Exploiting random lead times for significant inventory cost savings
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Abstract

We study the classical single-item inventory system in which unsatisfied demands are backlogged. Replenishment lead times are random, independent identically distributed, causing orders to cross in time. We develop a new inventory policy to exploit implications of lead time randomness and order crossover, and evaluate its performance by asymptotic analysis and simulations. Our policy does not follow the basic principle of Constant Base Stock (CBS) policy, or more generally, \((s, S)\) and \((r, Q)\) policies, which is to keep the inventory position within a fixed range. Instead, it uses the current inventory level (= inventory-on-hand minus backlog) to set a dynamic target for inventory in-transit, and place orders to follow this target. Our policy includes CBS policy as a special case, under a particular choice of a policy parameter.

We show that our policy can significantly reduce the average inventory cost compared with CBS policy. Specifically, we prove that if the lead time is exponentially distributed, then under our policy, with properly chosen policy parameters, the expected (absolute) inventory level scales as \(o(\sqrt{r})\), as the demand rate \(r \to \infty\). In comparison, it is known to scale as \(O(\sqrt{r})\) under CBS policy. In particular, this means that, as \(r \to \infty\), the average inventory cost under our policy vanishes in comparison with that under CBS policy. Furthermore, our simulations show that the advantage of our policy remains to be substantial under non-exponential lead time distributions, and may even be greater than under exponential distribution. We also use simulations to compare the average cost under
our policy with that achieved under an optimal policy for some cases where computing the optimal cost is tractable. The results show that our policy removes a majority of excess costs of CBS policy over the minimum cost, leading to much smaller optimality gaps.

1 Introduction

We consider the classical single-item inventory system. Demand units arrive as a constant rate $r$ Poisson process. Inventory is managed by a continuous-time replenishment policy. Unsatisfied demand units are backlogged and unused supply units are held in inventory. There is no capacity constraint nor fixed ordering cost. The inventory is replenished by ordering supply units, which are received after a generally random lead time. The task of inventory management is to determine the timing and quantity of supply orders based on the current state and history of the system. An inventory control policy performance measure/objective may depend on a specific application. In this paper we focus on the long-run average inventory cost, where each unit in inventory incurs a holding cost at rate $h$ and each unit of unsatisfied demand incurs a backlog cost at rate $\theta$.

As a fundamental result in the inventory theory, if the lead time is constant, then it is always optimal to follow Constant Base Stock (CBS) policy, which keeps the inventory position at a certain target level [10]. Here the inventory position is the total inventory (including both units on-hand and units in-transit) minus the backlog. The target level is obtained by solving an optimization problem that uses demand process structure and cost parameters as inputs. The optimality of CBS policy also extends to any system in which orders never cross in time, i.e., orders placed earlier also arrive earlier. However, this order-no-crossover condition is often not satisfied in practice. For instance, Zipkin gives a taxonomy of supply systems, many of which will lead to random lead times and order crossovers [25]. Robinson et al. and Bradley and Robinson ([16], [15]) present a variety of factors, ranging from production scheduling, parallel order processing to supplier diversity, geography, and transportation, that can cause later orders to arrive earlier. Disney et al. [7] perform an empirical analysis on port-to-port and door-to-door shipping times between many China-USA city pairs. By their estimation, crossover can occur to as many as 40% of orders.

In systems with random lead times and order crossovers, CBS policy is generally not optimal [2], and cannot be expected to be optimal. This, however, poses the question: how much better could well-designed “non-CBS” policies be compared with CBS policy. In this paper we show that non-CBS policies can be potentially infinitely better. We propose a new policy, Generalized Base Stock (GBS) policy, which achieves such infinite improvement asymptotically as the demand rate $r \to \infty$. Specifically, our main theoretical results prove that if the lead time is exponentially distributed, then under GBS policy with properly chosen parameters, the expected (absolute) inventory level scales as $o(\sqrt{r})$. In
In particular, this implies that, as $r \to \infty$, the average inventory cost under GBS policy vanishes in comparison to that under CBS policy.

The key feature of GBS policy is that, instead of focusing on maintaining the inventory position within a fixed range, it uses the current inventory level (= inventory-on-hand minus backlog) to set a dynamic target for inventory in-transit, and place orders to follow this target. The policy has a parameter $\gamma > 0$ which controls the rate of change of the target in response to changes of inventory level. When parameter $\gamma = 1$, GBS policy specializes to CBS policy. (Hence the name Generalized Base Stock.) However, as will be evident from our analysis, in general, the value of this parameter should be greater than 1, and significantly so in many cases.

In addition to theoretical results, we evaluate GBS performance via simulations. Our simulation results indicate that the advantage of GBS policy over CBS policy prevails in many cases that are outside the scope of our asymptotic analysis. In particular, we consider situations in which 1) the demand rate is small and/or 2) the lead time distribution is non-exponential. For the latter, we consider the following lead time distributions: 2.a) the sum of deterministic and exponential; 2.b) uniform; 2.c) Pareto. We show that in all these cases, our GBS policy strictly outperforms CBS policy. In some cases, savings of the inventory cost can be as high as 50% – 60%. In systems where lead times are exponentially distributed and demand rates are not high, computing the optimal policy and cost is tractable by viewing our model as a Markov Decision Process (MDP). We compare costs of GBS policy with the minimum costs, find that the optimality gaps are small in these cases, and discuss intuitions of this outcome.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we review related literature. Our formal model, the GBS policy definition and the main theoretical results (Theorem 1 and Corollary 2) are presented in Section 3. The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section 4. We present our simulation experiments in Section 5 and conduct a cost comparison between GBS and optimal policies in Section 6. We conclude the paper in Section 7.

Basic notation. For real numbers $a$ and $b$: $a \lor b = \max\{a, b\}$, $a \land b = \min\{a, b\}$, $a^+ = a \lor 0$, $a^- = (-a)^+ = -(a \land 0)$, $\lceil a \rceil$ is the smallest integer $i \geq a$. Indicator $I\{A\}$ of an event (or condition) $A$ is equal to 1 if $A$ holds, and 0 otherwise. Convergence of random variables in distribution is denoted by $\Rightarrow$; $\mathcal{N}(m, \sigma^2)$ denotes a normal random variable with mean $m$ and variance $\sigma^2$; $\Phi(x)$, $-\infty < x < \infty$, is the distribution function of the standard normal variable $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$; the stochastic order $X_1 \leq_{st} X_2$ between random variables $X_1$ and $X_2$ means that $\mathbb{P}\{X_1 > x\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{X_2 > x\}$ for all $x$. If $X(t)$, $t \geq 0$, is a random process for which a stationary regime exists, we denote by $X(\infty)$ the (random) value of $X(t)$ is this stationary regime. (Our main theoretical result concerns an irreducible countable continuous-time Markov chain, in which case the existence of unique stationary regime is equivalent to positive recurrence, or ergodicity.)
2 Related Work

The need to address random lead times and order crossover is well-recognized in the inventory theory. Nevertheless, to the best of our knowledge, before this work, almost all studies only consider policies that makes decisions based on the inventory position alone; and none of the previous work shows that $o(\sqrt{r})$ inventory cost scaling can be achieved.

There have been studies that focus on sequential systems in which the lead times are random but orders never cross in time; see [18]. Zipkin [24] develops an explicit order arrival mechanism that gives rise to such systems. As discussed in [25], there are many practical cases that correspond to sequential systems, e.g., cases when orders are processed FIFO by a single server with finite capacity. Analysis of sequential systems is facilitated by the fact that many results on the constant-leadtime systems continue to apply when orders always arrive in the same sequence as they are placed.

There also have been studies that consider systems with i.i.d. replenishment lead times, in which case order crossover is inevitable in general. The prevailing approach is to analyze and/or optimize the system under the framework of base stock policies (e.g., [23], [10], [1, 15], [12]), or more generally, $(s, S)$ (e.g., [2], [3]), or $(r, Q)$ (e.g., [9], [19], [11]) policies. Improvements are made by developing better ways to set policy parameters. Nevertheless, once these parameters have been determined, order arrivals depend only on the demand process and random lead times, and insulated from active, state-dependent adjustments. This makes the analysis more tractable, but also deprives the system of significant cost savings that such adjustments can bring about. In fact, Robinson et al. ([16], p.178) present a very simple discrete-time example with order crossover to show that it is possible to save more than 40% of inventory cost by replacing CBS policy with a policy that sets order quantities based on the inventory level. Nevertheless, their discussion does not go beyond a simple illustration that CBS policy is not always optimal, let alone a prescription of a general policy and a full-scale analysis of its effectiveness.

In a recent work [7], Disney et al. point out that when orders can cross in time, CBS policy does not minimize the variance of the net inventory level, which in turn determines the average inventory cost. They prescribe a Proportional Order-Up-To (POUT) policy and show that it results in a lower inventory cost compared with CBS policy. Nevertheless, their order decisions are still based solely on the inventory position. This should explain why the improvement of their policy from CBS policy, which is less than 1% (see Figure 8 and related discussions on page 482 in [7]), pales in comparison with improvements achieved by our approach (see results in Section 5 below).

The model studied in this paper has several other applications besides inventory systems. For example, it arises in modern call/contact centers [13], in which case the “demand units” are callers and “supply units” are agents answering the calls; the agents are not always available, they need to be invited and respond after random delays, which are the “lead times.” The objective in such systems is to minimize waiting times for both callers and agents (minimize
“inventory”). The theoretical results of [13] analyze an agent-invitation (“inventory control”) policy, which is different from GBS policy in two important respects. First, the underlying dynamics of the process is different and, second, the policy in [13] allows the option of un-inviting pending agents (those who were invited earlier, but have not responded yet) at any time. The latter option corresponds to discarding in-transit inventory at any time without penalty – this option usually is not available in inventory systems, and GBS policy does not utilize it. Other applications (or potential applications) of the model in this paper include telemedicine, crowdsourcing-based customer service, taxi-service system, buyers and sellers in a trading market, and assembly systems; see [13] for additional discussion and references.

Finally, we note that, methodologically, our theoretical results are closely related to diffusion limit/approximation results in queueing theory; see, e.g., [14] for an extensive review. The main technical challenge of our analysis stems from the above-mentioned fact that in-transit inventory cannot be freely discarded, which is a major consideration in developing inventory policies. Consequently, to prove the diffusion limit for the actual process we, first, obtain the diffusion limit for an artificial process (which can discard in-transit inventory) and then – this is the key part – derive bounds on the deviation of the actual process from the artificial one.

3 Model and main results

3.1 Model

Following the general description at the beginning of Section 1, we formally define the model as follows.

The demand, consisting of discrete units, follows a Poisson process of rate $r$. Inventory is managed by a continuous-review replenishment policy. An ordered supply unit arrives after a lead time which has the distribution function $F(\cdot)$ with mean $1/\beta$; the lead times are i.i.d.; we denote by $L$ a generic lead time, $\mathbb{E}[L] = 1/\beta$.

We will use the following notation, for $t \geq 0$: $Y(t)$ is the net inventory level (positive or negative) at time $t$; $\Lambda(t)$ is the number of demand units arrived in $(0,t]$; $Z(t)$ is the number of in-transit (ordered, but not arrived yet) supply units at $t$; $M(t)$ is the number of supply units that arrived in $(0,t]$ (i.e., moved from in-transit to actual inventory); $S(t)$ is the number of supply units ordered in $(0,t]$. Then,

$$Z(t) \equiv Z(0) + S(t) - M(t), \quad t \geq 0,$$

$$Y(t) \equiv Y(0) + M(t) - \Lambda(t), \quad t \geq 0;$$

and $B(t) = Y^-(t)$ and $I(t) = Y^+(t)$ are the backlog and inventory on-hand levels, respectively, at $t \geq 0$.

An inventory control policy defines $S(t)$ as a (non-anticipating) function of the process history up to time $t$. Performance measures and/or objectives of
a control policy may depend on the application. One of the most common performance measures is the long-run average inventory cost, defined as follows. Let \( h > 0 \) and \( \theta > 0 \) be the per-unit inventory holding and backlog costs per unit of time, respectively. Then the expected inventory cost at time \( t \) is given by
\[
C(t) = hE[I(t)] + \theta E[B(t)], \quad t \geq 0.
\]
The long-run average cost is then
\[
C = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T C(t)dt, \tag{1}
\]
assuming the limit (finite or infinite) exists. Our main theoretical results concern a setting and a specific policy, under which the system process is an irreducible countable continuous-time Markov chain. In this case the limit in (1) always exists, and if the process is positive recurrent (ergodic),
\[
C = hE[I(\infty)] + \theta E[B(\infty)]. \tag{2}
\]
In this paper, we will use the long-run average cost to evaluate the performance of our proposed policy and to compare it with CBS policy.

### 3.2 Generalized base-stock (GBS) Policy

The theoretical results of this paper concern a policy that we now introduce. (This policy is a modified version of a scheme proposed in [20].)

To make our terminology more concise and convenient for the algorithm definition and analysis, we will call a demand unit a *customer*, and a supply unit an *item*.

**Generalized base-stock (GBS) policy.**

The policy has three parameters: \( \gamma > 0, \ f > 0, \) and real \( x_* \). Denote \( X_* = r/\beta \) and \( X_{**} = r/\beta + \gamma x_* = X_* + \gamma x_* \). The policy maintains a “target” variable \( X \), which is just a function of \( Y \):
\[
X = X_* - \gamma(Y - x_*) \equiv X_{**} - \gamma Y; \tag{3}
\]
and also the “truncated target” (also just a function of \( Y \)):
\[
T = [X \land (X_* + f)] \lor 0. \tag{4}
\]

The policy “acts” only at the “arrival times”, i.e. times of either customer or items arrivals into the system. At an arrival time, the following steps are performed, in the specified sequence.

1. If it is a customer arrival, then \( Y := Y - 1 \).
2. Update \( T \) via (3) and (4).

**End of GBS policy definition**
Clearly, the underlying idea of GBS policy is to keep the inventory in-transit \( Z \) close to the target \( X_{**} - \gamma Y \) (which depends on \( Y \)), in other words to maintain \( Z + \gamma Y \approx X_{**} \). This means that in the special case \( \gamma = 1 \), the policy tries to keep the inventory position \( Y + Z \) close to the constant base-stock level \( X_{**} = X_\ast + \gamma x_\ast \). Therefore, when \( \gamma = 1 \) GBS policy essentially reduces to CBS policy — this explains the name generalized base-stock. GBS parameter \( \gamma \) is the key. When \( \gamma > 1 \), the GBS “response” to the current value of \( Y \) is “amplified” compared with that under CBS policy in that relation \( Z - X_{**} \approx -Y \) is replaced by \( Z - X_{**} \approx -\gamma Y \). We will elaborate on this in Sections 3.3 and 3.4.

Remark. As the first equality in (3) suggests — and our formal results will show — parameter \( x_\ast \) serves merely to recenter \( Y \) at a desired value. (This is useful when the objective is the average cost minimization, with holding and backlog cost rates being different, \( h \neq \theta \). See our simulation results.) Therefore, for the purposes of the policy analysis (as well as further policy discussion below) it is sufficient to consider the case where \( x_\ast = 0 \), that is \( X_{**} = X_\ast = r/\beta \).

Remark. Parameter \( f \) and the truncation of target \( T \) at the upper bound \( X_\ast + f \) are introduced to simplify the analysis. A practical version of GBS policy can work without this truncation, namely with \( T = X_\ast \). Our simulations show that the behavior and performance of these two policy versions is essentially indistinguishable, when \( f/\sqrt{r} \) is large — which is the regime we are mostly interested in. We note, however, that the version of GBS policy that we analyze, with \( T = [X_\ast \land (X_\ast + f)] \lor 0 \), requires no more information about the system parameters than the version with \( T = X_\ast \lor 0 \).

### 3.3 Discussion of key difference between GBS and existing inventory policies

The discussion in this subsection is informal — the reader interested only in the formal results’ statements and proofs can skip this subsection.

To gain insight into the basic system dynamics under GBS policy, and its key difference from existing policies, let us consider a system in continuous time, with “randomness removed:” constant-rate \( r \) non-random “fluid” customer input flow and continuous flow of items with instantaneous rate equal to \( \beta Z \). We will also assume \( x_\ast = 0 \), so that \( X_{**} = X_\ast = r/\beta \), and use notation \( U = Z - X_\ast \). Then, the system dynamics under GBS policy is described by the following ODE and the conservation law:

\[
Y' = \beta U, \quad \gamma Y + U = 0, \quad (5)
\]

or, equivalently,

\[
Y' = -\beta Y, \quad U = -\gamma Y. \quad (6)
\]

The dynamics under CBS policy is a special case of (6) with \( \gamma = 1 \), namely

\[
Y' = -\beta Y, \quad U = -Y. \quad (7)
\]

We see that GBS policy “amplifies” by factor \( \gamma \) the drift of the inventory level \( Y \) towards 0, compared with CBS policy.
A continuous time version of the POUT policy, introduced in [7], also with “randomness removed,” would be described (in notations of the present paper) by the following ODE:

\[ Y' = \beta U, \quad (Y + U)' = -\delta (Y + U). \tag{8} \]

(Here the parameter \( \delta > 0 \) is related to parameter \( 0 < \beta \leq 1 \) in [7] via \( e^{-\tau \delta} = 1 - \beta \), where \( \tau \) and \( \beta \) are their notations, not related to definitions in this paper). The CBS policy dynamics (7) is then a special case of POUT with \( \delta = +\infty \). We observe the following. POUT policy generalizes CBS policy in that it introduces some “inertia” into the dynamics of the inventory position \( Y + Z = (Y + U) + X_* \), as it drives it to the base-stock level \( X_* \). (CBS policy keeps the inventory position exactly at the base-stock level \( X_* \) at all times.) As a result, when/if the inventory position is equal/close to \( X_* \), the inventory level \( Y \) has a drift (\( -\beta Y \)) towards 0, which is proportional to \( |Y| \), but is not controlled by any policy parameter; in other words, when the inventory position is close to \( X_* \), the dynamics under POUT policy is same as that under CBS policy. In contrast, as discussed above, under GBS policy the drift (\( -\gamma \beta Y \)) of the inventory level to 0 is “amplified” by the policy parameter \( \gamma \), which can and, as we will see, should be greater than 1. We see that GBS policy, unlike CBS and POUT policies, directly controls the inventory level to reduce its variance and, consequently, cost.

### 3.4 Main results

We consider a sequence of systems with increasing parameter \( r \). The policy parameter \( f \) depends on \( r \), \( f = f(r) \), where \( f(r) \) is a fixed function such that

\[
\frac{f(r)}{r} \to 0, \quad \frac{f(r)}{\sqrt{r}} \to \infty.
\]

Parameter \( x_* \) also in general depends on \( r \), \( x_* = x_*(r) \); this dependence is arbitrary. The variables, pertaining to the system with parameter \( r \) will be supplied a superscript \( r \): \( Y^r, X^r, T^r, Z^r, X^r_* \).

**Theorem 1.** Consider a fixed integer \( \gamma \geq 1 \). Suppose the lead time distribution is exponential (with mean \( 1/\beta \)). Then, under GBS policy, the process \( (Y^r(t), Z^r(t)), t \geq 0, \) is an irreducible continuous-time countable Markov chain, and for any sufficiently large \( r \) it is positive recurrent (stochastically stable), and therefore has unique stationary distribution. The following convergence holds:

\[
\frac{Y^r(\infty) - x_*}{\sqrt{r}} \Rightarrow N(0, (\beta \gamma)^{-1}). \tag{9}
\]

Moreover, the expectations of \( [(Y^r(\infty) - x_*)/\sqrt{r}]^+ \) and \( [(Y^r(\infty) - x_*)/\sqrt{r}]^- \) converge to the corresponding expectations for the \( N(0, (\beta \gamma)^{-1}) \):

\[
E \left[ \frac{Y^r(\infty) - x_*}{\sqrt{r}} \right]^+ \to (2\pi \beta \gamma)^{-1/2}, \quad E \left[ \frac{Y^r(\infty) - x_*}{\sqrt{r}} \right]^- \to (2\pi \beta \gamma)^{-1/2}.
\]
Note that Theorem 1 requires that $\gamma \geq 1$ is integer. This assumption is made to simplify the analysis, and we believe it to be purely technical. We conjecture that Theorem 1 holds as is for any real $\gamma > 0$. GBS policy itself is defined for any real $\gamma > 0$, and we do use non-integer $\gamma$ in our simulations.

Also note that the variance $1/(\beta \gamma)$ of the limiting normal random variable in (9) has the GBS parameter $\gamma > 0$ in the denominator. This means that, in the asymptotic limit $r \to \infty$, GBS policy reduces the variance of the steady-state inventory level $Y^r(\infty)$ by the factor $\gamma$, compared with CBS policy. (This is the effect of GBS “amplifying” the drift of $Y^r$ towards 0 by factor $\gamma$; see the discussion in Section 3.3.) Does this mean that, for a given fixed $r$ “the larger the $\gamma$ the better?” Of course, not. As we increase parameter $\gamma$, the discrepancy between $Z^r$ and its dynamic target $T^r$ becomes larger; this is a factor that increases variance of $Y^r$, and it becomes dominant as $\gamma$ increases (with $r$ being constant). It is natural to expect, and our simulations confirm this, that for each $r$ there is a non-trivial optimal value of parameter $\gamma$, in the sense of minimizing the variance of $Y^r$. In rigorous terms, Theorem 1 implies the following

**Corollary 2.** Suppose we are in the conditions of Theorem 1, except $\gamma$ may depend on $r$. Then, the dependence $\gamma = \gamma(r)$ can be chosen in a way such that

$$\frac{Y^r(\infty) - x_*}{\sqrt{r}} \Rightarrow 0,$$

and, moreover,

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{Y^r(\infty) - x_*}{\sqrt{r}} \right| \to 0.$$

Let $C_{CBS}$ and $C_{GBS}$ denote the average costs under CBS policy and under GBS policy (with $\gamma$ chosen as in Corollary 2). It is well known that under CBS policy the distribution of $Y^r(\infty)/\sqrt{r}$ converges to normal with variance $r/\beta$. Therefore, Corollary 2 with $x_* \equiv 0$ implies that, in the case of exponential lead times,

$$C_{GBS}/C_{CBS} \to 0, \quad r \to \infty.$$  

In other words, GBS policy becomes infinitely better than CBS policy in the sense of average inventory costs.

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1

In this theorem, the integer parameter $\gamma \geq 1$ is fixed. Without loss of generality assume that $x_*(r) \equiv 0$. (If not, we can consider $Y^r - x_*(r)$ instead of $Y^r$, and exactly same proof applies.) Therefore, we have $X^r = X^r_* - \gamma Y^r$. Denote by $b = b(r) = f(r)/\gamma$ the scaled version of $f(r)$.

The fact that $(Y^r(t), Z^r(t)), t \geq 0$, is an irreducible continuous-time countable Markov chain is rather trivial; indeed, recall that $X^r_* = r/\beta$ is constant for each $r$, and $X^r$ and $T^r$ are just deterministic functions of $Y^r$: $X^r = X^r_* - \gamma Y^r$, $T^r = [X^r \wedge (X^r_* + f(r))] \vee 0$; the irreducibility is easy to verify directly. The
stability of this process (for any sufficiently large \( r \)) is also easily verified, for example by using the fluid limit technique \cite{17, 6, 24, 5}. Indeed, since for any fixed \( r \), \( Z^r(t) \) takes values in a finite set, it is easy to check that when \( |Y^r| \) is large, it will have an average drift towards the origin. We omit further details of the stability proof.

The rest of this section is structured as follows. In Section 4.1 we establish some key properties of the system process under GBS policy; namely we show that the steady-state deviation of \( Z^r \) from \( T^r \) is \( O(1) \). Then, in Section 4.2 we introduce and study an artificial process, which would arise if GBS policy would be allowed to remove in-transit items if necessary to keep \( Z^r \) always exactly equal \( T^r \); for the artificial process we prove the asymptotic limit of stationary distributions. In Section 4.3 we establish some relations and estimates, comparing the actual and the artificial processes. Section 4.4 combines all theses “pieces” to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.

4.1 Properties of the GBS process

We refer to \((Y^r(t), Z^r(t))\) as the GBS process, which specifies the net inventory level and inventory in-transit in system \( r \) under GBS policy. Recall that \((Y^r(\infty), Z^r(\infty))\) refers to the random state of process \((Y^r(t), Z^r(t))\) in stationary regime. In steady-state the average rate of item arrivals into the system is equal to the customer arrival rate, namely

\[
\beta \mathbb{E} Z^r(\infty) = r. \tag{10}
\]

The GBS process \((Y^r(t), Z^r(t))\) is such that \( Z^r(t) \geq \lfloor T^r(t) \rfloor \) at all times. Denote \( D^r(t) \equiv Z^r(t) - \lfloor T^r(t) \rfloor \) and \( \bar{D}^r(t) \equiv Z^r(t) - \lfloor T^r(t) \rfloor \wedge X^r(t) \); clearly, \( \bar{D}^r(t) \geq D^r(t) \geq 0 \).

**Lemma 3.** Expectations \( \mathbb{E} \bar{D}^r(\infty) \) are uniformly bounded: \( \sup_r \mathbb{E} \bar{D}^r(\infty) < \infty \). Consequently, for some constant \( C > 0 \) and all sufficiently large \( r \),

\[
\mathbb{E} D^r(\infty) \leq \mathbb{E} \bar{D}^r(\infty) \leq C.
\]

**Proof.** To improve exposition, within this proof, let us pretend that \( b = b(r) \) and \( X^r_i/\gamma \) (and then \( X^r_i \)) happen to be integer; this makes \( D^r(t) \), \( \bar{D}^r(t) \) and other process variables integer. (If this assumption is not true, it does not pose any additional difficulties, besides clogging notation – it will be clear that the proof is robust to apply to the general case as well. We will use this exposition-simplifying assumption in some other proofs as well.) Then the behavior of the process \( \bar{D}^r(t) \) is as follows. Upon a customer arrival at \( t \) (and the corresponding policy actions) \( \bar{D}^r \) jumps down as \( \bar{D}^r(t) = [\bar{D}^r(t-) - \gamma] \lor 0 \); in other words \( \bar{D}^r \) jumps down by \( \gamma \), but not below zero. Upon an item arrival at \( t \), \( \bar{D}^r \) jumps up as \( \bar{D}^r(t) = \bar{D}^r(t-) + (\gamma - 1) - [X^r(t)- - T^r(t-)) \lor 0 \land (\gamma - 1) \); in other words, \( \bar{D}^r \) jumps up by \( \gamma - 1 \) or, possibly, a smaller number (which happens only when \( X^r(t-) > T^r(t-) - Z^r(t-) = X^r_i + f(r) \)).

Note that the customer arrival rate is constant, equal \( r \). The item arrival rate is upper bounded by \( r + \beta f(r) \). Then, for an arbitrarily small fixed \( \epsilon > 0 \),
and all sufficiently large $r$, the probability a given arrival into the system is a customer arrival, is at least $1/2 - \epsilon$, regardless of the current state and history of the process. Consider the imbedded Markov chain at the times right after the arrivals (and corresponding policy actions); let $D_n^r$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, be the projection of this Markov chain on $D^r$. Using coupling, it is easy to see that, uniformly on all large $r$, process $D_n^r$ is stochastically dominated by the following random walk $Q_n$ (reflected at 0): at each time step $n$, $Q_n$ jumps as $Q_n = Q_{n-1} + (\gamma - 1)$ with probability $1/2 + \epsilon$ and jumps as $Q_n = [Q_{n-1} - \gamma] \vee 0$ with probability $1/2 - \epsilon$. Let $\epsilon$ be small enough, so that this random walk has negative one-step drift $-\delta = (1/2 + \epsilon)(\gamma - 1) - (1/2 - \epsilon)\gamma < 0$, as long as $Q_n \geq \gamma$. Then, in steady-state, $E Q_n < \infty$. (This follows by a standard drift argument. If in steady-state $E Q_n = \infty$ were to hold, then starting any fixed initial state $Q_0$, we would have $E Q_{n+1} - E Q_n^n = E [Q_{n+1} - Q_{n} | Q_n] \to -\infty$ as $n \to \infty$. In fact, $Q_n$ has a finite exponential moment, $E e^{cQ_n} < \infty$, for some $c > 0$, but we will only need the expectation bound.) Then, denoting by $Q_\infty$ and $D^r_\infty$ the random values of $Q_n$ and $D^r_n$, respectively, in steady-state, we obtain that $D^r_\infty \leq_{st} Q_\infty$, for all large $r$, where $E Q_\infty < \infty$.

Now note that, for any state of $\hat{D}^r(t)$, the expected time until next arrival is upper bounded by $1/r$ and lower bounded by $1/(3r)$. Using this and the relation between the stationary distributions of a Markov process and that of its sampled chain (see, e.g., the discussion and references in [11], page 510, and a general form of the relation, covering our setting, in [22], Lemma 10.1), we finally obtain that, for all large $r$, the steady-state value $\hat{D}^r(\infty)$ of the process $\hat{D}^r(t)$ is such that

$$P\{\hat{D}^r(\infty) \geq k\} \leq 3P\{\hat{D}^r_\infty \geq k\} \leq 3P\{Q_\infty \geq k\}, \ k \geq 0.$$  

We conclude that $E \hat{D}^r(\infty)$ is uniformly bounded for all large $r$. \hfill\Box

### 4.2 The artificial process

Consider the following artificial process, which will serve for comparison to GBS process. The artificial process describes the system, operating under a policy which is same as GBS policy, except the items not only can be invited at any time, but in-transit items (ordered but not arrived yet) can also be removed from the system at any time, so that $Z^r = [T^r]$ at all times. Specifically, the artificial process is defined as follows. For the variables pertaining to the artificial process, as opposed to the actual GBS process, we will use notations with a hat: $Y^*, X^*, T^*, \hat{Z}^r$; the value $X^*_r$ is common for both GBS and artificial processes. The system process $\hat{Y}^r(t)$ is one-dimensional, with $\hat{X}^r(t), \hat{T}^r(t), \hat{Z}^r(t)$ being deterministic functions of $\hat{Y}^r(t)$: $X^r = X^*_r - \gamma \hat{Y}^r, T^r = [X^r \wedge (X^*_r + f(r)] \vee 0, \hat{Z}^r(t) = \lfloor T^r(t) \rfloor$. Note that

$$\hat{Z}^r(t) = \lfloor \hat{T}^r(t) \rfloor = \lfloor (X^*_r - \gamma \hat{Y}^r(t)) \wedge (X^*_r + \gamma b) \rfloor.$$  

Also note that $\hat{Y}^r(t)$ can take any integer value in $(-\infty, X^*_r/\gamma]$, and $\hat{Z}^r(t)$ is confined to interval $[0, [X^*_r + \gamma b]]$. 
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The process \( \hat{Y}^r(t) \) is a simple one-dimensional birth and death Markov chain; its stability is easily verified. Similarly to (10), we have
\[
\beta \mathbb{E} \hat{Z}^r(\infty) = r. \tag{11}
\]

We now show that the properties stated in Theorem 1 hold for the artificial process.

**Lemma 4.** Consider a fixed integer \( \gamma \geq 1 \). Suppose the lead time distribution is exponential (with mean \( 1/\beta \)). For each \( r \) consider the system under the artificial process in the stationary regime. Then,
\[
\hat{Y}^r(\infty) \approx N(0, (\beta \gamma)^{-1}). \tag{12}
\]
Moreover, the expectations of \( [\hat{Y}^r(\infty)]/\sqrt{r}^+ \) and \( [\hat{Y}^r(\infty)]/\sqrt{r}^- \) converge to the corresponding expectations for the \( N(0, (\beta \gamma)^{-1}) \):
\[
\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}^r(\infty)/\sqrt{r}^+] \to (2\pi\beta \gamma)^{-1/2}, \quad \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}^r(\infty)/\sqrt{r}^-] \to (2\pi\beta \gamma)^{-1/2}. \tag{13}
\]

Before giving a formal proof, we note that the lemma is very natural. Indeed, the process \( \hat{Y}^r(t) \) is a birth and death process. Furthermore, note that, if we assume that \( b = f/\gamma \) and \( X^*_r/\gamma \) are integer, the process \( \hat{Y}^r(t) = X^*_r/\gamma - \hat{Y}^r(t) \) is nothing else but the process describing the number of customers in an \( M/M/N \) queueing system with the arrival rate \( r \), the service rate (by each server) \( \beta \gamma \), and the number of servers \( N = X^*_r/\gamma + f/\gamma \). The latter system’s offered load \( r/(\beta \gamma) = X^*_r/r \), and therefore the number of servers exceeds the offered load by \( b = f/\gamma \), where, recall, \( f/\sqrt{r} \to \infty \). Then, it is, of course, very natural that for the “diffusion-scaled” process
\[
\frac{\hat{Y}^r(\infty) - r/\beta \gamma}{\sqrt{r}} \Rightarrow N(0, (\beta \gamma)^{-1}).
\]

Nevertheless, we give a proof of Lemma 4 because, first, we could not find a result in the literature, which covers our specific case, where in addition to (12) we need (13); and, second, we need a proof that applies even if the integrality assumption on \( b = f/\gamma \) and \( X^*_r/\gamma \) does not hold.

**Proof of Lemma 4.** As we already did earlier to improve exposition, within this proof we will pretend that \( b = b(r) \) and \( X^*_r/\gamma \) (and then \( X^*_r \)) happen to be integer. (If this is not true, it does not pose any additional difficulties, besides clogging notation — it will be clear that our proof is robust to apply to the general case as well.) Then, \( X^*_r + \gamma b \) is integer, and
\[
\hat{Z}^r(t) \equiv \hat{T}^r(t) = (X^*_r - \gamma \hat{Y}^r(t)) \land (X^*_r + \gamma b)
\]
is integer at all times, confined to interval \([0, X^*_r + \gamma b]\). The process \( \hat{Y}^r(t) \) is confined at all times to the integers in \((-\infty, X^*_r/\gamma] = (-\infty, r/(\beta \gamma)] = (-\infty, \alpha r],\)

where we use notation $\alpha = 1/(\beta \gamma)$. This is a Markov birth and death process with the “down-transition” ($i \to i - 1$) rate from any state $i$ being constant $r$; the “up-transition” ($i \to i + 1$) rates are as follows

\[
\begin{cases}
  r - i/\alpha, & \text{if } -b \leq i \leq \alpha r \\
  r + b/\alpha, & \text{if } i < -b
\end{cases}
\]

Recall that $b = f/\gamma$, so $b/r \to 0$ and $b/\sqrt{r} \to \infty$ as $r \to \infty$.

Denote $\pi^r(i) = \mathbb{P}\{\hat{Y}^r(\infty) = i\}$, that is $\{\pi^r(i)\}$ is the stationary distribution of $\hat{Y}^r(\cdot)$ for a given $r$. Let $\{p^r(i)\}$ denote the scaled version of $\{\pi^r(i)\}$, such that

\[
p^r(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \alpha}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}}.
\]

In other words,

\[
p^r(i) = \frac{p^r(0)}{\pi^r(0)} \pi^r(i).
\]

Obviously,

\[
\pi^r(i) = \frac{p^r(i)}{\sum_j p^r(j)}.
\]

Fix any $a > 0$ and any $\nu > 1$. Consider an integer $1 \leq i \leq a\sqrt{r}$; note that $i/r \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$ uniformly on all such $i$. We have

\[
\frac{p^r(i)}{p^r(0)} = \prod_{j=1}^{i} \frac{r - j/\alpha}{r} = \prod_{j=1}^{i} (1 - \frac{j}{\alpha r}).
\]

Then for all sufficiently large $r$, uniformly in $1 \leq i \leq a\sqrt{r}$,

\[-\nu \sum_{j=1}^{i} \frac{j}{\alpha r} \leq \log \frac{p^r(i)}{p^r(0)} \leq -\sum_{j=1}^{i} \frac{j}{\alpha r}.
\]

The latter sum is estimated as

\[
\frac{i^2}{2\alpha r} = \int_0^i \frac{\xi}{\alpha r} d\xi \leq \sum_{j=1}^{i} \frac{j}{\alpha r} \leq \int_0^{i+1} \frac{\xi}{\alpha r} d\xi = \frac{(i + 1)^2}{2\alpha r}.
\]

Combining these estimates we conclude that, for all large $r$, uniformly in $1 \leq i \leq a\sqrt{r}$,

\[
\frac{p^r(i)}{p^r(0)} \to \exp\left(-\frac{(i/\sqrt{r})^2}{2\alpha}\right).
\] (14)

Then from (14) we obtain that, uniformly in $0 < c \leq a$,

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{c\sqrt{r}} p^r(j) \to \int_0^c \phi(\xi) d\xi,
\] (15)
where $\phi(\xi)$ is the density of $N(0, \alpha)$.

We also obtain “right tail” estimates. Observe that for $j \geq i$, the sequence $p^r(j)$ decreases at least geometrically,

$$p^r(j + 1) = p^r(j)(1 - \frac{j + 1}{\alpha r}) \leq p^r(j)(1 - \frac{i}{\alpha r}).$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{j \geq i} p^r(j) \leq p^r(i) \frac{\alpha r}{i} \leq 2p^r(0) \exp\left(-\frac{(i/\sqrt{r})^2}{2\alpha}\right) \frac{\alpha r}{i} \leq 2p^r(0) \exp\left(-\frac{(i/\sqrt{r})^2}{2\alpha}\right) \frac{\alpha i}{i/\sqrt{r}} \quad (16)$$

and

$$E\left[\hat{Y}^r(\infty)I\{\hat{Y}^r(\infty) > i\}\right] \leq \sum_{j \geq i} \pi^r(j) \left[i + \frac{\alpha r}{i}\right],$$

which in turn implies that, for all large $r$, uniformly in $1 \leq i \leq a\sqrt{r}$,

$$E\left[\hat{Y}^r(\infty)I\{\hat{Y}^r(\infty) > i\}\right] \leq \frac{\pi^r(0)}{p^r(0)} \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha}} \exp\left(-\frac{(i/\sqrt{r})^2}{2\alpha}\right) \frac{\alpha}{i/\sqrt{r}} \left[i + \frac{\alpha r}{i}\right]. \quad (17)$$

From (15) and (16) we see that for any $\epsilon > 0$ we can choose $a > 0$ sufficiently large, so that

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq a\sqrt{r}} p^r(j) = \int_0^a \phi(\xi) d\xi \in (1/2 - \epsilon, 1/2]$$

and

$$\limsup_{r \to \infty} \sum_{j > a\sqrt{r}} p^r(j) < \epsilon.$$ 

Now, the estimates analogous to (14), (15), (16), (17) can be similarly obtained for negative values of $i$, namely for $-a\sqrt{r} \leq i \leq 1$. (The estimates are essentially same, with $|i|$ replacing $i$, and minor adjustments.) Then we see that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a sufficiently large $a > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \sum_{|j| \leq a\sqrt{r}} p^r(j) = 2 \int_0^a \phi(\xi) d\xi \in (1 - 2\epsilon, 1]$$

and

$$\limsup_{r \to \infty} \sum_{|j| > a\sqrt{r}} p^r(j) < 2\epsilon.$$ 

Since this is true for any $\epsilon > 0$, we conclude that

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \sum_j p^r(j) \to 1.$$
and therefore the ratio $\pi^r(i)/p^r(j)$ (which is same for all $j$) converges to 1 as well. Then, (15) (along with its analog for negative $i$) implies the weak convergence (12).

Finally, for any fixed $a > 0$, it follows from (17) (along with $\pi^r(0)/p^r(0) \to 1$) that
\[
\limsup_{r \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\hat{Y}^r(\infty)}{\sqrt{r}} \mathbb{1} \left( \frac{\hat{Y}^r(\infty)}{\sqrt{r}} > a \right) \right] \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha}} \exp \left( -\frac{a^2}{2\alpha} \right) \frac{\alpha}{a} \left[ a + \frac{\alpha}{a} \right].
\]
The right-hand side can be made arbitrarily small by making $a$ large. Therefore, $\hat{Y}^r(\infty)/\sqrt{r}$ is uniformly integrable. Uniform integrability of $\hat{Y}^r(\infty)/\sqrt{r}$ is obtained similarly, using the version of (17) for negative $i$. This completes the proof of (13).

From Lemma 4 we have the following corollary which will be used later.

**Corollary 5.** For any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a sufficiently large fixed $c > 0$, such that, uniformly in $r$,
\[
\mathbb{E}[-c - \hat{Y}^r(\infty)/\sqrt{r}]^+ \leq \epsilon.
\]

4.3 **Comparison between the GBS process and artificial process**

**Lemma 6.**
\[
\hat{Y}^r(\infty) \leq_{st} Y^r(\infty),
\]
\[
\hat{T}^r(\infty) \geq_{st} T^r(\infty),
\]

**Proof.** Denote by $\eta(\cdot)$ the deterministic mapping that takes $Y^r$ into $[T^r]$ (and $\hat{Y}^r$ into $[\hat{T}^r]$). Then, by the definition of the processes, $Z^r(t) = \eta(Y^r(t))$, while $Z^r(t)$ is random but such that $Z^r(t) \geq \eta(Y^r(t))$. Therefore, $\hat{Y}^r(t)$ is a simple birth-death process, and $Y^r(t)$ can also be viewed as a birth-death process, except it has “birth” rates that are random and at least as large as those for $\hat{Y}^r(t)$. Standard coupling argument proves (19); this implies (20), because the mapping from $Y^r$ to $T^r$ (and from $\hat{Y}^r$ to $\hat{T}^r$) is non-increasing.

We will also need the following fact. For some finite $C > 0$, uniformly in $r$,
\[
\mathbb{E}[\hat{T}^r(\infty)] - \mathbb{E}[T^r(\infty)] \leq C.
\]

Indeed,
\[
\mathbb{E}[\hat{T}^r(\infty)] - \mathbb{E}[T^r(\infty)] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{Z}^r(\infty) - EZ^r(\infty) + EZ^r(\infty) - T^r(\infty)] = \mathbb{E}[D^r(\infty)] < C.
\]
4.4 Conclusion of the proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Once again, to improve exposition, within this proof we will pretend that \( b = b(r) \) and \( X_t^r / \gamma \) (and then \( X_t^r \)) happen to be integer – this makes all variables involved integer as well. (If this is not true, it does not pose any additional difficulties, besides clogging notation – it will be clear that our proof is robust to apply to the general case as well.) Since \([-X^r(t)]^+\) is positive only when \( X^r(t) < 0 \), and \( Z^r(t) \geq 0 \), we have

\[
[-X^r(t)]^+ \leq \tilde{D}^r(t). \tag{22}
\]

Recall that \( \gamma \hat{Y}^r(t) \leq X^r \) at all times.

We can write:

\[
\gamma EY^r(\infty) = E[(\gamma Y^r(\infty) \wedge X^r) \vee (-f(r))] + E[\gamma Y^r(\infty) - X^r]^+ - E[-f(r) - \gamma Y^r(\infty)]^+
\]

and

\[
\gamma E\hat{Y}^r(\infty) = E[(\gamma \hat{Y}^r(\infty)) \vee (-f(r))] - E[-f(r) - \gamma \hat{Y}^r(\infty)]^+,
\]

which lead to

\[
\gamma EY^r(\infty) - \gamma E\hat{Y}^r(\infty) \leq E[X^r - T^r(\infty)] + E[-X^r(\infty)]^+ - E[X^r - \hat{T}^r(\infty)] + E[-f(r) - \gamma \hat{Y}^r(\infty)]^+ \leq [E\hat{T}^r(\infty) - ET^r(\infty)] + E\tilde{D}^r(\infty) + \gamma E[-f(r)/\gamma - \hat{Y}^r(\infty)]^+.
\]

Therefore,

\[
\frac{\gamma EY^r(\infty) - \gamma E\hat{Y}^r(\infty)}{\sqrt{r}} \leq \frac{E\hat{T}^r(\infty) - ET^r(\infty)}{\sqrt{r}} + \frac{E\tilde{D}^r(\infty)}{\sqrt{r}} + \frac{\gamma E[-f(r)/\gamma - \hat{Y}^r(\infty)]^+}{\sqrt{r}}.
\]

It follows from (21), Lemma 3 and Corollary 5 that \( EY^r(\infty)/\sqrt{r} - E\hat{Y}^r(\infty)/\sqrt{r} \to 0 \). This, along with Lemma 4 and (19), implies the result. \( \square \)

5 Simulations

In this section we conduct simulations to evaluate the performance of GBS policy in a variety of scenarios. Our main theoretical results, Theorem 1 and Corollary 2, show that in the case of exponential lead times the cost advantage of GBS policy over CBS policy grows without bound, and the simulations do confirm that. We also experiment with non-exponential lead times (not covered by Theorem 1), and show that the significant advantage of GBS policy prevails in many cases. (Significant is the key word here. The fact that GBS policy cannot perform worse than CBS policy is automatic, because CBS policy is a special case of it.)

The choice of parameters. We let \( f = \infty \), that is the mapping from \( X \) to \( T \) is simply \( T = X \vee 0 \) (see the remark about parameter \( f \) in Section 3.2).
each value of parameter $\gamma$ we choose the (centering) parameter $x_*$ as follows. By Theorem 1, in the case of exponential lead time, for large $r$, the stationary net inventory level $Y(\infty)$ is distributed approximately as $\mathcal{N}(x_*, r/(\gamma\beta))$. Then, it is reasonable to choose $x_*$ as the unique solution of the optimization problem

$$
\min_x \left\{ \theta \mathbb{E}[\xi - x]^+ + h \mathbb{E}[x - \xi]^+ \right\},
$$

where $\xi = \mathcal{N}(0, r/(\gamma\beta))$; this gives

$$
x_* = \Phi^{-1} \left( \frac{\theta}{h + \theta} \right) \sqrt{\frac{r}{\gamma\beta}},
$$

where $\Phi^{-1}()$ is the inverse of the standard Normal distribution. This is the value of $x_*$ we use for a given $\gamma$ in all our simulations; note that $x_* = 0$ when $h = \theta$. Therefore, the base level in all simulations is set to

$$
X_{**} = X_* + x_* = \frac{r}{\beta} + x_*.
$$

According to Theorem 1 for GBS policy with a given fixed $\gamma$ (and exponentially distributed lead time), this choice of $X_{**}$ is asymptotically optimal as $r \to \infty$. For finite $r$ and/or non-exponential lead times, this value of $X_{**}$ is not necessarily optimal. However, our simulation results will show that the advantage of the policy is significant even with these roughly-chosen parameter values.

We start with the base case, in which the lead time is exponentially distributed with mean $1/\beta = 2$. We consider a series of systems with the demand rate $r$, which varies from 1 to 1000. Correspondingly, the mean lead time demand, $X_* = r/\beta$, ranges from 2 to 2000. We let $h = \theta = 1$, so by (23), $X_{**} = X_* = r/\beta$, which is also the base stock level of CBS policy.

Each simulation starts from an empty system and runs for 800 units of time. To avoid possible bias caused by the initial state, the first 200 units of time is for warm-up and output values are collected from the period $[200, 800]$. We run each case on 100 randomly generated sample paths and report their average values as results of the simulation.

Performance of a policy is evaluated by the inventory (backlog+ inventory holding) cost per unit of time, that is by the simulation estimate of $C$. Table 1 below compares their values, which shows GBS policy strongly dominates CBS policy, suggesting that replacing the latter can result in very significant reductions in inventory costs. The table also shows a clear trend that as the demand arrival rate $r$ increases, a larger value of $\gamma$ should be chosen for implementing GBS policy, and the cost saving compared with CBS policy increases. While these conclusions are expected from Corollary 2, the magnitude of the cost difference suggests that the advantage of GBS policy is not a niche effect.

Figure 1 highlights the asymptotic behavior. The horizontal axis is $\ln(r/\beta)$, the log value of the mean lead time demand, and the vertical axis is $\ln C$, the corresponding average inventory cost on the log scale. It is well-known that with Poission arrivals, the inventory cost under CBS policy scale as $O(\sqrt{r})$. This is
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consistently with the top line in the figure, which, by simple regression, fits almost perfectly ($R^2 > 0.999$) with the linear equation

$$\ln C = 0.1 + 0.5 \ln(r/\beta).$$

On the other hand, Corollary 2 shows that the cost under GBS policy is $o(\sqrt{r})$. This is confirmed by the bottom line in the figure, which fits the linear equation ($R^2 > 0.998$):

$$\ln C = 0.08 + 0.38 \ln(r/\beta).$$

The difference of the slopes of the two linear functions suggests that as the demand rate $r$ increases, the ratio of the costs under GBS and CBS policies decays approximately as $O(r^{-0.12})$.

Corollary 2 shows – and the above simulation results confirm – that GBS policy significantly outperforms CBS policy when $r$ is large. Next we investigate if GBS policy is significantly better when $r$ is not large. As is shown by the few cases reported in the top rows of Table 1, with $\gamma > 1$, GBS policy results in a distinctly lower inventory cost than CBS policy when the arrival rate is small or modest ($r = 1, 5, 10$). Table 2 shows that this difference remains to be significant in other cases, with asymmetric costs. For the case where $r = 10$, we vary cost parameters $h$ and $\theta$ from one extreme ($h/\theta = 9$) to another ($h/\theta = 1/9$). In the table, we show the base stock levels of CBS policy, parameter values of GBS policy, $\gamma$ and $X_*$, and compare the average inventory cost between the two policies.

The base stock level of CBS policy decreases with the inventory holding cost $h$ and increases with the backlog cost $\theta$, which is expected. Both $\gamma$ and $X_*$ of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$X_*=r/\beta$</th>
<th>GBS Policy</th>
<th>CBS Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>cost</td>
<td>cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: A Comparison between GBS and CBS Policies: lead time exponentially distributed with mean $\beta = 1/2$; $h = \theta = 1$
Figure 1: Changes of Costs with Mean Lead Time Demand on Log Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$h$ (holding cost)</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$ (backlog cost)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>base stock level</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cost</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBS</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X^*$</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cost</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Comparison of Average Costs between GBS and CBS, with $X^* = \frac{r}{\beta} = 20$

GBS policy follow the same trend, reflecting the fact that ordering more units becomes more costly when the holding cost is higher, and more economical when the backlog cost is higher. When the holding cost is extremely high, $h = 9$, both the base stock level of CBS policy and the base $X^*$ of GBS policy fall below the mean lead time demand $X^*$. Even so, results in Table 2 show that setting $\gamma$ above the unity still generates substantial cost savings. The saving becomes increasingly significant as we reduce the holding cost $h$ and increase the backlog cost $\theta$, which is not a surprise. Recall from the proof of Theorem 1 that in the artificial process, the inventory cost can be reduced to any level by increasing $\gamma$, because (in the artificial process) in-transit supply can be disposed at will. The latter assumption does not apply to the actual system under GBS policy, and as a result the inventory in the actual system is (stochastically) larger than in the artificial one. However, the negative impact of this difference diminishes when the cost of having backlogs dominates the cost of keeping inventory. So as $\theta$ increases and/or $h$ decreases, GBS policy can use a larger $\gamma$, and its performance advantage over CBS policy becomes more significant.
In practice, the lead time is typically non-exponential. All orders are likely to undergo some common delay component such as a constant transportation time. In the presence of a deterministic delay component, there is a limit on how fast outstanding backlogs can be cleared regardless how many units are ordered in response to the occurrence of these backlogs. Therefore any efficient policy needs to build an inventory position to cover demand variations within the constant delay time. Suppose all orders are subject to a minimum constant delay \( d > 0 \). Consider the process state at time \( t \). The inventory arrivals in interval \([t, t + d]\) cannot be controlled – they are random in general but depend only on the state of the inventory pipeline at time \( t \). Then the demand arrivals in \([t, t + d]\) are independent of the inventory arrivals, and they have asymptotically normal distribution with variance \( O(r) \). Therefore the steady-state inventory is at least \( O(\sqrt{r}) \). It follows that if \( d \) is a non-trivial fraction of the lead time, then no policy, including any GBS policy, can have the average inventory cost scaling as \( o(\sqrt{r}) \). Nevertheless, this does not mean that GBS policy will lose its edge completely. Our results below shows that as the deterministic delay component becomes larger, the advantage of GBS policy does deteriorate, but gradually.

We consider cases in which the lead time is composed of a constant lag time \( d \) and an exponentially-distributed random delay. The mean lead time is kept at the same value of 2. As in the base case, we let \( h = \theta = 1 \). We let the length of the constant lag time to be 0.2, 10% of the mean lead time and vary the demand arrival rate. Table 3 shows a comparison between GBS and CBS policies in these cases. There is little change of the inventory cost under CBS policy, which is implied by Palm’s Theorem [8]. In comparison with Table 1, average costs under GBS policy are larger and values of \( \gamma \) are smaller. Nevertheless, GBS policy remains to be noticeably better than CBS policy: in all cases, letting \( \gamma > 1 \) generates nontrivial amounts of cost savings, and the gap between the costs of GBS and CBS policies widens as the demand rate \( r \) increases.

CBS policy is optimal when the lead time is completely deterministic. Nevertheless, our simulations show that when the constant lag time grows as a part of the (fixed) mean lead time, the advantage of GBS policy, while weakened, does not disappear instantly. In Figure 2 we show two cases with moderate and high mean lead time demands (\( r/\beta = 20 \) and \( r/\beta = 1000 \), respectively). In each case, we vary the constant time lag \( d \) from 0 to the mean lead time 2. While the average inventory cost under CBS policy stays mostly the same (also expected from Palm’s Theorem [8]), the cost under GBS policy rises in a gradual manner. Cost savings by following GBS policy is still quite noticeable when the \( d > 1 \), i.e., when the deterministic component is more than 50% of the mean lead time. This outcome is supported by Figure 3, which shows that even when \( d \) becomes a very large fraction of the mean lead time the best choice of \( \gamma \) is above unity, which means that GBS policy strictly outperforms CBS policy.

Our simulations also show that performance advantage of GBS policy extends to systems with other non-exponentially distributed lead times. We change the setup of the base case by replacing the exponentially distributed lead time (with mean 2) by the uniformly distributed one in \([0, 4]\) (with the
same mean 2). A comparison between GBS and CBS policies are shown in Table 4. Just like the base case, the inventory cost is significantly lower under GBS policy, achieved by letting $\gamma > 1$. The gap between the two policies also keeps growing with $r$. Comparing results in Tables 1 and 4, the difference between the two lead time distributions does not affect the performance of CBS policy, which is expected. We notice, however, that the advantage of GBS policy over CBS policy diminishes when the lead time is uniformly-distributed (compared with the exponential lead time).

The uniform distribution has increasing hazard rate. We also run simulations with lead time having a decreasing hazard rate, namely Pareto distribution,

$$P(L > x) = 1 - F(x) = \frac{1}{(1 + \tau x)^q}, \quad (24)$$

with parameters $q = 3$ and $\tau = 0.25$, so that the mean lead time remains to be 2. The comparison between GBS and CBS policies in this case is shown in Table 5. Comparing Tables 1 and 5, we observe something quite surprising: replacing the exponential lead time distribution by the above Pareto distribution increases the advantage of GBS policy over CBS policy. Investigating this intriguing phenomenon is a subject of further research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ave. lead time demand $X_\alpha = r/\beta$</th>
<th>GBS Policy</th>
<th>CBS Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Comparison between GBS and CBS Policies: mean lead time=2, deterministic component $d = 0.2$
6 Numerical evaluation of the GBS optimality gap

We have shown that GBS policy can lead to very significant cost savings in comparison with CBS policy. We are yet to see the extent to which these savings can help to close the optimality gap. To answer this question, we need to compare the cost of GBS policy with the minimum cost achieved under an optimal policy. In systems with exponentially-distributed lead times, the latter cost is the optimal objective value of a two-dimensional MDP model. Due to the curse of dimensionality, solving the MDP problem is generally infeasible (or we would have found the optimal policy). Below we make cost comparisons for a few cases with manageable problem sizes.

The state space of the MDP is given by \((y, z)\), where \(y\) is the net inventory level and \(z\) \((z \geq 0)\) is the number of units in-transit. The state-dependent control is exercised by choosing \(a\) \((a \geq 0)\), the number of units to order, and the action is taken when the system enters a new state. Given \(a\), the mean sojourn time in state \((y, z)\) is \(1/(r + \beta(z + a))\). Upon departing from state \((y, z)\),
the system enters state \((y-1, z)\) with probability \(r/(r + \beta(z + a))\) and state \((y+1, z + a - 1)\) with probability \(\beta(z + a)/(r + \beta(z + a))\). The direct cost of being in state \((y, z)\) is

\[
c(y) = h \max(y, 0) - \theta \min(y, 0)
\]

per unit of time. The objective is to minimize the average inventory cost defined in (1) with \(C(t) = c(y_t)\), where \((y_t, z_t)\) is the system state at time \(t\).

We introduce a finite-state approximation to the MDP model by truncating its state space. Specifically, we assume that the control keeps the inventory position within a fixed finite range,

\[
I_m \leq y + z + a \leq I_M
\]

where \(I_m \geq 0\). We also assume that the demand stops arriving when the backlog reaches some level \(y < 0\), where \(|y|\) is sufficiently large. This is implemented by defining the demand rate \(r_y\) as a function of \(y\); namely, \(r_y = 0\) if \(y = y\) and \(r_y = r\) otherwise. This removes all states \((y, \cdot)\) with \(y < y\) from the model.

The above assumptions are needed for casting and solving the MDP problem as a Linear Program (LP) with a finite and tractable size. It is very intuitive to expect that, when parameters \(I_m, I_M, |y|\) are large, the optimal cost of the truncated model is very close to that of the actual model, because the actual process under an optimal control spends very little time in the states removed by the truncation.

Let \(g\) be the minimum long-run average expected cost. Let \(\nu(y, z)\) be the bias variable, which is (up to a shift by a constant) the difference in the minimum long-run total expected cost between the case where the system starts in state \((y, z)\) and the case where the per-time-unit cost is constant, equal to \(g\). Then the LP formulation of the MDP is
\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
ave. lead time demand & GBS & CBS \\
\hline
\multicolumn{3}{|c|}{X_* = r/\beta} \hspace{1cm} \text{opt. } \gamma \hspace{1cm} \text{cost} \hspace{1cm} \text{cost} \\
\hline
2 & 1.4 & 1.06 & 1.09 \hline
10 & 1.6 & 2.29 & 2.52 \hline
20 & 1.8 & 3.13 & 3.54 \hline
100 & 2.6 & 6.45 & 7.96 \hline
200 & 3.2 & 8.80 & 11.3 \hline
400 & 3.8 & 12.1 & 16.0 \hline
600 & 4.0 & 14.4 & 19.5 \hline
800 & 4.2 & 16.5 & 22.6 \hline
1000 & 4.4 & 18.2 & 25.2 \hline
1200 & 5.0 & 19.7 & 27.7 \hline
1400 & 5.2 & 21.2 & 30.0 \hline
1600 & 5.4 & 22.5 & 31.9 \hline
1800 & 5.4 & 23.8 & 33.9 \hline
2000 & 5.4 & 24.8 & 35.9 \hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Comparison between GBS and CBS Policies when the lead time is uniformly distributed in $[0, 4]$}
\end{table}

\text{max}_{g,\nu} g \quad (25)

subject to

\[ \nu(y, z) \leq \frac{c(y) - g}{r_y + \beta(z + a)} + \frac{r_y}{r_y + \beta(z + a)} \nu(y - 1, z + a) \]
\[ + \frac{\beta(z + a)}{r_y + \beta(z + a)} \nu(y + 1, z + a - 1), \quad (26) \]

for all $y \geq y, z \geq 0, a \geq 0$, and $I_m \leq y + z + a \leq I_M$,

\[ \nu(I_m, 0) = 0. \quad (27) \]

When solving the LP, we let

\[ I_M = \frac{r}{\beta} + \kappa_M \sqrt{\frac{r}{\beta}}, \quad I_m = \left( \frac{r}{\beta} - \kappa_m \sqrt{\frac{r}{\beta}} \right)^+, \quad \text{and } y = -\kappa_y \sqrt{\frac{r}{\beta}}, \]

where parameters $\kappa_M, \kappa_m, \kappa_y$ in each case are chosen large enough so that their further increase does not change the optimal value at the precision level of results reported in Table 4.

To keep the MDP problem tractable, we select a subset of cases in Table 1 with the demand rate not exceeding 2000 (i.e., $r/\beta \leq 1000$) for our comparison.
Table 5: Comparison between GBS and CBS Policies when the lead time has Pareto distribution with $q = 3$ and $\tau = 0.25$.

Table 6 shows the average inventory costs of CBS and GBS policies, to be compared with the minimum cost calculated by solving (25)-(27).

Differences between the CBS and GBS costs are far greater than differences between the GBS cost and the minimum cost. This means that the optimality gap of CBS policy is significantly smaller than that of the GBS policy. While the gap of the former can be higher than 100% and increasing, that of the latter never exceeds 15%. Furthermore, as $r$ increases, the gap under CBS policy grows without bound, reaching above 100% when $r$ exceeds 200. In contrast, under GBS policy, the growth of the optimality gap is small, and moreover, the gap appears to remain bounded as $r \to \infty$. The outcome strengthens our findings in previous sections. The GBS cost in these cases is not only a decreasing fraction of the CBS cost, but also appears to be with a constant factor from the minimum cost.

To get more details, consider the case where $r/\beta = 20$. The solution of (25)-(27) suggests that the optimal policy, similar to GBS and CBS policies, has the form of following an inventory level-dependent target. The target is set for the in-transit inventory level and varies with the current net inventory level. When the current number of units in transit ($z$) is below the target, a new order is placed to eliminate the difference. No action is taken when the in-transit inventory level is at or above the target.

Figure 4 shows values of three targets: optimal, GBS, and CBS. The optimal target is a nonlinear function of the net inventory level ($y$). The target is zero when $y \geq 2$, and rises rapidly as $y$ decreases and becomes negative (i.e., the system switches from having excess inventory to backlogging demands). As $y$
continues to decrease, the target keeps increasing, but at a slower rate.

As a comparison, the figure also shows target values under GBS policy, which change at a constant rate \( \gamma = 2.4 \) with the net inventory level. Observe from the figure that the GBS target can be viewed as a first-order approximation to the optimal target, and approximation error is small when \( y \in [-9, -1] \). This is a critical range where the system has lower levels of backlog. Under the optimal policy, the steep increase of the target level dictates to have many units in-transit, so the backlog can be reduced rapidly instead of accumulating. GBS policy follows the same strategy by prescribing similar target values. Nevertheless, subject to a constant rate of change with \( y \), the GBS target inevitably “overshoots” the optimal target in cases where \( y < 9 \), when the system has large backlogs, or \( y \in [2, 8] \), when the system has excess inventories.

The loss of the optimality is a necessary price for having a feasible and simple-to-implement policy in general systems. In the case we just discussed, the optimal target can be determined by solving LP (25)-(27) with 6,562 variables and 13,003 constraints. However, the computation quickly becomes impossible as the demand rate increases (when \( r/\beta = 1000 \), the LP has 626,752 variables and 1,252,000 constraints). In contrast, target values can be trivially computed if they change with the net inventory levels at a constant rate, which is the case with GBS and CBS policies. Figure 4 shows that with the rate of change preset at \( \gamma = 1 \), the CBS target bears little relevance to the optimal one. With a better choice of rate \( \gamma \), the discrepancy is largely corrected under GBS policy, resulting in, as we see from Table 6, the removal of a majority of the excess inventory cost of following CBS policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( r/\beta )</th>
<th>( \gamma )</th>
<th>MDP cost (minimum)</th>
<th>CBS cost</th>
<th>opt. gap ( \frac{CBS-\text{MDP}}{\text{MDP}} )</th>
<th>GBS cost</th>
<th>opt. gap ( \frac{GBS-\text{MDP}}{\text{MDP}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>119.8%</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>132.1%</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>143.5%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>151.2%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Comparison of average cost: CBS, GBS, and MDP (optimal)
Conclusion

Randomness in replenishment lead times, especially when it causes orders to cross in time, makes it difficult to analyze and optimize inventory systems. Our work shows that the challenge is worth to have. Randomness of lead times brings about opportunities for drastic performance improvement in inventory management. Such outcome can be achieved under our GBS policy, which responds to changes in the inventory level, by aggressively “pushing” the inventory-in-transit levels in the opposite direction. In comparison with the commonly-used CBS policy, GBS policy reduces the inventory cost by a sizable percentage, which keeps increasing with the demand rate. For many corporations that hold hundreds of millions, if not billions of dollars’ worth of inventory, even a small fraction of such reduction can translate into multi-million dollar annual savings.

The advantage of our approach is gained by departing from a common principle underlying many conventional approaches, which determine order quantities based only on the inventory position. We show that in the presence of random lead times and order crossovers, making order decisions based on both the inventory position and inventory level can make the system significantly more cost-efficient. This new feature of our policy leads to a much more complex inventory process than the ones under CBS policy. In the case of exponentially distributed lead times, we prove that, as the demand rate increases, the average inventory cost under GBS policy vanishes compared with that under CBS policy. Our simulation results also show that the superiority of our policy is persistent, or even more pronounced, in many other cases.

We are not aware of any work in the literature that take a similar approach to address systems with random lead times & crossovers, and thus believe this work represents a major and very promising departure from the existing literature.
While the path has been opened, the exploration is just beginning, as there is a host of interesting questions that need to be answered. For instance,

- A systematic method to determine good values of the key parameter $\gamma$ needs to be developed.

- Our simulations also show that when the lead time is exponentially-distributed and cost rates $h$ and $\theta$ are equal, the average inventory cost under GBS policy appears to grow as $r^\nu$, where $\nu \approx 0.38$. (From our asymptotic analysis we only know that the cost must grow slower than $r^{0.5}$, i.e. slower than under CBS policy.) Finding a formal basis for this particular growth rate will certainly deepen the understanding of our approach. Comparisons with the optimal policy show that the optimality gap of GBS policy does not increase substantially with $r$. In fact, they suggest that the GBS cost remains within a constant factor of the optimal cost – this is another question for further study.

- We have observed from the MDP solutions that in some cases with exponential lead times, the optimal policy has the form of the inventory level-dependent target, and the GBS target provides a close first-order approximation to the optimal one. It remains to be seen whether this result is generally applicable, and if so, how it can be used to optimize parameters of GBS policy and provide further quantification of its performance.

- In our simulations, the cost advantage of GBS policy over CBS policy becomes weaker under a uniform lead time distribution and stronger under a Pareto distribution. This observation about Pareto distribution is very intriguing and deserves further analysis, as does the general question of the dependence of GBS and other policies’ performance on the lead time distribution.

As mentioned earlier, a different type control scheme, oriented towards service systems, is analyzed in [13]. The latter policy is very attractive in that 1) it does not require a priori knowledge of the demand rate $r$ and mean lead time $1/\beta$, and 2) automatically adapts to changes in $r$ and $1/\beta$ over time. However, the rigorous analysis in [13] applies only to the case when the in-transit inventory items can be instantly removed without penalty. Such assumption is sometimes valid for service systems, but almost never valid for inventory systems, in which orders that have been placed cannot be freely canceled. It is an interesting challenge to see if a modification of the adaptive policy in [13], which does not remove in-transit inventory, can be proved to be as efficient as the GBS policy of this paper.
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