TEST Engineering & Management

January - February 2020
ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 7325 - 7332

The Optimal Ordering Policy of the Retailer in Diverse Commercial Atmosphere with Permitted Delay in Payments

I. Antonitte Vinoline, W. Ritha, J. Merline Vinotha and Nivetha Martin*
Department of Mathematics, Holy Cross College(Autonomous),Tiruchirappalli -620002.
*Department of Mathematics, Arul Anandar College(Autonomous), Karumathur.

Article Info
Volume 82
Page Number: 7325 - 7332
Publication Issue:
January-February 2020

Article History
Article Received: *18 May 2019*
Revised: *14 July 2019*
Accepted: *22 December 2019*
Publication: *03 February 2020*

Abstract
It is very basic for the wholesaler in partnership dealings to outfit the retailer an admissible postponement in installments to help the store's premium. At the surrender of the credit time frame, the retailer can either take care everything being equal or defer bringing about premium charges at the unpaid and past due funds to be paid to the premium earned and premium charged.In this paper, while an association gives an admissible put off in installments, we recollect unmistakable money related situations. The scientific model are created to locate the ideal amount of request and result time to expand the general benefit of the retailer for each money related condition.

Keywords: *Permissible delay in payments, Economic order quantity*

INTRODUCTION

In the present aggressive business condition, conveying retailers with the admissible defer in bills is a proper way for providers to draw in new customers and development benefits as it's far a state of value decrease. Additionally, during this season of sensible value slack, the vender ordinarily did never again should pay intrigue.A store can in this manner acquire enthusiasm on the amassed pay earned even as deferring bills until the stop of the passable period. On the off chance that installment isn't on time after that period, enthusiasm on the top notch security can be charged.

With not on time installments, the present writing has talked about the issue of stock altogether. Goyal[4] first built up a monetary request quantity(EOQ) underneath the state of fit expense defer, in which he determined intrigue pay principally based at the deal charge of merchandise sold inside the passable postpone period. Teng [10] changed the model of Goyal [4] with the guide of deciding premium earned on the possibility of the advancing pace of products. Liao [6] proposed a two-level exchange acknowledge EOQ system for exponentially rotting items. Chang et al. [3] fused the contemplations merchant customer and shopper credit dependent on request size.

Much investigations has been devoted to perusing stock difficulties with respect to trade

January - February 2020
ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 7325 - 7332

credit, not many of the exploration work have thought about the money related atmosphere and their outcomes on a trader's most valuable requesting inclusion and result time. Along these lines, our motivation is to deliberate the economic order quantity stock underneath the situations that the premium grossed steady with cash per unit time is greater than the premium changed by greenback and the premium grossed in accordance with cash with regards to unit time is decline than the premium accused in keeping of greenback in accordance with unit time. Besides, some numerical guides to outline the appropriate response system and blessing the outcomes of the parameters on the most excellent renewal process duration, request amount, result time and by and large benefit in step with unit time.

NOTATIONS

D - Demand per unit time

c -Purchase cost per unit, with c < p

P_s- Selling price per unit

O_s-Ordering cost per order

h -Unit holding cost per unit time excluding premium charges

I_c-Premium prices in keeping with dollar in inventory per unit time by way of the supplier

I_e-Premium earned with dollar per unit time

C_p - The prevention cost for per item

C_s - The screening cost

t -The transportation maintenance cost

n - Number of shipments from the supplier to the retailer in keeping with order,apositive integer

M - Permissible delay in relaxing account

Q - Order quantity

Q^*- Optimal order quantity

T- Replenishment phase time

T_i^*-Optimumphase time for case i, i = 1, 2

TAP_i (T) - Absolute benefit per unit time for case i, i = 1, 2

TAP_i^* - Optimum profit per unit time for case i,

$TAP_i^* = TAPi\,(T_i^*)$, i = 1, 2.

ASSUMPTIONS

1. The inventory system comprises simplest single item and the forecastingperspective is immeasurable.

2. Scarcities are not acceptable.

3. The demand D, for the object is persistent with time.

4. The merchant can adopt to repay all money owed moreover at the cease of the credit score period M or at any time point during (M, T].

January - February 2020
ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 7325 - 7332

5. If the merchantselects the second possibility, the retailer need to pay the seller premium accumulated.

MATHEMATICAL DESIGN

For each possible case, some suitable invent ory models are built in this section. Our goal is toopt imize the overall turnover. Second, we find the entir e turnover per period of replacement consisting

of the subsequent elements:

a) Tradesexpenses = P_sDT,

b) Rateof purchasing= cDT,

c) Ordering rate = O_s,

d) Carrying cost = $hD\frac{T^2}{2}$,

e) Screening cost = DC_S

f) Prevention cost = QC_p

g) Transportation cost= nt,

h)

Premium payable to the supplier per phase and

i) Earned premium per period,

With respect to premium charges and premium ear ned there are two possible cases, based on I_c and I_e, namely: (i) $I_e \geq I_c$ and (ii) $I_e < I_c$.

Case 1: $I_e \geq I_c$

This situation shows that the premium earned per dollar per unit time, i.e., is greater than or equal to the premium charges per dollar per unit time, i.e. The following two potential sub-cases are constructed on the criteria of T and M:

(i) T ≥ M and (ii) T ≤ M.

Case 1.1: T ≥ M

This condition suggests that the replaceme nt phase time T in payments M is larger than or equal to the permitted interval.

The entire turnover per replacement phase is therefore:Z_{11}(T)= tradesexpenses — rate of purchasing — ordering rate — carrying costs — premium payable + premium earned — screening costs — prevention costs — transport costs

$$= P_sDT - cDT - O_s - hD\frac{T^2}{2} - cI_cDT\,(T - M) + \frac{P_sI_eDT^2}{2} - DC_s - QC_p - nt \quad \ldots (1)$$

Case 1.2: T ≤ M

In this case, the replacement phase time T in settling account M is less than or equal to the allowable delay. At the conclusion of the M trade credit duration, the seller must pay off the total amount owed to the manufacturer. Any premium charges are charged for the products. The premium earned can be collected.

January - February 2020
ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 7325 - 7332

$\mathrm{I_e}\left(P_s\mathrm{DT}+\frac{P_s\mathrm{I_e}\mathrm{DT}^2}{2}\right)(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{T}) = P_s\mathrm{I_e}\left(\mathrm{DT}+\frac{\mathrm{I_e}\mathrm{DT}^2}{2}\right)(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{T})$ in the interval [T, M].The premium earned during the period [0, M] is

$$\mathrm{I_e}\left(P_s\mathrm{DT}+\frac{P_s\mathrm{I_e}\mathrm{DT}^2}{2}\right)(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{T}) = P_s\mathrm{I_e}\left(\mathrm{DT}+\frac{\mathrm{I_e}\mathrm{DT}^2}{2}\right)(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{T})$$

The entire turnover per replacement phase is :

$$Z_{12}(\mathrm{T}) = \mathrm{P_sDT} - \mathrm{cDT} - \mathrm{O_s} - \mathrm{hD}\frac{\mathrm{T}^2}{2} + P_s\mathrm{I_e}\mathrm{DT}\left[\frac{\mathrm{T}}{2}+\left(1+\frac{\mathrm{I_e}\mathrm{T}}{2}\right)(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{T})\right] - DC_s - QC_p - nt \qquad \text{. . . (2)}$$

Therefore, the total profit per unit time for case 1 (i.e., $I_e \geq I_c$) is as follows:

$$\mathrm{TAP_1}(\mathrm{T}) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{TAP_{11}}(\mathrm{T}), & \text{if } \mathrm{T} \geq \mathrm{M}, \\ \mathrm{TAP_{12}}(\mathrm{T}), & \text{if } \mathrm{T} \leq \mathrm{M}, \end{cases}$$

Where,

$$\mathrm{TAP_{11}}(\mathrm{T}) = (P_s - \mathrm{C})\mathrm{D} - \frac{O_s}{\mathrm{T}} - \mathrm{hD}\frac{\mathrm{T}}{2} - \mathrm{cI_c}\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{M}) + \frac{P_s\mathrm{I_e}\mathrm{DT}}{2} - \frac{DC_s}{T} - \frac{QC_p}{T} - \frac{nt}{T} \qquad \text{... (3)}$$

And,

$$\mathrm{TAP_{12}}(\mathrm{T}) = (P_s - \mathrm{C})\mathrm{D} - \frac{O_s}{\mathrm{T}} - \mathrm{hD}\frac{\mathrm{T}}{2} + P_s\mathrm{I_e}\mathrm{D}\left[\frac{\mathrm{T}}{2}+\left(1+\frac{\mathrm{I_e}\mathrm{T}}{2}\right)(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{T})\right] - \frac{DC_s}{T} - \frac{QC_p}{T} - \frac{nt}{T} \qquad \text{. . . (4)}$$

Case 2: $I_e < I_c$

In this case, the premium earned per dollar per unit time, I_e, is less than the premium charges per dollar unit time, I_c, Likewise, we have the foll owing two potential sub-cases based on the values of T and M: (i) T ≥ M and (ii) T ≤ M.

Case 2.1: T ≥ M

If$I_e < I_c$, the manufacturer pay the supplier as soon as possible for the total purchase cost. The seller sells products during [0, M] time and uses the income to gross premium.

The premiumreceived during the period [0, M] is $\frac{P_s\mathrm{I_e}\mathrm{DM}^2}{2}$

Therefore, at the time M, the manufacturer has $P_sDM + \frac{P_s I_e DM^2}{2}$. Since the retailer purchases DT units at time 0, the retailer owes the manufacturer cDT at time M. Based on the discrepancy between the retailer's $P_sDM + \frac{P_s I_e DM^2}{2}$ money and the trades cost cDT, We discuss the situation below.

Case 2.1-1: $P_sDM + \frac{P_s I_e DM^2}{2} < cDT \left(T > P_s M \left(\frac{1 + \frac{I_e M}{2}}{c} \right) \right)$

The cash in the merchant's account in this situatio n is lower than the purchase rate at M time. At the moment, the manufacturer charges $P_sDM + \frac{P_s I_e DM^2}{2}$ to the trader M and covers the difference

$$U = cDT - \left(P_s DM + \frac{P_s I_e DM^2}{2} \right)$$

Therefore,the entire turnover per replacement phase is:

$$Z_{21}(T) = P_s DT - cDT - O_s - hD\frac{T^2}{2} - \frac{I_c U^2}{2pD} + \frac{P_s I_e DM^2}{2} + \frac{P_s I_e D \left(T - M - \frac{U}{P_s D} \right)^2}{2} - DC_s - QC_p - nt \quad \ldots (5)$$

Where,

$$U \equiv cDT - \left(P_s DM + \frac{P_s I_e DM^2}{2} \right).$$

Case 2.2: T < M

This case is the same as case 1.2. Thus, the total profit per replenishment phase is:

Z_{23} (T) = Z_{12} (T)

$$= (P_s - c)DT - O_s - hD\frac{T^2}{2} + P_s I_e DT \left[\frac{T}{2} + \left(1 + \frac{I_e T}{2} \right)(M - T) \right] - DC_s - QC_p - nt \quad \ldots (6)$$

Therefore, the entire turnover per replacement phase for case 2 (i.e., $I_e < I_c$) is as follows:

January - February 2020
ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 7325 - 7332

$$\text{TAP}_{21}(\text{T}) = (P_s - \text{c})\text{D} - \frac{O_s}{\text{T}} - \text{hD}\frac{\text{T}}{2} - \frac{\text{I}_\text{c}\text{U}^2}{2\text{pDT}} + \frac{P_s\text{I}_\text{e}\text{DM}^2}{2\text{T}} + \frac{P_s\text{I}_\text{e}\text{D}\left(\text{T}-\text{M}-\dfrac{\text{U}}{\text{pD}}\right)^2}{2\text{T}} - \frac{DC_s}{T} - \frac{QC_p}{T} - \frac{nt}{T} \qquad \ldots (7)$$

where,

$$\text{U} \equiv \text{cDT} - \left(P_s\text{DM} + \frac{P_s\text{I}_\text{e}\text{DM}^2}{2}\right)$$

$$= \frac{\left\{\left(P_s\text{DM} + \dfrac{P_s\text{I}_\text{e}\text{DM}^2}{2} - \text{cDT}\right)\right\}\left[1+\text{I}_\text{e}(\text{T}-\text{M})\right] + P_s\text{DT}(\text{T}-\text{M}) + \dfrac{P_s\text{I}_\text{e}\text{D}(\text{T}-\text{M})^2}{2}}{\text{T}}$$

$$-\frac{O_s}{\text{T}} - \frac{\text{hDT}}{2} - \frac{DC_s}{T} - \frac{QC_p}{T} - \frac{nt}{T} \qquad \ldots (8)$$

And,

$$\text{TAP}_{23}(\text{T}) = (P_s - \text{c})\text{D} - \frac{O_s}{\text{T}} - \text{hD}\frac{\text{T}}{2} + P_s\text{I}_\text{e}\text{D}\left[\frac{\text{T}}{2} + \left(1+\frac{\text{I}_\text{e}\text{T}}{2}\right)(\text{M}-\text{T})\right] - \frac{DC_s}{T} - \frac{QC_p}{T} - \frac{nt}{T} \qquad \ldots (9)$$

TO FIND THE OPTIMAL REVENUE PER UNIT TIME FOR CASE i, i = 1, 2:

Case 1: $I_e \geq I_c$

Case 1.1: $T \geq M$

Differentiating TAP_{11} (T) with respect to T to increase the total profit per unit time, we get:

$$\frac{d\text{TAP}_{11}(\text{T})}{d\text{T}} = \frac{O_s + \text{DC}_s + QC_p + nt}{\text{T}^2} - \frac{\text{D}(\text{h} + 2\text{cI}_\text{c} - P_s\text{I}_\text{e})}{2} \qquad \ldots (10)$$

$$\text{T}^* = \sqrt{\frac{2(O_s + \text{DC}_s + QC_p + nt)}{\text{D}(\text{h} + 2\text{cI}_\text{c} - P_s\text{I}_\text{e})}} \qquad \ldots (11)$$

Case 1.2: $T \leq M$

$$\frac{d\text{TAP}_{12}(\text{T})}{d\text{T}} = \frac{O_s + \text{DC}_s + QC_p + nt}{\text{T}^2} - \frac{\text{hD}}{2} + \frac{P_s\text{I}_\text{e}\text{D}}{2} + \frac{P_s\text{I}_\text{e}^2\text{DM}}{2} - P_s\text{I}_\text{e}^2\text{DT} \qquad . . (12)$$

Case 2: $I_e \geq I_c$

TEST Engineering & Management

January - February 2020
ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 7325 - 7332

Case 2.1.1: $\mathbf{T > P_s M \frac{\left(1+\frac{I_e M}{2}\right)}{C}}$

$$\frac{dTAP_{21}(T)}{dT} = \frac{O_s}{T^2} - \frac{hD}{2} + \frac{Dc^2T(I_e - I_c)}{2p} - I_e cDT - \frac{P_s I_e^2 DM^3}{2T} + \frac{P_s I_e DT}{2} + \frac{DC_s}{T^2} + \frac{QC_p}{T^2} + \frac{nt}{T^2}.$$

.. . (13)

$$T^* = \sqrt{\frac{P_s\left(2(O_s + DC_s + QC_p + nt) + P_s I_e^2 DM^3\right)}{D\left(hP_s - c^2(I_e - I_c) + 2P_s I_e c - P_s^2 I_e\right)}}$$

...(14)

Case 2.2: $\mathbf{T \leq M}$

$$\frac{dTAP_{23}(T)}{dT} = \frac{O_s}{T^2} - \frac{hD}{2} - \frac{P_s I_e D}{2} + \frac{P_s I_e^2 DM}{2} - P_s I_e^2 DT + \frac{DC_s}{T^2} + \frac{QC_p}{T^2} + \frac{nt}{T^2}$$ . . . (15)

MATHEMATICAL ILLUSTRATION

Consider an inventory model with the following features

If the expense is made within 30 days, the manufacturer may give a reasonable extension. (M= 1/12= 0.0833 years, respectively). if the expense is not made in 30days, then the outstanding amount will be paid 15 percent premium (i.e., I_c= 0.15) per year. Assume D=2000units / year, h = \$3/unit/year, $C_s =$ \$0.01, $C_p =$ \$0.02, $t =$ \$3, $n = 3$, P_s= \$40, c = \$20, Q=3000 units and O_s = \$200 per order.

Suppose the enterprisespends in the storemarketplace and receives a return on investment of Ie= 20 percent per year, provided that $I_e = 0.2 > I_c = 0.15$.

$T^* = T_{11}$ = 2.21359 years is the optimum replenishment period time for case 1.

$TAP_1(T^*)$ = \$39563.3646

The average entireturnover per unit time for case 1 is Q*= 4427 units.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, the retailer would be allowed to pay back the amount owed for a defined loan period without penalty. The retailer may, under different economic circumstances, agree to pay the entire quantity due to the seller at the termination of the acceptable delay period or at the end of the replacement phase. Instead, the merchant will need extra duration to pay off the account after the end of the loan period. For a retailer, an inventory model has been designed to

January - February 2020
ISSN: 0193 - 4120 Page No. 7325 - 7332

predict the optimum replacement phase time, order capacity and pay-off time to maximize turnover per unit time. Eventually, to explain the solution process, numerical illustration was given.

REFERENCES:

1. S.P. Aggarwal, C.K. Jaggi, *Ordering policies of deteriorating items under permissible delay in payments*, Journal of the Operational Research Society 46 (1995) 658-662.
2. C.T. Chang, *An EOQ model with deteriorating items under inflation under supplier credits linked to order quantity*, International Journal of Production Economics 88 (2004) 307-316.
3. H.C. Chang, C.H. Ho, L.Y. Ouyang, C.H. Su, *The optimal pricing and ordering policy for an integrated inventory model when trade credit linked to order quantity*, Applied Mathematical Modelling 33 (2009) 2978-2991.
4. S.K. Goyal, *Economic order quantity under conditions of permissible delay in payments*, Journal of the Operational Research Society 36 (1985) 335-338.
5. C.K. Jaggi, S.K. Goyal, S.K. Goel, *Retailer's optimal replenishment decision with credit-linked demand under permissible delay in payments*, European journal of Operational Research 190 (2008) 130-135.
6. J.J. Liao, *An EOQ model with noninstataneous receipt and exponentially deteriorating items under two-level trade credit*, International Journal of Production Economics 113 (2008) 852-861.
7. H.D. Liu, *Optimal replenishment policy for the EPQ model with permissible delay in payments and allowable shortages*, Applied Mathematics modeling 34 (2010) 3108-3117.
8. B.N. Mandal, S. Phaujdar, *Some EOQ models under permissible delay in payments*, International Journal of Management and Systems 5 (1989) 99-108.
9. J. Min, Y.W. Zhou, J.Zhao, *An inventory model for deteriorating items under stock-dependent demand and two-level trade credit*, Applied Mathematical Modeling 34 (2010) 3273-3285.
10. J.T. Teng, *On the economic order quantity under conditions of permissible delay in payments*, Journal of the Operational Research Society 53 (2002) 915-918.