

# 存儲論論文選集

中国科学院数学研究所运筹室

1959年8月 北京

## 目次

1. Optimal Inventory Policy  
Kenneth J. Arrow, Theodore Harris, and Jacob  
Marschak..... 1-27
2. The Inventory Problem: I. Case of Known  
Distributions of Demand  
A. Dvoretzky, J. Kiefer, and J. Wolfowitz..... 28-37
3. The Inventory Problem: II. Case of Unknown  
Distributions of Demand  
A. Dvoretzky, J. Kiefer, and J. Wolfowitz..... 68-87
4. On the Optimal Character of the Policy  
in Inventory Theory  
A. Dvoretzky, J. Kiefer, and J. Wolfowitz..... 88-100

請注意：

有\*符号的地方，表示打字有遺漏，接連着的\*  
表示補充。

## OPTIMAL INVENTORY POLICY

By Kenneth J. Arrow, Theodore Harris, and Jacob Marschak

Optimal inventory policy is first derived for a simple model in which the future (and constant) demand flow and other relevant quantities are known in advance. This is followed by the study of uncertainty models- a static and a dynamic one- in which the demand flow is a random variable with a known probability distribution. The best maximum stock and the best reordering point are determined as functions of the demand distribution, the cost of making an order, and the penalty of stock depletion.

(From *Econometrica*, Vol. 19, No. 3 July, 1951 pp. 250-272).

### 1. Introduction

We propose to outline a method for deriving optimal rules of inventory policy for finished goods. The problem of inventories exists not only for business enterprises, but also for nonprofit agencies such as governmental establishments and their various branches. Moreover, the concept of inventories can be generalized so as to include not only goods, but also disposable reserves of manpower as well as various stand-by devices. Also, while inventories of finished goods present the simplest problem, the concept can be extended to goods which can be transformed, at a cost, into one or more kinds of finished goods if and when the need for such goods arises. The following notes prepare the way for a more general future analysis of "flexible planning".

We shall call "net utility" the quantity that the policymaker seeks to maximize. In the case of profit-making enterprises this is conveniently approximated by profit: the difference between gross money revenue and money cost. A nonprofit agency such as a hospital may often be able to compute directly its money cost, and has to assign an approximate monetary value to the "gross utility" of the performance of its tasks; it corresponds to the "gross revenue" of an enterprise run for profit.

The net utility to any policymaker is, in general, a random variable depending on certain conditions (i.e., on variables or on relations between variables). Some of these conditions he can control, others he cannot. The former are policy means (rules of action, strategies). The noncontrolled conditions are, in general, defined by a joint probability distribution of certain variables. Rational policy consists in fixing the controlled conditions so as to maximize the expected value of net utility, given the probability distribution of noncontrolled conditions. When this probability distribution degenerates into a set of non-

random variables we have the case of "certainty". In this limiting case, net utility itself is a nonrandom variable, to be maximized by the policy-maker.

In the present paper, the policymaker is the holder of inventories. At most one of the noncontrolled conditions will be regarded as a random one: the rate of demand for the policymaker's product. Other non-controlled conditions will be regarded as constants, or as relations with constant parameters: the pipeline time; the cost of making an order; the relation between storage cost and the size of inventory; the price paid or its relation to the size of order (the "supply function"); the gross revenue (or, more generally, the gross utility) obtained. (Speculative inventories are thus excluded from consideration.)

As to controlled conditions, we shall assume that the policy-maker can control only the size of the orders he makes (at discrete points of time). This eliminates, for example, such policy means as the fixing of the selling price, or the use of advertising, to influence demand, and any bargaining with buyer(s) or competitor(s).

We believe our specialized formulation is a workable first approximation. By regarding the order size as the only controlled condition, and the demand as the only random noncontrolled condition, we do take account of most of the major questions that have actually arisen in the practice of business and nonprofit organizations.<sup>4</sup>

## 2. The case of certainty

2.1 Let  $x$  be the known constant rate of demand for the product of the organization, per unit of time. Let the gross utility (i.e., utility before deducting cost) obtained by the organization through satisfying this demand be, per unit of time,

$$ax + a_0$$

With a nonprofit organization,  $a_0$  expresses the value of its "being" (word coined for the British Navy). If the organization is a commercial firm,  $a$  is the selling price; otherwise  $a$  is the value to the organization of a unit of its operations. In general,  $a$  is a function of  $x$ . It will be sufficient, for our purposes, to assume a constant, and  $a_0 = 0$ . Denote by  $b = b(q)$  the purchasing price of one unit when the size of order is  $q$ . We shall assume that  $q \cdot b(q)$  is an increasing function of  $q$ , and that  $b'(q) < 0$  (possible economy of large scale orders). Let  $k$  be the cost of handling an order, regardless of its size. Let the cost





of carrying a stock  $z$  over one unit of time be

$$C_0 + zcz,$$

where  $C_0$  is the overhead cost of storage. In general,  $C_0$  varies with the maximum amount stocked, and  $c$  varies with the current stock  $z$  and also (because of spoilage, leakage, and obsolescence) with the prices paid. However, we shall assume  $C_0$  and  $c$  constant.

2:B. With  $K$  positive a continuous flow of orders would be infinitely expensive. Hence orders will be given at discrete time intervals. Let the first ordering date be 0. Let the length of the  $i$ th time interval be  $\theta_i$ . Then the delivery during that interval is  $x_i$ . See Figure 1a, where the common slope of all slanting lines is the demand flow,

We shall show that, under certain conditions, optimal policy will be as shown in Figure 1b: the intervals, possibly excepting the first one, will have the same optimal length and the same optimal highest and lowest stock levels.



We shall first assume that orders are fulfilled immediately. Then the amount ordered at the beginning of the  $i$ th interval,

$$q_i = S_{i-1} - y_{i-1} \geq 0,$$

where  $S_{i-1}$  and  $y_{i-1}$  denote, respectively, the stocks available at the beginning of the  $i$ th interval after and before the replenishment. Since the delivery during that interval is

$$x_i = S_{i-1} - y_{i-1}$$

therefore

$$(2.1) \quad q_i = x\theta_i + y_i - y_{i-1} \quad (i=1, 2, \dots),$$

while the average stock during the  $i$ th interval is

$$(2.2) \quad \bar{z}_i = (S_{i-1} + y_i) / 2 = (x\theta_i + 2y_i) / 2 \quad (i=1, 2, \dots).$$

The net utility achieved during the  $i$ th interval (not allowing for a time discount) is

$$(2.3) \quad u_i(\theta_i) = a x \theta_i - q_i b(q_i) - 2c \bar{z}_i \theta_i - K.$$

By (2.1), (2.2), this is a decreasing function of  $y_i \geq 0$ . Hence, for given  $\theta_i$  and  $y_{i-1}$ ,  $u_i(\theta_i)$  has its maximum when  $y_i = 0$ . Further, we can put  $y_0 = 0$ .

If the agency begins its operations with a stock  $y > 0$ , its best policy is not to place orders till the stock runs down to zero,  $y/x$  time units later; and this time point can be regarded as the origin. Then, by (2.3)  $u_i(\theta_i)$  is largest, for a given  $\theta_i$ , when  $y_i = 0$ ; and for any given sequence of interval lengths  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$ , the sum  $U = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i(\theta_i)$  will have its maximum at  $y_1 = \dots = y_n = 0$ .

Suppose the agency maximizes the sum of utilities over a certain given time  $T$ , neglecting any discounting for time. That is, it maximizes  $U = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i(\theta_i)$  (where  $\sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i = T$ ), and therefore maximizes the average utility over time,  $U/T = \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i v(\theta_i) / \sum \theta_i$ .

where  $v(\theta_i) = u_i(\theta_i) / \theta_i$ . We have seen that this requires  $y_i = 0$  ( $i=1, 2, \dots$ ) for any given sequence of the  $\theta_i$ . Furthermore  $U/T$ , being the weighted average of the  $v(\theta_i)$ , reaches its maximum when every  $v(\theta_i)$  is equal to  $\max \theta_i v(\theta_i) = v(\theta^*)$  say. But, by (2.1)-(2.3) (with  $y_i = 0, i \geq 0$ ),

$$(2.4) \quad v(\theta) = ax - [ab(x\theta) + cx\theta + K/\theta] = ax - C(\theta),$$

the expression in square brackets being the total cost per time unit,  $C(\theta)$ . If  $v(\theta)$  has a maximum and  $C(\theta)$  has a minimum at  $\theta = \theta^*$ , then

$$(2.5) \quad C'(\theta^*) = 0 = x^2 b'(x\theta^*) + cx - K/(\theta^*)^2.$$

The optimal interval  $\theta^*$  between orders can thus be computed as depending on the cost parameters,  $c$  and  $K$ , and the purchasing

price function,  $b(q)$  - provided the policymaker maximizes the sum of utilities over time,  $U$ , without any discounting for futurity during which the initial stock will last.

We obtain thus (as in Figure 1b), for the case in which orders are fulfilled immediately (pipeline time  $= 0$ ), a periodically repeated change from maximum stocks

$$(2.6) \quad S^* = x\theta^*$$

to minimum stocks

$$y = 0,$$

where the period,  $\theta^*$ , satisfies (2.5).

2:C. We shall assume the purchase price function linear, so that  $b''(q) = 0$  identically and

$$b(q) = b_0 - b_1 q;$$

say, with  $b_1 \geq 0$ . Then, by (2.5),

$$(2.7) \quad \theta^* = \sqrt{K/x(c - b_1 x)}.$$

It is seen from the second-order conditions for maximum  $v(\theta)$  in (2.4) that the expression under the root sign is always positive (i.e., there would be no positive and finite optimum storage period if the ordering of one more unit decreased the price optimum storage period if the ordering of one more unit decreased the price of the commodity by more than it increased the cost of storing one unit). Using (2.6), the optimal maximum stock is

$$(2.8) \quad S^* = \sqrt{Kx/(c - b_1 x)}.$$

Hence, as should be expected, the optimal order size, and therefore the optimal ordering interval, is larger, the larger the cost  $K$  of handling an order, the smaller the unit (marginal) storage cost  $c$ , and the larger the effect  $b_1$  of the size of order upon the unit price.

We believe this is, in essence, the solution advanced by R. H. Wilson [1-4], formerly of the Bell Telephone Company, and also by other writers; see Alford and Banks [1]. We have proved the validity of Figure 1b (usually accepted intuitively) and have shown how to evaluate the optimal storage period.

2:D. If we now introduce a constant pipeline time,  $\tau > 0$



elapsing between order and delivery, this will not affect  $S^*$  or  $\theta^*$ , but the time of issuing the order will be shifted  $\gamma$  time units ahead. The order will be issued when the stock is reduced, not to zero, but to  $\gamma$  units.

2:E. The policymaker may not have full control of the length of the time interval between any two successive orders. Transportation schedules or considerations of administrative convenience may be such as to make ordering impossible at intervals of length other than, say,  $\theta^0 \neq \theta^*$ . For example,  $\theta^0$  may be one business day or week, or it may be the period between two visits of a mail boat to an island depot.  $\theta^0$  is thus the "scheduled" or "smallest feasible" period between two non-zero orders. Denote the "best feasible period" by  $\theta'$ , an unknown multiple integer of  $\theta^0$ . As before  $\theta^*$  is the best (but possibly a non-feasible) period. By considering the expression  $C(\theta)$  defined in (2.4) as total cost, one finds easily that: (1) if  $\theta^0 > \theta^*$ ; then  $\theta' = \theta^0$ ; (2) if  $\theta^* > \theta^0$  then  $\theta' = \theta^*$ , provided  $\theta^*$  is an integer multiple of  $\theta^0$ ; (3) if  $\theta^*$  is larger than  $\theta^0$  but is not an integer multiple of  $\theta^0$ , then define the integer  $\bar{n} < \theta^*/\theta^0 < \bar{n}+1$  the best feasible period  $\theta'$  is, in this case, either  $\bar{n}\theta^0$  or  $(\bar{n}+1)\theta^0$ , whichever of the two results in a smaller cost when  $\theta'$  is substituted in (2.4). In our paper, Arrow et al. [1, Section 2: E-F], this was treated in more detail, and an extension was made to the case in which ordering at nonscheduled times is not impossible but merely more costly than ordering at scheduled times.

For reasons of space we omit here the problem of firm aggregation, also treated in that paper [1, Section 2:G-I] and, from a more general viewpoint, in Marschak [2]. We assume that there is only one commodity, or that the characteristic parameters for all commodities are such as to yield the same optimal period  $\theta^*$  for all. We also assume that there is only one giver of orders (depot) and one receiver of orders (manufacturer) on this, see Tompkins [1].

### 3. A static model with uncertainty

3:A Suppose an organization wants to choose the level  $S \geq 0$  that the stock of a certain commodity should have at the beginning of a given period, in order to provide for the demand (requirements) that will occur during that period. We shall choose the time unit to be equal to the length of this period and shall use the notations of Section 2. Thus  $x \geq 0$  will denote the demand during the period. However,  $x$  will now be regarded as a random variable. We shall suppose that the organization knows the cumulative distribution of demand,  $F(x)$ . The gross



utility, to the organization, of delivering  $\xi$  units of its product will be

$$(3.1) \quad a\xi + a_0 \quad (a, a_0 \text{ constant}).$$

The delivery during the period is a random variable:  $\xi$  equals  $x$  or  $S$ , whichever is smaller. Hence the expected gross utility is

$$(3.2) \quad aS[1 - F(S)] + a \int_0^S x dF(x) + a_0$$

We shall assume that the amount to be spent in purchasing  $S$  units is

$$(3.3) \quad S(b_0 - b_1 S) + K, \quad b_0 > 0, \quad b_1 \geq 0,$$

so that, as in Section 2:C, the purchase price is either constant or linearly decreasing with the amount purchased. As before, the cost of handling an order is denoted by  $K$  but this term will not play any further role in the static model. We assume here that the whole stock  $S$  is to be purchased and that no utility is derived from satisfying demand after the period's end. Finally, the cost of carrying over our period the stock which has level  $S$  at the beginning of the period will be assumed to be

$$(3.4) \quad \text{const.} + cS.$$

Then, apart from a "depletion penalty," which we shall introduce in Section 3:B, the net expected loss (the negative of net expected utility) is

$$(3.5) \quad \text{const.} + S(c + b_0 - b_1 S) - aS[1 - F(S)] - a \int_0^S x dF(x).$$

3:B. We now define  $\pi$ , the depletion penalty, as follows: If  $x \leq S$ , there is no unsatisfied demand, and  $\pi = 0$  but if  $x > S$ , the organization would be willing to pay an amount  $\pi > 0$  to satisfy the excess,  $x - S$ , of demand over available stock.

We assume the penalty function as given. The organization - whether commercial or noncommercial - has a general idea of the value it would attach to the damage that would be caused by the nonavailability of an item. It knows the cost and the poorer

performance of emergency substitutes. The penalty for depleted stocks may be very high: "A horse, a horse, my kingdom for a horse," cried defeated Richard III.

3:C. Note that, in the case of a commercial enterprise, an independent penalty function,  $\pi = \pi(x - S)$ , need not be introduced. It can be replaced by considerations of "losing custom," as in the following model. Let  $F_t$  be a Poisson distribution of demand for the period  $(t, t+1)$  with the following interpretation. Its mean,  $\mu_t$ , is proportional (a) to the probability that a member of a large but finite reservoir of customers will want to buy during that period, and (b) to the number of customers,  $\mu_t$  equals  $\mu_{t-1}$  if the demand during  $(t-1, t)$  was satisfied. But, if that demand was in excess of the then available stock,  $\mu_t$  is smaller than  $\mu_{t-1}$  by an amount proportional to the unsatisfied demand, as some of the disappointed customers will drop out of the market. The problem is to maximize total expected utility over a sequence of periods  $(0, 1), (1, 2), \dots$  if the initial distribution  $F_0$  is given. (Such a dynamic model would be different from the one we are going to treat in Sections 4-7).

3:D. We shall assume

$$\pi = A + B(x - S) \text{ if } x > S,$$

$$\pi = 0 \text{ otherwise,}$$

where  $A, B$  are nonnegative constants, not both zero. Then  $\pi$  is a random variable, with expectation

$$(3.6) \quad (A - BS) [1 - F(S)] + B \int_S^\infty x dF(x).$$

Accordingly, the expected net loss, taking account of the expected penalty, is the sum of expressions (3.5) and (3.6) and equals, apart from a constant,

$$(3.7) \quad S(c + b_0 - b_1 S) + A[1 - F(S)] - (B + a)S[1 - F(S)]$$

$$- (B + a) \int_0^S x dF(x) = L(S).$$

say. The stock level  $S = S^*$  is optimal if  $L(S) \leq L(S)$

for every  $S$ . Suppose the distribution function  $F(x)$  possesses a differentiable density function,  $f(x) \equiv dF(x)/dx$ . If the absolute minimum of  $L$  is not at  $S=0$ , it will be at some point satisfying the relations

$$dL(S^*)/dS = 0, \quad d^2L(S^*)/dS^2 > 0,$$

which imply that

$$(3.8) \quad [c + b_0 - 2b_1S^*] - Af(S^*) - (B + a)[1 - F(S^*)] = 0,$$

$$(3.9) \quad -2b_1 - Af'(S^*) + (B + a)f(S^*) > 0.$$

3.E. In the economist's language, the first bracketed term in (3.8) is the "marginal cost" of (of buying and carrying an additional unit in stock); the remaining two terms yield the "marginal expected utility."

It is seen from (3.8) that the optimal stock  $S^*$  is determined by the following "noncontrolled" parameters: (1) the demand distribution function,  $F(x)$ ; (2) certain utility and cost parameters,  $(c + b_0)$ ,  $b_1$ ,  $A$  and  $(B + a)$ . If, in particular,  $b_1 = 0$  (i.e., the economy of big-lot purchases is negligible), these parameters reduce to two:  $A/(c + b_0)$  and  $(B + a)/(c + b_0)$ . To simplify further, for the sake of illustration, suppose also that  $B = a = 0$  (that is, the penalty is either zero or  $A$ , independent of the size of the unsatisfied demand) and that utility derived from the functioning of the organization does not depend on the amounts delivered. Then (3.8), (3.9) become

$$(3.10) \quad f(S^*) = (c + b_0)/A, \quad f'(S^*) < 0.$$

A graphical solution for this case is shown in Figure 2. (Note that  $f'(S^*) < 0$  but  $f'(S) > 0$ ;  $S^*$  is the best stock level, but  $S'$  is not).




Figure 2



3:F. In some previous literature (Fry 1, Eisenhart[1]) the decision on inventories was related, not to utility and cost considerations, but to a preassigned probability  $[1 - F(S)]$  that demand will not exceed stock. The choice of the probability level  $1 - F(S)$  depends, of course, on some implicit evaluations of the damage that would be incurred if one were unable to satisfy demand. In the present paper, these evaluations are made explicit. On the other hand, since parameters such as  $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $a$  can be estimated only in a broad way (at least outside of a purely commercial organization, where utility equals dollar profit and where models such as that of Section 3:C can be developed), it is a welcome support of one's judgment to check these estimates by referring to the corresponding level of probability for stock depletion. For example, if the distribution in Figure 2 were approximately normal, then to assume that penalty  $A$  is 100 times the marginal cost  $c + b_0$  would be approximately equivalent to making depletion probability equal to 5% etc.

3:G In the more general case, when  $B + a > 0$  (but still  $b_1 = 0$ ), a given optimal stock level  $S^*$  and consequently a given probability of depletion  $1 - F(S^*)$  is consistent with a continuous set of values of the pair of parameters,  $A/(c + b_0) = A'$ ,  $(B + a)/(c + b_0) = B'$ , such as would satisfy the linear equation (3.8). For example, if  $F(x)$  is approximately normal, then an optimal stock exceeding the average demand by two standard deviations (and, consequently, a depletion probability of approximately 2.3%) will be required by any pair of values of  $A', B'$  lying on the straight line intersecting the  $A'$ -axis at 13 and intersecting the  $B'$ -axis at 44; while an optimal stock exceeding the average demand by three standard deviations (and, consequently, a depletion probability of 0.1%) will correspond to a straight line intersecting those axes at 228 and 740, respectively. Thus a set of contour lines helps to choose an interval of optimal stock values consistent with a given region of plausible values of parameters describing penalty and gross utility.

\* prescribing that the shaded area measuring the depletion probability should be 0.3%; to assume that  $A = 10(c + b_0)$  would be

#### 4. A dynamic model with uncertainty: problem

4:A. The model described in Section 3 may be called a static one. We shall now present a dynamic model. In this model the commodity can be reordered at discrete instants  $0, \theta_0, \dots, t\theta_0, \dots$  where  $\theta_0$  is a fixed constant. We can therefore use  $\theta_0$  as a time unit. Let  $x_t$  ( $t$  integer) be the demand over the interval  $(t, t+1)$ . Assume the probability distribution of demand  $F(x)$  to be independent of  $t$ . Denote by  $y_t$  the stock available at instant  $t$ , not including

any replenishment that may arrive at this instant. Denote by  $z_t$  the stock at  $t$  including the replenishment. Denote by  $q_t$  the amount ordered at time  $t$ . Let the time between the ordering and the receiving of goods (pipeline time) be  $\tau$ , an integer. Then

$$(4.1) \quad y_t = \max(z_{t-1} - x_{t-1}, 0) \quad (t=1, 2, \dots),$$

$$(4.2) \quad z_{t+\tau} = y_{t+\tau} + q_t \quad (t=0, 1, \dots),$$

In general,  $\tau$  is a nonnegative random variable. We shall, however, assume  $\tau=0$  to simplify the analysis at this stage. Then (4.2) becomes

$$(4.3) \quad z_t = y_t + q_t$$

Choose two numbers  $S$  and  $s$ ,  $S > s > 0$ , and let them define the following rule of action:

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{array}{ll} \text{If } y_t > s, & q_t = 0 \quad (\text{and hence } z_t = y_t); \\ \text{if } y_t \leq s, & q_t = S - y_t \quad (\text{and hence } z_t = S) \end{array}$$

$S$  and  $s$  are often called, respectively, the maximum stock and the reordering point (provided  $\tau=0$ ).

Figure 3 shows the sort of curve that might be obtained for stock level as a function of time if such a rule is adopted.

Figure 4 shows  $z_t$  as a function of  $y_t$ .




Figure 3 Time




Figure 4

4:B. We shall assume (as we have done in Sections 2 and 3) that the cost of handling an order does not depend on the amount ordered. Let this cost be  $K$ , a constant. Let the depletion penalty be  $A$ , a constant [compare Section 3:D, with  $B=0$ ]. Let the marginal cost of carrying stock during a unit of time be  $c$ , as in (3.4). Assume the purchasing price per unit of commodity to be independent of the amount bought and equal to the marginal utility of one unit (i.e., in the notation of Section 3:A  $b_1=0$ ,  $b_0=a$ ). That is, the utility of operations of the agency, in excess of the expenses paid for these operations is assumed constant, apart from the cost of storage and of handling orders. In the notation of Section 3:A, this constant is  $a_0$ , while  $K$  and  $c$  denote, respectively, the cost of handling an order (of any size) and the marginal cost of storage. Our assumption is an admissible approximation in the case of some nonprofit agencies. It would certainly be both more general and more realistic to make the marginal utility of an operation differ from its purchasing price, as was the case in our static model. But this will require further mathematical work (see Section 7:A).

4:C. If  $y_0$  is given and values  $S$  and  $s$  are chosen, the subsequent values  $y_t$  form a random process which is "Markovian"; see Feller [2, Chapter XV]. That is, the probability distribution of  $y_{t+1}$ , given the value of  $y_t$ , is independent of  $y_{t-1}, \dots, y_0$ . During the period  $(t, t+1)$  a certain loss will be incurred whose conditional expectation, for a fixed value of  $y_t$ , we denote by  $l(y_t)$ . Under the simplifying assumptions of Section 4:B,

$$(4.5) \quad l(y_t) = \begin{cases} cy_t + A[1 - F(y_t)] & \text{for } y_t > s, \\ cS + A[1 - F(S)] + K & \text{for } y_t \leq s. \end{cases}$$

Thus the function  $l(y_t)$  involves  $S$  and  $s$  as parameters and is constant for  $y_t \leq s$ . Note that

$$(4.6) \quad l(0) = l(S) + K.$$

The unconditional expectation of the loss during  $(t, t+1)$  that is, the expectation of  $l(y_t)$ , with  $y_t$  as a random variable, will be denoted by

$$(4.7) \quad l_t = l_t(y_0).$$

We shall write  $l_t(y_0)$  rather than  $l_t$  only when we need to empha-



size the dependence of  $l_t$  on the initial stock level. Clearly  $l_0(y) = l(y)$  for every value  $y$  of  $y_0$ . Figure 5 shows a possible type of graph for  $l(y_t)$ .



Figure 5

4:D. We now introduce the concepts of a discount factor,  $\alpha$ , and of the "present value" of a loss. If the value of  $y_{t_0}$  is given, the present value at time  $t_0$  of the expected loss incurred in the interval  $(t_0 + t, t_0 + t + 1)$  is  $\alpha^t \mathcal{E}[l(y_{t_0+t})] = \alpha^t l_t(y_{t_0})$ . When maximizing expected utility, the policymaker takes into account the present values of losses, not their values at the time when they are incurred. In commercial practice,  $\alpha$  is equal to  $1/(1+\rho)$  where  $\rho$  is an appropriate market rate of interest. In nonprofit practice,  $\alpha$  would have to be evaluated separately (see also footnote 3). Later, however, it will be shown (see Section 5:B) that, under certain conditions, the optimal values of the parameters  $S, s$  can be found for  $\alpha$  essentially equal to 1.

If we now define the function

$$L(y) = l_0(y) + \alpha l_1(y) + \alpha^2 l_2(y) + \dots,$$

we see from definition (4.7) that  $L(y_t)$  is the present value at time  $t$  of the total expected loss when  $y_t$  is given. By definition,  $L(y)$  involves the parameters  $S$  and  $s$ ; the the policymaker fixes these parameters so as to minimize  $L(y_0)$ , the loss incurred during the period  $(t, t+1)$  and all subsequent pe

4:E<sup>5</sup>. Now suppose  $y_0$  is given. For a fixed value of  $y_0$  the present value of the total expected loss over all periods

is

$$(4.8) \quad L(y_0) + \alpha L(y_1) + \alpha^2 E_{y_1} [L(y_2)] + \alpha^3 E_{y_1} [L(y_3)] + \dots$$

where we have used  $E_{y_1} [L(y_r)]$  to denote the conditional expectation of  $L(y_r)$ , given the fixed value  $y_1$ . Now

$$E_{y_1} [L(y_r)] = L_{r-1}(y_1) \quad (r=1, 2, \dots)$$

because of the fact that, if  $y_1$  is fixed, the subsequent value  $y_r$  ( $r=1, 2, \dots$ ), is connected with  $y_1$  in the same manner that  $y_{r-1}$  is connected with  $y_0$  if  $y_1$  is not specified. Therefore, expression (4.8) is equal to

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & L(y_0) + \alpha L_0(y_1) + \alpha^2 L_1(y_1) + \alpha^3 L_2(y_1) + \dots \\ & = L(y_0) + \alpha [L_0(y_1) + \alpha L_1(y_1) + \alpha^2 L_2(y_1) + \dots] = L(y_0) + \alpha L(y_1). \end{aligned}$$

The total expected loss over all periods from the beginning, which by definition is  $L(y_0)$ , is the expectation of the expression in (4.9), with  $y_1$  regarded as a random variable. Hence

$$(4.10) \quad L(y_0) = L(y_0) + \alpha E[L(y_1)].$$

To express the expected value of  $L(y_1)$  as a function of  $y_0$  we note that, if  $y_0 \leq S$ , then  $z_0 = S$  and  $y_1 = \max(S - x_0, 0)$ ; while, if  $y_0 > S$ , then  $z_0 = y_0$  and  $y_1 = \max(y_0 - x_0, 0)$ . Then

$$(4.10') \quad \begin{aligned} E[L(y_1)] &= \int_0^S L(S-x) dF(x) + L(0)[1-F(S)] \quad \text{for } y_0 \leq S, \\ E[L(y_1)] &= \int_0^{y_0} L(y_0-x) dF(x) + L(0)[1-F(y_0)] \quad \text{for } y_0 > S. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that from the way we have defined the rule of action,  $L(y)$  is constant for  $0 \leq y \leq S$  so that  $L(0)$  is unambiguously defined. Putting  $y_0 = y$  we obtain from (4.10) and (4.10') the equation

$$(4.11) \quad L(y) = L(y) + \alpha \int_0^S L(S-x) dF(x) + \alpha L(0)[1-F(S)] \quad \text{if } y \leq S,$$

$$(4.12) \quad \text{if}$$

$$(4.12) \quad L(y) = L(y) + \alpha \int_0^y L(y-x) dF(x) + \alpha L(0)[1-F(y)] \quad \text{if } y > s$$

Our problem is to find the function  $L(y)$  that satisfies (4.11), (4.12) and to minimize  $L(y_0)$  with respect to  $S, s$ .

## 5. A dynamic model: method of solution

5:A In treating equations (4.11) and (4.12) we drop for the time being the assumption that  $F(x)$  has a density function and assume only that the random variable  $x$  cannot take negative values. In order to take care of the possibility that  $F(x)$  has a discontinuity at  $x=0$  (i.e., a positive probability that  $x=0$ ), we adopt the convention that Stieltjes integrals of the form  $\int_0^y (\cdot) dF(x)$  will be

understood to have  $0^-$  as the lower limit. We continue to assume that  $L(y)$  is given by (4.5), but it is clear that a similar treatment would hold for any non-negative function  $L(y)$  that is constant for  $0 \leq y \leq s$  and satisfies certain obvious regularity conditions.

Since  $L(y)$ , and therefore also  $L(y)$ , is independent of  $y$  for  $0 \leq y \leq s$ , equation (4.11) tells us simply that

$$(5.1) \quad L(0) = L(0) + \alpha \int_0^s L(s-x) dF(x) + \alpha L(0)[1-F(s)],$$

while putting  $y=s$  in (4.12) gives

$$(5.2) \quad L(s) = L(s) + \alpha \int_0^s L(s-x) dF(x) + \alpha L(0)[1-F(s)].$$

Substituting (5.2) from (5.1) we obtain, using (4.6)

$$(5.3) \quad L(0) - L(s) = K,$$

an expression which is in fact obvious since if the initial stock is 0 we immediately order an amount  $s$  at cost  $K$  for ordering. We shall solve equation (4.12) for the function  $L(y)$  considering  $L(0)$  as an unknown parameter, and then use (5.3) to determine  $L(0)$ .

On the right side of (4.12) we make the substitution

$$(5.4) \quad \int_0^y L(y-x) dF(x) = \int_0^{y-s} L(y-x) dF(x) + L(0) \int_{y-s}^y dF(x);$$

the last term follows from the fact that  $L(y-x) = L(0)$