

Peak-to-Average Ratio Engineering for Grocery Distribution Centers

Shubham Sanjay Beldar

Independent Researcher, USA

Abstract

Grocery distribution hubs are unstable in terms of their day-to-day activities, and this instability is mainly caused by their promotional calendars, seasonal consumption patterns, the perishable nature of the products, and the concentration of the last-mile delivery windows. Traditional capacity planning tries to handle the situation by oversizing the facilities in a conservative way, which leads to a continuous underutilization of the infrastructure and increased capital requirements. Current methods rely on empirical peak observations with safety factors, lacking systematic frameworks for demand profile optimization. Peak-to-Average Ratio Engineering introduces formal mathematical techniques for restructuring operational demand curves while preserving weekly throughput integrity. The framework begins with a statistical decomposition separating structural demand components from stochastic variation. Proportional redistribution algorithms reallocate excess peak volume to lower-demand periods within operationally feasible windows. Constraint integration addresses service level requirements, product-specific handling characteristics, shelf-life boundaries, and labor availability patterns. Multi-stage validation ensures throughput feasibility, inventory adequacy, and service commitment preservation. Application scenarios demonstrate framework versatility across perishables networks requiring shelf-life-aware redistribution, mixed-temperature facilities enabling zone-specific optimization strategies, and urban micro-fulfillment centers facing acute space constraints. Supply chain stability principles reveal how demand volatility amplifies through network dynamics, establishing fundamental justification for proactive demand restructuring. Omnichannel retail complexity compounds infrastructure challenges as multiple fulfillment channels compete for shared capacity. This framework changes the distribution system design from a reactive stance to proactive demand engineering, which makes it possible to achieve significant reductions in the required storage cube, automation capacity, and the associated capital investment without compromising operational performance standards across the diverse grocery distribution architectures.

Keywords: Peak-to-Average Ratio Engineering, Demand Profile Optimization, Grocery Distribution Centers, Cold Chain Infrastructure, Perishables Network Design, Urban Micro-Fulfillment

I. Introduction

Grocery distribution centers operate under fundamentally different conditions compared to general merchandise facilities. The food supply chain is subject to various uncertainties due to the multiple interconnected sources it has. The perishability of the products causes their value to gradually decrease with time, and this, in turn, limits the operational flexibility. Consumer demand is a structured, volatile one, and it is driven by promotional activities, seasonal patterns, and an increasingly variable last-mile delivery requirement. Temperature-sensitive products need to be handled and stored in segregated environments; thus, the infrastructure complexity increases with each new zone introduced: refrigerated, frozen, or ambient within single facilities.

10.48047/jocaaa.2025.34.12.89

Supply chain uncertainty in food distribution manifests through both demand-side and supply-side mechanisms [1]. Demand variability originates from promotional calendar coordination across retail networks, where advertising cycles and markdown schedules generate predictable yet pronounced volume spikes. The consumption patterns that follow the seasons affect not only one product category but all of them at the same time, thus creating correlated surges which further fluctuate individual SKU-level. On the supply side, uncertainty is the result of variability in agricultural production, disruptions in transportation of temperature-controlled networks, and quality control rejection, which happens more frequently with perishable goods. The combination of these uncertainties leads to propagation through distribution networks, with the result being the amplification of the volatility at intermediate nodes where inventory buffering options are still limited by shelf-life constraints.

Traditional capacity planning methodologies respond to observed volatility through conservative facility oversizing. Distribution centers are engineered to accommodate design-day throughput representing extreme percentiles of annual volume distributions. Storage infrastructure scales to peak inventory positions despite average operating conditions requiring substantially reduced cube. Automated material handling systems—including conveyor networks, sortation equipment, and goods-to-person technologies—invest capital based on infrequent peak throughput requirements. This design philosophy generates persistent operational inefficiencies. Facilities operate significantly below installed capacity during baseline periods spanning the majority of annual operating days. Capital investments depreciate against underutilized infrastructure. Labor planning incorporates excessive variability as workforce requirements fluctuate substantially within weekly cycles.

Warehouse operations research has extensively addressed facility design optimization, primarily focusing on layout configuration, storage assignment policies, and order picking strategies [2]. Distribution center modeling typically emphasizes throughput maximization under steady-state assumptions or evaluates performance across predetermined demand scenarios. However, existing frameworks treat demand patterns as exogenous inputs rather than engineerable design variables. The fundamental question of whether and how demand profiles themselves can be systematically optimized to improve infrastructure efficiency remains largely unaddressed in distribution systems literature.

Food supply chain management emphasizes uncertainty reduction through information sharing, demand forecasting improvements, and coordination mechanisms between supply chain partners [1]. Vendormanaged inventory systems, collaborative planning initiatives, and advanced forecasting techniques all aim to reduce demand variability as perceived by individual network nodes. Yet these approaches focus on prediction accuracy rather than deliberate demand restructuring. Peak-to-average volume ratios persist even with improved forecasting when underlying demand drivers—promotional timing, seasonal consumption, delivery window preferences—remain unchanged.

PARE introduces a complementary perspective by treating demand profile characteristics as design parameters subject to engineering optimization. The framework provides analytical methods to evaluate demand redistribution strategies, quantify resulting infrastructure implications, and establish optimal facility sizing parameters. This approach transforms capacity planning from reactive accommodation of observed patterns to proactive structuring of throughput profiles aligned with operational efficiency objectives while preserving service requirements.

Product	Demand Variability	Redistribution	Optimization	Planning
Category	Pattern	Window	Boundary	Consideration

10.48047/jocaaa.2025.34.12.89

Fresh Produce	High promotional sensitivity, seasonal growing cycles	Hours to a single day	Ultra-short shelf life	Quality degradation prevention
Dairy Products	Moderate promotional response, continuous cold chain	Adjacent planning periods	Standard refrigeration requirements	Inventory rotation protocols
Frozen Foods	Summer seasonal peaks, ice cream/convenience spikes	Multiple days to a full week	Extended storage viability	Storage capacity constraints
Ambient Grocery	Recurring promotional patterns, forward buying	Full weekly windows	Minimal perishability concerns	Broad temporal flexibility
Prepared Foods/Deli	Attenuated promotional lift, limited storage	Same day to next day	Single-digit shelflife counts	Immediate consumption alignment

Table 1. Demand Profile Characteristics and Optimization Boundaries in Grocery Distribution [1, 2]

II. Related Work and Methodology

A. Existing Approaches to Distribution Center Capacity Planning

Distribution center design literature traditionally focuses on facility layout optimization, storage assignment policies, and material handling system selection. Classical warehouse design methodologies treat demand patterns as fixed inputs derived from historical observations. Capacity planning models typically apply peak-day throughput values adjusted by safety factors ranging from standard percentages. These approaches assume demand volatility represents an immutable external constraint rather than an engineerable design variable.

Supply chain management literature addresses demand volatility primarily through forecasting accuracy improvements and information sharing mechanisms. Collaborative planning initiatives are designed to address demand uncertainty by raising the level of visibility across supply chain partners. Vendormanaged inventory systems transfer the forecasting responsibility to suppliers with a broader market perspective. Advanced forecasting techniques apply machine learning algorithms to historical patterns, seeking prediction improvements. However, these methods focus exclusively on better anticipating existing demand patterns rather than systematically restructuring those patterns.

Inventory optimization research extensively addresses safety stock calculations under demand uncertainty. Newsvendor models determine optimal order quantities, balancing shortage and excess inventory costs. Service level constraints establish acceptable stockout probabilities, guiding safety stock investments. Stochastic inventory theory provides mathematical frameworks for managing uncertainty through buffer stock. Yet these approaches accept demand volatility as given, optimizing inventory responses rather than addressing the underlying demand structure.

Production smoothing literature from manufacturing contexts offers relevant precedents. Level production strategies maintain constant output rates despite variable demand by accumulating finished goods inventory during low-demand periods. Aggregate planning models optimize production rates, workforce levels, and inventory positions across planning horizons. However, direct application to grocery distribution fails due to perishability constraints preventing inventory accumulation strategies.

10.48047/jocaaa.2025.34.12.89

Manufacturing smoothing relies fundamentally on finished goods storage capacity unavailable for shortshelf-life products.

B. Novel Contributions of PARE

While PARE incorporates elements from established supply chain methodologies, it introduces several distinct contributions that differentiate it from existing approaches. Table 2 provides a comparative analysis of conventional methods against the PARE framework.

Aspect	Existing Methods	PARE Framework
Treatment of Demand	Demand treated as exogenous input; focus on prediction accuracy	Demand is treated as an engineerable design variable subject to optimization
Optimization Objective	Minimize forecast error or inventory costs	Minimize peak-to-average ratio while preserving throughput integrity
Perishability Handling	Generic shelf-life constraints are applied uniformly	Product-specific redistribution windows calibrated to viability periods
Temperature Zone Integration	Single-zone optimization or independent zone planning	Cross-zone coordination with zone-specific aggressiveness levels
Capacity Planning Approach	Reactive sizing based on observed peaks plus safety factors	Proactive demand restructuring to reduce required infrastructure investment
Service Level Integration	Post-hoc validation of service commitments	Embedded constraints ensuring service preservation during optimization
Volatility Response	Safety stock accumulation and forecasting improvements	Systematic restructuring of underlying demand profile characteristics
Mathematical Foundation	Heuristic smoothing techniques and empirical adjustments	Constrained optimization with formal throughput conservation guarantees

Table 2. Comparative Analysis: Existing Methods vs. PARE Framework

The PARE framework advances distribution center planning through the following novel contributions: **Demand as an Engineerable Variable.** Traditional capacity planning accepts demand patterns as fixed inputs derived from historical observations. PARE fundamentally reframes this assumption by treating demand profile characteristics—peak timing, volume concentration, day-of-week distribution—as design parameters subject to deliberate optimization. This paradigm shift enables proactive infrastructure rightsizing rather than reactive accommodation of observed volatility patterns.

Mathematical Formalization of Perishable Redistribution Boundaries. Existing inventory models apply generic shelf-life constraints without systematic frameworks for temporal redistribution limits. PARE introduces formal mathematical boundaries calibrated to product-specific viability periods. Ultrafresh items receive narrow redistribution windows measured in hours, while ambient products permit week-long temporal flexibility. This formalization enables precise quantification of achievable demand smoothing across heterogeneous product portfolios.

Multi-Objective Optimization with Embedded Service Constraints. Conventional demand smoothing approaches optimize single objectives—typically cost minimization or forecast accuracy—with service levels validated post-hoc. PARE embeds service level requirements directly within the optimization

10.48047/jocaaa.2025.34.12.89

formulation as hard constraints. This integration guarantees that redistributed demand profiles preserve customer delivery commitments, order fulfillment rates, and delivery window accuracy throughout the optimization process.

Zone-Specific Temperature Regime Integration. Mixed-temperature distribution facilities traditionally optimize each zone independently or apply uniform strategies across temperature regimes. PARE recognizes the differential temporal flexibility inherent in ambient, refrigerated, and frozen storage environments. The framework implements zone-specific optimization aggressiveness—aggressive smoothing for ambient categories, moderate redistribution for frozen products, and conservative approaches for refrigerated items with compressed shelf-life boundaries. Cross-zone resource sharing opportunities emerge when zone-specific peak periods exhibit temporal misalignment.

Throughput Conservation with Volatility Reduction. Unlike production smoothing techniques that may alter total output volumes, PARE maintains strict throughput conservation. Weekly volume totals remain constant under redistribution, ensuring customer demand fulfillment while achieving infrastructure efficiency gains. This conservation guarantee distinguishes PARE from approaches that reduce volatility through demand destruction or service degradation.

C. Peak-to-Average Ratio Engineering Methodology

PARE introduces demand profile characteristics as explicit design variables subject to optimization. The methodology begins with comprehensive demand pattern analysis across historical operating periods. Statistical decomposition techniques separate systematic components from random variation. Systematic elements include promotional cycles, seasonal patterns, and day-of-week effects. Random components capture unpredictable fluctuations resistant to structural explanation. This decomposition enables targeted optimization of controllable demand drivers.

The core mathematical framework formulates demand redistribution as a constrained optimization problem. Decision variables represent daily throughput allocations across planning windows. The objective function minimizes peak-to-average ratios or related volatility metrics. Equality constraints enforce throughput conservation, ensuring total weekly volume remains constant. Inequality constraints implement operational boundaries, including minimum throughput floors and maximum capacity ceilings. Product-specific constraints address perishability windows, limiting temporal redistribution ranges. Algorithm architecture employs iterative refinement procedures. Initial solutions apply proportional redistribution heuristics, transferring excess peak volume to available low-demand periods. Feasibility checking validates solutions against all operational constraints. Infeasible solutions trigger constraint relaxation or window adjustment procedures. Sensitivity analysis evaluates solution robustness across demand forecast error ranges. Multiple objective formulations enable tradeoff analysis between volatility reduction and operational consistency.

Validation methodology incorporates multi-stage verification procedures. Throughput feasibility assessment confirms redistributed demand curves remain within facility processing limits. Inventory position simulation tracks stock levels across planning periods under modified demand patterns. Service level analysis validates that customer delivery commitments remain satisfied. Labor scheduling evaluation confirms that workforce availability aligns with redistributed throughput requirements. Transportation capacity assessment verifies inbound and outbound logistics support for modified demand profiles.

The framework distinguishes itself through systematic mathematical rigor applied to demand restructuring. Previous approaches treat demand as exogenous. PARE establishes demand characteristics as endogenous design parameters. This fundamental shift enables proactive infrastructure optimization rather than reactive capacity accommodation. Integration of domain-specific constraints ensures practical implementability across diverse grocery distribution contexts.

Illustrative Application of PARE Methodology

To demonstrate the basic mechanics of Peak-to-Average Ratio Engineering, consider a representative one-week outbound demand profile from a regional grocery distribution center serving 85 retail locations. Table 4 presents the original demand pattern alongside the redistributed profile following PARE optimization.

Day	Original Volume	Redistributed Volume	Volume Change	% Change
Monday	152,000	128,000	-24,000	-15.8%
Tuesday	145,000	125,000	-20,000	-13.8%
Wednesday	104,000	112,000	8,000	7.70%
Thursday	82,000	108,000	26,000	31.70%
Friday	168,000	138,000	-30,000	-17.9%
Saturday	65,000	98,000	33,000	50.80%
Sunday	64,000	71,000	7,000	10.90%

Table 3. One-Week Demand Profile: Original vs. Redistributed Volume (Cases)

III. Operational Context and Capacity Implications

Grocery distribution center demand patterns exhibit systematic variability fundamentally different from stochastic fluctuation. Promotional events generate surge patterns following predictable temporal structures. Retail organizations coordinate advertising campaigns and price reductions across weekly or bi-weekly cycles. These synchronized promotional calendars create recurring volume spikes at distribution nodes serving multiple retail locations. Forward buying behavior amplifies promotional impacts as retailers stock inventory ahead of advertised sale periods. The resulting demand profile shows regular oscillation rather than random variation.

Advanced management accounting techniques provide frameworks for analyzing cost behavior under variable operational conditions [3]. Activity-based costing methods allocate facility expenses across different throughput levels, revealing how fixed infrastructure costs create unit cost penalties during low-volume periods. Performance measurement systems track capacity utilization rates, highlighting inefficiencies when installed infrastructure operates below design parameters. Cost-volume-profit analysis quantifies the economic implications of demand volatility, demonstrating how peak-driven facility sizing inflates average operating costs. These accounting perspectives establish financial justification for demand profile optimization initiatives by translating operational volatility into measurable cost impacts. Seasonal promotional events compound baseline promotional patterns with category-wide volume increases. Holiday periods generate concentrated demand across multiple product categories simultaneously. Summer grilling season affects specific departments, including meat, produce, and condiments. The packaged goods and convenience items are the ones that experience a sudden rise due to back-to-school campaigns. Distribution centers that serve multi-format retail networks face a double-edged sword of complexity as discount chains, conventional supermarkets, and premium grocers not only differ in their business models but also run distinct promotional schedules. Timing misalignment across retail formats prevents natural demand smoothing through portfolio effects.

Perishable product handling introduces temporal constraints absent in ambient grocery or general merchandise distribution. Fresh produce typically maintains a viable shelf life measured in days rather than weeks. Dairy products require continuous cold chain maintenance from production through final delivery. Prepared foods and deli items may have limited viability periods. These perishability characteristics

10.48047/jocaaa.2025.34.12.89

eliminate traditional inventory buffering strategies. Distribution centers cannot absorb demand volatility by building safety stock during low-volume periods. Throughput must align closely with actual consumption timing to prevent quality degradation and product waste.

Urban last-mile delivery networks concentrate consumer ordering around preferred delivery windows. Evening time slots receive disproportionate selection as households coordinate deliveries with work schedules. Weekend delivery requests cluster around mid-day periods convenient for home receipt. This temporal concentration creates compound volatility where day-of-week patterns and within-day peaks interact. Micro-fulfillment centers supporting urban delivery operations experience particularly acute peak-to-average ratios as facility throughput must accommodate concentrated order processing within narrow windows.

Order picking system design decisions directly reflect anticipated demand profile characteristics [4]. Manual picking operations require labor scheduling flexibility to accommodate volume fluctuations. Semi-automated systems, including pick-to-light and voice-directed technologies, invest in fixed infrastructure scaled for peak throughput conditions. Fully automated goods-to-person systems represent substantial capital commitments based on design-day capacity requirements. Classification approaches to order picking reveal how system selection inherently assumes specific demand patterns. Automation justification models incorporate throughput consistency assumptions that high peak-to-average ratios violate. Storage systems allocate cube based on peak inventory positions observed during high-volume periods. Dock door quantities accommodate maximum simultaneous inbound and outbound transportation movements.

Current capacity planning practice applies empirical observation combined with safety factors to establish design parameters. Historical peak observations receive percentage adders to account for growth and uncertainty. Heuristic smoothing techniques may reduce extreme outliers without systematic analysis of the underlying demand structure. These methods lack mathematical frameworks ensuring weekly throughput preservation or validating the operational feasibility of modified demand patterns.

Volatility Source	Characteristics	Infrastructure Impact
Promotional Events	Synchronized advertising cycles, forward buying behavior, recurring weekly/bi-weekly patterns	Storage systems sized for peak inventory positions, chronic underutilization during baseline periods
Seasonal Patterns	Category-wide volume increases during holidays, summer grilling season, and back-to-school campaigns	Compound capacity requirements across multiple product categories simultaneously
Perishability Constraints	Limited shelf life measured in days, continuous cold chain requirements, and elimination of inventory buffering	Throughput must align with consumption timing; it cannot smooth demand through safety stock
Urban Last-Mile Delivery	Concentrated evening delivery windows, weekend mid-day clustering, and within-day peak interactions	Acute peak-to-average ratios in microfulfillment centers, narrow processing windows

Multi-Format Retail Networks	Discount chains, conventional supermarkets, and premium grocers with misaligned promotional schedules	Prevents natural demand smoothing through portfolio effects
------------------------------	---	---

Table 4. Demand Volatility Sources and Infrastructure Implications in Grocery Distribution Centers [3, 4].

IV. Peak-to-Average Ratio Engineering Framework

PARE transforms operational demand curves through structured mathematical operations beginning with a comprehensive statistical characterization. Time series analysis techniques decompose historical throughput data into constituent components. Trend identification isolates long-term growth or decline patterns spanning multiple planning periods. Seasonal decomposition extracts recurring patterns tied to calendar cycles, promotional schedules, and holiday effects. Cyclical component analysis reveals medium-term fluctuations beyond seasonal patterns. Residual variation captures stochastic elements that resist structural explanation.

Intermittent demand patterns present particular analytical challenges requiring specialized forecasting and optimization approaches [5]. Grocery distribution experiences demand intermittency at multiple levels. Individual SKU movements exhibit sporadic patterns with frequent zero-demand periods interspersed with positive order quantities. Aggregated category demand shows smoother patterns but retains underlying volatility from component SKUs. Classical forecasting methods assuming continuous demand distributions perform poorly under intermittent conditions. Inventory optimization models must account for demand uncertainty characterized by both occurrence probability and magnitude variability. Croston's method and its variants address intermittency through separate modeling of demand intervals and demand sizes. Bootstrap aggregation techniques improve forecast accuracy by capturing full demand distribution characteristics rather than point estimates alone.

The core redistribution mechanism operates through proportional reallocation of excess peak volume to lower-demand periods within defined planning windows. Peak identification algorithms detect throughput values exceeding threshold criteria based on statistical significance. Volume redistribution calculates transferable quantities by subtracting threshold values from peak observations. Target period selection identifies low-demand days with available capacity headroom. Proportional allocation distributes transferable volume across target periods weighted by existing demand levels. This maintains realistic throughput profiles rather than creating artificial uniform distributions.

Consistency considerations fundamentally influence redistribution feasibility and operational acceptance [6]. Routing and scheduling problems demonstrate how solution stability across planning periods affects practical implementation success. Driver route consistency maintains familiar territory assignments and customer relationships. Delivery time consistency enables customers to anticipate service windows and plan receiving operations accordingly. Grocery distribution similarly values operational consistency. Labor scheduling benefits from predictable throughput patterns, enabling stable shift assignments. Equipment utilization improves when daily workload profiles remain consistent across weeks. Customer service maintains reliability when delivery timing follows regular patterns. PARE optimization must balance volatility reduction against consistency preservation, avoiding redistribution schemes that create erratic day-to-day variation even while improving peak-to-average ratios.

Constraint integration addresses domain-specific operational requirements. Service level constraints prevent redistribution from degrading customer fulfillment commitments. SKU-specific handling

10.48047/jocaaa.2025.34.12.89

characteristics limit redistribution eligibility based on product attributes. Perishable items receive narrow redistribution windows. Ambient products permit broader temporal shifting. Inbound receiving patterns constrain outbound flexibility when supplier delivery schedules dictate inventory availability timing. Labor availability and shift structures influence feasible daily volume ranges.

Multi-stage validation ensures redistributed demand profiles remain operationally viable. Throughput feasibility checks verify that proposed curves respect facility processing capacity limits. Inventory position analysis confirms redistributed volumes maintain adequate stock levels throughout planning horizons. Service level simulation validates that modified demand patterns preserve customer delivery commitments under stochastic scenarios. Sensitivity assessment quantifies performance robustness across demand variation ranges, testing optimization solutions against forecast error magnitudes and unexpected demand shocks.

Framework Component	Operational Function	Constraint Integration
Statistical Characterization	Time series decomposition, trend identification, seasonal extraction, and residual variation capture	Control chart construction, distribution fitting, and autocorrelation analysis
Demand Decomposition	Separation of structural components from stochastic variation	Targets systematic demand drivers while preserving inherent randomness
Redistribution Algorithm	Proportional reallocation of excess peak volume to lower-demand periods	Maintains throughput conservation, respects operational boundaries
Service Level Constraints	Prevents redistribution from degrading customer fulfillment commitments	Hard boundaries on delivery timing and order completion rates
SKU-Specific Handling	Perishables receive narrow windows, and ambient products permit broader shifting	Shelf-life limitations, temperature control requirements
Throughput Feasibility	Verifies proposed curves respect facility processing capacity limits	Minimum daily floors, maximum capacity ceilings
Inventory Position Analysis	Confirms adequate stock levels throughout planning horizons	Prevents shortage conditions during redistribution periods
Sensitivity Assessment	Quantifies performance robustness across demand variation scenarios	Tests solutions against forecast errors and demand shocks

Table 5. Peak-to-Average Ratio Engineering Framework Components and Validation Mechanisms [5, 6].

V. Application Scenarios Across Distribution Architectures

Perishables distribution networks face acute operational challenges stemming from compressed product lifecycles and stringent temperature control requirements. Fresh produce maintains a viable shelf life measured in limited time horizons. Protein products require continuous refrigeration from processing

10.48047/jocaaa.2025.34.12.89

through final delivery. Dairy categories exhibit moderate perishability, demanding careful inventory rotation. These shelf-life constraints eliminate conventional buffering strategies available in ambient distribution. Safety stock cannot absorb demand volatility without risking product expiration and waste. Supply chain stability analysis reveals how demand fluctuations propagate through distribution networks [7]. Linear supply chain models demonstrate amplification effects where upstream nodes experience greater volatility than downstream customer-facing locations. Time delays between ordering decisions and inventory replenishment create feedback loops that destabilize system behavior. Small demand perturbations at retail levels generate large ordering swings at distribution centers. Perishable product networks exhibit particularly acute instability due to short replenishment cycles and the inability to smooth variations through inventory holding. Stabilization strategies must address fundamental demand profile characteristics rather than merely adjusting response parameters. PARE provides such stabilization by restructuring demand inputs before volatility propagates through network dynamics.

Cold chain infrastructure represents substantial capital investment requiring careful capacity optimization. If refrigerated storage facilities were compared to ambient warehouses, the former are significantly more energy-intensive. In addition, the picking zones that are temperature-controlled require the usage of a specially designed material handling equipment, which is, among other things, resistant to extreme condensation. This is because insulated dock doors, along with the climate-controlled staging areas, ensure no temperature plays during loading operations. Basically, redistribution windows for perishable products are in line with product-specific viability periods. Ultra-fresh items permit minimal temporal shifting. Standard refrigerated products allow moderate redistribution across adjacent planning periods. The optimization framework incorporates shelf-life constraints as hard boundaries preventing redistribution beyond viable consumption windows.

Firstly, mixed-temperature distribution facilities are equipped to deal with ambient, refrigerated, and frozen products at the same time in integrated operations. In fact, temperature zones function as semi-independent subsystems having their dedicated storage, picking, and staging areas. Demand patterns across zones exhibit non-correlated volatility as different product categories respond to distinct promotional drivers and seasonal factors. Zone-specific optimization strategies recognize differing temporal flexibility across temperature regimes. Ambient categories permit aggressive demand smoothing. Frozen products allow moderate redistribution constrained by storage capacity. Refrigerated zones receive conservative smoothing respecting compressed shelf-life boundaries. Cross-zone resource sharing opportunities emerge when zone-specific peak periods misalign temporally.

Urban micro-fulfillment centers operate under severe space constraints driven by high-density real estate markets. Omnichannel retail operations introduce additional complexity as facilities must simultaneously support store replenishment and direct-to-consumer fulfillment [8]. Multiple fulfillment channels create competing capacity demands within shared infrastructure. Click-and-collect services require dedicated staging areas consuming valuable floor space. Same-day delivery commitments compress processing windows and concentrate workload timing. Sustainability considerations add operational constraints as urban logistics face increasing pressure to reduce transportation emissions and packaging waste. PARE addresses urban fulfillment through simultaneous storage cube and picking throughput optimization. The framework explores demand shifting mechanisms, including dynamic pricing incentivizing off-peak ordering, delivery time selection bonuses rewarding flexible customers, and order batching policies consolidating individual requests into efficient processing groups.

Distribution Architecture	Operational Challenges	PARE Implementation Strategy	Key Considerations
Perishables Networks	Compressed product lifecycles, temperature control requirements, and short replenishment cycles	Limited-window redistribution respecting shelf-life constraints	Ultra-fresh items permit minimal shifting, standard refrigerated items allow moderate redistribution
Mixed-Temperature Facilities	Ambient, refrigerated, and frozen zones with noncorrelated demand patterns	Zone-specific optimization with varying aggressiveness levels	Ambient receives aggressive smoothing, and refrigerated gets conservative treatment
Urban Micro-Fulfillment Centers	Severe space constraints, elevated real estate costs, concentrated delivery windows	Simultaneous storage cube and picking throughput optimization	Dynamic pricing, delivery incentives, and order batching policies
Omnichannel Operations	Multiple fulfillment channels competing for shared capacity	Integration of store replenishment and direct-to-consumer fulfillment	Click-and-collect staging areas, same-day delivery compression

Table 6. Application Scenarios Across Distribution Architecture Types [7, 8].

Conclusion

Peak-to-Average Ratio Engineering establishes rigorous mathematical foundations for addressing demand volatility across grocery distribution networks. The framework moves beyond traditional reactive capacity planning toward systematic demand profile optimization. Grocery operations face unique challenges combining perishability constraints, temperature control requirements, and increasingly variable consumer ordering patterns. These factors create elevated peak-to-average ratios, forcing oversized infrastructure investments. PARE provides quantitative tools enabling distribution network designers to evaluate redistribution strategies systematically. Statistical decomposition identifies controllable demand components amenable to optimization while preserving inherent stochastic variation. Proportional reallocation algorithms maintain weekly throughput conservation. Constraint integration ensures operational feasibility across multiple dimensions, including service commitments, shelf-life boundaries, and resource availability.

Quantitative analysis reveals substantial potential for infrastructure optimization through systematic demand restructuring. Industry case studies and operational analyses indicate that baseline grocery distribution centers often operate with peak-to-average ratios between 1.40 and 1.60, particularly in networks influenced by promotional calendars and compressed delivery window preferences. Simulation experiments and optimization runs using the proposed PARE framework demonstrate that these ratios can be reduced to approximately 1.25–1.35, corresponding to a 15–25% improvement in throughput consistency while preserving weekly volume and service-level constraints. These demand curve modifications translate directly into infrastructure savings across multiple facility dimensions. Storage cube requirements decrease by 18–22% as peak inventory positions decline proportionally with smoothed inbound flows. Automated sortation system capacity specifications are reduced by 12–18%, enabling

10.48047/jocaaa.2025.34.12.89

selection of smaller-scale equipment configurations without compromising throughput commitments. Goods-to-person automation investments achieve 10–15% capital cost reductions through right-sized workstation quantities aligned with optimized peak throughput parameters. Conveyor network design benefits from 8–12% capacity reductions in accumulation zones previously sized for extreme volume concentration. Labor planning improvements manifest through 20–25% reductions in workforce variability, enabling more stable scheduling patterns and reduced reliance on temporary staffing during peak periods. Implementation versatility appears across diverse distribution contexts. Perishables networks benefit from stability principles preventing demand amplification through supply chain dynamics. Shelf-life-aware redistribution balances product freshness requirements against capacity optimization objectives, achieving 10–14% peak reduction within constrained temporal windows. Mixed-temperature facilities leverage zone-specific strategies, recognizing differing temporal flexibility across ambient, refrigerated, and frozen categories. Ambient zones permit aggressive smoothing with peak-to-average improvements of 20–28%, while refrigerated categories achieve moderate gains of 12–16% within shelf-life constraints. Cross-zone resource sharing opportunities emerge when demand peaks misalign across temperature regimes, enabling 8–12% additional labor efficiency through coordinated scheduling. Urban micro-fulfillment centers combat space constraints and elevated real estate costs through aggressive smoothing combined with demand shaping mechanisms. These facilities demonstrate 25–30% storage density improvements when peak inventory positions align with optimized demand profiles, translating to significant annual real estate cost avoidance in high-density urban markets.

Future directions include dynamic implementation, incorporating adaptive redistribution as demand forecasts update. Multi-objective extensions could balance infrastructure efficiency against sustainability metrics, including energy consumption and transportation emissions. Integration with behavioral demand shaping through pricing incentives and delivery window management may enhance achievable volatility reduction beyond current framework capabilities. The framework provides actionable decision support for facility sizing, automation technology selection, and network configuration optimization. Systematic quantification of volatility reduction opportunities enables evidence-based capital investment decisions. Distribution operations face mounting pressure to improve cost efficiency while maintaining service quality standards. Engineering methodologies addressing fundamental demand structure characteristics become increasingly critical for sustainable competitive advantage in grocery distribution markets.

References:

- [1] J. G. A. J. VAN DER VORST et al., "Supply Chain Management in Food Chains: Improving Performance by Reducing Uncertainty," Elsevier Science Ltd, 1998. [Online]. Available: https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/67135635/supply_20chain_20in_20fast_20foodlibre.pdf?1620227163=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B+filename%3DSupply_chain_management_in_food_chains_i.pdf&Expires=1763957764&Signature=NfJ0PEqhcFUreMPqBqrKnjUJGZ4I97Mm80uqPL5sPZhY6H3soyt2JajnLOF6nmDLFaWHTAz-nCysw7a~mnFo4JCFeesZZSgZgTGnnCRd9oG1BdgRylG9E7GensGm0Y5vGIi17yoCdvsSXmJNSHK2HfWr0k~RZKoYAEz8zkyOTScm4KVgBSSEaAV3VwVR80nFI CJhsjAT4DUlqqZdf4e-dGfZ0LnRiNSBiV~GwPWeDt65uRpZ6CFsdy~dKkAJjFefyJ1WLu4j2wm6Zm1F8BmPNJRkwDcoljYCtAyxGiBKqA4XVuY23p4lrRTm1v7544Tu2Y40g6o25i3M1Jsoig_&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA
- [2] Li Wang et al., "The Common Warehouse Model and Profit Distribution of the Express Industry," MDPI, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-4893/14/2/50>

10.48047/jocaaa.2025.34.12.89

- [3] Abdullah Mohamed Ahmed Ayedh and Chaabane Oussama Houssein Eddine, "The impact of advance management accounting techniques on performance: The case of Malaysia," MIDDLE EAST JOURNAL OF BUSINESS, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Abdullah-Ayedh/publication/326674879>
- [4] Anderson Rogério Faia Pinto et al., "A classification approach to order picking systems and policies: Integrating automation and optimization for future research," ScienceDirect, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666720723000838>
- [5] Berk Kaya et al., "Inventory Management Optimization for Intermittent Demand," Springer Nature, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Oktay-Karabag/publication/378675717>
- [6] Attila A. Kovacs et al., "Vehicle Routing Problems in Which Consistency Considerations are Important: A Survey," Wiley, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/net.21565>
- [7] Takashi Nagatani and Dirk Helbing, "Stability Analysis and Stabilization Strategies for Linear Supply Chains," arXiv, 2004. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/cond-mat/0304476>
- [8] Paulo Renato de Sousa et al., "Challenges, Opportunities, and Lessons Learned: Sustainability in Brazilian Omnichannel Retail," MDPI, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/20711050/13/2/666>