Ushus-Journal of Business Management
2023, Vol. 22, No. 1, *19-30*
ISSN 0975-3311 | https://doi.org/10.12725/ujbm.62.2

Inventory Model for Deteriorated Goods Under Inflation and Permissible Delayed Payments

Mini Verma*

Abstract

As-built models play a leading role in analysing many real-world situations encountered in places such as grocery and vegetable markets, market yards, and oil extraction industries. In this article, we developed an inventory model for depleted items and set an acceptable default for inflation. Given this model, the demand rate is assumed to depend on the inventory, and the deterioration rate for each position follows a Weibull distribution. This model is developed under the circumstances depending on whether the credit life is less than the cycle time. Also, in these scenarios, new model has been developed to obtain the EOQ. Finally, we analyse the results and present working examples.

Keywords: Inflation; Inventory-Dependent Demand, Perishable Goods

Introduction

According to the classic inventory EOQ strategy, buyers often pay for their items when they get them. Customers may be given credit time by the provider to re-energize them in a competitive marketplace. Deferring payment to the provider as a value refund is an option that customers may choose to employ. Since the purchase price is lowered, clients are more likely to look for additional income. Due to suppliers' exchange credit, businesses are often incentivized to buy in bulk. Expired fees will not be levied if the case is settled

* Department of Mathematics, DIHE Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India

within the allotted time period. In the event that a payment is not made in full, interest will continue to accumulate until the debt is paid off. The "rescue esteem" of a resource refers to its resale worth after its useful life has expired. Experts in the design of several inventory models have taken into consideration I allowable instalment deferral (iii) salvage value.

It is commonly accepted that Goyal (1985) is the leading proponent of the EOQ model if payments are properly deferred. He figured out how much money he had made from the company based on the unit price tag. Abad P.L. and Jaggi C.K. (2003) explored integrated approaches for estimating unit costs and credit terms for vendors in their study. Under exchange credit finance, Huang YF., focused on the ideal retailer's request (2003). Cash rebates and exchange credits were taken into consideration while determining the optimum recharging and instalment methods, as Huang Y.F. and Chung K.J Teng JT (2002) and Chung KJ Liao JJ Liao JJ studied a few types of acceptable deferral in instalments (2004). In 2009, Chung KJ came up with the idea of accumulating and delaying decaying goods until they are no longer useable. In 2003 and 2000, Chang CT and Liao HCC (2000) focused their study on the creation arranging model under exchange credit. Some of the more recent investigations are those by Jaggi (1994), Liao et al. (2007), Chung KJ. (1997), Shah Huang (2007). (2003) Renew and pay using the EOQ model's best options under the cash rebates and exchange credit options If an instalment payment may be postponed, as Nita H (2006) found, the merchant may be able to collect interest by postponing payments until the end of the term permitted for postponement. Stores that want to take advantage of a weaker exchange credit market could acquire weak units at a discount and quickly auction them off, according to Shah Nita H (2010). According to Tripathy and Mishra, the best EOQ model with straight deteriorating rates is one with defects and the ability to delay payments. (2010).

In fostering the current model, request of an item is thought to be steady and the decay is taken as three boundary Weibull disintegration. No deficiencies and limitless renewal rate have been expected for fostering the models. The rescue esteem is related to the weakened units. Our objective is to limit the retailer's absolute expense. Ideal absolute expense, ideal requesting amount, and ideal cycle length have been determined for the model. Mathematical models have been given to delineate the model. Affectability investigation has additionally been completed to notice the impacts of different boundaries on the ideal all out cost and ideal process duration.

Assumptions and Notations:

The following notations and assumptions are required to develop the proposed mathematical model.

Assumptions used for this model are given as follows:

(i) The inventory system viable arrangements with single thing.

(ii) The arranging skyline is boundless.

(iii) The request of the item is steady. Deficiencies are not permitted and lead-time is zero.

(iv) The weakened units can nor be fixed nor supplanted during the process duration. It follows three boundary Weibull decay work.

(v) The retailer can store produced deals income in a premium bearing record during the allowable credit time frame. Toward the finish of this period, the retailer settles the record for every one of the units offered saving the distinction for everyday use, and paying the interest charges on the unsold items in the stock.

(vi) The rescue esteem a C ($0 < a < 1$) is related to weakened units during the process duration.

Notations used in this model are as follows:

R: Demand rate per unit time.

C: The unit purchase cost.

P: The unit selling price with ($P > C$).

h: The inventory holding cost per unit per year excluding interest charges.

A: The ordering cost per order

M: The permissible credit period offered by the supplier to the retailer for settling the account.

Ic: The interest charged per monetary unit in stock per annum by the supplier.

Ie: The interest earned per monetary unit per year, where le < lc.

Q: The order quantity.

0: Where 9 is the Weibull three parameter deterioration rate.

$\theta = \alpha\beta(t-\gamma)^{\beta-1}, 0 < \alpha < 1$Is the scale parameter and /? > 1 is the shape parameter and y>Ois the location parameter.

T: The cycle time.

K1: The total average cost per unit time for the case when M < T.

Mathematical Model

At any instant of time 0 ≤ t≤ T How much inventory is there, therefore, if Q(t) is a measure of how much inventory is presently available? The following differential equation governs the rate of change in inventory level when units are depleted as a result of demand and degradation:

$$\frac{dQ(t)}{dt} + \theta Q(t) = -R$$

0 ≤ t≤ T

Where 0 is the Weibull three parameter deterioration rate. $\theta = \alpha\beta(t-\gamma)^{\beta-1}, 0 < \alpha < 1$Is

determines the scalar scale, whereas β≥ 1 may be used as a shape parameter γ > 0the parameter specifying where something is located.

The following are the boundary conditions: Q(0) = Q and Q(T) =0

Equation (1) is a linear differential equation.

Its integrating factor is given by

$$e^{\int \alpha\beta(t-\gamma)^{\beta-1}dt} = e^{\alpha(t-\gamma)^{\beta}}$$

The solution of equation (1) can be written as

$$Q(t)e^{\alpha(t-\gamma)^{\beta}} = \int -Re^{\alpha(t-\gamma)^{\beta}}dt + c$$

The solution to equation (l) may be stated as follows, discarding the second and higher powers of a because is so little when using series expansion.

$$Q(t)e^{\alpha(t-\gamma)^{\beta}} = \int -R\left[1+\alpha(t-\gamma)^{\beta}\right]dt + c\big]$$
$$= -R\left[t + \frac{\alpha(t-\gamma)^{\beta+1}}{\beta+1}\right] + c \qquad \text{……1}$$

Using Q(T) = Equation (1)'s answer may be stated as follows in the aforementioned equation.

$$Q(t) = R\left[(T-t) + \frac{\alpha\{(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}-(t-\gamma)^{\beta+1}\}}{\beta+1} - \alpha(T-t)(t-\gamma)^{\beta}\right] \qquad \text{……2}$$

Equation 2 states that the purchase quantity is Q(0) = Q.

$$Q = R\left[T + \frac{\alpha\{(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}-(-\gamma)^{\beta+1}\}}{\beta+1} - \alpha T(-\gamma)^{\beta}\right] \qquad \text{……3}$$

For every cycle, there are about units that degrade.

$$D = D(T) = Q - RT$$
$$= \frac{\alpha R\{(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}-(-\gamma)^{\beta+1}\}}{\beta+1} - \alpha RT(-\gamma)^{\beta} \qquad \text{…….4}$$

The deterioration Cost is

$$CD = \frac{\alpha RC\{(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}-(-\gamma)^{\beta+1}\}}{\beta+1} - \alpha RTC(-\gamma)^{\beta} \qquad \text{…….5}$$

Salvage value of deteriorated units is

$$SV = aCD = \frac{\alpha RCa\{(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}-(-\gamma)^{\beta+1}\}}{\beta+1} - \alpha RTCa(-\gamma)^{\beta} \qquad \text{……..6}$$

The inventory holding cost is

$$IHC = h\int_0^T Q(t)dt$$
$$= hR\int_0^T \left[(T-t) + \frac{\alpha\{(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}-(t-\gamma)^{\beta+1}\}}{\beta+1} - \alpha(T-t)(t-\gamma)^{\beta}\right]dt \qquad \text{…..7}$$
$$= hR\left[\frac{T^2}{2} + \frac{\alpha T\{(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}+(-\gamma)^{\beta+1}\}_{+}}{\beta+1} + \frac{2\alpha)(-\gamma)^{\beta+2}-(T-\gamma)^{\beta+2}\}}{(\beta+1)(\beta+2)}\right]$$

Ordering cost per order is

OC =A

After looking at the lengths of T and M, we can see that interest is either charged or earned in both circumstances.

Case -I: M < T

Customers may buy and sell units at a deal value P during [o, A/] at a financing cost Ie for each unit each year in a premium bearing record at the merchants' discretion. That is why [o, M] yielded an absolute premium of

$$IE_1 = PI_e \int_0^M Rtdt = \frac{PI_eRM^2}{2}$$

During [M, T], the shop will pay a total of [M, T] interest charges.

$$IC_1 = CI_c \int_M^T Q(t)dt$$

$$= CI_cR \int_M^T \left[(T-t) + \frac{\alpha\{(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}-(t-\gamma)^{\beta+1}}{\beta+1} - \alpha(T-t)(t-\gamma)^\beta\right] dt$$

$$= CI_cR \left[\frac{T^2}{2} + \frac{M^2}{2} - TM + \frac{\alpha(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}(T-M)}{(\beta+1)} + \frac{2\alpha\{(M-\gamma)^{\beta+2}-(T-\gamma)^{\beta+2}\}}{(\beta+1)(\beta+2)} + \frac{\alpha(M-\gamma)^{\beta+1}(T-M)}{(\beta+1)}\right] \quad \textbf{......8}$$

Total cost AT, (F) per time unit is

$$K_1(T) = \frac{1}{T}[OC + IHC + CD + IC_1 - IE_1 - SV]$$

$$= \frac{A}{T} + hR\left[\frac{T}{2} + \frac{\alpha\{(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}+(-\gamma)^{\beta+1}\}}{\beta+1} + \frac{2\alpha\{(-\gamma)^{\beta+2}-(T-\gamma)^{\beta+2}\}}{T(\beta+1)(\beta+2)}\right] + \frac{\alpha RC(1-a)\{(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}-(-\gamma)^{\beta+1}\}}{(\beta+1)T} - \alpha RC(1-a)(-\gamma)^\beta \quad \textbf{.......9}$$

$$+CI_cR\left[\frac{T}{2} + \frac{M^2}{2T} - M + \frac{\alpha(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}(T-M)}{T(\beta+1)} + \frac{2\alpha\{(M-\gamma)^{\beta+2}-(T-\gamma)^{\beta+2}\}}{T(\beta+1)(\beta+2)} + \frac{\alpha(M-\gamma)^{\beta+1}(T-M)}{T(\beta+1)}\right] - \frac{PI_eRM^2}{2T}$$

Total cost must be taken into account when determining what values of T are best for minimising costs.

$dk_1/dt = 0$

$$\Rightarrow -\frac{A}{T^2} + hR\left[\frac{1}{2} + \alpha(T-\gamma)^\beta - \frac{2\alpha\{(-\gamma)^{\beta+2}-(T-\gamma)^{\beta+2}\}}{T^2(\beta+1)(\beta+2)} - \frac{2\alpha(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}}{T(\beta+1)}\right]$$
$$-\frac{\alpha RC(1-a)\{(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}-(-\gamma)^{\beta+1}\}}{(\beta+1)T^2} + \frac{1}{T}\alpha RC(1-a)(T-\gamma)^\beta$$
$$+CI_cR\left[\frac{1}{2} - \frac{M^2}{2T^2} - M + \frac{\alpha(T-\gamma)^\beta(T-M)}{T} - \frac{2\alpha\{(M-\gamma)^{\beta+2}-(T-\gamma)^{\beta+2}\}}{T^2(\beta+1)(\beta+2)}\right.$$
$$\left.+\frac{\alpha(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}M}{T^2(\beta+1)} - \frac{2\alpha(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}}{T(\beta+1)} + \frac{\alpha(M-\gamma)^{\beta+1}M}{T^2(\beta+1)}\right] + \frac{PI_eRM^2}{2T^2} = 0 \quad \textbf{....10}$$

Only if T is set to the value given in equation (32) will it reduce Kx.

$$\frac{\partial^2 K_1}{\partial T^2} > 0.$$

$$\frac{\delta K_1^2}{\partial T^2} = \frac{2A}{T^3} + hR\left[\alpha\beta(T-\gamma)^{\beta-1} + \frac{2\alpha(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}}{T^2(\beta+1)} + \frac{4\alpha\{(-\gamma)^{\beta+2}-(T-\gamma)^{\beta+2}\}}{T^3(\beta+1)(\beta+2)}\right.$$
$$\left.\frac{2\alpha(T-\gamma)^\beta}{T} + \frac{2\alpha(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}}{(\beta+1)T^2}\right] - \frac{2\alpha RC(1-a)(T-\gamma)^\beta}{T^2} + \frac{\alpha\beta RC(1-a)(T-\gamma)^{\beta-1}}{T}$$
$$+\frac{2\alpha RC(1-a)\{(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}-(-\gamma)^{\beta+1}\}}{T^3(\beta+1)} + CI_cR\left[\frac{M^2}{T^3} + \alpha\beta(T-\gamma)^{\beta-1}\left(1-\frac{M}{T}\right)\beta + 2\right.$$
$$\frac{2M\alpha(T-\gamma)^\beta}{T^2} - \frac{2M\alpha(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}}{T^3(\beta+1)} + \frac{2\alpha(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}}{T^2(\beta+1)} + \frac{4\alpha\{(M-\gamma)^{\beta+2}-(T-\gamma)^{\beta+2}\}}{T^3(\beta+1)(\beta+2)}$$
$$\left.\frac{2\alpha(T-\gamma)^\beta}{T} + \frac{2\alpha(T-\gamma)^{\beta+1}}{(\beta+1)T^2} - \frac{2M\alpha(M-\gamma)^{\beta+1}}{T^3(\beta+1)}\right] - \frac{PI_eRM^2}{T^3}$$

.....11

Numerical Examples:

Example-1: (Case-I:M)

Considering [.A, C, h, P, a, /?, y, a, R, Ic, /e, M] =

[500, 40, 4,100, 0.4, 20, 0.6, 0.4,1000, 0.16, 0.04, 0.0548] (in their proper units). Utilizing these qualities in condition (12) the worth of T is gotten as, r = 0.311205. Utilizing this worth of T in condition (13) the worth of the second request subordinate viewed as 33418.5 which is positive. Consequently, this worth of Twill limit the absolute factor cost. Henceforth from condition (11) the all-out factor cost is viewed as K{= 2885.5. Here it is obviously seen that M <T

Sensitivity Analysis:

Table, for Case (M < T)

Parameter	% Change	T	K
	-50	0.347688	1945.73
	-25	0.269834	2455.23
	0	311205	2885.5
	25	0.3476'88	3264.92
A	50	0.380691	3608.1S
	-50	0.372232	2504.55
	-25	0.3317507	2706.78
	0	0.311205	2467.52
	25	0.290407	3046.09
c	50	0.21343,7	3037.53
	-50	0.346277	2857.69
	-25	0.32734	2345.98
	0	0.311205	2885.5
	25	0.297243	3037.53
h	50	0.285005	3183.02
	-50	0.346277	2857.69
	-25	0.32734	2345.98
	0	0.311205	2804.33
	25	0.297243	2968.12
p	50	0.285005	3023.3

Parameter	% Change	T	K
j	-50	0.311205	2887.2
	-25	0.2904-07	2889.3
	0	0.21343,7	2885.1
	25	0.312323	2884.4
	50	0.302341	2886.1
R	-50	0.346277	2857.69
	-25	0.32734	2345.98
	0	0.311205	2804.33
	25	0.297243	2968.12
	50	0.285005	3023.3
a	-50	0.311206	2885.66
	-25	0.311204	2885.58
	0	311205	2885.5
	25	0.311206	2885.42
	50	0.311207	288534
r	-50	0.439321	2887.2
	-25	0.3590216	2889.3
	0	0.278632	2885.1
	25	0.261245	2884.4
	50	0.256543	2886.1
j	-50	0.311249	2504.2
	-25	0.311205	2765.3
	0	0.311202	2805.5

Parameter	% Change	T	K
	25	0.311202	3021.7
	50	0.311205	3112.4
	-50	0.311204	2857.69
	-25	0.311204	2345.98
	0	311205	2804.33
M	25	0.311.206	2968.12
	50	0.311207	3023.3

Table shows a variety of viewpoints from individuals, as seen here: The optimal process duration shrinks when the requested expenses, scale bounds, area borders, and tolerable credit timeframes all fall in line with one other. Increasing the system's purchase expenses while decreasing its inventory holding costs and increasing its unit selling value improves its duration. As the system's rescue esteem, request rate, premium charged, and premium gained grow, so does the risk. The ideal all-out cost of the system rises as the requesting cost, purchase cost, inventory keeping cost, rescue esteem, request rate, and premium paid per unit reduce, while it falls as the unit selling value, scale boundary, area boundary, premium gained, and the tolerable credit time. The overall cost rises once again when the boundary's shape is altered. As demonstrated in the table, when the advantages of one border are altered while those of the other boundaries stay same, the duration and total cost of the procedure are compared. The early qualities of Model 2 are being used in this situation.

Conclusion

In this paper, using the production inventory model, things with three-border Weibull crumbling may be depicted. Any departures from this assumption would be deemed faults. In order to fulfil the demand, things that have degraded to some degree are sold at a lower price than those that have fully disintegrated. The model's creation time, holding costs, and overall variable costs may all be accurately estimated. In order to better understand the various process boundaries, it is necessary to look at affectability. Costs should be reduced by lowering the set-up cost, but the value of the form boundary or area border should be increased, according to the affectability inquiry.

References

[1] Chang, H. J. and Dye, C.Y. (1999). An EOQ model for deteriorating items with time varying demand and partial backlogging. Journal of the Operational Research Society, 50(11), 1176-1182.

[2] Choi, S. and Hwang, H., (1986), Optimization of production planning problem with continuously distributed time-lags. International Journal of Systems Science, 17 (10), 1499- 1508.

[3] Chung, K. J. and Huang, C. K. (2009). An ordering policy with allowable shortage and permissible delay in payments. Applied Mathematical Modelling, 33, 2518-2525.

[4] Abad, P.L. (1996). Optimal pricing and lot sizing under conditions of perishability and partial backlogging. Management Science, 42(8), 1093-1104.

[5] Abad, P.L. (2001). Optimal price and order-size for a reseller under partial backlogging. Computers and Operation Research, 28, 53 -65.

[6] Abad, P.L. and Jaggi, C.K. (2003). A joint approach for setting unit price and the length of the credit period for a seller when end demand is price sensitive. International Journal of Production Economics 83, 115-122.

[7] Aggarwal, S.P (1978). A note on an order-level model for a system with constant rate of deterioration. Opsearch, 15, 184-187.

[8] Aggarwal, S.P., Jaggi, C.K. (1995). Ordering policies of deteriorating items under permissible delay in payments. Journal of the Operational Research Society 46, 658-662.

[9] Aggarwal, V and Bahari-Hashani, H. (1991). Synchronized production policies for deteriorating items in a declining market. HE Transactions. 23(2), 185-197.

[10] Axsater, Sven. (2006). Inventory Control, Springers international series, 2nd edition.

[11] Balkhi, Z.T., and Benkherouf, L. (1996). A production lot size inventory model for deteriorating items and arbitrary production and demand rate. European Journal of Operational Research, 92, 302-309.

[12] Chand, S. and Ward, J (1985). A note on economic order quantity under conditions of permissible delay in payments. J. Operational Res, 38, 83-84.

[13] Chang, C. T., et al. (2003). An EOQ model for deteriorating items under supplier credits linked to ordering quantity. Applied Mathematical Modeling 27, 983 - 996.

[14] Chang, C.T. (2004). An EOQ model with deteriorating items under inflation when supplier credits linked to order quantity. International Journal of Production Economics, 88, 307-316.