A simple method to compute economic order quantities revisit

Yi-Fong Lin

Department of Fashion Business Management, Lee-Ming Institute of Technology, Taiwan

Abstract

This study examines Teng (2009) that was published in European Journal of Operational Research 198, 351-353 to provide a simpler solution procedure for EOQ/EPQ inventory models by using Arithmetic-Geometric-Mean inequality. We will point out Teng (2009) adopted the fill rate from Wee, Wang and Chung (2009), European Journal of Operational Research 194, 336-338 to convert two-variable minimum problems into one-variable problems. Hence, his simpler solution procedure is standing on the shoulder of a giant. There are three related papers: Cárdenas-Barrón (2010a, b) and Leung (2010) to further discussed Teng (2009). We will provide our comments on these four related papers.

Keywords: inventory models; arithmetic-geomsetric-mean (AGM) inequality; without calculus; fill rate

1. Introduction

In the revolution of academic history, if a researcher can provide a simple solution process to replace previously established lengthy and hard-working procedures, then his breaking through achievement will have great impact on scholastic society. Teng [39] announced that he created a new solution approach that is superior to Chang *et al*. [10], Grubbström and Erdem [21], Ronald *et al*. [36], Sphicas [38], Wee and Chung [46], Wu and Ogyang [51], and others. This astonished improvement arouses our attention which deserves a careful study.

Until now, there are 46 papers that had been referred to Teng [39] in their References. We divide them into the following three categories.

A. There are three comprehensive literature survey papers: Andriolo *et al*. [1], Drake and
B. Marley [17] and Shekarian *et al*. [37].
C. Three papers are really related to Teng [39]: Cárdenas-Barrón [2, 3] and Leung [30].
D. The rest 40 papers only mentioned Teng [39] in their Introduction and then they concentrated on their new inventory models. We list them in the following: Leung [29], Teng and Goyal [40], Chang and Ho [6], Dellino *et al*. [18], Widyadana and Wee [49], Cárdenas-Barrón [4], Cárdenas-Barrón *et al*. [5], Chang and Ho [7], Pasandideh *et al*. [34], Teng *et al*. [41], Widyadana *et al*. [50], Chang [8], Chung [14], Li *et al*. [26], Yadav *et al*. [52, 53], Chung [15, 16], Gambini *et al*. [19], Lou and Wang [31], Teng *et al*. [42], Wee *et al*. [48], Yadav *et al*. [54], Chang [9], Chen *et al*. [11], Chern *et al*. [13], Gambini *et al*. [20], Liao *et al*. [27], Teng *et al*. [43], Nagoor Gani and Raja Dharik [32], Teng and Hsu [44], Chen *et al*. [12], Kumar and Aarya [25], Niknamfar and Niaki [33], Gong *et al*. [22], Goyal *et al*. [23], Kojić [24], Liao *et al*. [28], Rajan and Uthayakumar [35] and Vidal-Carreras *et al*. [45].

From the above discussion, we can claim that we will focus on Teng [39], Cárdenas-Barrón [2, 3] and Leung [30] for the rest of our paper.

2. Materials and methods

To be compatible with Teng [39], we use the same notation and assumptions as to his paper.

Notation

A The ordering cost per replenishment

h The holding cost per unit and per unit of time

d The constant demand per unit of time

p The production rate per unit of time

Q The order quantity per replenishment

Q^* The optimal order quantity

r The fill rate, that is the ratio between the inventory period and one replenishment cycle

T The planning horizon for one replenishment

v The backorder cost per item per unit of time

Assumptions

1. The lead time is zero so that replenishment is instantaneous.
2. There is no quantity discount.
3. Both the initial and the ending inventory levels are zero so that there is no salvage value.
4. $TC_1(Q)$ is the EOQ model without backorders.
5. $TC_2(Q)$ is the EOQ model with backorders.
6. $TC_3(Q)$ is the EPQ model with backorders.

3. Results & Discussion

3.1 Review of Teng [39]

Teng [39] mentioned that he applied the Arithmetic-Geometric-Mean (AGM) inequality, which is

$$\frac{a+b}{2} \geq \sqrt{ab}$$

(1)

for any two positive real numbers. The equality holds if and only if $a = b$.

Teng [39] considered three inventory models: (a) EOQ model without backorders, (b) EOQ model with backorders, and (c) EPQ model with backorders.

For the EOQ model without backorders, the objective function is expressed as

$$TC_1(Q) = \frac{Ad}{Q} + \frac{hQ}{2}$$

(2)

Teng [39] applied AGM to derive

$$TC_1^*(Q) = \sqrt{2Adh}$$

(3)

And $Q^* = \sqrt{2Ad/h}$

For the EOQ model with backorders, Teng [39] cited the objective function from Wee et al. [47],

$$TC_2(Q) = \frac{Ad}{Q} + \frac{Q}{2}\left[hr^2 + v(1-r)^2\right]$$

(4)

Teng [39] applied AGM to derive

$$TC_2^*(Q) = \sqrt{2Ad\left[hr^2 + v(1-r)^2\right]}$$

(5)

And $Q^* = \sqrt{2Ad/\left[hr^2 + v(1-r)^2\right]}$.

For the EPQ model with backorders, Teng [39] cited the objective function from Wee et al. [47],

$$TC_3(Q) = \frac{Ad}{Q} + \frac{Q}{2}\left(\frac{p-d}{p}\right)\left[hr^2 + v(1-r)^2\right]$$

(6)

Teng [39] applied AGM to derive

$$TC_3^*(Q) = \sqrt{2Ad(p-d)\left[hr^2 + v(1-r)^2\right]/p}$$

(7)

And $Q^* = \sqrt{2Ad/\left\{(p-d)\left[hr^2 + v(1-r)^2\right]\right\}}$.

Teng [39] mentioned that his solution approach is easy-to-apply and simple-to-understand. We quote his assertion in his Conclusions "By using the proposed method, we also can obtain the global minimum solutions much easier and simpler than the method of computing perfect square established by Chang et al.

[10], and Erdem (1999), Ronald et al. [36], Sphicas [38], Wee and Chung [46], Wu and Ouyang [51], and others."

3.2 Our comments for Teng [39]

For the EOQ model with backorders, the objective function of Wee et al. [47],

$$TC_2(Q,r) = \frac{Ad}{Q} + \frac{Q}{2}\left[hr^2 + v(1-r)^2\right]$$

(8)

And then Wee et al. [47] applied Cost-Difference Comparison Method (CDCM) to derive

$$r^* = \frac{v}{h+v}$$

(9)

We must clearly point out that in Teng [39], he never mentioned the result of Equation (9).

Grubbström and Erdem [21], and Ronald et al. [36] considered the EOQ model with backorders, in a different expression,

$$C(Q,B) = \frac{D}{B+Q}\left(\frac{b}{2D}B^2 + \frac{h}{2D}Q^2 + K\right)$$

(10)

We transfer their expressions to the same notation as Wee et al. [47], then

$$C(rQ,(1-r)Q) = \frac{Ad}{Q} + \frac{h}{2}(rQ)^2 + \frac{v}{2}[(1-r)Q]^2$$

(11)

Grubbström and Erdem [21], and Ronald et al. [36] were facing a two-variable minimum problem. Teng [39] adopted a result from Wee et al. [47] to convert his two-variable problem into one-variable problem, and then Teng [39] asserted that his solution approach is simpler than Grubbström and Erdem [21], and Ronald et al. [36]. However, Teng [39] did not clearly inform readers that he used Equation (9) during his conversion. Hence, his simpler announcement is a bias assertion.

For the EPQ model with backorders, Chang et al. [10] considered the following minimum problem, in a different expression,

$$C(Q,B) = \frac{D}{B+Q}\left(\frac{b}{2D}B^2 + \frac{h}{2D}Q^2 + K\rho\right) + cD$$

(12)

We transfer their expressions to the same notation as Wee et al. [47], then

$$C(rQ,(1-r)Q) = \frac{Ad}{Q} + \frac{h}{2}(rQ)^2\left(\frac{p-d}{p}\right) + \frac{v}{2}[(1-r)Q]^2\frac{p-d}{p} + cd$$

(13)

Such that Chang et al. [10] was facing a two-variable minimum problem.

In Wee et al. [47], they did not apply CDCM to find r^* for EPQ model with backorders. Instead, Wee et al. [47] claimed that by a similar argument for the EOQ model with backorders, they can derive $r^* = v/(h+v)$.

Teng [39] quoted the results from Wee *et al*. [47] to simplify $TC_3(Q,r)$ with two variables Q and r to $TC_3(Q)$ with one variable Q.

The superiority of Teng [39] with $TC_3(Q)$ to Chang *et al*. [10] with $C(rQ,(1-r)Q)$ is a misleading assertion because Teng [39] implicitly applied $r^* = v/(h+v)$ during his reduction.

3.3 Review of Cárdenas-Barrón [2] with our comments

Cárdenas-Barrón [2] extended AGM mentioned by Teng [39] to a more general setting, for $a_1, a_2, ..., a_n$ being n positive real numbers

$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k}{n} \geq \left(\prod_{k=1}^{n} a_k\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}$$

(14)

With equality if and only if $a_1 = a_2 = ... = a_n$. Cárdenas-Barrón [2] also recalled the Cauchy-Bunyakovsky-Schwarz (CBS) inequality

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k^2 \sum_{k=1}^{n} b_k^2 \geq \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k b_k\right)^2$$

(15)

For two sets of real numbers $a_1, a_2, ..., a_n$ and $b_1, b_2, ..., b_n$, with equality if two sets of real numbers are proportional as $(a_1/b_1) = (a_2/b_2) = ... = (a_n/b_n)$.

Cárdenas-Barrón [2] considered the same EOQ model with backorders, but in different expression, where Q is the order quantity and B is the maximum backorders level such that the maximum inventory level is $Q - B$

$$TC(Q,B) = \frac{Ad}{Q} + \frac{h(Q-B)^2}{2Q} + \frac{vB^2}{2Q}$$

(16)

Cárdenas-Barrón [2] rewrote Equation (16) as

$$TC(Q,B) = \frac{Ad}{Q} + \frac{Q}{2}\left\{\left[\sqrt{h}\left(1 - \frac{B}{Q}\right)\right]^2 + \left[\sqrt{v}\frac{B}{Q}\right]^2\right\}$$

(17)

Cárdenas-Barrón [2] adopted a genius formula

$$1 = \left\{\left(\sqrt{\frac{v}{h+v}}\right)^2 + \left(\sqrt{\frac{h}{h+v}}\right)^2\right\}$$

(18)

To further rewrite Equation (18) as

$$TC(Q,B) = \frac{Ad}{Q} + \frac{Q}{2}\left\{\left[\sqrt{h}\left(1-\frac{B}{Q}\right)\right]^2 + \left[\sqrt{v}\frac{B}{Q}\right]^2\right\}\left\{\left(\sqrt{\frac{v}{h+v}}\right)^2 + \left(\sqrt{\frac{h}{h+v}}\right)^2\right\}$$

(19)

Cárdenas-Barrón [2] applied CBS inequality to Equation (19) to derive

$$TC(Q,B) \geq \frac{Ad}{Q} + \frac{Q}{2}\left\{\left[\sqrt{h}\left(1-\frac{B}{Q}\right)\right]\sqrt{\frac{v}{h+v}} + \left[\sqrt{v}\frac{B}{Q}\right]\sqrt{\frac{h}{h+v}}\right\}^2$$

(20)

and the equality holds when $h(1-(B/Q)) = v(B/Q)$ which is identical to the fill rate $(Q-B)/Q = v/(h+v)$ proposed by Wee *et al*. [47].

Cárdenas-Barrón [2] simplified Equation (20) to obtain

$$TC(Q, B = hQ/(h+v)) = \frac{Ad}{Q} + \frac{Q}{2}\sqrt{\frac{hv}{h+v}}$$

(21)

Based on Equation (21), Cárdenas-Barrón [2] derived

$$Q^* = \sqrt{\frac{2Ad(h+v)}{hv}}$$

(22)

And

$$TC(Q^*, B^* = hQ^*/(h+v)) = \sqrt{\frac{2Adhv}{h+v}}$$

(23)

We can claim that Cárdenas-Barrón [2] provided a patchwork for Teng [39] for applying CBS inequality to solve EOQ models with backorders.

Moreover, for the EPQ model with backorders

$$TC(Q,B) = \frac{Ad}{Q} + \frac{h(Q\delta - B)^2}{2Q\delta} + \frac{vB^2}{2Q\delta}$$

(24)

with $\delta = 1 - (d/p)$, Cárdenas-Barrón [2] repeated his solution approach for EOQ models to solve his EPQ models. Cárdenas-Barrón [2] overlooked Sphicas [38] already used $\hat{A} = A\delta$ and $\hat{Q} = Q\delta$ to rewrite Equation (24) as

$$TC(\hat{Q},B) = \frac{\hat{A}d}{\hat{Q}} + \frac{h(\hat{Q} - B)^2}{2\hat{Q}} + \frac{vB^2}{2\hat{Q}}$$

(25)

If we neglect the "cap" of Equation (25), then Equation (25) is identical to Equation (16) such that findings from an EOQ model can be directly applied for an EPQ model, without the lengthy repeated computation proposed by Cárdenas-Barrón [2].

3.4 Review of Cárdenas-Barrón [3] with our comments

Cárdenas-Barrón [3] mentioned that

$$\frac{Z_1 + Z_2 + ... + Z_n}{n} \geq \sqrt[n]{Z_1 Z_2 .. Z_n}$$

(26)

where $Z_1, Z_2, ..., Z_n$ are functions of variables $x_1, x_2, ..., x_2$, then the following three restrictions:

(i) All functions $Z_1, Z_2, ..., Z_n$ are positive functions,
(ii) The multiplication of all functions is a constant, that is, $Z_1 Z_2 .. Z_n$ is independent of $x_1, x_2, ..., x_2$,
(iii) When these functions are assumed to be equal, that is, $Z_1 = Z_2 = ... = Z_n$, then the substituted system can be solved,
that must be held, before applying AGM to solve minimum problems as applied by Teng [39], and then he criticized Wee *et al.* [47] did not find the backorders level.

Cárdenas-Barrón [3] referred the fill rate $r = v/(h+v)$ derived by Wee *et al.* [47] by CDCM to claim

$$B = Q(1-r) = \left(\frac{h}{h+v}\right)Q \tag{27}$$

$$Q = \sqrt{\frac{2Ad(h+v)}{hv}} \tag{28}$$

And

$$TC = \sqrt{\frac{2Adhv}{h+v}} \tag{29}$$

However, in Cárdenas-Barrón [3], he did not inform us how to derive Equations (28) and (29). Similar problems occur for the EPQ model with backorders of Cárdenas-Barrón [3].

We find that Wee *et al.* [47] did not write the backorder level, B for their EOQ and EPQ models. However, Wee *et al.* [47] already found Q^* and r^* such that the derivation of the maximum backorder level as

$$B^* = Q^*(1 - r^*) \tag{30}$$

Becomes a trivial exercise.
A similar problem occurs for his criticism for the backorder level of Wee *et al.* [47] for EPQ model with backorders. Cárdenas-Barrón [3] provided a patchwork for the missing discussion for fill rate in Wee *et al.* [47] for EPQ models and then Cárdenas-Barrón [3] still obtained the fill rate $r = v/(h+v)$. However, the optimal order quantity for EPQ models

$$Q = \sqrt{\frac{2Ad(h+v)}{(1-(d/p))hv}} \tag{31}$$

still suddenly appeared in Cárdenas-Barrón [3] without any explanation.

3.5 Review of Leung [30] with our comments
There are two comments for Leung [30] with respect to Teng [39]. For the first comment, Leung [30] noticed that in Teng [39], the fill rate, r, is not treated. Instead to cite from Wee *et al.* [47] for $r = v/(h+v)$, Leung [30] considered to minimize the last term of Equation (4) used by Teng [39], to denote it as a new expression, say $\eta(r)$, with

$$\eta(r) = hr^2 + v(1-r)^2 \tag{32}$$

to derive

$$\eta(r) = (h+v)\left(r - \frac{v}{h+v}\right)^2 + \frac{hv}{h+v} \tag{33}$$

Hence, Leung [30] obtained the optimal fill rate, $r^* = v/(h+v)$.
For the second comment, Leung [30] mentioned that for EOQ model with backorders, then the objective function should contain two variables: Q and r such that Leung [30] changed Equation (4) to the following

$$TC(Q, r) = \frac{Ad}{Q} + \frac{Q}{2}\left[hr^2 + v(1-r)^2\right] \tag{34}$$

Leung [30] pointed out that the solution procedure should be divided into three parts: Situation (a): $0 < r < 1$, Situation (b): $r = 0$, and Situation (c): $r = 1$.

Under three different situations, Leung [30] found

$$TC_{(a)}^* \equiv TC(Q^*, r^*) = \sqrt{\frac{2Adhv}{h+v}} \tag{35}$$

$$TC_{(b)}^* \equiv TC(Q_{(b)}^*, r = 0) = \sqrt{2Adv} \tag{36}$$

And

$$TC_{(c)}^* \equiv TC(Q_{(c)}^*, r = 1) = \sqrt{2Adh} \tag{37}$$

Leung [30] compared findings of Equations (35-37) to imply that $TC_{(a)}^* < TC_{(b)}^*$ and $TC_{(a)}^* < TC_{(c)}^*$ to conclude that $TC_{(a)}^*$ is the global minimum.
We will show that the second comment of Leung [30] is unnecessary. We recall the first comment of Leung [30] by an algebraic method to derive $r^* = v/(h+v)$ for $0 \le r \le 1$ such that it is unnecessary to divide $0 \le r \le 1$ into three situations as Situation (a): $0 < r < 1$, Situation (b): $r = 0$, and Situation (c): $r = 1$.
We can offer a reasonable explanation of why Leung [30] assumes three different situations: Situation (a): $0 < r < 1$, Situation (b): $r = 0$, and Situation (c): $r = 1$.
If researchers used calculus to find $r^* = v/(h+v)$, because calculus only handles interior points that are belonging to $0 < r < 1$ and then researchers will have three different objective functions: one for interior points, and two for two boundaries, $r = 0$ and $r = 1$. For these three objective functions, each one has its own local minimums and then researchers have to compare three local minimums to decide which one is the global minimum.
However, Leung [30] applied algebraic method without calculus such that there is only one objective function that is suitable for

12

$0 \le r \le 1$ to consider three different situations is tedious and useless.

4. Conclusions

Teng [39] adopted the findings of Wee *et al.* [47] to change two-variable minimum problems into one-variable minimum problems, and then Teng [39] claimed that his solution approach is simpler than several papers dealt with two-variable setting. Teng [39] overlooked that he already stands on the shoulder of a giant such that the comparison of his solution approach with the previous paper is unfair and misleading. Here conclude your finding to with object of your studies.

5. References

1. Strachey R. Catalogue of the Plants of Kumaon and of the Adjacent Portions of Garhwal and Tibet, Periodical Experts, New Delhi, India, 1852, 92.
2. Polunin O, Stainton A. Flowers of the Himalaya. Oxford University Press, New
3. Delhi, India, 1984, 192. (For Books)
4. Mahmood U, Kaul VK, Acharya R, Jerovetz L. *p*-Coumaric acid esters from *Tanacetum longifolium*. Phytochemistry, 2003; 64(4):851-853. (For Article)
5. Andriolo A, Battini D, Grubbström RW, Persona A, Sgarbossa F, A century of evolution from Harris's basic lot size model: Survey and research agenda. International Journal of Production Economics. 2014; 155:16-38.
6. Cárdenas-Barrón LE, An easy method to derive EOQ and EPQ inventory models with backorders. Computers and Mathematics with Applications. 2010a; 59(2):948-952.
7. Cárdenas-Barrón LE, A simple method to compute economic order quantities: Some observations. Applied Mathematical Modelling. 2010b; 34(6):1684-1688.
8. Cárdenas-Barrón LE, The derivation of EOQ/EPQ inventory models with two backorders costs using analytic geometry and algebra. Applied Mathematical Modelling. 2011; 35(5):2394-2407.
9. Cárdenas-Barrón LE, Wee HM, Blos MF, Solving the vendor-buyer integrated inventory system with arithmetic-geometric inequality. Mathematical and Computer Modelling. 2011; 53(5-6):991-997.
10. Chang HC, Ho CH, Exact closed-form solutions for "optimal inventory model for items with imperfect quality and shortage backordering". Omega. 2010; 38(3-4):233-237.
11. Chang HC, Ho CH, A note on solving the EOQ model with imperfect quality subject to in-house inspection. IMA Journal of Management Mathematics. 2011; 22(3):301-306.
12. Chang HC, Determining replenishment lot size and shipment policy in an EPQ model with quality assurance: An alternative approach and analysis. International Journal of Information and Management Sciences. 2012; 23(3):323-332.
13. Chang HC, An analysis of production-inventory models with deteriorating items in a two-echelon supply chain. Applied Mathematical Modelling. 2014; 38(3):1187-1191.
14. Chang SKJ, Chuang JPC, Chen HJ, Short comments on technical note –The EOQ and EPQ models with shortages derived without derivatives. International Journal of Production Economics. 2005; 97:241–243.
15. Chen SC, Cárdenas-Barrón LE, Teng JT, Retailer's economic order quantity when the supplier offers conditionally permissible delay in payments link to order quantity. International Journal of Production Economics, 2014; 155:284-291.
16. Chen X, Huang G, Zhu H, Suo M, Dong C, Inexact inventory theory-based waste management planning model for the city of Xiamen. China Journal of Environmental Engineering. 2016; 142(5); article No. 04016013.
17. Chern MS, Chan YL, Teng JT, Goyal SK, Nash equilibrium solution in a vendor-buyer supply chain model with permissible delay in payments. Computers and Industrial Engineering. 2014; 70(1):116-123.
18. Chung KJ. On the validity of the arithmetic-geometric mean method to locate the optimal solution in a supply chain system. International Journal of Systems Science. 2012; 43(8):1454-1463.
19. Chung KJ. An easy method to derive the integrated vendor-buyer production-inventory model with backordering using cost-difference rate comparison approach. Mathematical and Computer Modelling. 2013a; 57(3-4):632-640.
20. Chung KJ. The EOQ model with defective items and partially permissible delay in payments linked to order quantity derived analytically in the supply chain management. Applied Mathematical Modelling. 2013b; 37(4):2317-2326.
21. Drake MJ, Marley KA, A century of the EOQ. International Series in Operations Research and Management Science. 2014; 197:3-22.
22. Dellino G. Kleijnen JPC, Meloni C, Robust optimization in simulation: Taguchi and Response Surface Methodology. International Journal of Production Economics. 2010; 125(1):52-59.
23. Gambini A, Mingari Scarpello G, Ritelli D, Mathematical properties of EOQ models with special cost structure. Applied Mathematical Modelling. 2013; 37(6):659-666.
24. Gambini A, Scarpello GM, Ritelli D, Existence of EOQ and its evaluation: Some cases of stock blow down dynamics depending on its level. International Series in Operations Research and Management Science. 2014; 197:59-78.
25. Grubbström RW, Erdem A. The EOQ with backlogging derived without derivatives. International Journal of Production Economics. 1999; 59:529-530.
26. Gong DC, Kang JL, Lin GC, Hou TC, On an IC wire bonding machine production–inventory problem with time value of money. International Journal of Production Research. 2017; 55(9):2431-2453.
27. Goyal SK, Singh SR, Yadav D. Economic order quantity model for imperfect lot with partial backordering under the effect of learning and advertisement dependent imprecise demand. International Journal of Operational Research. 2017; 29(2):197-218.
28. Kojić V, Solving the consumer's utility-maximization problem with CES and Cobb-Douglas utility function via mathematical inequalities. Optimization Letters. 2017; 11(4):875-884.
29. Kumar M, Aarya DD. Optimal payment policy with price-dependent demand and three parameters dependent deterioration rate under the influence trade credit.

International Journal of Operational Research. 2016; 26(2):236-251.

30. Li J, Feng H, Chung KJ. Using the algebraic approach to determine the replenishment optimal policy with defective products, backlog and delay of payments in the supply chain management. Journal of Industrial and Management Optimization. 2012; 8(1):263-269.

31. Liao JJ, Huang KN, Ting PS. Optimal strategy of deteriorating items with capacity constraints under two-levels of trade credit policy. Applied Mathematics and Computation. 2014; 233:647-658.

32. Liao JJ, Huang KN, Chung KJ, Ting PS, Lin SD, Srivastava HM, Lot-sizing policies for deterioration items under two-level trade credit with partial trade credit to credit-risk retailer and limited storage capacity. Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences. 2017; 40(6):2122-2139.

33. Leung KNF. A technical note on "Optimizing inventory decisions in a multi-stage multi-customer supply chain". Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review. 2009; 45(4):572-582.

34. Leung KNF. Some comments on "A simple method to compute economic order quantities". European Journal of Operational Research. 2010; 201(3):960-961.

35. Lou KR, Wang L, Optimal lot-sizing policy for a manufacturer with defective items in a supply chain with up-stream and down-stream trade credits. Computers and Industrial Engineering. 2013; 66(4):1125-1130.

36. Nagoor Gani A, Raja Dharik S. A new approach on fuzzy cost-difference rate comparison in the integrated vendor-buyer production inventory model with backordering. International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics. 2015; 110(1):27-41.

37. Niknamfar AH, Niaki STA. Soft time-windows for a bi-objective vendor selection problem under a multi-sourcing strategy: Binary-continuous differential evolution. Computers and Operations Research. 2016; 76:43-59.

38. Pasandideh SHR, Niaki STA, Nia AR, A genetic algorithm for vendor managed inventory control system of multi-product multi-constraint economic order quantity model. Expert Systems with Applications. 2011; 38(3):2708-2716.

39. Rajan RS, Uthayakumar R. Comprehensive solution procedure for optimizing replenishment policies of instantaneous deteriorating items with stock-dependent demand under partial trade credit linked to order quantity. International Journal of Systems Assurance Engineering and Management. 2017; 8:1343-1373.

40. Ronald R, Yang GK, Chu P. Technical note: The EOQ and EPQ models with shortages derived without derivatives. International Journal of Production Economics. 2004; 92:97-200.

41. Shekarian E, Kazemi N, Abdul-Rashid SH, Olugu EU, Fuzzy inventory models: A comprehensive review. Applied Soft Computing Journal. 2017; 55:588-621.

42. Sphicas GP. EOQ and EPQ with linear and fixed backorder costs: Two cases identified and models analyzed without calculus. International Journal of Production Economics. 2006; 100:59-64.

43. Teng JT. A simple method to compute economic order quantities. European Journal of Operational Research. 2009; 198:351-353.

44. Teng JT, Goyal SK. Comment on "Optimal inventory replenishment policy for the EPQ model under trade credit derived without derivatives". International Journal of Systems Science. 2009; 40(10):1095-1098.

45. Teng JT, Cárdenas-Barrón LE, Lou KR, The economic lot size of the integrated vendor-buyer inventory system derived without derivatives: A simple derivation. Applied Mathematics and computation. 2011; 217(12):5972-5977.

46. Teng JT, Cárdenas-Barrón LE, Lou KR, Wee HM, Optimal economic order quantity for buyer-distributor-vendor supply chain with backlogging derived without derivatives. International Journal of Systems Science. 2013; 44(5):986-994.

47. Teng JT, Lou KR, Wang L. Optimal trade credit and lot size policies in economic production quantity models with learning curve production costs. International Journal of Production Economics. 2014; 155:318-323.

48. Teng HM, Hsu PH. Optimal production lots for items with imperfect production and screening processes without using derivatives. International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development. 2015; 14(2):172-185.

49. Vidal-Carreras PI, Garcia-Sabater JP, Garcia-Sabater JJ, A practical model for managing inventories with unknown costs and a budget constraint. International Journal of Production Research. 2017; 55(1):118-129.

50. Wee HM, Chung CJ. A note on the economic lot size of the integrated vendor-buyer inventory system derived without derivatives. European Journal of Operational Research. 2007; 177:1289-1293.

51. Wee HM, Wang WT, Chung CJ. A modified method to computer economic order quantities without derivatives by cost-difference comparisons. European Journal of Operational Research. 2009; 194:336-338.

52. Wee HM, Wang WT, Lee MC, Cárdenas-Barrón LE. Solving a finite horizon EPQ problem with backorders. Applied Mathematical Modelling. 2013; 37(14-15):7876-7882.

53. Widyadana GA, Wee HM. Revisiting lot sizing for an inventory system with product recovery. Computers and Mathematics with Applications. 2010; 59(8):2933-2939.

54. Widyadana GA, Cárdenas-Barrón LE, Wee HM. Economic order quantity model for deteriorating items with planned backorder level. Mathematical and Computer Modelling. 2011; 54(5-6):1569-1575.

55. Wu KS, Ouyang LY. An integrated single-vendor single-buyer inventory system with shortage derived algebraically. Production Planning and Control. 2003; 14:555-561.

56. Yadav D, Singh SR, Kumari R. Effect of demand boosting policy on optimal inventory policy for imperfect lot size with backorder in fuzzy environment. Control and Cybernetics. 2012a; 41(1):191-212.

57. Yadav D, Singh SR, Kumari R. "Effect of demand boosting policy on optimal inventory policy with backorder in fuzzy environment under the effect of learning", International Journal of Procurement Management. 2012b; 5(2):178-201.

58. Yadav D, Singh SR, Kumari R. Inventory model with learning effect and imprecise market demand under sscreening error. OPSEARCH. 2012c; 50(3):418-432.