gains from automation may be shared with customers through reduced operating costs or retained by the logistics provider to recover capital investment. The terms of this value distribution must be clearly defined in customer contracts before automation projects begin. Organizations that attempt to reconfigure pricing structures mid-contract after automation deployment typically encounter significant customer resistance that can threaten contract renewal [9].

4. The Automation Readiness Journey

Automation readiness is a developmental journey organizations have to go on before implementing sophisticated automation technologies; it is not a fixed condition. Companies that try to apply automated storage systems or robotics before building robust operational foundations consistently fall short of their productivity targets and often fail implementation that could have been avoided with a more methodical readiness strategy [10].

Enhancement of WMS marks the start of the readiness path. Automation systems depend on correct, real-time inventory data, consistent task management logic, and strong system integration to run properly—that is, they are inherently data-dependent. Whatever the level of sophistication of the automation technology, WMS systems without real-time inventory accuracy, thorough task interleaving capabilities, or integration-ready architecture cannot support automation effectively. Therefore, it is not an optional improvement but rather a prerequisite; addressing WMS deficiencies before automation deployment is so necessary [11].

Process standardization is the second readiness requirement. Automation systems execute defined operational workflows with high consistency and limited adaptability. If the workflows they are designed to execute are not consistently followed in the current manual operation, automation will encode existing inefficiencies at machine speed rather than improving performance. Organizations must audit and standardize their operational processes—receiving, storage, picking, packing, and shipping—before automation deployment to ensure that the processes being automated are the correct and optimal processes [3].

Semi-automation deployment represents the final readiness stage before full automation commitment. Semi-automation solutions—pick-to-light systems, conveyor-assisted packing lines, and automated label applicators—deliver measurable productivity improvements at significantly lower capital investment than full automation. They also serve as operational proving grounds that help organizations identify the process standardization gaps and system integration challenges that would undermine full automation performance, allowing them to be resolved before larger capital commitments are made [12].

Readiness Stage	Key Actions Required	Readiness Indicator	Consequence if Skipped
Stage 1 — WMS Enhancement	Achieve real-time inventory accuracy; enable task interleaving; build integration-ready architecture	WMS supports live data feeds and API connectivity	Automation systems operate on inaccurate data, causing fulfillment errors
Stage 2 — Process Standardization	Audit and standardize receiving, storage, picking, packing, and shipping workflows	All processes documented and consistently followed	Automation encodes existing inefficiencies at machine speed
Stage 3 — Workflow Optimization	Eliminate redundant steps and align workflows to automation logic requirements	Optimized workflows validated through manual operation	Suboptimal automation performance from day one
Stage 4 — Semi-Automation Deployment	Deploy pick-to-light, conveyor-assisted packing, and automated label applicators	Measurable productivity gains achieved; integration gaps identified	Full automation capital committed without identifying avoidable failure points
Stage 5 — Full Automation Readiness	Confirm stable operations across all prior stages; validate system integration	Consistent throughput, inventory accuracy, and process adherence metrics	Increased risk of failed full automation implementation

Table 2: Automation Readiness Stages and Prerequisites [10, 11, 12]

5. Autonomous Mobile Robots in Mid-Size Warehouses

There are many economic and operational justifications for using AMR (automated mobile robots) as an automated solution in mid-sized warehousing applications. Real-time mapping algorithms and onboard sensor systems enable AMRs to transport products to and from warehousing locations, pick stations, and packing areas without requiring continuous changes to the underlying infrastructure. Scalability matches medium-sized companies' capital constraints [13] because AMR's capacity for a phased expansion of effective operations increases with the addition of more robots. In addition, all AMR's positions of activity do not require any structural changes to the facility.

The main practical advantage of AMR implementation is the decrease in non-value-added travel time in picking activities. Operators in traditional manual picking situations might devote fifty percent or more of their work time going between storage sites. Typically providing picking efficiency gains in the thirty to fifty percent range depending on the operational profile and deployment setup, AMR systems that bring storage sites to fixed pick stations or that lead operators through optimized picking paths can significantly reduce this travel time [14].

The technology's somewhat low capital requirement in contrast to fixed automation solutions, its fast deployment timeline—systems often become running in weeks rather than months—and its flexibility to be reconfigured or redistributed as operating needs change support the financial justification for AMR installation in mid-size warehouses. 3PL providers catering to customers under short-term contracts have a major financial edge over fixed automation investments [15], as they may redeploy AMR assets over client accounts or alter deployment configurations without capital write-off.

Evaluation Criteria	**Autonomous Mobile Robots (AMR)**	**Automated Storage & Retrieval Systems (AS/RS)**	**Goods-to-Person (GTP) Systems**
Infrastructure Requirement	No structural facility changes needed	Requires dedicated high-density storage structures	Requires fixed workstations and integrated storage system
Deployment Timeline	Weeks	Months	Months
Scalability Model	Phased — add robots incrementally	Fixed capacity at installation; expansion requires structural investment	Expandable workstation capacity
Primary Operational Benefit	Reduces picker travel time (30–50% efficiency gain)	Increases storage density (2–3× vs. selective racking)	Delivers inventory to stationary operators (2–3× picking productivity)
Best-Fit Warehouse Profile	Multi-client, variable layout, short-term contracts	High real-estate cost environments; high-value or security-sensitive inventory	E-commerce, high SKU count, each-pick fulfillment
Capital Flexibility	High — assets redeployable across clients	Low — fixed investment tied to facility	Moderate-workstations can be reconfigured
Operator Role	Guided or assisted picking	Reduced storage/retrieval labor	Stationary pick-and-pack operator
3PL Suitability	High	Moderate (best for stable, long-term clients)	High for e-commerce 3PL clients

Table 3: AMR vs. AS/RS vs. Goods-to-Person — Technology Comparison for Mid-Size Warehouses [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]

6. Automated Storage and Retrieval Systems and Goods-to-Person Technologies

Automated storage and Retrieval Systems use robotic cranes, shuttle vehicles, or vertical carousel mechanisms to automatically store and retrieve inventory from high-density storage structures. AS/RS technology is particularly well suited to warehouses where storage density is a binding constraint, where inventory accuracy requirements are stringent, or where rapid, precise retrieval of specific inventory items is operationally critical. For mid-size warehouses operating in high real-estate-cost environments or managing high-value, security-sensitive inventory, AS/RS can deliver compelling operational and financial returns [16].

Operational advantages of AS/RS installation include much greater storage density—automated storage systems typically have two to three times the storage density of traditional selective racking—better inventory accuracy via system-controlled storage and retrieval transactions, lower labor needs for storage and retrieval activities, and quicker retrieval times for high-velocity SKUs. Mid-sized businesses can get these advantages without committing to total-facility automation [17] by targeted AS/RS installation in particular warehouse regions like tiny parts storage, high-value inventory zones, or temperature-controlled storage areas.

By combining automated storage and retrieval with ergonomic workstation design, goods-to-person systems stretch the AS/RS concept to provide inventory straight to stationary operators executing pick and pack chores without roaming the warehouse. Operations with many SKU assortments, high order numbers, and each-pick fulfillment needs benefit especially well from GTP systems. While increasing picking precision and lowering operator tiredness, studies have shown GTP systems providing two to three times the picking productivity of manual picking activities [18]. For mid-sized 3PL companies assisting e-commerce consumers, GTP technology provides a great-impact automation investment that tackles the labor-intensive quality of little order fulfillment.

7. Financial Evaluation Criteria for Automation Investments

The financial assessment of automation investments in mid-size warehouse settings has to cover the whole financial effect of technological implementation over the pertinent time horizon beyond basic return on investment computations. This calls for research over many financial dimensions that are often undervalued in automation business plans [19].

Depreciation analysis determines how the capital cost of automating equipment will be spread over the financial reporting periods during which the machinery runs. Though depreciation schedules and the contract lengths they must be recovered inside might be considerably shorter, automation systems in warehouse settings generally have operational lifespans of seven to twelve years. Building financially correct business cases and making sure automation pricing reflects actual cost recovery needs depend on an awareness of the depreciation consequences of automation investments.

Beyond acquisition price, total cost of ownership analysis covers the full lifecycle cost of automation deployment, including installation, system integration, operator training, preventative maintenance programs, spare parts inventory, software licensing and update fees, and the expense of operational interruption during commissioning and implementation. Studies on automation investment results consistently show that businesses that don't effectively model total cost of ownership systematically underestimate the genuine financial investment of automation initiatives, therefore causing profit losses that hurt both operator trust and customer relationships [20].

8. The Automation Decision Framework

The Automation Decision Framework given here combines the analytical aspects discussed in the previous chapters into a methodical assessment sequence that mid-size warehouse operators can follow consistently before allocating funds to automated systems. Each of the five criteria the framework assesses automation opportunities must come back favorable before an investment may go forward.

Operational readiness assesses the process standardization, WMS ability, and operational stability required in the warehouse to allow automation performance. Given reasonable productivity assumptions and total cost of ownership estimates, financial feasibility assesses if the investment can meet the demanded ROI inside the relevant payback time frame. Customer alignment determines if customers who will be impacted by the automation's inventory or service delivery have been engaged and have consented to the operational adjustments the implementation will make. Technology flexibility judges whether the automation solution may adjust to shifts in operational needs—SKU mix changes, volume fluctuations, or customer transitions—that may present during the investment payback period. Contract stability determines whether consumer agreements go enough beyond the ROI recovery date to guarantee that the investment will be completely reimbursed before contract expiration. Financial risk is brought about by uncertainty [2].

Better implementation results, fewer post-deployment operational interruptions, and higher financial returns are all consistently attained by companies that systematically use this framework prior to automation investments than by those who move forward without careful assessment. Though the framework does not remove automation risk, it helps to find and solve the most frequent causes of automation failure before money is committed, hence increasing the chance of successful deployment significantly.

Framework Dimension	Key Assessment Questions	Go Condition	No-Go Indicator
Operational Readiness	Is the WMS capable of supporting automation data needs? Are operational processes standardized and stable?	WMS integration-ready; processes consistently followed	Active WMS deficiencies; unstandardized workflows
Financial Feasibility	Does the investment meet the required ROI within the payback period using realistic productivity and TCO assumptions?	Positive ROI within 12–18 months under conservative assumptions	ROI dependent on best-case volume or productivity projections
Customer Alignment	Have affected customers been engaged and agreed to operational and pricing changes the automation will require?	Written customer agreement on workflow changes and pricing terms	Customer engagement pending or pricing terms unresolved
Technology Flexibility	Can the automation solution adapt to SKU mix changes, volume fluctuations, or client transitions during the payback period?	The solution supports reconfiguration without capital write-off	Fixed solution with no redeployment or reconfiguration capability
Contract Stability	Do customer contracts extend sufficiently beyond the ROI recovery date to guarantee full investment reimbursement?	The contract term exceeds payback period by meaningful margin	Contract expiration coincides with or precedes full cost recovery

Table 4: Automation Decision Framework — Five-Dimension Assessment Checklist [2, 3, 6]

9. Conclusion

Automation represents one of the most significant operational and financial investment decisions that mid-size warehouse operators face in the current competitive environment. The potential benefits—improved productivity, reduced labor dependency, enhanced service reliability—are real and achievable. But they are achievable only when automation investments are preceded by the operational readiness development, financial analysis, customer alignment, and strategic sequencing that the complexity of warehouse automation demands.

The Automation Decision Framework presented in this article provides logistics engineering and operations leaders with a structured decision architecture for evaluating automation opportunities with the rigor that mid-size operations require. By assessing operational readiness, financial feasibility, customer alignment, technology flexibility, and contract stability systematically before committing capital, organizations can substantially reduce automation risk while improving the probability that their investments will deliver the productivity gains, cost improvements, and competitive differentiation that justify the commitment.

As automation technology continues to evolve—with AMR systems becoming increasingly capable, AS/RS costs continuing to decline, and GTP systems expanding their applicability to smaller-scale operations—the strategic importance of structured automation decision-making will only increase. Organizations that develop the institutional capability to evaluate and execute automation investments effectively will gain an enduring operational and competitive advantage in the logistics markets they serve.

REFERENCES

1. Natnaree Nantee & Panitas Sureeyatanapas, "The Impact of Logistics 4.0 on Corporate Sustainability: A Performance Assessment of Automated Warehouse Operations," Benchmarking: An International Journal, vol. 28, no. 10, pp. 2865–2895, 2021. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/BIJ-11-2020-0583/full/html
2. Vivek Kumar Dubey, Dharmaraj Veeramani , "A Decision-Making Framework for Automating Distribution Centers in the Retail Supply Chain," Heliyon, vol. 10, no. 10, p. e30854, 2024. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2405844024068853
3. Martina Baglio et al., "'Logistics 4.0' Technologies in the 3PL Industry: A Maturity Model," Production Planning and Control, vol. 36, no. 12, pp. 1696–1712, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2024.2405717
4. Sadia Samar Ali et al., "A Framework of Enablers of Third-Party Logistics Service Providers (3PLs) for Smart Warehousing in Emerging Economy," Journal of Enterprise Information Management, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 1089–1125, 2025. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JEIM-05-2023-0273/full/html
5. Aurélie Edouard, "Automated Storage and Retrieval Systems: An Attractive Solution for an Urban Warehouse's Sustainable Development," Sustainability, vol. 14, no. 15, p. 9518, 2022. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/15/9518
6. Aurelija Burinskiene, "The Framework for Strategic Decision Making for the Implementation of Collaborative Mobile Robots for Warehouse Automatisation: Methodology Presentation," in International Conference on Industrial Logistics, Springer, 2025. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-032-14489-8_22
7. Frederik H. Nielsen, "Designing a Compatibility Evaluation Framework for Integration of 3PL Warehouse Clients in Warehouse Systems: An Action Design Research Study in a Danish 3PL Company," Proceedings of the Design Society, vol. 5, pp. 1305–1314, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1017/pds.2025.10144
8. Martina Baglio et al, "The 'Perfect'" Warehouse: How Third-Party Logistics Providers Evaluate Warehouse Features and Their Performance," Applied Sciences, vol. 13, no. 5, p. 3316, 2023. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/13/12/6862
9. Antonov, Aleksandr, "Automation of Warehouse Handling Processes at the Seaport as Part of an Integrated Scenario Supported by the 3PL Operator," Lappeenranta University of Technology, Master's Thesis, 2022. https://lutpub.lut.fi/handle/10024/164409
10. Zeenat Khan1 and Mohsin Bilal Ahmed, "Advancements in Automated Storage and Retrieval Systems: A Comprehensive Review," Robotics and Automation Engineering Journal, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2025. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388354352_Automated_Storage_and_Retrieval_Systems_A_Comprehensive_Review
11. Augustyn Lorenc, Aurelija Burinskiene, "Improve the Orders Picking in E-Commerce by Using WMS Data and Big Data Analysis," FME Transactions, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 73–81, 2021. https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/1451-2092/2021/1451-20922101233L.pdf
12. Bruno J. B. Julião , "A Systematic Lean-Driven Framework for Warehouse Optimization," Systems, vol. 13, no. 9, p. 813, 2025. https://www.mdpi.com/2079-8954/13/9/813
13. Kaveh Azadeh, "Robotized Warehouses—Design and Performance Analysis," Erasmus University Rotterdam, PhD Thesis, 2021. https://pure.eur.nl/en/publications/robotized-warehouses-design-and-performance-analysis
14. Paweł Rymarczyk, "Optimizing Order Picking Processes in Warehouses: Strategies for Efficient Routing and Clustering," Journal of Modern Science, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 74–93, 2024. https://www.jomswsge.com/Optimizing-order-picking-processes-in-warehouses-strategies-for-efficient-routing,191201,0,2.html
15. Masoud Zafarzadeh, "A Systematic Review on Technologies for Data-Driven Production Logistics: Their Role from a Holistic and Value Creation Perspective," Logistics, vol. 5, no. 2, p. 23, 2021. https://www.mdpi.com/2305-6290/5/2/24
16. Lucia Cassettari, "A 4.0 Automated Warehouse Storage and Picking System for Order Fulfillment," Lecture Notes in Mechanical Engineering, 2021. https://www.iaeng.org/publication/WCE2021/WCE2021_pp317-327.pdf
17. Konrad Lewczuk, "The Study on the Automated Storage and Retrieval System Dependability," Eksploatacja i Niezawodnosc—Maintenance and Reliability, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 709–718, 2021. https://ein.org.pl/The-study-on-the-automated-storage-and-retrieval-system-dependability,158426,0,2.html
18. J. C. Duque-Jaramillo, et al., "Warehouse Management Optimization Using a Sorting-Based Slotting Approach," Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 285–303, 2024. https://jiem.org/index.php/jiem/article/view/5661
19. Alessandro Chiaraviglio et al., "Overall Warehouse Effectiveness (OWE): A New Integrated Performance Indicator for Warehouse Operations," Logistics, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 7, 2025. https://www.mdpi.com/2305-6290/9/1/7
20. Noorul Shaiful Fitri Abdul Rahman, "Decision Analysis of Warehouse Productivity Performance Indicators to Enhance Logistics Operational Efficiency," International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, vol. 72, no. 8, pp. 2087–2112, 2023. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJPPM-06-2021-0373/full/html