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An Inventory Model for Weibull Distribution Deterioration with Allowable Shortage under Cash Discount and Permissible Delay in Payments

Sanjay Jain\textsuperscript{a}, Priya Advani\textsuperscript{b} and Mukesh Kumar\textsuperscript{c}

Abstract
The inventory theory has undergone a profound structural transformation in the last few decades. The trade credit/cash discount scheme revolution has expanded well beyond the cutting-edge high-tech industrial sector redefining the rules of global competition. Numerous studies have been undertaken to explain inventory models with different features. While findings from earlier studies have been conflicting, recent industrial-level studies indicate that multi-features inventory models has a positive impact on business scenario. We propose an inventory model with integration of many real features like two-parameter Weibull distribution deterioration allowing shortages under cash discount scheme and permissible delay in payments. A numerical example is taken to illustrate the application of developed models and to examine the sensitivity of model parameters.

Key Words: Weibull distribution, Permissible delay in payments, Trade credit, Cash discount, Deterioration, Shortage.

Introduction
The traditional inventory models were developed under the assumption that payment will be made to the suppliers immediately on receipt of the consignment. But in real life, suppliers allow some grace period/credit facilities before they settle account with the retailers. In such a case no interest is charged if the account is settled within the permissible delay period. Beyond this period the supplier will charge interest. Such a benefit motivates the retailers to order more quantity because delay in payment indirectly reduces the purchase cost of the items. However, if the items in the inventory system deteriorate, ordering large quantities would not be economical. Owing to this fact, during the past few years, many articles dealing with models under trade credit have appeared in various research journals.


In the above mentioned models, cash discount factor is not taken into consideration. The supplier often provides its customers a cash discount so as to motivate payment as early as possible, stimulate sales, or reduce credit expenses. The retailer can obtain cash discount if the payment is
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made within cash discount period offered by the supplier. Otherwise, the retailer will have to pay
full payment within the trade credit period.

Many inventory models under cash discount policy and delay in payments can be found in Chang
by assuming that the retailer pays the supplier the sales revenue when items are sold. Huang et
al. (2007) investigated the cash where the retailer's unit selling price and the purchasing price per
unit are not necessarily equal within the economic production quantity (EPQ) framework under
cash discount and permissible delay in payments.

In this paper we develop an inventory model for deteriorating items with two-parameter Weibull
distribution deterioration allowing shortages under cash discount and permissible delay in
payments. This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 assumptions and notations are
presented. In section 3 the mathematical model is formulated. In section 4 algorithm is stated. In
section 5 numerical examples are cited and sensitivity analysis of the optimal solution with
respect to parameters of the system is carried out.

Assumptions and Notations

Inventory model is developed under following assumptions and notations:

Assumptions

• Replenishment rate is infinite.
• The lead-time is zero.
• The rate of deterioration at any time \( t \) follows the two-parameter Weibull distribution:
  \[ Z(t) = \alpha \beta t^{\beta-1}, \]
  where \( \alpha (0 < \alpha < 1) \) is the scale parameter and \( \beta (> 0) \) is the
  shape parameter.
• Inventory level remains non-negative for a time \( t_1 \) in each cycle after which shortages are
  allowed and unsatisfied demand is backlogged at the rate \( \delta \).
• Supplier offers cash discount if payment is made within time \( M_1 \); otherwise the full
  payment is due within time \( M_2 \).

Notations

\( c_1 \) = set-up cost.
\( c_2 \) = per unit holding cost excluding interest charges.
\( c_3 \) = shortage cost per unit per unit time.
\( c_4 \) = opportunity cost due to lost sales per unit.
\( c_5 \) = deterioration cost per unit per unit time.
\( c \) = item cost per unit.
\( R \) = demand rate per unit per unit time.
\( Q \) = order quantity per cycle.
\( I(t) \) = inventory level at time.
\( I_e \) = interest earned per unit time.
\( I_p \) = interest paid per unit time.
\( r \) = cash discount rate.
\( M_1 \) = period of cash discount.
\( M_2 \) = last time of permissible delay (for settling the accounts \( M_2 > M_1 \)).
$T = \text{length of replenishment cycle.}$

$T_i = \text{length of positive inventory period.}$

$(T^a_1, T^a) = \text{optimal value of } (T_1, T) \text{ in case 1.1.}$

$(T^b_1, T^b) = \text{optimal value of } (T_1, T) \text{ in case 1.2.}$

$(T^c_1, T^c) = \text{optimal value of } (T_1, T) \text{ in case 1.3.}$

$(T^d_1, T^d) = \text{optimal value of } (T_1, T) \text{ in case 1.4.}$

**Model Formulation**

The system starts with $Q$ units of on-hand inventory. Depletion of inventory occurs due to combined effects of demand and deterioration in the interval $0 < t < T_1$. Demand is partially backlogged in the interval, $T_1 < t < T$. Variation of inventory level $I(t)$ at any time $t$ is given by

$$\frac{d I(t)}{d t} + \alpha \beta t^{\beta-1} I(t) = -R \quad ; 0 \leq t \leq T_1 \quad - - - (1)$$

$$\frac{d I(t)}{d t} = -\delta R \quad ; T_1 \leq t \leq T \quad - - - (2)$$

The solutions of (1) and (2) with the boundary condition are respectively

$$I(T) = R \left( (T_1 - t) - \alpha (T \beta - t \beta^{+1}) + \frac{\alpha}{\beta + 1} (T^{\beta+1} - t^{\beta+1}) \right) \quad ; 0 \leq t \leq T_1 \quad - - - (3)$$

$$I(t) = \delta R (T_1 - t) \quad ; T_1 \leq t \leq T \quad - - - (4)$$

Thus the order quantity per cycle is

$$Q = I(0) + \delta R (T - T_1)$$

$$= R \left( (1 - \delta) T_1 + \frac{\alpha}{\beta + 1} T^{\beta+1} + T \delta \right) \quad - - - (5)$$

Since the supplier offers a premium of cash discount, there are two payment policies for the retailer:

1. Payment is made at time $M_1$ to get the cash discount (Case 1)
2. Payment is made at time $M_2$ not to get the cash discount (Case 2)

These two cases are as follows:

Case 1. Payment is made at time $M_1$

**Case 1.1 $M_1 < T_1$**

In this case the length of the positive stock period is larger than the period of cash discount.
Inventory level

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lost Sales} \\
\text{Case 1.1 } M_1 < T_i
\end{align*}
\]

The components of total cost are calculated as follows.

(a) The setup cost per setup is fixed at \( c_s \).

(b) Holding cost during the interval \([0, T_i]\) is given by

\[
HC = c_s \int_0^{T_i} I(t) \, dt \\
= c_s R \left\{ \frac{T_i^2}{2} + \frac{\alpha \beta}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} T_i^{\beta+2} \right\} \\
- - - (6)
\]

(c) Shortage cost during the interval \([T_i, T]\) is given by

\[
SC = c_s \int_{T_i}^{T} I(t) \, dt = \frac{c_s \delta R}{2} (T - T_i)^2 \\
- - - (7)
\]

(d) Opportunity cost due to lost sales in the interval \([T_i, T]\) is given by

\[
OC = c_s \int_{T_i}^{T} R(1 - \delta) \, dt = c_s R(1 - \delta)(T - T_i) \\
- - - (8)
\]

(e) Deterioration cost is given

\[
DC = c_5 \left[ I(0) - \int_0^{T_i} R \, dt \right] \\
= \frac{c_5 \alpha R}{(\beta + 1)} T_i^{\beta+1} \\
- - - (9)
\]

(f) Interest payable per cycle is given by

\[
IP = c \int_{M_i}^{T_i} I(t) \, dt
\]
\[ c I_p R \left\{ \frac{(T_1 - M_1)^2}{2} + \frac{\alpha \beta}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} T_1^{\beta + 2} + \frac{\alpha}{(\beta + 1)} - T_1 M_1 (M_1^\beta - T_1^\beta) \right\} \]  

\( \text{--- (10)} \)

\( (g) \) Interest earned per cycle is given by

\[ I_E = c I_e \int_0^{M_1} R t \ dt \]

\[ = \frac{c I_e R M_1^2}{2} \]  

\( \text{--- (11)} \)

\( (h) \) Since the payment is made at time \( M_1 \), the retailer can get a \( r \) cash discount off the price of merchandise is given by

\[ \text{CD} = r c Q \]

\[ = r c R \left\{ (1 - \delta) T_i + \frac{\alpha}{(\beta + 1)} T_i^{\beta + 1} + \delta T \right\} \]  

\( \text{--- (12)} \)

Therefore the total cost per unit time is

\[ C_1 (T_1, T) = \frac{C_1 + HC + SC + OC + DC + IP - IE - CD}{T} \]  

\( \text{--- (13)} \)

Using (6) to (12) in (13), we get

\[ \frac{1}{T} \left\{ c_1 + \frac{c_2 R T_i^2}{2} + \frac{\alpha \beta R}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} (c_2 + c I_p) T_1^{\beta + 2} + \frac{c_3 \delta R}{2} (T - T_i)^2 
\]

\[ + c_4 R (1 - \delta) (T - T_i) + c I_p R \left\{ \frac{(T_1 - M_1)^2}{2} + \frac{\alpha T_i}{(\beta + 1)} M_1^{\beta + 1} - \frac{\alpha \beta}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} \right\} M_1^{\beta + 2} 
\]

\[ - \frac{\alpha R}{(\beta + 1)} (c I_p M_1 + r c - c_s) T_i^{\beta + 1} - \frac{c I_e R M_1^2}{2} - r c R \left\{ (1 - \delta) T_i + \delta T \right\} \right\} \]  

\( \text{--- (14)} \)

For the minimization of cost we set,

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial T} C_1 (T_1, T) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial T_1} C_1 (T_1, T) = 0 \]  

\( \text{--- (15)} \)

\[ \Rightarrow T = \frac{1}{c_1 \delta} \left\{ \frac{\alpha \beta}{(\beta + 1)} (c_2 + c I_p) T_i^{\beta + 1} - \alpha (c I_p M_1 + r c - c_s) T_i^\beta + (c_2 + c_s) \delta + c I_p) T_i 
\]

\[ - c_4 (1 - \delta) - r c (1 - \delta) - c I_p M_1 + \frac{c I_p \alpha}{(\beta + 1)} M_1^{\beta + 1} \right\} \]  

\( \text{--- (15-a)} \)

\[ \text{and} \]
\[ T^2 = \frac{2}{c_3 \delta R} \left\{ \frac{\alpha \beta R}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} (c_2 + c_1 \beta \gamma) T_1^{\beta + 2} - \frac{\alpha R}{(\beta + 1)} (c \beta \gamma M_1 + r c - c_3) T_1^{\beta + 1} \\
+ (c_2 + c_3 \delta) \frac{RT_1^2}{2} - (c_4 + r c) R (1 - \delta) T_1 \\
+ c_1 \beta \gamma R \left[ \frac{(T_1 - M_1)^2}{2} + \frac{\alpha T_1 M_1^{\beta + 1}}{\beta + 1} - \frac{\alpha \beta}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} M_1^{\beta + 2} \right] \\
- \frac{c_1 \beta \gamma R M_1^2}{2} + c_1 \right\} \]

To get the optimal values \( T^* \) and \( T_1^* \) of \( T \) and \( T_1 \) respectively we can proceed as follows:

Eliminating \( T \) from above two equations 15(a) & 15(b) as \( [T]^2 - T^2 = 0 \), we get

\[
\left\{ \frac{1}{c_3 \delta R} \left[ \frac{\alpha \beta}{(\beta + 1)} (c_2 + c_1 \beta \gamma) T_1^{\beta + 1} - \alpha (c \beta \gamma M_1 + r c - c_3) T_1^{\beta + 1} \\
+ (c_2 + c_1 \delta + c_1 \beta \gamma) T_1 - c_4 (1 - \delta) - r c (1 - \delta) - c_1 \beta \gamma M_1 + \frac{c_1 \beta \gamma}{(\beta + 1)} M_1^{\beta + 1} \right] \right\}^2 = 0
\]

\[
\frac{2}{c_3 \delta R} \left\{ \frac{\alpha \beta R}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} (c_2 + c_1 \beta \gamma) T_1^{\beta + 2} - \frac{\alpha R}{(\beta + 1)} (c \beta \gamma M_1 + r c - c_3) T_1^{\beta + 1} \\
+ (c_2 + c_1 \delta) \frac{RT_1^2}{2} - (c_4 + r c) R (1 - \delta) T_1 \\
+ c_1 \beta \gamma R \left[ \frac{(T_1 - M_1)^2}{2} + \frac{\alpha T_1 M_1^{\beta + 1}}{\beta + 1} - \frac{\alpha \beta}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} M_1^{\beta + 2} \right] \\
- \frac{c_1 \beta \gamma R M_1^2}{2} + c_1 \right\} = 0
\]

Equation (15-c) is reducing now in one nonlinear variable \( T_1 \), so cannot be solved analytically.

Available software MS-Excel Solver is used here for solving \( T_1 \), \( T \) & \( C_1 \) from these equations as follows:

- Calculate the value of \( T \) from equation (15-a) and then square it. Calculate the value of \( T^2 \) from equation (15-b).
- Set the difference of above two calculated values equal to zero by changing the value of \( T_1 \). The value thus obtained will be \( T_1^* \) (Multiply this value by 365).
- The value of \( T_1^* \) is now substitute in either (15-a) or (15-b) to obtain the value of \( T^* \) (Multiply this value by 365).
- \( C_1 \) can be calculated by using optimal value of \( T_1 \) & \( T \) in equations (14) and (15-a) respectively.

It can be shown easily that second order sufficient conditions for a minimum value are satisfied.
Case 1.2 $T_1 \leq M_1$

In this case the length of the positive stock period is not greater than the period of cash discount. Inventory level

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Case 1.2 } & T_1 \leq M_1 \\
\text{The setup cost, holding cost, shortage cost, opportunity cost due to lost sales and cash discount} \\
\text{are identical to case 1.2. However since } T_1 \leq M_1, \text{ the retailer pays no interest during the period} \\
[0, M_1] \text{ and the interest earned is given by} \\
\text{Therefore the total cost per unit time is} \\
\text{For the minimization of cost we set,}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
IE &= c I(x) \int_0^{T_1} R t \, dt + RT_1 \left( M_1 - T_1 \right) \\
&= \frac{c R I_t}{2} \left( 2 M_1 T_1 - T_1^2 \right) \\
\therefore C_2 (T_1, T) &= \frac{c_1 + H C + S C + O C + D C - I E - C D}{T} \\
&= \frac{1}{T} \left( c_1 + c_2 R \left( \frac{T_1^2}{2} + \frac{\alpha \beta}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} T_1^{3 \beta + 2} \right) + \frac{c_3 \delta R}{2} (T - T_1)^2 + c_4 R (1 - \delta)(T - T_1) \\
&\quad \quad + \frac{\alpha R C_3}{\beta + 1} T_1^{3 \beta + 1} - \frac{c I_t R}{2} \left( 2 M_1 T_1 - T_1^2 \right) - r c R \left( (1 - \delta)T_1 + \frac{\alpha}{(\beta + 1)} + \delta T \right) \right) \\
\frac{\partial C_2(T_1, T)}{\partial T} &= 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial C_2(T_1, T)}{\partial T_1} = 0
\end{align*}
\]
The value of $T_1$, $T$ & $C_2$ can be obtained similarly as described in case 1.1 also it can be shown easily that second order sufficient conditions for a minimum value are satisfied.

**Case 2.** Payment is made at time $M_2$

**Case 2.1** $M_2 < T_1$

In this case the length of the positive stock period is greater than the last credit period. The setup cost, holding cost, shortage cost, opportunity cost due to lost sales are identical to case 1.1. The retailer has no cash discount in this case and the interest payable is given by

$$IP = cI_p \int_{M_2}^{T_1} I(t) \, dt$$

$$= cI_p R \left\{ \frac{(T_1 - M_2)^2}{2} + \frac{\alpha \beta}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} T_1^{\beta+2} + \frac{\alpha}{(\beta + 1)} T_1 M_2 (M_2^\beta - T_1^\beta) - \frac{\alpha \beta}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} M_2^{\beta+2} \right\}$$

- - - (20)

Interest earned per cycle is given by

$$IE = cI_e \int_0^{M_2} R t \, dt$$

$$= \frac{cI_e R M_2^2}{2}$$

- - - (21)

Therefore the total cost per unit time is

$$C_1(T_1, T) = \frac{c_1 + HC + SC + OC + DC + IP - IE}{T}$$

- - - (22)
\[
\begin{align*}
&= \frac{1}{T} \left\{ c_1 + c_2 R T_1^2 + \frac{\alpha \beta R}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} (c_2 + c I_p) T_1^{\beta + 2} + \frac{c_3 \delta R}{2} (T - T_1)^2 \\
&+ c_4 R (1 - \delta)(T - T_1) + c I_p R \left( \frac{(T_1 - M_2)^2}{2} + \frac{\alpha T_1 M_2^{\beta + 1}}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} \right) \right\} M_2^{\beta + 2} \\
&\quad - \frac{\alpha R}{\beta + 1} (c I_p M_2 - c_5) T_1^{\beta + 1} - \frac{c I_e R M_2^2}{2} 
\end{align*}
\]

For the minimization of cost we set,
\[
\frac{\partial C_1(T_1, T)}{\partial T} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial C_3(T_1, T)}{\partial T_1} = 0
\]

The value of \( T_1, T \) & \( C_3 \) can be obtained similarly as described in case 1.1 also it can be shown easily that second order sufficient conditions for a minimum value are satisfied.

**Case 2.2** \( T_1 \leq M_2 \)

In this case the length of the positive stock period is not greater than the last credit period. The setup cost, holding cost, shortage cost, opportunity cost due to lost sales are identical to case 1.1. The retailer has no cash discount and no interest payable in this case and the interest earned is given by

\[
IE = c I_e \left[ \int_0^{T_1} R t \, dt + RT_1 \left( M_2 - T_1 \right) \right] \\
= \frac{c R I_e}{2} \left( 2 M_2 T_1 - T_1^2 \right)
\]

---

For the minimization of cost we set,
\[
\frac{\partial C_1(T_1, T)}{\partial T} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial C_3(T_1, T)}{\partial T_1} = 0
\]

The value of \( T_1, T \) & \( C_3 \) can be obtained similarly as described in case 1.1 also it can be shown easily that second order sufficient conditions for a minimum value are satisfied.

**Case 2.2** \( T_1 \leq M_2 \)

In this case the length of the positive stock period is not greater than the last credit period. The setup cost, holding cost, shortage cost, opportunity cost due to lost sales are identical to case 1.1. The retailer has no cash discount and no interest payable in this case and the interest earned is given by

\[
IE = c I_e \left[ \int_0^{T_1} R t \, dt + RT_1 \left( M_2 - T_1 \right) \right] \\
= \frac{c R I_e}{2} \left( 2 M_2 T_1 - T_1^2 \right)
\]
Therefore the total cost per unit time is

\[
C_4(T_1, T) = \frac{c_1 + HC + SC + OC + DC - IE}{T} \tag{26}
\]

\[
-\frac{1}{T}\left\{ c_1 + c_2 R \left( \frac{T_1^2}{2} + \frac{\alpha \beta}{(\beta + 1)(\beta + 2)} T_1^{\beta+2} \right) + \frac{c_3 \delta R}{2} (T - T_1)^2 \right. \\
+ c_4 R (1 - \delta)(T - T_1) + \frac{\alpha R c_5}{\beta + 1} T_1^{\beta+1} - \frac{c I_e R}{2} \left( 2 M_2 T_1 - T_1^2 \right) \right\} \tag{27}
\]

For the minimization of cost we set,

\[
\frac{\partial C_4(T_1, T)}{\partial T} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial C_4(T_1, T)}{\partial T_1} = 0 \tag{28}
\]

The value of \(T_1, T\) & \(C_4\) can be obtained similarly as described in case 1.1 also it can be shown easily that second order sufficient conditions for a minimum value are satisfied.

**Algorithm**

The optimal replenishment policies and minimum total cost per unit time can be obtained by using the following algorithm:

**Step 1.** Determine \(T_1^a\) and \(T^a\) from (15). If \(M_1 < T_1^a\), obtain \(C_1(T_1^a, T^a)\) from (14); otherwise \((T_1^a, T^a)\) is infeasible.

**Step 2.** Determine \(T_1^b\) and \(T^b\) from (19). If \(T_1^b \leq M_1\), obtain \(C_2(T_1^b, T^b)\) from (18); otherwise \((T_1^b, T^b)\) is infeasible.

**Step 3.** Determine \(T_1^c\) and \(T^c\) from (24). If \(M_2 < T_1^c\), obtain \(C_3(T_1^c, T^c)\) from (23); otherwise \((T_1^c, T^c)\) is infeasible.

**Step 4.** Determine \(T_1^d\) and \(T^d\) from (27). If \(T_1^d \leq M_2\), obtain \(C_4(T_1^d, T^d)\) from (28); otherwise \((T_1^d, T^d)\) is infeasible.

**Step 5.** By comparing \(C_1(T_1^a, T^a), C_2(T_1^b, T^b), C_3(T_1^c, T^c)\) and \(C_4(T_1^d, T^d)\), select the optimum replenishment cycle and optimal stock period (denoted by \(T^*\) and \(T_1^*\) respectively) with the least total cost per unit time (denoted by \(C^*\)). Once the optimal value \(T^*\) and \(T_1^*\) are obtained, the optimal order quantity, \(Q^*\), can be obtained from (5).

**Numerical Example**

For the numerical illustration of the developed model, we consider the following values of the parameters

\[
c_1 = \$200 \text{ per setup} \quad c_2 = \$2 / \text{unit/year} \quad c_3 = \$8 / \text{unit/year} \\
c_4 = \$2 / \text{unit/year} \quad c_5 = 1.25 \text{ unit/year} \quad R = 1000 \text{ unit/year} \\
c = \$20 / \text{unit} \quad I_e = 0.13 / \text{year} \quad I_p = 0.15 / \text{year} \\
\delta = 0.8
\]
Sample calculation procedure for obtaining values in tabular format is as follows:
Substituting the above parameters with \( M_1 = 5, M_2 = 30, \alpha = 0.02 \) and \( \beta = 1.5 \) in equation (15-c) and solving by MS-Excel Solver software as described in case 1.1, we obtain \( T_1^* = 0.248039 \) and \( T^* = 0.36732427 \). Multiplying them by 365 we get \( T_1^* = 90.53408 \) and \( T^* = 134.0734 \). Substituting these values in equation (14) we get \( C_1 = 1003.428 \). Values of \( C_2, C_3 \) and \( C_4 \) can be obtained in the same way respectively in their cases. The optimal cost \( C^* \) can be obtained by using the algorithm given above.

The optimal solutions obtained by varying the values of \( r, M_1, M_2, \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are shown in tables below.

### \( r = 0.01 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( M_1 )</th>
<th>( M_2 )</th>
<th>( A )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( C^* )</th>
<th>( T_1^* ) in days</th>
<th>( T^* ) in days</th>
<th>Payment Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1003.428</td>
<td>90.53408</td>
<td>134.0734</td>
<td>( M_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>879.5674</td>
<td>99.50439</td>
<td>126.846</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>698.6566</td>
<td>103.9072</td>
<td>120.9178</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>975.7464</td>
<td>91.5139</td>
<td>133.4743</td>
<td>( M_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>879.4976</td>
<td>99.50439</td>
<td>126.846</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>698.5339</td>
<td>103.9072</td>
<td>120.9178</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>947.8437</td>
<td>92.47791</td>
<td>132.8471</td>
<td>( M_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>879.4318</td>
<td>99.50476</td>
<td>126.8467</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>698.4176</td>
<td>103.9072</td>
<td>120.9178</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( M_1 )</th>
<th>( M_2 )</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( C^* )</th>
<th>( T_1^* ) in days</th>
<th>( T^* ) in days</th>
<th>Payment Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>909.8052</td>
<td>91.0145931</td>
<td>133.7769862</td>
<td>( M_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>879.3887</td>
<td>99.5043912</td>
<td>126.846009</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>698.3433</td>
<td>103.907209</td>
<td>120.917783</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>881.9129</td>
<td>91.4853843</td>
<td>133.4565872</td>
<td>( M_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>879.319</td>
<td>99.5047595</td>
<td>126.846008</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>698.2206</td>
<td>103.907209</td>
<td>120.917784</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>853.7974</td>
<td>92.9280967</td>
<td>132.496071</td>
<td>( M_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>852.9891</td>
<td>93.0386659</td>
<td>132.560669</td>
<td>( M_1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>698.1044</td>
<td>103.907209</td>
<td>120.917784</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### \( r = 0.015 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( M_1 )</th>
<th>( M_2 )</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( C^* )</th>
<th>( T_1^* ) in days</th>
<th>( T^* ) in days</th>
<th>Payment Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>911.5065</td>
<td>91.0145931</td>
<td>133.7769862</td>
<td>( M_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>879.3887</td>
<td>99.5043912</td>
<td>126.846009</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>698.3433</td>
<td>103.907209</td>
<td>120.917783</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>881.9129</td>
<td>91.4853843</td>
<td>133.4565872</td>
<td>( M_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>879.319</td>
<td>99.5047595</td>
<td>126.846008</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>698.2206</td>
<td>103.907209</td>
<td>120.917784</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>853.7974</td>
<td>92.9280967</td>
<td>132.496071</td>
<td>( M_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>852.9891</td>
<td>93.0386659</td>
<td>132.560669</td>
<td>( M_1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>698.1044</td>
<td>103.907209</td>
<td>120.917784</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### \( r = 0.01 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( M_1 )</th>
<th>( M_2 )</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( C^* )</th>
<th>( T_1^* ) in days</th>
<th>( T^* ) in days</th>
<th>Payment Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1003.615</td>
<td>90.5048652</td>
<td>134.0547862</td>
<td>( M_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>877.9349</td>
<td>99.7759595</td>
<td>127.0292776</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>694.6428</td>
<td>104.450754</td>
<td>121.2487103</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>975.9333</td>
<td>91.4853843</td>
<td>133.4565872</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>877.9049</td>
<td>99.7759595</td>
<td>127.0292776</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>694.6169</td>
<td>104.450754</td>
<td>121.2487103</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>948.0314</td>
<td>92.4498511</td>
<td>132.8297723</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>877.8765</td>
<td>99.7759592</td>
<td>127.0292776</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>694.5918</td>
<td>104.450754</td>
<td>121.2487103</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For fixed $r$ and $M_1$ the larger the values of $M_2$ is, the smaller the total cost per unit time would be.

For fixed $r$ and $M_2$ the larger the values of $M_1$ is, the smaller the optimal cost, the larger the value of $M_1$ is, the smaller the optimal total cost per unit time would be i.e. 1003, 975, 947 as the optimal payment time is $M_2$.

However if the optimal payment time is $M_2$, the optimal total cost per unit time is independent of $M_1$.

For fixed $r$, $M_1$ and $\beta$ as the value of scale parameter $\alpha$ increases the total cost also increases as compared to the model by Ouyang et al.

For fixed $r$, $M_1$ and $\alpha$ as the value of scale parameter $\beta$ increases the total cost of the inventory system again increases as compared to the cost obtained by Ouyang et al. under same parametric values. Although the increase in cost is much significant with the increasing values of $\alpha$ as compared to the cost when the value of $\beta$ increases.

### Conclusion

An inventory model with Weibull distribution deterioration, shortages, cash discount and permissible delay in payment has been developed in the article. An algorithm is suggested to find the optimal replenishment policies and minimum total cost per unit time, which helps the inventory manager to decide whether it would be worthwhile to take advantage of a longer credit period for repaying the supplier by ordering a larger amount of the commodity. The sensitivity analysis reveals the importance of developed model. The model developed is much more realistic as it considers time-dependent deterioration.
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