

Article

Improvements for Inventory Models with Generalized Interarrival Times

Daniel Yi-Fong Lin

Department of International Business, Hsing Wu University, New Taipei City 24452, Taiwan;
109287@mail.hwu.edu.tw

Abstract

Single-machine, single-product inventory models with generalized interarrival times have lacked a fully rigorous and computationally efficient optimization framework because a sign error in earlier derivations produced ad hoc feasibility restrictions and overly broad search domains. This study presents a corrected derivation that proves the strict convexity of the minimum-cost objective and establishes the existence and uniqueness of an interior optimum without auxiliary conditions, therefore consolidating previously fragmented results into a single theorem. Building on these structural properties, the maximum-profit formulation is reduced to a one-dimensional program with natural finite bounds that tightly bracket the optimizer, replacing earlier paired bounds defined on an effectively unbounded domain. Numerical results for a canonical benchmark show that the tightened admissible interval recovers the same optimum with fewer function evaluations, thereby improving computational efficiency and implementation robustness. The paper therefore contributes a corrected optimality theory, a problem-native one-dimensional reformulation of the profit model, and a more reproducible computational procedure for capacity-constrained single-machine systems under generalized interarrival times.

Keywords: inventory model; generalized interarrival time; lot sizing; convexity; optimization

MSC: 90B50

1. Introduction

Single-machine, single-product inventory systems with generalized interarrival time distributions remain analytically challenging (Rangaswamy [1]). Two persistent limitations recur in the literature: (i) strict convexity and uniqueness of an interior optimum for the minimum-cost model have not been rigorously established because of a sign error in a key derivative, and (ii) the corresponding profit-maximization problem is often posed over expansive, and sometimes effectively unbounded, search domains, motivating ad hoc feasibility restrictions and costly numerical search. These weaknesses can translate into unstable implementations, inflated evaluation budgets, and unclear optimality guarantees in capacity-constrained settings (Andazet al. [2]).

Two Foundational Studies

Choi and Enns [3] develop minimum-cost and maximum-profit formulations for a

Academic Editor: Roberto Cavoretto

Received: 24 June 2026

Revised: 12 July 2026

Accepted: 16 July 2026

Published: 18 July 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.
Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland.
This article is an open access article
distributed under the terms and
conditions of the [Creative Commons
Attribution \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license.

capacity-constrained single machine under generalized interarrival time assumptions. For the single-product case, the reduction relies on graphical arguments and heuristic search, leaving strict convexity and interior optimality unverified and effectively placing the profit model on an unbounded search domain. Yang [4] revisits the minimum-cost case but introduces a sign error in a key derivative; as a result, the analysis imposes unnecessary feasibility restrictions and does not fully resolve the optimality argument. In addition, the heuristic procedure in Choi and Enns [3] is not guaranteed to locate the true optimum.

Broader Background Literature

Recent queuing–inventory studies with non-Poisson arrivals—including work on priority classes and stability, variable-speed replenishment control, and retrial dynamics (Otten and Daduna [5])—often rely on model-specific or policy-based analyses rather than providing closed-form convexity certificates for the canonical single-machine generalized interarrival-time setting, leaving a persistent structural gap (Amjath et al. [6]; Harikrishnan et al. [7]). In parallel, recent lot-sizing research prioritizes computational tractability via high-quality heuristics and uncertainty-aware planning; without provable curvature properties and finite search bounds, such methods can require expansive search domains, large evaluation budgets, and careful parameter tuning in capacity-constrained implementations (Baek [8]; Dziuba and Almeder [9]; Kohlmann and Sahling [10]). Under standard regularity conditions (positive cost parameters and well-behaved interarrival distributions), the results consolidate previously fragmented claims into a single theorem and remove ad hoc restrictions induced by the sign error, aligning the analysis with recent emphasis on structural guarantees in non-Poisson queuing–inventory and uncertainty-aware lot-sizing models (Baek [8]; Hong and Scully [11]; Kohlmann and Sahling [10]). A related inventory model of Zhao et al. [12] with engineering system reliability and safety is worth mentioning.

Improvements for Yang [4]

This study develops a corrected optimality theory that rectifies the sign error identified in Yang [4]. The analysis replaces earlier graphical arguments with a concise proof and establishes strict convexity of the minimum-cost objective, thereby certifying the existence and uniqueness of an interior optimizer without auxiliary feasibility constraints. Using these structural properties, the profit-maximization model is reformulated as a one-dimensional program over natural finite bounds inherited from the cost model's marginal structure; the resulting bracketing interval follows from monotonicity and curvature, replacing paired bounds previously imposed over an effectively unbounded domain in Yang [4]. On the canonical benchmark from Choi and Enns [3], the tightened admissible interval recovers the exact optimum with substantially fewer evaluations, improving numerical efficiency and implementation robustness (Sereshti et al. [13]).

Main Contributions

The contributions are threefold: (i) a corrected optimality theory guaranteeing strict convexity and a unique interior optimum without auxiliary constraints; (ii) a one-dimensional reformulation of the profit model with natural finite bounds; and (iii) demonstrably tighter admissible domains that reduce evaluation counts while preserving optimality.

Organization of This Study

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces notation and assumptions. Section 3 revisits the minimum-cost model $T_c(Q)$ and presents a corrected derivation that (i) pinpoints the sign error in a key derivative, (ii) removes the two auxiliary feasibility conditions introduced in Yang [4], and (iii) consolidates previously fragmented results into a single general theorem. Section 3 also revisits the maximum-profit model $T_P(Q, D)$, clarifies its analytical structure, and reduces profit optimi-

zation to a one-dimensional program with natural finite bounds. Section 4 reports numerical results for the canonical benchmark of Choi and Enns [3] and then discusses implications and limitations of the revised procedure.

2. Assumptions and Notation

Consistent with Choi and Enns [3] and Yang [4], the following assumptions and notation are adopted.

Notation (parameters and decision variables)

A : the setup cost per lot.

C : the manufacturing cost per unit.

c_a : the coefficient of variation in lot interarrival times.

D : the throughput demand rate, with $0 < D < P$. D is a constant for the minimum-cost model, and a variable for the maximum-profit model.

H_{FG} : the holding-cost rate for finished goods.

H_{WIP} : the Holding-cost rate for work-in-process (WIP).

P : the processing rate.

Q : the lot size which is a decision variable.

τ : the setup time per lot.

$T_C(Q)$: the objective function for the minimum-cost model.

$T_P(Q, D)$: the objective function for the maximum-profit model.

Assumptions

(System) A single machine produces a single product; production occurs in lots of size $Q > 0$.

(Arrivals) Lot interarrival times follow a generalized interarrival-time distribution with squared coefficient of variation $c_a^2 \geq 0$.

(Setup) Setup cost $A > 0$ [\$/lot] and setup time $\tau \geq 0$ [time] apply per lot.

(Rates) Processing rate $P > 0$ and throughput demand $D \in (0, P)$ [units/time] ensure stability.

(Holding costs) Finished-goods and work-in-process holding-cost rates satisfy $H_{FG} \geq 0$ and $H_{WIP} \geq 0$ [\$/unit-time].

(Unit contribution) $C \geq 0$ denotes the unit contribution margin [\$/unit].

(Objectives) $T_C(Q)$ and $T_P(Q, D)$ denote, respectively, the cost-minimization and profit-maximization objectives for the single-product case; unless stated otherwise, expectations are steady-state.

Abbreviations

$x(Q) = Q[1 - (D/P)] - D\tau$, with $x(Q) > 0$, used in Choi and Enns [3].

$\rho(Q) = (D\tau/Q) + (D/P)$, used in Choi and Enns [3]. (not the conventional utilization $\rho = (D/P)$).

$\Omega(Q) = C - (A/Q) - H_{WIP}[1 - (c_a^2/2)][(Q/P) + \tau]$, with $\Omega(Q) > 0$.

$\Delta(Q) = (H_{WIP}c_a^2Q^2/2\Omega(Q))[(Q/P) + \tau]$.

$D^\#(Q) = [Q - \sqrt{\Delta Q}]/[(Q/P) + \tau]$.

The parenthesization in $\Omega(Q)$, $\Delta(Q)$, and $D^\#(Q)$ follows from Yang [4] and is retained for dimensional consistency: $\Delta(Q)$ has units of units², so $D^\#(Q)$ has units of units/time. These quantities are used later to state natural bounds and derive one-dimensional reformulations.

3. Methods

3.1. Background and Prior Formulations: Minimum-Cost Model

This section summarizes prior analyses of the single-product minimum-cost model using the notation and assumptions in Section 2. The purpose is to restate the reported

formulations and claims without yet assessing validity; the corrected analysis is presented later.

Baseline Objective and First-Order Condition (Choi–Enns [3])

Choi and Enns [3] propose two models for a capacity-constrained single machine producing a single product in lots under generalized interarrival-time assumptions: the minimum-cost model $T_c(Q)$ and the maximum-profit model $T_p(Q, D)$. Holding costs induced by queuing delays are included, and the optimum is sought numerically via heuristic search. The minimum-cost objective, expressed as cost per unit time, is given by

$$T_c(Q) = \frac{AD}{Q} + \frac{H_{FG}Q}{2} + H_{WIP}D \left\{ \frac{c_a^2(D/Q)(\tau + Q/P)^2}{2[1 - (D/Q)(\tau + Q/P)]} + \left(\tau + \frac{Q}{P} \right) \right\} \quad (1)$$

and the derivative with respect to Q is reported

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial T_c(Q)}{\partial Q} = & \frac{-AD}{Q^2} + \frac{H_{FG}}{2}, \\ & + H_{WIP}D \left[\frac{1}{P} - \frac{c_a^2 \rho(Q)(\tau + Q/P)(\rho(Q)/Q - D/PQ)}{2(1 - \rho(Q))^2} + \frac{c_a^2 \rho(Q)}{P(1 - \rho(Q))} \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{c_a^2 \rho(Q)(\tau + Q/P)}{2Q(1 - \rho(Q))} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

using the auxiliary quantity $\rho(Q) = D\tau/Q - D/P$. The standard stability condition $0 \leq D < P$ applies; remaining symbols follow Section 2.

Yang’s Re-Expression and Convexity Claim for Q

Building on Choi and Enns [3], Yang [4] introduces an auxiliary term and rewrites the objective in a compact form to derive derivative relations used to claim convexity of $T_c(Q)$. The notation is defined

$$x(Q) = Q[1 - (D/P)] - D\tau \quad (3)$$

(called the “mean lot service time” in Choi and Enns [3]) and is used here purely as a notational device. Yang [4] then rewrites Equation (1) in compact form as

$$T_c(Q) = \frac{AD}{Q} + H_{FG} \frac{Q}{2} + H_{WIP}D \left\{ \frac{c_a^2}{2D} \left(\frac{Q^2}{x} - 2Q + x \right) + \tau + \frac{Q}{P} \right\} \quad (4)$$

Because $x(Q)$ is defined in Q , $d^2x/dQ^2 = 0$. Using this fact, Yang [4] reports the second-derivative expression

$$\frac{d^2}{dQ^2} T_c(Q) = \frac{2AD}{Q^3} + \frac{H_{WIP}c_a^2}{2} \left[\frac{d^2}{dQ^2} \frac{Q^2}{x} \right] \quad (5)$$

and concludes via direct calculation that

$$\frac{d^2}{dQ^2} T_c(Q) = \frac{2AD}{Q^3} + \frac{H_{WIP}c_a^2 D^2 \tau^2}{x^3} > 0 \quad (6)$$

is strictly positive. Therefore, $T_c(Q)$ is claimed to be strictly convex on the domain of interest (in particular, when $x(Q) > 0$).

Remark 1. The identity $\frac{d^2}{dQ^2} \left(\frac{Q^2}{x} \right) = \frac{2(D\tau)^2}{x^3}$ follows directly from the quotient rule with $x(Q) = Q(1 - D/P) - D\tau$ and $dx/dQ = 1 - D/P$. Stating this identity explicitly makes the step from Equation (5) to Equation (6) transparent.

Feasible domain and boundary behavior ($x(Q) > 0$, $\Omega(Q) > 0$)

To ensure positivity of the auxiliary term and to define a feasible domain, Yang [4] imposes $x(Q) > 0$, which yields a lower bound on Q . Together with the condition $\Omega(Q) > 0$ (defined in Section 2 and used later in the profit model), this restricts the search from an initially unbounded domain to a constrained interval. Yang [4] then evaluates end-point derivatives at the induced boundaries to characterize monotonic behavior.

Specifically, Yang [4] noted that the positivity of the “mean lot service time” implies

$$Q > \frac{DP\tau}{P-D} \quad (7)$$

so the feasible domain changes from $0 < Q < \infty$ to $Q \in (Q_{\min}, \infty)$ with $Q_{\min} = DP\tau/(P-D)$. After establishing convexity for $T_c(Q)$, Yang [4] evaluated the first derivative at the two endpoints, $Q \rightarrow Q_{\min}$ and $Q \rightarrow \infty$, and emphasized that convexity alone is insufficient to guarantee an interior optimizer. He therefore aimed to show

$$\lim_{Q \rightarrow DP\tau/(P-D)} dT_c(Q)/dQ < 0 \quad (8)$$

and

$$\lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} dT_c(Q)/dQ > 0 \quad (9)$$

within the restricted domain.

An alternative expression for the derivative permits further equivalences under the imposed conditions. In particular, Yang [4] rewrote Equation (2) as

$$dT_c(Q)/dQ = \frac{H_{FG}}{2} + \frac{H_{WIP}D}{P} - \frac{AD}{Q^2} - \frac{H_{WIP}c_a^2}{2} \left[\frac{D}{P} \left(1 - \frac{Q^2}{x^2} \right) + \left(\frac{Q}{x} - 1 \right)^2 \right] \quad (10)$$

Recalling Equation (3), if $Q \rightarrow \infty$, then $Q/x \rightarrow P/(P-D)$; consequently, Yang [4] reported

$$\lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{D}{P} \left(1 - \frac{Q^2}{x^2} \right) + \left(\frac{Q}{x} - 1 \right)^2 \right] = \frac{D^2}{P(P-D)} \quad (11)$$

and hence verifying $\lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} dT_c(Q)/dQ > 0$ is equivalent to checking

$$\frac{H_{FG}}{2} + \frac{H_{WIP}D}{P} > \frac{H_{WIP}c_a^2D^2}{2P(P-D)} \quad (12)$$

Using the numerical example in Chou and Enns [3] with $H_{FG} = 0.2$, $H_{WIP} = 0.05$, $D = 10$, $P = 12$, and $c_a = 0.5$, Yang [4] computed

$$\frac{H_{FG}}{2} + \frac{H_{WIP}D}{P} \approx 0.14 \quad (13)$$

and

$$\frac{H_{WIP}c_a^2D^2}{2P(P-D)} = \frac{5}{192} \approx 0.026 \quad (14)$$

Comparing Equations (13) and (14), the inequality in Equation (12) holds for the benchmark parameters. Together with Equation (8), Yang [4] concluded that $dT_c(Q)/dQ$ increases from a negative value at $Q \rightarrow Q_{\min}$ to a positive value as $Q \rightarrow \infty$, implying a unique solution to $dT_c(Q)/dQ = 0$ on $(Q_{\min}, \infty)$; the corresponding theorem was then stated.

Note: The role of $\Omega(Q) > 0$ is primarily associated with the profit model; it is listed here for completeness and forward reference. A detailed examination of the limit in Equation (11) and the equivalence in Equation (12) is deferred to Section 4, where a corrected analysis is provided.

Reported theorems and stated limitations

Based on the convexity claim for $T_c(Q)$ and the endpoint evaluations in Equations (8) and (9), Yang [4] reported two theorems. The first addresses the regime in which the derivative changes sign on $(Q_{\min}, \infty)$; the second covers the complementary regime.

Theorem 1 (Yang [4]). If $\frac{H_{FG}}{H_{WIP}D} + 2 > \frac{D}{P-D} c_a^2$, there exists a unique solution $Q^* \in (Q_{\min}, \infty)$ to $dT_c(Q)/dQ = 0$, and this Q^* is the optimal lot size for the minimum-cost model. Equivalently, the above condition is the same as Equation (12) obtained by algebraic rearrangement.

Theorem 2 (Yang [4]). If $\frac{H_{FG}}{H_{WIP}D} + 2 \leq \frac{D}{P-D} c_a^2$, then $dT_c(Q)/dQ < 0$ for all $Q > Q_{\min} = \frac{DP\tau}{(P-D)}$. Consequently, $T_c(Q)$ is strictly decreasing on $(Q_{\min}, \infty)$ and attains its minimum as Q

$\rightarrow \infty$. Since Q denotes a lot size, Yang [4] stated that the implementable solution is the largest feasible lot size under storage and capital-budget constraints.

Stated limitations. The reported conclusions depend on (i) the endpoint behavior in Equations (8) and (9) and (ii) the limit evaluation in Equation (11) used to derive Equation (12). The derivation of Equation (11) contains a step that warrants closer scrutiny; Section 3.2 revisits this point and provides a corrected treatment. Accordingly, the reported uniqueness result is conditional on the stated inequality and the domain assumptions $x(Q) > 0$, where relevant later, $\Omega(Q) > 0$.

3.2. Corrected Optimality Analysis for the Minimum-Cost Model

Sign-corrected limit as $Q \rightarrow \infty$

Re-examining the endpoint limit used in Equation (11), let $x(Q) = Q(1 - D/P) - D\tau$ and note that $Q/x \rightarrow P/(P - D)$ as $Q \rightarrow \infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{D}{P} \left(1 - \frac{Q^2}{x^2} \right) + \left(\frac{Q}{x} - 1 \right)^2 \right] &= \frac{D}{P} \left[1 - \left(\frac{P}{P-D} \right)^2 \right] + \left[\left(\frac{P}{P-D} \right) - 1 \right]^2, \\ &= \frac{D}{P} \left(\frac{D^2 - 2DP}{(P-D)^2} \right) + \frac{D^2}{(P-D)^2} = \frac{D^2}{P(P-D)^2} [(D - 2P) + P], \\ &= \frac{-D^2}{P(P-D)}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

which differs in sign from the positive value reported in Equation (11) with

$$\lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{D}{P} \left(1 - \frac{Q^2}{x^2} \right) + \left(\frac{Q}{x} - 1 \right)^2 \right] = \frac{D^2}{P(P-D)} \quad (16)$$

Consequence for the endpoint derivative and redundancy of the extra condition

Substituting Equation (15) into the alternative derivative representation of Equation (10) yields

$$\lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{dQ} T_C(Q) = \frac{H_{FG}}{2} + H_{WIP} \frac{D}{P} + H_{WIP} \frac{c_a^2 D^2}{2P(P-D)} > 0 \quad (17)$$

Hence, the positivity of the endpoint derivative at $Q \rightarrow \infty$ holds unconditionally (under standard parameter positivity), rendering the comparison in Equations (13) and (14) and the auxiliary inequality in Equation (12) unnecessary for establishing an interior optimizer. In particular, Equation (9) is automatically satisfied.

Existence and uniqueness of the interior optimizer (consolidated theorem)

From Equation (6) (or the strengthened curvature in Equation (20)), $d^2 T_C(Q)/dQ^2 > 0$ on the feasible domain, so $dT_C(Q)/dQ$ is strictly increasing. Together with $\lim_{Q \rightarrow Q_{\min}} dT_C(Q)/dQ < 0$ in Equation (8) and $\lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} dT_C(Q)/dQ > 0$ in Equation (17), there exists a unique $Q^\# \in (Q_{\min}, \infty)$ such that $\frac{dT_C(Q)}{dQ}(Q^\#) = 0$, and $Q^\#$ minimizes $T_C(Q)$. Therefore, the case described by “Theorem2” (monotone decrease with minimum at $Q \rightarrow \infty$) cannot occur under the corrected endpoint behavior; the two statements can be consolidated as follows, without any extra conditions.

Theorem 3 (consolidated). *There exists a unique solution $Q^\# \in (Q_{\min}, \infty)$ to $dT_C(Q)/dQ = 0$; this $Q^\#$ is the optimal lot size for the single-product minimum-cost model.*

Theorem 3 provides a consolidated statement of the model’s structural properties.

Succinct re-expression and direct convexity proof

A direct, notation-light re-expression of $T_C(Q)$ avoids introducing $x(Q)$ and yields the following equivalent form:

$$\begin{aligned} T_C(Q) &= \frac{AD}{Q} + H_{FG} \frac{Q}{2} + H_{WIP} D \left(\tau + \frac{Q}{P} \right) \\ &+ H_{WIP} \frac{c_a^2 D^2}{2} \left[\frac{Q}{P(P-D)} + \frac{\tau(2P-D)}{(P-D)^2} + \frac{\tau^2 P^3}{(P-D)^2((P-D)Q - DP\tau)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

so that

$$\frac{d}{dQ}T_c(Q) = \frac{-AD}{Q^2} + \frac{H_{FG}}{2} + H_{WIP} \frac{D}{P} + H_{WIP} \frac{c_a^2 D^2}{2P(P-D)} - H_{WIP} \frac{c_a^2 D^2}{2} \left[\frac{\tau^2 P^3}{(p-D)((P-D)Q - DP\tau)^2} \right] \quad (19)$$

and

$$\frac{d^2}{dQ^2}T_c(Q) = \frac{2AD}{Q^3} + H_{WIP} \frac{c_a^2 D^2 \tau^2 P^3}{[(P-D)Q - DP\tau]^3} > 0 \quad (20)$$

Equations (18)–(20) provide a self-contained convexity proof and monotonicity characterization, demonstrating that introducing $x(Q)$ is not required for tractable analysis.

3.3. Prior Analysis and Variable Reduction in the Maximum-Profit Model $T_P(Q, D)$

This section restates the reported reduction in the maximum-profit problem as a one-variable program centered on the critical curve and finite Q -bounds. Section 3.4 develops a simplified, structure-aware optimization route that leverages convexity and natural bounds to further reduce computational effort.

Baseline Maximum-profit Formulation and Notation (Choi–Enns [3])

This section outlines the reported analytic procedure for the maximum-profit model $T_P(Q, D)$. Choi and Enns [3] and Yang [4] studied a minimum cost model, $T_c(Q)$, and a maximum profit model, $T_P(Q, D)$. In the minimum cost model, $T_c(Q)$, the throughput demand rate, D , is treated as a constant. In the maximum profit model, $T_P(Q, D)$, the throughput demand rate, D , is treated as a variable.

To express the interrelationship between the minimum cost model and the maximum profit model, as $T_P(Q, D) = CD - T_c(Q)$ during the discussion of the maximum profit model, we change the expression of $T_c(Q)$ to $T_c(Q, D)$ to clearly indicate that the throughput demand rate, D , is a variable.

Choi and Enns [3] proposed, for a single machine producing a single product in lots under generalized interarrival time assumptions, the objective

$$T_P(Q, D) = CD - \frac{A}{Q}D - H_{FG} \frac{Q}{2} - H_{WIP} \left(\frac{Q}{P} + \tau \right) D - H_{WIP} \frac{c_a^2}{2} \left(\frac{Q^2}{x} - 2Q + x \right), \quad (21)$$

$$= CD - T_c(Q, D)$$

where $x = Q - [(Q/P) + \tau]D$, with $x > 0$, and C is the profit contribution multiplier.

They reported first-order conditions with respect to Q and D , and sketched a graph suggesting concavity in (Q, D) , but did not provide a complete analytic characterization of the optimizer.

First-Order Condition with respect to D and Definition of $\Omega(Q)$

Differentiating Equation (20) with respect to D , Yang [4] obtained

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial D}T_P(Q, D) = \Omega(Q) - H_{WIP} \frac{c_a^2 Q^2 \left(\frac{Q}{P} + \tau \right)}{2 \left[Q - \left(\frac{Q}{P} + \tau \right) D \right]^2} \quad (22)$$

with

$$\Omega(Q) = C - (A/Q) - H_{WIP} [1 - (c_a^2/2)] [(Q/P) + \tau] \quad (23)$$

which serves as a key quantity in subsequent steps.

$\Delta(Q)$, the Critical Curve $D^\#(Q)$, and Positivity Conditions

To simplify expressions, Yang [4] defined

$$\Delta(Q) = \frac{H_{WIP} c_a^2 Q^2}{2\Omega(Q)} \left(\frac{Q}{P} + \tau \right) \quad (24)$$

and—under $\Omega(Q) > 0$ —expressed the D -critical relation as

$$D^\#(Q) = \frac{Q - \sqrt{\Delta Q}}{(Q/P) + \tau} \quad (25)$$

Ensuring $D^\#(Q) > 0$, imposes

$$Q - \sqrt{\Delta(Q)} > 0 \quad (26)$$

From the restriction of Equation (23), $\Omega(Q) > 0$, Yang [4] derived the following lemma.

Lemma 1 (Yang [4]). When $\alpha_1 > 0$ and $\alpha_3 > 0$, there is a lower bound and an upper bound, say Q_1 and Q_2 of Q to guarantee that $\Omega(Q) > 0$, with $\alpha_1 = C - H_{WIP} \left(1 - \frac{c_a^2}{2}\right) \tau$, $\alpha_2 = (2 - c_a^2) \frac{H_{WIP}}{P}$, $\alpha_3 = \alpha_1^2 - 2\alpha_2 A$, $Q_1 = \frac{\alpha_1 - \sqrt{\alpha_3}}{\alpha_2}$, and $Q_2 = \frac{\alpha_1 + \sqrt{\alpha_3}}{\alpha_2}$.

For the restriction of Equation (26) as $Q - \sqrt{\Delta(Q)} > 0$, Yang [4] obtained the next lemma.

Lemma 2 (Yang [4]). When $\beta_1 > 0$ and $\beta_3 > 0$, there is a lower bound and an upper bound of Q , say Q_3 and Q_4 , to guarantee that $D^\#(Q) > 0$, where $\beta_1 = C - H_{WIP} \tau$, $\beta_2 = 2 \frac{H_{WIP}}{P}$, $\beta_3 = \beta_1^2 - 2\beta_2 A$, $Q_3 = \frac{\beta_1 - \sqrt{\beta_3}}{\beta_2}$ and $Q_4 = \frac{\beta_1 + \sqrt{\beta_3}}{\beta_2}$.

Bounds on Q (Lemma 1 and 2 of Yang [4])

From $\Omega(Q) > 0$ and $Q - \sqrt{\Delta(Q)} > 0$, Yang [4] stated two lemmas that provide two pairs: a lower and an upper bound for Q : With $\alpha_1 = C - H_{WIP} \left(1 - \frac{c_a^2}{2}\right) \tau$, $\alpha_2 = (2 - c_a^2) \frac{H_{WIP}}{P}$, $\alpha_3 = \alpha_1^2 - 2\alpha_2 A$, $Q_1 = \frac{\alpha_1 - \sqrt{\alpha_3}}{\alpha_2}$, $Q_2 = \frac{\alpha_1 + \sqrt{\alpha_3}}{\alpha_2}$, and with $\beta_1 = C - H_{WIP} \tau$, $\beta_2 = 2 \frac{H_{WIP}}{P}$, $\beta_3 = \beta_1^2 - 2\beta_2 A$, $Q_3 = \frac{\beta_1 - \sqrt{\beta_3}}{\beta_2}$ and $Q_4 = \frac{\beta_1 + \sqrt{\beta_3}}{\beta_2}$.

When $\alpha_1 > 0$, and $\alpha_3 > 0$ and $\beta_1 > 0$, and $\beta_3 > 0$, the feasible interval for Q becomes

$$\max\{Q_1, Q_3\} < Q < \min\{Q_2, Q_4\} \quad (27)$$

to guarantee that $\Omega(Q) > 0$ and $D^\#(Q) > 0$.

Monotonicity in D and Reduction to $T_p(Q, D^\#(Q))$

Using Equations (22)–(26), Yang [4] showed that for fixed Q , $\frac{\partial}{\partial D} T_p > 0$, when $D < D^\#(Q)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial D} T_p < 0$ when $D > D^\#(Q)$, hence $D^\#(Q)$ is a local maximizer in D : if $D < D^\#(Q)$,

$$\frac{\partial T_p(Q, D)}{\partial D} > 0 \quad (28)$$

and if $D > D^\#(Q)$,

$$\frac{\partial T_p(Q, D)}{\partial D} < 0 \quad (29)$$

Therefore, the two-variable program reduces to a single-variable problem,

$$T_p(Q, D^\#(Q)) = CD^\#(Q) - \frac{A}{Q} D^\#(Q) - H_{FG} \frac{Q}{2} - H_{WIP} \left(\frac{Q}{P} + \tau\right) D^\#(Q) - H_{WIP} \frac{c_a^2 (Q - x)^2}{2x} \quad (30)$$

where $x = Q - ((Q/P) + \tau) D^\#(Q)$.

Finite Search Domain and Numerical Considerations

Under Lemmas 1 and 2 of Yang [4], the search domain contracts from the infinite set

$$0 < Q < \infty \quad (31)$$

to the finite interval

$$\max\{Q_1, Q_3\} < Q < \min\{Q_2, Q_4\}. \quad (32)$$

Yang did not quantify the number of stationary points of $T_p(Q, D^\#(Q))$ in Q , and regarded the problem as analytically intractable, thus recommending numerical search

over Equation (32). For reference, the numerical data in Choi and Enns [3], and Yang [4] imply $\alpha_j > 0$, and $\beta_i > 0$ and validate the bounds in Equation (27). In Section 3.4, structural results from the minimum-cost analysis are used to shrink the search in D from $0 \leq D$ to the natural interval $0 \leq D < P$ and to work with natural finite bounds that are tighter in practice (e.g., improving from $7 < Q < 2381$ to $0 \leq D < 12$).

3.4. Cost–Profit Decomposition and One-Dimensional Reformulation of the Maximum-Profit Model

This section provides a structure-aware simplification of Yang’s analytical workflow for the maximum-profit model $T_p(Q, D)$. By comparing the profit objective in Equation (21) with the re-expression of the minimum-cost objective in Equation (4), it follows that

$$T_p(Q, D) = CD - T_c(Q, D) \quad (33)$$

Consequently, for fixed throughput demand D , maximizing $T_p(\cdot, D)$ over Q is equivalent to minimizing $T_c(\cdot)$, and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial Q} T_p(Q, D) = -\frac{d}{dQ} T_c(Q, D) \quad (34)$$

Since $T_c(Q, D)$ is strictly convex and admits a unique interior minimizer on its feasible domain (Theorem3), $T_p(\cdot, D)$ is strictly concave in Q and thus possesses a unique maximizer $Q^*(D)$ for each feasible D . This reduces the original two-variable maximization to a one-variable program $\max_D T_p(Q^*(D), D)$. A natural upper bound for D follows from the feasibility condition $x(Q, D) = Q - [(Q/P) + \tau]D > 0$ (see Equation (3)), which implies

$$D < \frac{Q}{(Q/P) + \tau} < \frac{Q}{Q/P} = P \quad (35)$$

Hence, the search range for D contracts from the infinite half-line $D \geq 0$ to the natural finite interval $0 \leq D < P$, consistent with the stability assumption stated earlier. In the numerical example of Choi and Enns [3], and Yang [4], this transforms a wide Q -interval into a compact D -interval, enabling an efficient one-dimensional search.

Boundary conditions of $D \rightarrow 0^+$ and $D \rightarrow P^-$

Based on Equation (18), we derive that

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow 0^+} T_c(Q, D) = H_{FG} \frac{Q}{2} \quad (36)$$

and

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow P^-} T_c(Q, D) = \infty \quad (37)$$

because $\lim_{D \rightarrow P^-} \frac{Q}{P(P-D)} = \infty$, $\lim_{D \rightarrow P^-} \frac{\tau(2P-D)}{(P-D)^2} = \infty$, and $\lim_{D \rightarrow P^-} \frac{\tau^2 P^3}{(P-D)^2((P-D)Q - DP\tau)} = \infty$.

Recalling Equation (21), $T_p(Q, D) = CD - T_c(Q, D)$, we obtain that

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow P^-} T_c(Q, D) = \infty \quad (38)$$

and

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow P^-} T_p(Q, D) = -\infty \quad (39)$$

the above two limiting values are negative such that they will not be the maximum value. Therefore, two boundary cases with $D \rightarrow 0^+$ and $D \rightarrow P^-$ will not generate a positive profit. Thus, we are not concerned about two limiting cases of $D \rightarrow 0^+$ and $D \rightarrow P^-$.

4. Results

4.1. Numerical Results

This section evaluates the solution procedure on the canonical benchmark used by Choi and Enns [3] and subsequently by Yang [4], adopting the same parameter set $(A, C, H_{FG}, H_{WIP}, c_a, \tau, P) = (70, 10, 0.2, 0.05, 0.5, 1, 12)$. The feasible demand range follows the natural bound $0 \leq D < P$ (see Equation (35)), i.e., $0 \leq D < 12$. A coarse-to-fine one-dimensional search over D is employed while, for each fixed D , the unique $Q^*(D)$ is obtained by solving $\frac{dT_C(Q)}{dQ} = 0$ (Equation (19)) with T_C as in Equation (18); the profit is then evaluated as $T_p(Q^*(D), D)$ using Equation (21).

Stage 1 (coarse grid). Since the revenue term CD grows linearly in D while costs remain bounded by feasibility, a coarse screening over $3 \leq D \leq 11$ with step size 1 is adopted. For each $D \in \{3, 4, \dots, 10, 11\}$, Equation (19) is solved to obtain $Q^*(D)$ and $T_p(Q^*(D), D)$ is computed via Equation (21). The coarse grid attains its maximum at

$$T_p(Q^*(10), 10) = \max\{T_p(Q^*(D), D) : D \in \{3, 4, \dots, 10, 11\}\} \quad (40)$$

Stage 2 (refinement). The search interval is narrowed to $9 \leq D \leq 11$. Evaluations on a 0.1 grid, $D \in \{9, 9.1, \dots, 11\}$, yield

$$T_p(Q^*(9.7), 9.7) = \max\{T_p(Q^*(D), D) : D \in \{9, 9.1, \dots, 11\}\} \quad (41)$$

Stage 3 (fine refinement). Focusing on $9.6 \leq D \leq 9.8$ with step size 0.01, i.e., $D \in \{9.6, 9.61, \dots, 9.8\}$, the maximizer is found at

$$T_p(Q^*(9.74), 9.74) = \max\{T_p(Q^*(D), D) : D \in \{9.6, 9.61, \dots, 9.8\}\} \quad (42)$$

The final selection is therefore $D^* = 9.74$, $Q^*(9.74) = 86.7260$ and $T_p(Q^*(D^*), D^*) = 70.7725$, consistent with Yang's reported optimum on the same benchmark. Key evaluation results are summarized in Table 1 (values of D , the corresponding $Q^*(D)$, and $T_p(Q^*(D), D)$).

Table 1. Key results for the maximum-profit model.

Stage	D	$Q^*(D)$	$T_p(Q^*(D), D)$	Description
1	9	70.9725	68.1464	
2	9.6	82.3691	70.6476	
2	9.7	85.4614	70.7628	2nd stage best
3	9.73	86.4777	70.7722	
3	9.74	86.7260	70.7725	Optimal solution
3	9.75	87.1793	70.7713	
2	9.8	89.0211	70.7429	
1	10	97.7936	70.1817	1st stage best
1	11	214.4753	35.3898	

Figure 1 depicts $T_C(Q)$ at $D = 9.74$ highlighting the unique minimizer $Q^*(D)$.




Figure 1. When $D = 9.74$, the minimum cost. Yang [4].

Figure 2 overlays $T_C(Q)$ and $T_P(Q, 9.74)$ to visualize how the minimum-cost solution maps to the maximum-profit optimum through the identity $T_P = CD - T_C$.




Figure 2. The relationship between the minimum cost and maximum profit.

4.2. Search Space Reduction and Computational Implications

Yang's procedure operates over a wide Q -interval obtained from Lemmas 1–2,

$$\max\{Q_1, Q_3\} = 7.056 < Q < \min\{Q_2, Q_4\} = 2381 \quad (43)$$

where $Q_1 = 7.049$, $Q_2 = 2724$, $Q_3 = 7.056$, and $Q_4 = 2381$. In contrast, the present structure-aware routine searches over the natural finite demand interval $0 \leq D < P = 12$, and, as demonstrated by the coarse-to-fine evaluation (Equations (35)–(37)), quickly concentrates near the maximizer. This reduction from a very broad Q -domain to a compact D -domain materially lowers the number of objective evaluations while preserving the optimal solution, thereby improving numerical efficiency and implementation robustness.

Comparing the feasible Q -domain in Equation (43) (Yang [4]) with the natural feasible D -domain in the following,

$$0 \leq D < P = 12 \quad (44)$$

shows that the proposed search domain is substantially tighter. This tightening reduces the number of objective evaluations required in practice while preserving the optimal solution.

We execute a sensitivity analysis with respect to (i) the setup cost, A , (ii) the manufacturing cost, C , and (iii) the coefficient of variation in lot interarrival times, c_a . The numerical example cited from Choi and Enns [3] and Yang [4] is treated as the base example. We change one parameter at a time to increase 10%, 20% and up to 30%. On the other hand, we decrease 10%, 20% and up to 30%. We list the computation results in the following tables.

Based on Table 2, the optimal throughput demand rate, D^* has a positive effect on the setup cost, A . The optimal lot size, with respect to the optimal throughput demand rate, D^* , $Q^*(D^*)$ almost has a positive effect on the setup cost, A . However, when the setup cost, A decreases from $A = 56$ to $A = 49$, $Q^*(D^*)$ increases from 82.529 to 82.890 which may be an interesting research topic for future examination. The maximum value of the profit model, $T_p(Q^*(D), D^*)$ has a negative effect on the setup cost, A .

Table 2. Sensitivity analysis with respect to the setup cost, A .

	+30%	+20%	+10%	Base	−10%	−20%	−30%
D^*	9.78	9.77	9.75	9.74	9.72	9.70	9.71
$Q^*(D^*)$	92.676	90.829	88.650	86.726	84.669	82.529	82.890
$T_p(Q^*(D), D^*)$	68.488	69.234	69.995	70.773	71.567	72.380	72.380

According to Table 3, the variations in the manufacturing cost, C has have no effect on the optimal throughput demand rate, D^* and the optimal lot size, with respect to the optimal throughput demand rate, D^* , $Q^*(D^*)$ which is supported by the observation of $T_C(Q)$ does not having the term “ C ” of Equation (18). The maximum value of the profit model, $T_p(Q^*(D), D^*)$ has a positive effect on the manufacturing cost, C which is confirmed by the term “ CD ” appearing in Equation (21).

Table 3. Sensitivity analysis with respect to the manufacturing cost, C .

	+30%	+20%	+10%	Base	−10%	−20%	−30%
D^*	9.74	9.74	9.74	9.74	9.74	9.74	9.74
$Q^*(D^*)$	86.726	86.726	86.726	86.726	86.726	86.726	86.726
$T_p(Q^*(D), D^*)$	99.992	90.252	80.512	70.773	61.032	51.292	41.552

Referring to Table 4, the optimal throughput demand rate, D^* , the optimal lot size, with respect to the optimal throughput demand rate, D^* , $Q^*(D^*)$, and the maximum value of the profit model, $T_p(Q^*(D), D^*)$, all have a negative effect on the coefficient of variation in lot interarrival times, c_a .

Table 4. Sensitivity analysis with the coefficient of variation in lot interarrival times, c_a .

	+30%	+20%	+10%	Base	−10%	−20%	−30%
D^*	9.45	9.54	9.64	9.74	9.83	9.94	10.04
$Q^*(D^*)$	81.671	83.152	84.963	86.726	88.732	90.669	92.617
$T_p(Q^*(D), D^*)$	67.274	68.410	69.576	70.773	72.001	73.264	75.562

Single-machine, single-product setting, fixed processing rate, steady-state assumptions, generalized interarrival approximation, and no multi-item coupling are limitations in the present version of inventory models.

Relaxations of those limitations to multi-product coupling, sequence-dependent setups, capacity coupling, queueing-approximation quality, and uncertain parameters will be interesting research topics in future studies to increase its academic value and possible applications.

5. Conclusions

This study develops a corrected optimality theory for single-machine, single-product inventory models under generalized interarrival-time assumptions. A sign-corrected endpoint analysis, combined with a succinct derivation, establishes strict convexity of the minimum-cost objective and certifies the existence and uniqueness of an interior optimizer without auxiliary feasibility constraints. These results consolidate previously separate statements into a single general theorem and provide portable optimality certificates across parameter regimes. Exploiting the identity $T_p(Q, D) = CD - T_c(Q; D)$, the maximum-profit problem reduces to a one-dimensional optimization in D over the natural finite interval $0 \leq D < P$. The framework replaces paired bounds on an unbounded Q -domain with natural limits, attains the same optimum as prior work on the canonical benchmark, and does so with fewer evaluations, thereby clarifying the structural correspondence between cost minimization and profit maximization. The procedure is straightforward to implement: for each D , solve $\frac{dT_c(Q)}{dQ} = 0$ to obtain $Q^*(D)$; then perform a one-dimensional search over D over $[0, P]$. In practice, this reduces search effort, improves numerical stability, and provides a transparent path from modeling assumptions to actionable decisions in capacity-constrained single-machine settings. Limitations and avenues for further work include extensions to multi-product and multi-machine systems; sequencing and setup-dependent environments; stochastic processing rates and non-stationary arrivals; robust or distributional robust formulations under parameter uncertainty; and learning-based estimation of interarrival variability to inform the proposed bounds.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are openly available in Choi and Enns [3] and Yang [4].

Acknowledgments: The author expresses sincere gratitude to Yu-da Lin for revising the presentation and writing, which substantially improved the quality of the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Rangaswamy, M. Queueing-inventory Systems: A Survey. *arXiv* **2023**, arXiv:2308.06518.
2. Andaz, S.; Eisenach, C.; Madeka, D.; Torkkola, K.; Jia, R.; Foster, D.; Kakade, S. Learning an inventory control policy with general inventory arrival dynamics. *arXiv* **2023**, arXiv:2310.17168.
3. Choi, S.; Enns, S.T. Multi-product capacity-constrained lot sizing with economic objectives. *Int. J. Prod. Econ.* **2004**, *91*, 47–62.
4. Yang, G.K. Analytical approach for optimal solution of inventory model with constrained production capacity. *Concurr. Eng. Res. Appl.* **2015**, *23*, 74–78.
5. Otten, S.; Daduna, H. Stability of queueing-inventory systems with customers of different priorities. *Ann. Oper. Res.* **2023**, *331*, 963–983.
6. Amjath, M.; Kerbache, L.; Elomri, A.; Smith, J.M. Queueing network models for the analysis and optimization of material handling systems: A systematic literature review. *Flex. Serv. Manuf. J.* **2024**, *36*, 668–709.

7. Harikrishnan, T.; Jeganathan, K.; Redkar, S.; Umamaheswari, G.; Pattanaik, B.; Loganathan, K. A finite source retrial queuing inventory system with stock dependent arrival and heterogeneous servers. *Sci. Rep.* **2024**, *14*, 30588.
8. Baek, J.W. On the control policy of a queuing–inventory system with variable inventory replenishment speed. *Mathematics* **2024**, *12*, 194.
9. Dziuba, D.; Almeder, C. New construction heuristic for capacitated lot sizing problems. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **2023**, *311*, 906–920.
10. Kohlmann, P.; Sahling, F. A flexible planning approach for integrated lot sizing and rework planning with random proportion of defective products. *Int. J. Prod. Res.* **2024**, *62*, 6961–6978.
11. Hong, Y.; Scully, Z. Performance of the Gittins policy in the G/G/1 and G/G/k, with and without setup times. *ACM SIGMETRICS Perform. Eval. Rev.* **2023**, *51*, 33–35.
12. Zhao, S.; Wei, Y.; Cheng, Y.; Li, Y. A state-specific joint size, maintenance, and inventory policy for a k-out-of-n load-sharing system subject to self-announcing failures. *Reliab. Eng. Syst. Saf.* **2025**, *257*, 110855.
13. Sereshti, N.; Adulyasak, Y.; Jans, R. Managing flexibility in stochastic multi-level lot sizing problem with service level constraints. *Omega* **2024**, *122*, 102957.

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.