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Abstract: In 1996, Khouja and Mehrez investigated the effect of supplier credit policies depending on the order quantity. The authors assumed that the supplier offers the retailer fully permissible delay in payments if the retailer ordered a sufficient quantity. Otherwise, permissible delay in payments would not be permitted. However, in this article, we want to extend this case by assuming that the supplier would offer the retailer partially permissible delay in payments when the retailer ordered a sufficient quantity. Otherwise, permissible delay in payments would not be permitted. Then, we model the retailer’s inventory system and develop three theorems to efficiently determine the optimal lot-sizing decisions for the retailer.
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INTRODUCTION

To encourage customers to order a large quantity, the supplier may give the payments delay only for a large order quantity. In other words, the supplier requires immediate payments for a small order quantity. In 1985, considering the inventory replenishment problem under permissible delay in payments independent of the order quantity. In 1996, investigated the effect of supplier credit policies depending on the order quantity. Then, Chang et al. and Chung and Liao established an EOQ model for deteriorating items under supplier credits linked to order quantity. In this regard, Chang extended Chung and Liao by taking into account inflation and finite time horizon. Recently, Chung et al. investigated retailer’s lot-sizing policy under permissible delay in payments depending on the ordering quantity. Chang and Dye investigated an inventory model for deteriorating items with time varying demand and deterioration rates when the credit period depends on the retailer’s ordering quantity.

However, all above published papers dealing with retailer’s lot-sizing policy in the presence of payments delay assumed that the supplier offers the retailer full payments delay when the retailer ordered a sufficient quantity. Otherwise, payments delay would not be permitted. That is, the retailer would obtain 100% payments delay if the retailer ordered a sufficient quantity. We know that this is just an extreme case. In reality, the supplier can relax this extreme case to offer the retailer partial payments delay. That is, the retailer must make a partial payment to the supplier when the order is received. Then, the retailer must pay off the remaining balances at the end of the permissible delay period. In other words, the supplier requires immediate full payments for a small order quantity. That is, payments delay would not be permitted.

Under this condition, we model the retailer’s inventory system and develop three theorems for efficiently determination the optimal lot-sizing decisions for the retailer.

Model formulation: The following notation and assumptions are used throughout this article.

Notation

D = demand rate per year
W = quantity at which the partially delay payments permitted per order
A = cost of placing one order
c = unit purchasing price
h = unit stock holding cost per year excluding interest charges
α = the fraction of the total amount owed payable at the time of placing an order, 0 < α ≤ 1
I_s = interest earned per $ per year
I_e = interest charges per $ investment in inventory per year
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\[ M = \text{the length of the payments delay period in years} \]
\[ T = \text{the cycle time in years} \]
\[ TRC(T) = \text{the annual total relevant cost when } T > 0 \]
\[ T^* = \text{the optimal cycle time of } TRC(T) \]
\[ Q^* = \text{the optimal order quantity } = DT^*. \]

**Assumptions**

- Demand rate is known and constant.
- Shortages are not allowed.
- Time horizon is infinite.
- Replenishments are instantaneous.
- \( I_s \leq I_r \)
- If \( Q < W \), i.e. \( T < W/D \), the payments delay would not be permitted. Otherwise, partially delayed payment is permitted. Hence, if \( Q \geq W \), the retailer must make a partial payment, \( \alpha DT \), to the supplier. Then the retailer must pay off the remaining balances, \( (1-\alpha)CT \), at the end of the trade credit period. Otherwise, as the order is filled, the retailer must pay the full payments immediately to the supplier.
- During the time period that the account is not settled, generated sales revenue is deposited in an interest-bearing account.

**The model:** The annual total relevant cost consists of the following elements. There are three situations to occur: (I) \( M \geq W/D \), (II) \( M < W/D < M/\alpha \) and (III) \( M/\alpha < W/D \).

**Case I: Suppose that \( M \geq W/D \)**

- Annual ordering cost = \( A/T \)
- Annual stock holding cost (excluding interest charges) = \( DTh/2 \).
- From assumptions (6) and (7), there are four sub-cases in terms of annual opportunity cost of the capital.

**Sub-case 1: \( M/\alpha \leq T \)**

Annual opportunity cost of the capital
\[
\begin{aligned}
&= cl_i \left( \frac{\alpha DT^2}{2} + \frac{D(T-M)^2}{2} \right) / T - cl_i \left( \frac{DM(M-\alpha^2T)}{2} \right) / T \\
&= cl_i \left( \frac{\alpha DT^2}{2} + \frac{D(T-M)^2}{2} \right) / T - cl_i \left( \frac{DM(M-\alpha^2T)}{2} \right) / T
\end{aligned}
\]

**Sub-case 3: \( W/D \leq T < M \)**

Annual opportunity cost of the capital
\[
\begin{aligned}
&= cl_i \left( \frac{\alpha DT^2}{2} \right) / T - cl_i \left( \frac{(1-\alpha)\alpha^2DT^2}{2} + \frac{(1-\alpha)\alpha DT + DT(M-T)}{2} \right) / T + DT(M-T) \\
&= cl_i \left( \frac{\alpha^2DT^2}{2} \right) / T - cl_i \left( M - \frac{(1+\alpha^2)T}{2} \right) / T
\end{aligned}
\]

**Sub-case 4: \( 0 \leq T < W/D \)**

Annual opportunity cost of the capital = \( cl_i \left( \frac{DT^2}{2} \right) / T \)

From the above arguments, the annual total relevant cost for the retailer can be expressed as:

Annual total relevant cost = ordering cost + stock-holding cost + opportunity cost of the capital.

We show that the annual total relevant cost is given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
TRC_r(T) &= \begin{cases} \\
\text{if } T \geq \frac{M}{\alpha} \\
\text{if } M \leq T < \frac{M}{\alpha} \\
\text{if } W/D \leq T < M \\
\text{if } 0 < T < W/D 
\end{cases} \quad (1a) \\
TRC(T) &= \begin{cases} \\
TRC_r(T) \\
TRC(T) \\
RC_r(T) \\
RC(T)
\end{cases} \quad (1b) \\
TRC_r(T) &= \begin{cases} \\
T \geq \frac{M}{\alpha} \\
M \leq T < \frac{M}{\alpha} \\
W/D \leq T < M \\
0 < T < W/D
\end{cases} \quad (1c)
\]

Where:

\[
\begin{aligned}
TRC_r(T) &= A \left( T \right) + DTh + cl_i \left( \frac{\alpha DT^2}{2} - (1-\alpha)DTM \right) / T \\
&- cl_i \left( \frac{(1-\alpha)\alpha^2DT^2}{2} \right) / T \\
TRC(T) &= A \left( T \right) + DTh + cl_i \left( \frac{\alpha^2DT^2}{2} + \frac{D(T-M)^2}{2} \right) / T \\
&- cl_i \left( \frac{DM(M-\alpha^2T)}{2} \right) / T \\
TRC(T) &= A \left( T \right) + DTh + cl_i \left( \frac{\alpha^2DT^2}{2} + \frac{DM(M-\alpha^2T)}{2} \right) / T \\
&- cl_i \left( \frac{DM(M-\alpha^2T)}{2} \right) / T \\
TRC(T) &= A \left( T \right) + DTh + cl_i \left( \frac{\alpha^2DT^2}{2} + \frac{DM(M-\alpha^2T)}{2} \right) / T \\
&- cl_i \left( \frac{DM(M-\alpha^2T)}{2} \right) / T \\
\end{aligned}
\]

and

\[
\begin{aligned}
TRC_r(T) &= A \left( T \right) + DTh + cl_i \left( \frac{\alpha^2DT^2}{2} / T \right) \\
TRC_r(T) &= A \left( T \right) + DTh + cl_i \left( \frac{\alpha^2DT^2}{2} / T \right) \\
TRC_r(T) &= A \left( T \right) + DTh + cl_i \left( \frac{\alpha^2DT^2}{2} / T \right) \\
TRC_r(T) &= A \left( T \right) + DTh + cl_i \left( \frac{\alpha^2DT^2}{2} / T \right)
\end{aligned}
\]
Since, \( TRC_2 \left( \frac{M}{\alpha} \right) = TRC_1 \left( \frac{M}{\alpha} \right) \), \( RC_2(M) = TRC_2(M) \), \( TRC_2(W/D) < TRC_1(W/D) \), \( TRC(T) \) is continuous except at \( T = W/D \). All \( TRC_1(T), TRC_2(T), TRC_3(T) \) and \( TRC_4(T) \) are defined on \( T > 0 \). From Eq. 2-5, we can obtain \( TRC_1(T) > TRC_2(T), TRC_2(T) > TRC_3(T) \) for all \( T > 0 \) and \( TRC_3(T) > TRC_2(T) \) for \( M < T < M/\alpha \). That is, \( TRC_4(T) \) will be higher than all \( TRC_1(T), TRC_2(T) \) and \( TRC_3(T) \) on suitable domain. From now on, we can neglect \( TRC_4(T) \) when we want to develop the efficient procedure to determine the optimal lot-sizing decisions for the retailer.

Then, we can rewrite

\[
TRC_1(T) = \frac{D(h + cl_k)}{2T} \left[ T - \sqrt{\frac{2A - c(1 - \alpha)DM^2I_1}{D(h + cl_k)}} \right] \\
+ \frac{\sqrt{D(h + cl_k)[2A - c(1 - \alpha)DM^2I_1]}}{-c(1 - \alpha)I_1DM}
\]  

From Eq. 6 the minimum of \( TRC_1(T) \) is obtained when the quadratic non-negative term, depending on \( T \), is equal to zero. The optimum value \( T_1^* \) is

\[
T_1^* = \frac{2A - c(1 - \alpha)DM^2I_1}{D(h + cl_k)} \text{ if } 2A - c(1 - \alpha)DM^2I_1 > 0
\]  

Therefore,

\[
TRC_1(T_1^*) = \frac{\sqrt{D(h + cl_k)[2A - c(1 - \alpha)DM^2I_1]}}{-c(1 - \alpha)I_1DM}
\]  

Similarly, we can derive \( TRC_2(T) \) without derivatives as follows:

\[
TRC_1(T) = \frac{D(h + cl_k)(1 + \alpha^2)}{2T} \left[ T - \sqrt{\frac{2A + cDM^2(l_k - l_k)}{D(h + cl_k)(1 + \alpha^2)}} \right] \\
+ \frac{\sqrt{D[h + cl_k(l_k + \alpha^2)(l_k - l_k)]}}{-cDM(2l_k + \frac{\alpha^2}{2}l_k)}
\]  

From Eq. 9 the minimum of \( TRC_1(T) \) is obtained when the quadratic non-negative term, depending on \( T \), is equal to zero. The optimum value \( T_1^* \) is

\[
T_2^* = \frac{2A + cDM^2(l_k - l_k)}{D[h + cl_k(l_k + \alpha^2)]}
\]  

Therefore,

\[
TRC_2(T_1^*) = \frac{\sqrt{D[h + cl_k(l_k + \alpha^2)][2A + cDM^2(l_k - l_k)]}}{-cDM(2l_k + \frac{\alpha^2}{2}l_k)}
\]  

Likewise, we can derive \( TRC_3(T) \) algebraically as follows:

\[
TRC_3(T) = \frac{\sqrt{2A}}{2T} \left[ T - \sqrt{\frac{D[h + \alpha^2cl_k + (1 + \alpha^2)cl_k]}{-cDM(2l_k + \frac{\alpha^2}{2}l_k)}} \right] \\
+ \frac{\sqrt{2A[h + \alpha^2cl_k + (1 + \alpha^2)cl_k] - DMel_k}}{-cDM(2l_k + \frac{\alpha^2}{2}l_k)}
\]

From Eq. 12 the minimum of \( TRC_3(T) \) is obtained when the quadratic non-negative term, depending on \( T \), is equal to zero. The optimum value \( T_3^* \) is

\[
T_3^* = \frac{2A}{\sqrt{D[h + \alpha^2cl_k + (1 + \alpha^2)cl_k] - DMel_k}}
\]

Therefore,

\[
TRC_3(T_3^*) = \frac{\sqrt{2A}}{2T} \left[ T - \sqrt{\frac{D(h + cl_k)(1 + \alpha^2)}{D(h + cl_k)}} \right]
\]

\[
TRC_2(T_1^*) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
TRC_2(T) \text{ if } T \geq \frac{M}{\alpha} \\
TRC_1(T) \text{ if } W/D \leq T < \frac{M}{\alpha} \\
TRC_1(T) \text{ if } 0 < T < W/D
\end{array} \right.
\]

Case II: Suppose that \( M < W/D < M/\alpha \): If \( M < W/D < M/\alpha \), Eq. 1(a, b, c, d) will be modified as

\[
TRC_1(T) \text{ if } T \geq \frac{M}{\alpha} \text{ (15a)}
\]

\[
TRC(T) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
TRC_1(T) \text{ if } W/D \leq T < \frac{M}{\alpha} \\
TRC_1(T) \text{ if } 0 < T < W/D
\end{array} \right.
\]

Since \( TRC_1(M/\alpha) = TRC_2(M/\alpha) \), \( TRC_3(W/D) < TRC_4(W/D) \), \( TRC(T) \) is continuous except at \( T = W/D \). All \( TRC_1(T), TRC_2(T), TRC_3(T) \) and \( TRC_4(T) \) are defined on \( T > 0 \). Similar to Case I discussion, \( TRC_4(T) \) will be higher than both \( TRC_1(T) \) and \( TRC_2(T) \) on suitable domain. Hence, we can neglect \( TRC_4(T) \) when we want to develop the efficient procedure to determine the optimal lot-sizing decisions for the retailer.

Case III: Suppose that \( M/\alpha < W/D \): If \( M/\alpha < W/D \), Eq. 1(a, b, c, d) will be modified as

\[
TRC(T) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
TRC_1(T) \text{ if } T \geq W/D \\
TRC_1(T) \text{ if } 0 < T < W/D
\end{array} \right.
\]
Since \( TRC_i \) (W/D) < \( TRC_j \) (W/D), \( TRC \) (T) is continuous except at \( T = W/D \). All \( TRC_i \) (T), \( TRC_j \) (T) and \( TRC \) (T) are defined on \( T > 0 \). We can easily obtain that \( TRC_i (T) > TRC_j (T) \) for all \( T > 0 \). Hence, we can neglect \( TRC_i (T) \) when we want to develop the efficient procedure to determine the optimal lot-sizing decisions for the retailer.

**Determination of the optimal cycle time \( T^* \)**

**Case I:** Suppose that \( M > W/D \): Equation 7 gives that the optimal value of \( T^* \) for the case when \( T > M/\alpha \) so that \( T^* > M/\alpha \). We substitute Eq. 7 into \( T_1^* > M/\alpha \), then we can obtain that:

\[
\frac{M}{\alpha} < T_1^* \text{ if and only if } -2A + DM \left( c_1 - \frac{\alpha + c_1}{\alpha^2} \right) > 0
\]

Similar discussion, we can obtain following results:

\[
\frac{M}{\alpha} < T_2^* \text{ if and only if } -2A + DM \left( c_1 - \frac{\alpha + c_1}{\alpha^2} \right) > 0 \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
W/D < T_3^* < M/\alpha \text{ if and only if } -2A + DM \left( h + \alpha c_1, \alpha (1 + \alpha' c_1) \right) > 0 \quad \text{and}
\]

Furthermore, we let

\[
\Delta_1 = -2A + DM \left( c_1 - \frac{\alpha + c_1}{\alpha^2} \right)
\]

\[
\Delta_2 = -2A + DM \left( c_1 - \frac{\alpha + c_1}{\alpha^2} \right)
\]

\[
\Delta_3 = -2A + DM \left[ h + \alpha c_1, \alpha (1 + \alpha' c_1) \right]
\]

and

\[
\Delta_4 = -2A + DM \left( h + \alpha c_1, \alpha (1 + \alpha' c_1) \right)
\]

From Eq. 17-21, we can easily obtain \( \Delta_1 > \Delta_2 > \Delta_3 \), \( \Delta_4 < \Delta_1 \) and \( \Delta_2 < \Delta_4 \). Summarized above arguments, the optimal cycle time \( T^* \) can be obtained as follows.

**Theorem 1**

(A) If \( \Delta_1 > 0 \), \( \Delta_2 > 0 \) and \( \Delta_4 > 0 \), then \( TRC (T^*) = TRC_1 \) (W/D). Hence \( T^* \) is W/D.

(B) If \( \Delta_1 > 0 \), \( \Delta_2 > 0 \) and \( \Delta_4 < 0 \), then \( TRC (T^*) = TRC_1 \) (W/D). Hence \( T^* \) is W/D.

(C) If \( \Delta_1 > 0 \), \( \Delta_2 < 0 \) and \( \Delta_4 > 0 \), then \( TRC (T^*) = TRC_1 \) (W/D). Hence \( T^* \) is W/D.

(D) If \( \Delta_1 < 0 \), \( \Delta_2 < 0 \) and \( \Delta_4 > 0 \), then \( TRC (T^*) = \min \{ TRC_1 (T_*^1), TRC_2 (T_*^2) \} \). Hence \( T^* \) is T_1^* or T_2^* associated with the least cost.

(E) If \( \Delta_1 > 0 \) and \( \Delta_2 < 0 \), then \( TRC (T^*) = TRC_2 \) (T_2^*). Hence \( T^* \) is T_2^*.

(F) If \( \Delta_1 > 0 \) and \( \Delta_2 < 0 \), then \( TRC (T^*) = TRC_1 \) (T_1^*). Hence \( T^* \) is T_1^*.

(G) If \( \Delta_1 > 0 \), \( \Delta_2 > 0 \) and \( \Delta_4 < 0 \), then \( TRC (T^*) = \min \{ TRC_1 (T_*^1), TRC_1 (T_*^2) \} \). Hence \( T^* \) is T_1^* or T_2^* associated with the least cost.

(H) If \( \Delta_1 < 0 \), \( \Delta_2 > 0 \) and \( \Delta_4 < 0 \), then \( TRC (T^*) = \min \{ TRC_1 (T_*^1), TRC_2 (T_*^2) \} \). Hence \( T^* \) is T_1^* or T_2^* associated with the least cost.

(I) If \( \Delta_1 < 0 \), \( \Delta_2 > 0 \) and \( \Delta_4 < 0 \), then \( TRC (T^*) = \min \{ TRC_1 (T_*^1), TRC_2 (T_*^2) \} \). Hence \( T^* \) is T_1^* or T_2^* associated with the least cost.

(J) If \( \Delta_1 < 0 \), \( \Delta_2 > 0 \) and \( \Delta_4 < 0 \), then \( TRC (T^*) = \min \{ TRC_1 (T_*^1), TRC_2 (T_*^2) \} \). Hence \( T^* \) is T_1^* or T_2^* associated with the least cost.

(K) If \( \Delta_1 < 0 \) and \( \Delta_2 > 0 \), then \( TRC (T^*) = TRC_1 \) (T_1^*). Hence \( T^* \) is T_1^*.

(L) If \( \Delta_1 < 0 \) and \( \Delta_2 > 0 \), then \( TRC (T^*) = \min \{ TRC_1 (T_*^1), TRC_2 (T_*^2) \} \). Hence \( T^* \) is T_1^* or T_2^* associated with the least cost.

(M) If \( \Delta_1 < 0 \) and \( \Delta_2 < 0 \), then \( TRC (T^*) = TRC_1 \) (T_1^*). Hence \( T^* \) is T_1^*.

**Case II:** Suppose that \( M < W/D < M/\alpha \): If \( M < W/D < M/\alpha \), Eq. 1(a, b, c and d) will be modified as Eq. 15 (a, b and c). Similar to above Case I discussion, we can obtain following results:

\[
\frac{M}{\alpha} < T_1^* \text{ if and only if } -2A + DM \left( c_1 - \frac{\alpha + c_1}{\alpha^2} \right) > 0
\]

\[
W/D < T_2^* < M/\alpha \text{ if and only if } -2A + DM \left( c_1 - \frac{\alpha + c_1}{\alpha^2} \right) > 0 \quad \text{and}
\]

Furthermore, we let

\[
\Delta_5 = -2A + DM \left[ h + \alpha c_1, \alpha (1 + \alpha' c_1) \right]
\]

From Eq. 17-21, we can easily obtain \( \Delta_5 > \Delta_1 \) and \( \Delta_5 > \Delta_2 \). Summarized above arguments, the optimal cycle time \( T^* \) can be obtained as follows.

\[
\Delta_5 = -2A + DM \left[ h + \alpha c_1, \alpha (1 + \alpha' c_1) \right]
\]
From Eq. 17, 18 and 22, we can easily obtain $\Delta_1 > 0$ and $\Delta_2 > 0$. Summarized above arguments, the optimal cycle time $T^*$ can be obtained as follows:

**Theorem 2**

A. If $\Delta_1 > 0$ and $\Delta_2 > 0$, then $\text{TRC} (T^*) = \text{TRC}_1 (W/D)$. Hence $T^*$ is $W/D$.

B. If $\Delta_1 < 0$ and $\Delta_2 < 0$, then $\text{TRC} (T^*) = \text{TRC}_2 (T_2^*)$. Hence $T^*$ is $T_2^*$.

C. If $\Delta_1 < 0$ and $\Delta_2 > 0$, then $\text{TRC} (T^*) = \text{TRC}_1 (T_1^*)$. Hence $T^*$ is $T_1^*$.

D. If $\Delta_1 < 0$, $\Delta_2 > 0$ and $\Delta_3 < 0$, then $\text{TRC} (T^*) = \min \{ \text{TRC}_1 (T_1^*), \text{TRC}_2 (T_2^*) \}$. Hence $T^*$ is $T_1^*$ or $T_2^*$ associated with the least cost.

E. If $\Delta_1 < 0$, then $\text{TRC} (T^*) = \text{TRC}_3 (T_3^*)$. Hence $T^*$ is $T_3^*$.

**Case III:** Suppose that $M/\alpha < W/D$: If $M/\alpha < W/D$, Eq. 1 (a, b, c and d) will be modified as Eq. 16 (a and b). Similar to above Case I and Case II discussions, we can obtain the following results:

$$\frac{W}{D} \leq T_1^* \quad \text{if and only if} \quad -2A + DM \sqrt{c(1-\alpha)} + D \left( \frac{W}{D} \right) (h + c_1) \leq 0$$

Furthermore, we let

$$\Delta_1 = -2A + DM \sqrt{c(1-\alpha)} + D \left( \frac{W}{D} \right) (h + c_1) \quad (23)$$

Summarized above arguments, the optimal cycle time $T^*$ can be obtained as follows:

**Theorem 3**

A. If $\Delta_1 > 0$, then $\text{TRC} (T^*) = \text{TRC}_1 (W/D)$. Hence $T^*$ is $W/D$.

B. If $\Delta_1 < 0$, then $\text{TRC} (T^*) = \text{TRC}_1 (T_1^*)$. Hence $T^*$ is $T_1^*$.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The assumption in previously published results that the full payments delay is permitted if the retailer ordered a sufficient quantity. We know 100% payments delay is just an extreme case. This article amended the assumption of the full payments delay to partial payments delay when the retailer ordered a sufficient quantity. We adopt the assumption to model the retailer’s inventory problem. In addition, we establish three easy-to-use theorems to help the retailer to find the optimal lot-sizing policy.
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