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Abstract: A deterministic production and transportation planning problem is considered over a finite time horizon for two products that can be produced in each of two regions. Each region uses its own facility to supply the demands for two products. Demands for product 2 in one region can be satisfied either by its own production or by transportation from other region, while no transportation between two regions is allowed for product 1. Production, inventory and transportation costs are assumed to be non-decreasing and concave. The objective is to find the schedule of production and transportation in each region by which the total cost over the horizon is minimized. Using a network flow approach, we develop a dynamic programming algorithm that can find an optimal policy.
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1. Introduction

Until the 1980s, traditional dynamic lot-sizing models have been applied for solving the production and inventory problems. Various production and inventory models have been developed for single and multi-facility problem with a finite planning horizon of \( T \) periods. For example, a single product, single facility dynamic lot-sizing problem with time-dependent concave costs have been first proposed in [1]. In certain types of concave cost networks, the algorithm to determine minimum cost flows has been considered in [2]. A similar problem under the assumption that the production levels were restricted to period-dependent capacity limits has also studied in [3]. They have devised a dynamic programming and shortest path algorithm only for the case of constant capacity. A single-facility multi-product production planning problem with no capacity constraint was proposed in [4]. A deterministic capacity expansion model for two facility types has been described in [5]. At the beginning of each period, facility \( i (i = 1, 2) \) could be expanded, either by new construction, or by conversion of idle capacity associated with facility \( j (j = 1, 2 \text{ and } j \neq i) \) to accommodate the demand for facility \( i \). In these papers, they have assumed the cost functions to be concave, but they haven’t considered the transportation of the products. Above these papers, a lot of papers have been published handling the problems related to the dynamic lot-sizing for many different types of production environment. [6-10] Whereas, in the supply chain management (SCM) area that developed in earnest in the 1990s [11], there have been many efforts to resolve the integrated problems considering key business processes of production, storage and distribution, from original suppliers through end users. [12-14] However, they have assumed the cost functions to be linear due to the intrinsic complexity of the concave function. But it is more realistic that the cost functions are assumed to be non-decreasing and concave reflecting the economies of scale. In this paper, based on the traditional dynamic lot-sizing problem, we consider integrated production, inventory and transportation problem. We assume that the cost functions used in this problem are to be non-decreasing and concave in order to represent the realistic cost functions. Though the problem suggested in this paper does not resolve the general integrated supply chain problem, it is meaningful in respect of applying more realistic cost functions to somewhat simplified supply chain problem. In this paper, we consider a production, inventory and transportation planning problem for which two production regions are involved. In each region, a single facility manufactures two items (or products) each taking a fixed part of the whole production amount to satisfy its own demands over the discrete \( T \) periods. In the problem, we assume that the transportation is allowed only for product 2 from one region to another.
Such a problem involving multi-products by a single facility occurs frequently in two functionally distinctive classes of manufacturing industries; one in chemical industry and the other in machinery (or food) industry. Each of these cases is described in a bit more detail. In the first case, the involved input resource contains various components in a fixed quantity proportion, which are distinctively converted into their corresponding commercial products in the fixed proportion. Therefore, all the products are distinctively various in both quality and quantity. As an example, an oil refinery problem can be considered, for which each unit of crude oil is refined to produce different products, say gasoline and a fine chemical resource, in the fixed quantity ratios, say $\alpha_1 > 0$ and $\alpha_2 > 0$, respectively. As another example, consider a production system, for which each operation generates by-product in a fixed ratio, say $\alpha$. In the other class, the employed facility (plant) with a certain number of distinctive sub-operation lines attached operates to supply a resource (fixed) simultaneously to all the attached lines, each of which generates its own commercial products. Therefore, all the products are in the same quality but their quantities are distinctively dependent on the capacities (fixed) of the involved sub-operation lines. As an example, a steel processing system can be considered, for which each unit of steel is processed to produce nail and wire simultaneously in a pre-specified weight proportion.

In connection with transportation, the following example can be taken into account. As the first example, an import policy for cotton is implemented at two regions, for which two kinds of blended yarns are manufactured in each region, one with 40% chemical fiber mixed and the other one with 60% chemical fiber mixed. Only the blended yarn with 60% chemical fiber mixed can be transported from one region to another. In the case, the chemical fiber resource is assumed to be plentifully available for blending the two distinctive yarns. As another example, consider a general chemical process, for which a by-product is generated and its transportation from one region to another is allowed for its own market demands.

The associated policy consists of determining the production and transportation amounts in each period at each region over the planning horizon. The incurring costs include both the production and transportation costs and the inventory holding costs. All the involving cost functions depend on period and are non-decreasing concave. The goal of this paper is then to find an optimal policy by which the total cost incurred over the whole horizon is minimized.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the proposed problem is formulated as a non-linear programming problem. Then we show that the constraints in the formulated model can be described as a single source network problem. The characteristics of an optimal solution are identified and a dynamic programming approach is addressed to solve the problem in Section 3. In Section 4, the algorithm is illustrated with a numerical example. Finally, a conclusion is drawn in Section 5.

2. Model Formulation

The model assumes a finite planning horizon of $T$ periods in which each production (and each transportation, if necessary) occurs instantaneously and simultaneously at the beginning of each period. Useful notations are defined as follows:

\[ r_{ik}^t = \text{Demand for product } i \text{ in region } k \text{ at period } t, \]

\[ R_{ik}^k(t) = \sum_{s=1}^{T} r_{ik}^s \]

\[ x_{ik}^t = \text{Amount of production for product } i \text{ in region } k \text{ at the beginning of period } t \]

\[ I_{ik}^t = \text{Amount of inventory for product } i \text{ in region } k \text{ at the end of period } t \]

\[ y_{ik}^t = \text{Transportation amount of product } 2 \text{ from region } k \text{ to region } j \text{ at the beginning of period } t, \]

\[ P_{ik}^k(x_{ik}^t) = \text{Cost of producing } x_{ik}^t \text{ at the beginning of period } t \]

\[ Q_{ik}^j(y_{ik}^t) = \text{Cost of transporting } y_{ik}^t \text{ from region } k \text{ to region } j \text{ at the beginning of period } t \]

\[ H_{ik}^t(I_{ik}^t) = \text{Inventory holding cost of } I_{ik}^t \text{ from period } (t-1) \text{ to period } t \]

It is assumed that $P_{ik}^k(\cdot)$, $Q_{ik}^j(\cdot)$, and $H_{ik}^t(\cdot)$ are non-decreasing concave functions. And also we assume that $x_{ik}^t = x_{ik}^t = x_{ik}^t$. This assumption implies that one unit of resource consumption leads to all the involved products each resulting in its own single commodity unit. From the above assumption, we can let $P_{ik}^k(x_{ik}^t) = \sum_{s=1}^{T} P_{ik}^k(x_{ik}^t)$, for all $t$.

There is no loss of generality in assuming that both the initial and final inventories are zero for each of the products, since otherwise the original problem can be adjusted by employing certain fictitious periods or artificial demands at the end of period $T$.

The problem is then to minimize the total costs of production, inventory and transportation, which can be formulated as follows:

\[ \text{(PB)} \]

\[ \text{minimize } F(z) = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{2} \left( P_{ik}^k(x_{ik}^t) + Q_{ik}^j(y_{ik}^t) \right) \right] + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{2} H_{ik}^t(I_{ik}^t) \right] \]

subject to

\[ I_{ik}^t = I_{ik}^{t-1} + x_{ik}^t - r_{ik}^t, \quad k = 1, 2, t = 1, 2, ..., T \]

\[ I_{ik}^t = I_{ik}^{t-1} + x_{ik}^t + y_{ik}^t - r_{ik}^t \]

\[ x_{ik}^t \geq 0, \quad y_{ik}^t \geq 0, \quad I_{ik}^t \geq 0, \quad i, k = 1, 2, t = 1, 2, ..., T \]

The objective function $F(z)$ is concave, since $P_{ik}^k(\cdot)$, $Q_{ik}^j(\cdot)$, and $H_{ik}^t(\cdot)$ are concave functions. The constraints (1)-(4) of the problem (PB) define a closed bounded convex set. Since $F(z)$ is non-decreasing concave, there exists an extreme point optimal solution. The constraints (1)-(4) can be described as a single source network problem. The network is shown in Figure 1.

The constraints (1)-(4) can be shown to be totally unimodular as done in [15]. Therefore, since the demands are integers, any extreme point solution consists of integer values.
for all variables.

In the next section, we shall describe the properties of an optimal solution and an algorithm for finding the solution.

3. Extreme Flows and Optimal Schedules

3.1. Characteristics of an Optimal Solution

Since the constraints (1) - (4) define a convex set, and \( F(\bullet) \) is concave, the minimum cost is attained at an extreme point of the set. So we shall concentrate on finding such an extreme point solution.

We shall first derive certain optimality properties, some of which will be used later to construct a solution algorithm. As done in [16], it can be shown easily that a feasible flow in the network of Figure 1 corresponds to an extreme flow if and only if it does not contain any cycle with positive flows. Furthermore, referring to [2], an extreme flow is composed of some nodes and arcs, where each of the nodes has at most one positive input. These extreme flow properties lead to the following sufficient conditions for an extreme point solution of the given problem:

(i) \( l_{t-1}^k \cdot l_{t-1}^k \cdot x_t^k = 0, k = 1, 2 \) and \( t = 1, 2, \ldots, T \)

(ii) \( y_t^k \cdot l_{t-1}^k = 0, k = 1, 2 \) and \( t = 1, 2, \ldots, T \)

(iii) \( x_t^k \cdot y_t^k = 0, k, j = 1, 2 \) and \( k \neq j, t = 1, 2, \ldots, T \)

However, the extreme flow property clarified in [2] is for single source networks, so that it is not always satisfied in our model. Therefore, we shall find some additional properties that are useful for our algorithm development.

Let period \( t \) be called an “inventory point” if \( l_{t-1}^k = 0 \) for at least one of both \( i \) and \( k \), that is, \( \prod_{i,k=1,2,t} l_{it}^k = 0 \). And a production (transportation) point of a schedule \( z \) in region \( k \) is defined as a period \( t \) in which \( x_t^k > 0 \) (\( y_t^k > 0 \)).

**Theorem 1** Let \( u \) and \( v \) be two consecutive inventory points (\( u < v \)). If \( z \) is an extreme point solution, then the following properties are satisfied:

(i) In each region, there exists at most one production point between \( u \) and \( v \) (including \( v \))

(ii) \( y_u^k \cdot y_v^k = 0, u < t_1, t_2 \leq v \)

(iii) \( y_u^k \cdot l_{t}^k = 0, k = 1, 2, u < t_3, t_4 \leq v \)

**Proof of (i)**. We consider a region \( k \). Assume that a feasible solution \( z = (x_1^k, \ldots, x_T^k; y_1^k, \ldots, y_T^k) \) and \( z_i^k = 0, i = 1, 2 \). Then there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that \( \delta \cdot l_{t-1}^k \cdot x_t^k \neq 0 \) for \( t = t_1, t_2, u < t_1, t_2 \leq v \). Therefore, there exists two distinct production points \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) such that \( l_{t}^k \cdot x_t^k \neq 0 \) for \( t = t_1, t_2, u < t_1, t_2 \leq v \).

We now describe the dynamic programming approach to solve the problem (PB). Let \( d_{u,v}(l_u, l_v) \) be the minimal cost between two successive inventory points \( u \) and \( v \). Then,
\[ \text{Problem (PB) is spent on computing period (9) can be expressed as follows:} \]

subject to

(i) \( I_u \) and \( I_v \) are inventory point values,

(ii) Constraints (1) - (4) are satisfied for \( t = u + 1, \ldots, v \),

(iii) \( \prod_{i,k=1,2} t_{ik}^0 > 0, t = u + 1, \ldots, v - 1 \),

(iv) \( x_t^u \) and \( y_t^v \) satisfy the properties described in Theorem 1, for each \( t \) and \( k \), \((t = u + 1, \ldots, v; k = 1, 2)\).

Subsequently, if the right hand sides of the equation (10) and (11) are not equal, then the subproblem is infeasible. Otherwise the subproblem is feasible. Letting \( Y = Y^1 - Y^2 \) and \( |Y| \) denote the absolute value of \( Y \), we can see from Theorem 1 that either \( Y^1 = |Y| \) or \( Y^2 = |Y| \). In other words, if \( Y > 0, Y = Y^1 \) but \( Y < 0, -Y = Y^2 \). Further, if any one of \( D^1 \) and \( D^2 \) is negative, then the subproblem is also infeasible.

Moreover, suppose that \( y_{u+1}^k \neq 0 \) but \( y_{u+1}^k = 0 \) and \( Y^j = 0 \) \((k \neq j, k = 1, 2)\). Then, \( y_{u+1}^k > 0 \) or \( x_{u+1}^k = D^k \) is required to satisfy the demand \( r_{u+1}^k \). However, since \( Y^j < 0 \), it is required that \( x_{u+1}^k = D^k \). This implies that in this case, the production point in region \( k \) is fixed at period \( u + 1 \).

These properties lead to the following proposition, which describes the feasible location of a transportation point for a \((u-v)\) subproblem.

**Proposition 1** Assume that a \((u-v)\) subproblem is given and \( Y^j > 0 \). Then the optimal transportation point within the subproblem can be only one point between period \( u \) and \( \hat{t} \) (including \( \hat{t} \)), where period \( t \) satisfies the following relationships:

(i) \( 0 < Y^j < l_{2v}^k + r_{2v}^k \), for \( k, j = 1, 2 \) and \( k \neq j \), then \( \hat{t} = v \)

(ii) If \( l_{2v}^k + r_{2v}^k < Y^j < l_{2v}^k + \sum_{u+1}^v y_{u+1}^k \), for \( k, j = 1, 2 \) and \( k \neq j \), then there exists a period \( \hat{t} \) such that \( l_{2v}^k + \sum_{u+1}^v r_{2u}^k < Y^j < l_{2v}^k + \sum_{u+1}^v r_{2u}^k \), \( u + 1 \leq \hat{t} < v \)

(iii) If \( Y^j = l_{2v}^k + \sum_{u+1}^v y_{u+1}^k \), for \( k, j = 1, 2 \) and \( k \neq j \), then \( \hat{t} = u + 1 \).

Proof. Since proofs of (i) and (iii) are obvious, we consider only the proof of (ii). Consider period \( t^* \) \((u + 1 \leq t^* \leq v)\) such that \( y_{t^*}^j > 0 \) so that \( y_{t^*}^j = Y^j > 0 \).

From the assumption that \( x_{t^*}^u = x_{t^*}^v \), for all \( t \), we see that \( D^k = D^k \), \( k = 1, 2 \). Let \( Y^k \) be the transportation amount from region \( k \) to region \( j \) \((k, j = 1, 2 \) and \( k \neq j)\) over periods \( u + 1, \ldots, v \); that is, \( Y^k = \sum_{u+1}^v y_{t^*}^j \).

Then equation (9) can be expressed as follows:

\[ D^k = l_{2v}^k - l_{2u}^k + \sum_{u+1}^v y_{t^*}^j + Y^k - Y^j \]

Since \( D^1 = D^2 \), \( k = 1, 2 \), we can see from (9) that

\[ Y^1 - Y^2 = (l_{2v}^1 - l_{2u}^1 + \sum_{u+1}^v y_{t^*}^1) - (l_{2v}^1 - l_{2u}^1 + \sum_{u+1}^v y_{t^*}^2) \]

\[ Y^1 - Y^2 = (l_{2v}^2 - l_{2u}^2 + \sum_{u+1}^v y_{t^*}^2) - (l_{2v}^2 - l_{2u}^2 + \sum_{u+1}^v y_{t^*}^1) \]

Transportation policies are summarized in the following Theorem.

**Theorem 2** Suppose that \( Y^j - Y^k > 0 \), for \( j, k = 1, 2 \) and \( j \neq k \). Then, we can use the following policies to get the optimal transportation point.

(i) If \( l_{2v}^k + D^k < r_{2v}^k \), then \( y_{u+1}^j = Y^j \) and all other transportation variables have values of zero.

(ii) Otherwise, there exists only one transportation point \( p \) between \( u \) and \( \hat{t} \) (including \( \hat{t} \)) such that \( y_{p}^j = Y^j \), where \( \hat{t} \) is the period obtained from Proposition 1.

Likewise, for the case of \( H_{2u}^k > 0 \), \((k = 1, 2)\), a similar relationship can be constructed for the production point.

**Proposition 2** Consider the case of \( H_{2u}^k > 0 \), \((k = 1, 2)\). Let

\[ d_{uv}(l_u, l_v) = \min_{x_t^u, y_t^v} [\mathcal{L} + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^{n_k} (x_t^u)^2 + Q_t^k (y_t^v)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} H_{ik}^u (l_u^i)] \]
\( t^k \) and \( t^u \) \((u < t^k, t^u \leq v)\) be the periods in which the following relationships are satisfied:

(i) If \( I_{1u}^k \leq r^1_{1u+1} \), then \( t^k = u + 1 \)

(ii) If \( r^k_{1u+1} < I_{1u}^k < \sum_{i=1}^{u} r^k_{1i} \), then there exists \( t^k \) such that \( \sum_{t=1}^{t^k-1} r^k_{1t} \leq I_{1u}^k < \sum_{t=1}^{t^k} r^k_{1t} \), for \( u + 1 < t^k \leq v \)

(iii) If \( I_{1u}^k > \sum_{i=1}^{u} r^k_{1i} \), then \( t^k = v \)

(iv) If \( D^k < I_{1v}^k + r^k_{1v} \), then \( t^k = v \)

(v) If \( D^k \geq I_{1v}^k + r^k_{1v} \), then there exists \( t^v \) such that \( I_{1v}^k + \sum_{i=1}^{u} r^k_{1i} \leq D^k < I_{1v}^k + \sum_{i=1}^{v} r^k_{1i} \), for \( u + 1 \leq t^v < v \)

Then, there exists only one optimal production point located between \( u \) and \( t^k \) (including \( t^k \)) in region \( k \), where \( t^k = \min \{ t^k, t^v \} \).

Proof. If \( t^k = v \), the above property is obviously satisfied. Consider the case of \( u < t^k < v \).

Suppose that \( t^k = t^v \) and in period \( t \) \((u < t < v)\), \( x^t > 0 \). For the case of (i), it leads to an infeasible solution for the \((u-v)\) subproblem, since \( I_{1u}^k + r^k_{1v} \leq 0 \).

Next, consider the case (ii). In this case, \( I_{1u}^k - \sum_{t=1}^{u} r^k_{1t} < 0 \). Hence, the amount of \( D^k \) produced at period \( t \) incurs negative inventories \( l^2_t < 0 \), at each period \( t \), \( t = t^k, \ldots, t^v - 1 \). Therefore, its solution is infeasible.

Furthermore, in the case of which \( t^k = t^v \), it is similarly proved by following the proof steps in Proposition 1.

These production policies are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1. Production Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( I_{1u}^k )</th>
<th>( x^t_{1u+1} = D^k )</th>
<th>( x^t_k = D^k, u &lt; t \leq t^k )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>( x^t_{1u+1} = D^k )</td>
<td>( x^t_k = D^k, u &lt; t \leq t^k )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theorem 1, Theorem 2, and the information in Table 1 can be employed together to solve every \((u-v)\) subproblem, which represent output solution algorithm.

In the next section, a numerical example is presented to illustrate the algorithm.

**4. A Numerical Example**

We illustrate the algorithm with a 3-period two-product two-facility problem. The production, inventory and transportation cost functions are given as follows:

- \[ P_1^k(x_1^t) = (30 + 8x_1^t)(0.9)^{t-1} \]
- \[ P_2^k(x_2^t) = (20 + 10x_2^t)(0.9)^{t-1} \]
- \[ H_1^k(t_1^k) = 5t_1^k(0.9)^{t-1} \]
- \[ Q_1^k(y_1^t) = 5y_1^t(0.9)^{t-1} \]

\( t = 1, 2 \) and \( k = 1, 2 \)

The demand data for \( r^1_{11}, r^1_{12}, r^2_{11} \) and \( r^2_{12} \) are given as \((2, 2, 1), (1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 1) \) and \((1, 2, 2)\), respectively.

Conveniently, we shall assume that \( y_1^t = 0, t = 1, 2, \ldots, T \).

Let \( S_{ti} \) be the \( i^{th} \) state variable at inventory point \( t \). Then the recursive equations shown in (6) and (7) are represented as follows:

\[ f_i(S_{ui}) = \min_{u+1 \leq t \leq T} [\delta_{ui}(S_{ui}, S_{uj}) + f_i(S_{uj})], \quad S_{ui} \in G_u, \quad u = T - 1, \ldots, 1, 0, \ i = 1, \ldots, N_u, \ j = 1, \ldots, N_v \]

\[ f_T(S_{T1}) = 0, \ S_{T1} = I_T = (0, 0; 0, 0), \]

\[ S_{01} = I_0 = (0, 0; 0, 0) \]

Where \( G_u \) is the set of all possible “inventory point” values at period \( u \) and \( N_u \) is the number of states at period \( t \). \( S_{ti} \) values are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2. \( S_{ti} \) values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( i )</th>
<th>( S_{t1} )</th>
<th>( S_{t2} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>(0, 1, 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>(0, 1, 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 1, 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 1, 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 1, 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 0, 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 0, 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 0, 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 0, 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 0, 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 0, 0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider the subproblem \( d_{32}(S_{01}, S_{31}) \), where \( S_{01} = S_{31} = (0, 0, 0) \). By equations (8) and (11), \( D^1 = 5, D^2 = 3, \) and \( Y^1 = 2 \). According to the information in Theorem 2 and Table 1, policy (i) yields \( x_1^1 = 5, x_2^1 = 3, y_1^1 = 2 \) with the total cost of 207.5, policy (ii) yields \( x_1^1 = 5, x_2^1 = 3, y_1^2 = 2 \) and other variables are zero with a total cost 206.5. Hence the result of the policy (ii) is the optimal one. As another subproblem, the values of \( d_{32}(S_{01}, S_{31}) \) are shown in Table 3. Other \( d_{uv}(S_{ui}, S_{vj}) \) values for \( 0 \leq u < v \leq 3 \) can be calculated similarly.

After solving all such subproblems, the shortest path is searched using the dynamic programming formulation in equations (6') and (7'). The \( f_i(S_{ti}) \) values can be calculated and its results are shown in Table 4.

**Table 3. (2-3) subproblem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( i )</th>
<th>( S_{t1} )</th>
<th>( d_{32}(S_{t1}, S_{31}) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>55.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>30.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>59.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be extended to the case in which capacity bounds on production and transportation model. Using a network flow model, transportation are allowed.
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5. Conclusion

In this paper, we described a two-product two-region production and transportation model. Using a network flow approach, properties of extreme points were identified. Then, they were used to develop an efficient solution search procedure for each independent subproblem, based upon which a dynamic programming algorithm was constructed for an optimal solution search. However, the computational efficiency of the algorithm is closely dependent on the number of nodes associated with the demand size in each period as well as the planning horizon $T$. Thus, our attention is paid to further research effort on decreasing the number of such nodes for a better algorithm development. And also the model can be extended to the case in which capacity bounds on transportation are allowed.

Table 4. \( f_3(S_{3i}) \) values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( i )</th>
<th>( f_1(S_{1i}) )</th>
<th>( f_2(S_{2i}) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>111.15</td>
<td>55.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>90.45</td>
<td>30.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.15</td>
<td>59.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>115.20</td>
<td>34.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>94.95</td>
<td>38.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>79.20</td>
<td>24.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>106.20</td>
<td>28.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>79.20</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>78.48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>80.28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.33</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>58.50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>62.55</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The optimal policy of the entire problem is then \( x^1_1 = 2 \), \( x^1_2 = 3 \), \( x^3_1 = 0 \), \( x^1_2 = 2 \), \( x^2_1 = 0 \), \( x^1_2 = 1 \), \( y^1_1 = 0 \), \( y^1_2 = 1 \), and \( y^2_2 = 1 \) with the total minimum cost 195.95. Its optimal sequence is \( S_{01} \rightarrow S_{15} \rightarrow S_{27} \rightarrow S_{31} \).

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we described a two-product two-region production and transportation model. Using a network flow approach, properties of extreme points were identified. Then, they were used to develop an efficient solution search procedure for each independent subproblem, based upon which a dynamic programming algorithm was constructed for an optimal solution search. However, the computational efficiency of the algorithm is closely dependent on the number of nodes associated with the demand size in each period as well as the planning horizon $T$. Thus, our attention is paid to further research effort on decreasing the number of such nodes for a better algorithm development. And also the model can be extended to the case in which capacity bounds on transportation are allowed.
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