

UNCLASSIFIED

AD 407 040

DEFENSE DOCUMENTATION CENTER

FOR

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION

CAMERON STATION, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA



UNCLASSIFIED

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

407040

APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS LABORATORIES

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
CALIFORNIA


PRODUCTION PLANNING WITH CONVEX COSTS: A PARAMETRIC STUDY

BY

ARTHUR F. VEINOTT, JR.

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 66

MAY 22, 1963



407040

SUPPORTED BY THE ARMY, NAVY AND AIR FORCE UNDER
CONTRACT Nonr-225(53) (NR-042-002)
WITH THE OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH



Best Available Copy

PRODUCTION PLANNING WITH CONVEX COSTS: A PARAMETRIC STUDY

by

Arthur F. Veinott, Jr.

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 66

May 22, 1963

Supported by the Army, Navy and Air Force under

Contract Nonr-225(53) (NR-042-002)

with the Office of Naval Research

Gerald J. Lieberman, Project Director

Reproduction in Whole or in Part is Permitted for
any Purpose of the United States Government

APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS LABORATORIES

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

PREFACE

Nonmathematical Summary

This study is concerned with the problem of choosing the amounts $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ of a single product (or aggregation of several products) to produce in each of n successive time periods $1, 2, \dots, n$ so as to minimize the total manufacturing costs over the n periods. The requirements $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n$ for the product occurring in periods $1, 2, \dots, n$ are assumed to be known in advance. Requirements in a period are satisfied in so far as possible from stock on hand at the beginning of the period and from production during the period. Requirements which cannot be met in this way are backlogged until they can be satisfied by subsequent production.

Let $y_1 = \sum_{j=1}^1 (x_j - r_j)$. If $y_1 \geq 0$, then y_1 is the amount of inventory on hand at the end of period 1. If y_1 is negative, then $-y_1$ is the total amount by which the cumulative requirements exceed the cumulative production in the first 1 periods. We suppose that this excess, $-y_1$, is backlogged until it can subsequently be satisfied.

Denote the cost of producing x_1 units in period 1 by $c_1(x_1)$. The cost of storing $y_1 (\geq 0)$ units at the end of period 1 is denoted by $h_1(y_1)$. When $y_1 < 0$, $h_1(y_1)$ is the penalty cost incurred because $-y_1$ units of requirements are backlogged at the end of period 1.

We suppose that there are given upper and lower limits $\bar{x}_1$ and $\underline{x}_1$ ($\underline{x}_1 \leq \bar{x}_1$) respectively on production in period 1 ($= 1, 2, \dots, n$). In addition there are given upper and lower limits $\bar{y}_1$ and $\underline{y}_1$ ($\underline{y}_1 \leq \bar{y}_1$)

on y_i in period i ($i=1,2,\dots,n-1$); and no inventory or backlog is allowed at the end of period n , i.e., $y_n = 0$.

The problem is to choose production levels $x_1, \dots, x_n$ that minimize the total cost

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} h_i(y_i)$$

over the n periods subject to the above named constraints.

We assume that the cost functions c_i and h_i are convex. For example they might appear as in Figure 1.




Figure 1

(The functions in Figure 1 are convex because the chord connecting any two points on the graph of either function does not fall below the graph of the function between the two given points.)

The objective of our study is to determine the effect of changes in the requirements and capacity limitations (production, storage, backlog) upon the optimal production levels. We show that the optimal production level in a given period is a non-decreasing function of (1) the requirements in any period, (2) the upper and lower production capacity limits

in the given period, and (3) the upper and lower storage limits $\underline{l}$ in the given and all succeeding periods; the optimal production level in a given period is a non-increasing function of (1) the upper and lower production capacity limits in any other period and (2) the upper and lower storage limits in all preceding periods. The above results also lead to simple and efficient computational procedures for finding optimal production quantities.

As an illustration of these methods, suppose that the production levels are assumed to be integers. Suppose also that we have optimal (integer) production levels $x_1, \dots, x_n$ for the (integer) requirements $r_1, \dots, r_n$. We seek optimal production levels $x'_1, \dots, x'_n$ for the requirements $r'_1, \dots, r'_n$ where $r'_k = r_k \pm 1$ for some k and $r'_i = r_i$ for $i \neq k$. In this circumstance we show that there is an integer j (not necessarily equal to k) for which $x'_j = x_j \pm 1$ and $x'_i = x_i$ for $i \neq j$.


Example:

As an example of the way in which this result can be applied to find an optimal production schedule, suppose the data are as given in table 1 below.

1/

In this discussion backlogged requirements are viewed as negative inventories.

Table 1

1	r_1	$\bar{x}_1$	$\bar{y}_1$	$\bar{y}_1$	$c_1(1)$	$c_1(2)$	$c_1(3)$	$h_1(-1)$	$h_1(1)$	$h_1(2)$	$h_1(3)$
1	-2	3	-1	2	10	21	33	7	1	3	
2	1	3	0	3	13	26	40		2	5	8
3	3	2	-1	2	9	28		10	1	2	
4	1	0									

Also $c_1(0) = h_1(0) = \underline{x}_1 = 0$ for all i .

The idea is to begin by defining a sequence of requirements for which there is only one feasible set of production levels. For example, if $r_1 = -2, r_2 = 0, r_3 = 1, r_4 = 1$ then $x_i = 0$ for $i=1,2,3,4$ is the only feasible set of production levels since $\underline{x}_1 = 0$ for all i . We now increase the requirements one unit at a time until we obtain the requirements in table 1. At each stage we find a corresponding optimal collection of production levels.

We begin by increasing the requirements in (say) period 3 to two. From what we have said above, this requires us to produce one additional unit in one of the first four periods. Increasing production in periods one or four is not feasible, the former because the upper inventory limit in period one would be violated and the latter because the upper limit on production in period four would be violated. The cost of producing the one unit in periods two and three is

$$c_2(1) + h_1(2) + h_2(3) + h_3(1) = 13+3+8+1 = 25$$

and

$$c_3(1) + h_1(2) + h_2(2) + h_3(1) = 9+3+5+1 = 18$$

respectively. Thus, the production levels $x_3 = 1$ and $x_i = 0, i \neq 3$, are optimal for the requirements $r_1 = -2, r_2 = 0, r_3 = 2, r_4 = 1$. Next we increase the requirements in period two by one. This time the most economical plan is to increase production in period two by one. The final step is to increase requirements in period three again by one unit obtaining $r_1 = -2, r_2 = 1, r_3 = 3, r_4 = 1$. The best plan is now to increase production in period two by one, obtaining $x_1 = 0, x_2 = 2, x_3 = 1, x_4 = 0$ as the final set of optimal production levels.

PRODUCTION PLANNING WITH CONVEX COSTS:

A PARAMETRIC STUDY

by

Arthur F. Veinott, Jr.

1. Introduction and Summary

We consider the problem of choosing the amounts $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ of a single product to produce in each of n successive time periods $1, 2, \dots, n$ so as to minimize the total manufacturing costs over the n periods. The requirements $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n$ for the product occurring in periods $1, 2, \dots, n$ are known in advance. Requirements in a period are satisfied in so far as possible from stock on hand at the beginning of the period and from production during the period. Requirements which cannot be met in this way (because, for example, of limited production capacity) are backlogged until they can be satisfied by subsequent production. It is convenient in the sequel to view backlogged requirements as a negative inventory. Similarly, disposal of ("excess") stock is viewed as negative production.

We admit two types of costs in a given period: production and holding, the former being a disposal cost when the production level is negative and the latter being a backlogging cost when the inventory level is negative. These costs are assumed to be convex functions respectively of the quantities produced during and stored at the end of the period. In addition we permit upper and lower limits to be imposed on the amounts produced and stored. The cost functions and quantity limitations for successive periods need not be the same.

The model can be interpreted in a variety of different ways including service scheduling, warehousing decisions, and distribution of effort. Several of these possibilities are discussed in [4] and [7].

Our objective is to study the effect upon the optimal production levels of changes in the parameters, i.e., the requirements and quantity limitations. In the event that the total cost function is strictly convex, the optimal production quantities are unique. For this case our two main results are easily stated as follows. First, the optimal production level in a given period is a non-decreasing function of (1) the requirements in any period, (2) the upper and lower production capacity limits in the given period, and (3) the upper and lower storage limits in the given and all succeeding periods; the optimal production level in a given period is a non-increasing function of (1) the upper and lower production limits in every other period and (2) the upper and lower storage limits in any preceding period. Second, the optimal cumulative production levels $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ are each non-decreasing functions of the cumulative requirements $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n$ in each period, where $X_i = \sum_{j=1}^i x_j$ and $R_i = \sum_{j=1}^i r_j$ for all i .

The first result is of interest for studies of possible changes in the production or storage capacities, or changes in the minimal guaranteed production level. The first result is also the basis for some efficient parametric programming procedures to be described later. The second result is useful in forecasting. For example suppose that we do not know the actual cumulative requirements $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n$, but

can forecast maximal and minimal cumulative requirements $\tilde{R}_1, \tilde{R}_2, \dots, \tilde{R}_n$ and $\underline{R}_1, \underline{R}_2, \dots, \underline{R}_n$ respectively with assurance that $\underline{R}_1 \leq R_1 \leq \tilde{R}_1$ for all i . We may then compute the corresponding optimal maximal and minimal cumulative production levels $\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2, \dots, \tilde{X}_n$ and $\underline{X}_1, \underline{X}_2, \dots, \underline{X}_n$ and be assured that the cumulative production levels $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ that are optimal for $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n$ are such that $\underline{X}_1 \leq X_1 \leq \tilde{X}_1$ for all i .

At the beginning of period one we will ordinarily only have to choose X_1 and not subsequent production levels. If it happens that $\underline{X}_1 = \tilde{X}_1$ - and this can occur even when the $\tilde{R}_1$ and $\underline{R}_1$ are not all the same - then the optimal amount to produce in period one is determined as $\underline{X}_1$ without complete knowledge of the R_1 . If instead $\underline{X}_1 < \tilde{X}_1$, then improved forecasting is needed in order to determine the optimal value of X_1 . The value of narrowing the forecast interval in various periods can be assessed by determining its effect upon the width of the interval $[\underline{X}_1, \tilde{X}_1]$.

The rather intuitive relations described above between the optimal production levels and the various parameters do not hold in general, but do seem to be valid in a number of situations not encompassed by our hypotheses. It is somewhat surprising, however, that the results may fail to hold when the total costs are convex but cannot be expressed in the form assumed in this paper. For example, suppose the total cost for a two period model is

$$\max(x_2, 3x_1 + 2x_2 - 6) .$$

This function is convex since the maximum of two linear functions is convex. However, if the requirements are $r_1 = r_2 = 1$, then the optimal

production levels are $x_1 = 2$, $x_2 = 0$, while if $r_1 = 1$, $r_2 = 3$ the optimal production levels are $x_1 = 1$, $x_2 = 3$ (assuming $X_2 = R_2$ and $x_1 \geq 0$, $x_2 \geq 0$). Observe that neither of our two results holds here.

The fact that the optimal production quantities are non-decreasing functions of the requirements leads immediately to an extremely simple procedure for computing optimal production schedules. In order to justify the algorithm we are about to describe, it is necessary to make two additional assumptions. First, the cost functions are piecewise linear with the endpoints of each of the intervals on which the functions have linear segments being integers also. Second, the requirements and the upper and lower limits on production and storage are all integers. Under these conditions we show that there are optimal production levels that are also integers. ^{1/}

In the most elemental problem with which our algorithm deals, we start with optimal production levels $x_1, \dots, x_n$ (all integers) for a given sequence of requirements $r_1, \dots, r_n$. We then wish to find optimal production quantities $x'_1, \dots, x'_n$ for the new requirements $r'_1, \dots, r'_n$ where $r'_1 = r_1 + 1$ ($= r_1 - 1$) for some i and $r'_j = r_j$ for $j \neq i$. Our basic result is that there is an integer k ($1 \leq k \leq n$) for which $x'_k = x_k + 1$ ($= x_k - 1$) and $x'_j = x_j$ for $j \neq k$. This means that in

^{1/} This fact is not surprising since several authors [1], [6] have shown that special cases of our model can be formulated as transportation type linear programming problems for which integer solutions exist. (The amounts "shipped" and "received" must be integers, of course, as they would be under our assumptions.) Our problem can also be formulated in this way.

order to find $\{x_j'\}$, it suffices to compute the total cost under each of the n possible production sequences (corresponding to $k=1,2,\dots, n$), and then to choose the cheapest one.

Our approach to more complex problems involves solving a sequence of elemental problems. For example, suppose that we seek optimal production levels $x_1', \dots, x_n'$ for a requirements sequence $r_1', \dots, r_n'$ for which the r_j' are arbitrary integers. We begin by defining a sequence of requirements $r_1, \dots, r_n$ for which there is only one feasible set of production levels $x_1, \dots, x_n$. To illustrate, if disposal of stock is not allowed, we may choose $x_j = r_j = 0$ for all j (provided that this choice is feasible). We then construct a new requirements sequence by adding $+1(-1)$ to any r_j for which $(r_j' - r_j)$ is positive (negative). Next we find an optimal production schedule for the new requirements sequence using the technique described in the preceding paragraph. We then repeat the process after replacing the original r_j by the new requirements. We continue in this way until we find that $r_j' = r_j$ for all j , at which point the original problem is solved. The process must terminate because at each stage we reduce $\sum_{j=1}^n |r_j' - r_j|$ by $+1$.

When the r_j' are all non-negative, one can view the above process as satisfying each unit of requirements in turn as cheaply as possible. The special case of this procedure in which requirements must be satisfied in order of their due dates is shown by Johnson [2] to be optimal for the special case of our problem in which no backlogging is allowed, no storage limits are permitted, and the inventory carrying costs are linear.

The parametric programming procedure that we have described above involves only changes in the requirements. In section 4 we develop a generalized procedure in which changes in ^{the} production and storage limits are allowed as well.

Alternative procedures for solving the problem considered by Johnson are offered in [4], [5], and [8]. In [9] a generalization of Johnson's procedure is shown to be applicable where the price received for each unit of product sold depends on the quantity sold.^{1/} A dynamic programming procedure that solves the general problem in this paper and that neatly exploits the convexity assumptions is given in [4]. References to earlier work will be found in [1], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9].

We outline the plan of this paper. The problem is formulated in section 2. We establish certain fundamental inequalities in section 3. In section 4 we develop computational procedures for finding optimal production levels.

2. Formulation of the Problem

Let y_0 be a given constant and let

$$(1) \quad y_1 = \sum_{j=1}^1 (x_j - r_j) + y_0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

We interpret $|y_1|$ as the total amount of stock on hand at the end of period 1 when $y_1 \geq 0$, and as the total amount of backlogged requirements at that time when $y_1 < 0$. We are implicitly assuming

^{1/} Actually our model provides for this possibility by allowing disposal of stock. We omit a discussion of this point, however.

that it is not possible to end a period with both a positive inventory and a positive amount of backlogged requirements. Similar remarks apply to production and disposal in a given period.

There are given upper and lower bounds, $\bar{y}_i$ and $\underline{y}_i (\leq \bar{y}_i)$ on y_i , i.e.,

$$(2) \quad \underline{y}_i \leq y_i \leq \bar{y}_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1.$$

Observe that by choosing $\underline{y}_i = 0$ for all i that we eliminate all backlogging. We may also allow minimum inventory levels (e.g., as a hedge against uncertainty) by letting $\underline{y}_i$ be positive.

We suppose that

$$(3) \quad \underline{x}_i \leq x_i \leq \bar{x}_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

where the $\bar{x}_i$ and $\underline{x}_i$ ($\underline{x}_i \leq \bar{x}_i$) are given constants. The presence of minimal production levels enables us to study the effect of different guaranteed employment policies.

Let $g(x, r)$ be the total cost associated with the production schedule $x = (x_i)$ and requirements schedule $r = (r_i)$.^{1/} We assume that g can be written in the form

$$(4) \quad g(x, r) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(x_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} h_i(y_i)$$

^{1/} We write $z = (z_i)$ to mean that z is a vector whose i^{th} coordinate is z_i .

where c_i and h_i are convex and continuous on the intervals $[\underline{x}_i, \bar{x}_i]$ and $[\underline{y}_i, \bar{y}_i]$ respectively. In applications $c_i(x_i)$ is the cost in period i of producing x_i units if $x_i \geq 0$ and of disposing of $-x_i$ units if $x_i < 0$; $h_i(y_i)$ is the cost in period i of carrying y_i units in inventory if $y_i \geq 0$ and of backlogging $-y_i$ units if $y_i < 0$.

There is no loss of generality in assuming that $y_0 = 0$ since, by virtue of (1), (2), and (4), we may replace r_1 by $(r_1 - y_0)$. This substitution could lead to a negative value of r_1 - a possibility that we do not rule out. Indeed we permit any of the r_i to be negative.

Our final assumption is that

$$(5) \quad y_n = 0,$$

which states that we must end period n with no inventory or backlog.

It is convenient to let $\bar{x} = (\bar{x}_i)$, $\underline{x} = (\underline{x}_i)$, $\bar{y} = (\bar{y}_i)$, $\underline{y} = (\underline{y}_i)$, and $p = (-r, \bar{x}, \underline{x}, \bar{y}, \underline{y})$. We call p a parameter set.

In the sequel we shall say that the production schedule x is feasible for the parameter set p (or briefly, x is feasible for p) if the restrictions (1), (2), (3), and (5) are satisfied. If x minimizes (4) subject to the above constraints, we say that x is optimal for p . Finally, we say that p is feasible if there is an x that is feasible for p .

Since the collection of feasible production schedules is compact whenever p is feasible, and since g is continuous, there exists an optimal x whenever p is feasible.

In certain situations it is desirable to drop the assumption (5). When this is the case we shall suppose that there are given limits y_n and $\bar{y}_n$ on the inventory level at the end of period n . We can then imbed the original n -period problem in an $(n+1)$ -period problem in which (5) does hold without loss of optimality.

In the extended problem we put $r_{n+1} = \bar{y}_n$, $\bar{x}_{n+1} = \bar{y}_n - y_n$, $x_{n+1} = 0$, and let $c_{n+1}(z) = 0$ and $h_{n+1}(z) = 0$ for all z . Denote by x any feasible production schedule for the n -period model in which (5) is not imposed. Then in order for the schedule $\tilde{x} = (x, x_{n+1})$ to be feasible for the $(n+1)$ -period model in which (5) does hold, we must have

$$0 = y_{n+1} = y_n + x_{n+1} - r_{n+1}$$

by (1). Hence, $x_{n+1} = r_{n+1} - y_n$. This uniquely defined value of x_{n+1} also satisfies (3) for $i = n+1$ by virtue of the definition of the parameters for period $n+1$.

We now show that x^* is an optimal schedule for the n -period model in which (5) need not hold if and only if $\tilde{x}^* = (x^*, x_{n+1}^*)$ is optimal for the $(n+1)$ -period model with (5) holding. First suppose that x^* is optimal for the n -period model and that $\tilde{x} = (x, x_{n+1})$ is any feasible schedule for the $(n+1)$ -period model with requirements schedule $\tilde{r} = (r, r_{n+1})$. Then x is feasible for the n -period model. Also $g(\tilde{x}, \tilde{r}) = g(x, r) \geq g(x^*, r) = g(\tilde{x}^*, \tilde{r})$, which was to be shown. Now suppose that $\tilde{x}^*$ is optimal for the $(n+1)$ -period model. Then $g(x, r) = g(\tilde{x}, \tilde{r}) \geq g(\tilde{x}^*, \tilde{r}) = g(x^*, r)$, which completes the proof.

The above remarks enable us to confine our discussion in the sequel to situations in which (5) holds.

3. The Fundamental Inequalities

In this section we establish two important inequalities that relate the difference between two parameter sets to the difference between the corresponding optimal production schedules. In order to state the first result it is convenient to introduce a definition. Let $z = (z_i)$ be an $(n-1)$ coordinate vector of real numbers. Let $m(z)$ be the corresponding n coordinate vector of real numbers whose i^{th} ($1 \leq i < n$) coordinate is $\max_{j \geq i} z_j$ and whose n^{th} coordinate is zero.

Theorem 1

Suppose that $p = (-r, \bar{x}, \underline{x}, \bar{y}, \underline{y})$ and $p' = (-r', \bar{x}', \underline{x}', \bar{y}', \underline{y}')$ are feasible parameter sets and that $p' \leq p$. ^{1/} If $x(x')$ is optimal for $p(p')$, then there is an $x'(x)$ that is optimal for $p'(p)$ and that satisfies

$$(6) \quad (x' - x) \geq -(\bar{x} - \bar{x}') - (\underline{x} - \underline{x}') - m(\bar{y} - \bar{y}') - m(\underline{y} - \underline{y}').$$

Before proving the theorem we note briefly some of its implications. Observe that if p and p' coincide except that $r' \geq r$, then (6)

^{1/} Let $v = (v_i)$ and $w = (w_i)$ be vectors of real numbers. We say that $v \geq w$ if $v_i \geq w_i$ for all i .

states that $x' \geq x$.^{1/} On the other hand if p and p' are identical except that $\bar{x}_1' < \bar{x}_1$ for some i , then (6) states that $x_j' \geq x_j$ for $j \neq i$ and $x_i' \geq x_i - (\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_1')$. Finally, if p and p' differ only in that $\bar{y}_1' < \bar{y}_1$ for some i , then (6) states that $x_j' \geq x_j - (\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_1')$ for $j \leq i$ and $x_j' \geq x_j$ for $j > i$.

We remark that the inequality (6) can be sharpened at the expense of complicating its statement. The simpler treatment is adequate for our purposes, however.

Proof:

It is convenient to let $y = (y_i)$ and $z = x - (\bar{x} - \bar{x}') - (x - x') - m(\bar{y} - \bar{y}') - m(y - y')$.

We prove only the first part of the theorem, i.e., if x is optimal for p , etc. (The proof of the second part is similar and will not be detailed.) We do so by showing that for any schedule x^* that is feasible for p' and that does not satisfy $x^* \geq z$, there is an alternative schedule x' such that

^{1/}

This special case of theorem 1 was motivated in part by theorem 2', p. 245 in [3], which applies to a generalization of our problem in which the requirements in each period are random variables. Theorem 2' in [3] is not as strong as our theorem 1 for the case of deterministic requirements. In our notation theorem 2' asserts only that $x_1' \geq x_1$. In theorem 2 of this paper we shall show that the inequality $x_1' \geq x_1$ holds under the weaker condition that $R_1' \geq R_1$ for all i .

- (i) x' is feasible for p' ;
- (ii) $g(x', r') \leq g(x^*, r')$;
- (iii) $(x' - x, x' - z, y' - y)$ has one (or more) fewer non-zero coordinates than $(x^* - x, x^* - z, y^* - y)$. ^{1/}

Assuming for the moment the truth of the above result, observe that either $x' \geq z$ or, upon replacing x^* by x' , that it is possible to construct a new x' having the properties (i), (ii), (iii). Since at each repetition of this procedure we either terminate by finding an x' satisfying (i) and (ii) and having the property that $x' \geq z$, or we reduce the number of non-zero coordinates of $(x' - x, x' - z, y' - y)$ by one, we must terminate in at most $3n-1$ steps. To complete the proof of the first assertion of the theorem, it is sufficient to observe that if x^* is optimal for p' , the x' that is obtained at the termination of the above process satisfies the conclusions of the theorem.

It remains to describe a procedure for constructing a schedule x' with the properties (i), (ii), (iii). Since $x^* \not\geq z$, there exists an i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, for which $x_i^* < z_i$. It is convenient now to consider two cases, $y_{i-1}^* \leq y_{i-1}$ and $y_{i-1}^* > y_{i-1}$.

^{1/}

In order to conserve space we have not stated explicitly that y^* is the vector of inventories associated with x^* and r' because the notation makes this fact evident. For the same reason we shall subsequently refer to y_i^* without identifying it as the i th coordinate of y^* . We shall follow a similar practice hereafter when no ambiguity will result.

Case 1: $y_{i-1}^* \leq y_{i-1}$

Let j be the smallest integer greater than i for which $x_j^* > x_j$. Such an integer must exist for if not

$$y_n^* = y_{i-1}^* + \sum_{t=1}^n (x_t^* - r_t') < y_{i-1} + \sum_{t=1}^n (x_t - r_t) = y_n = 0$$

which contradicts (5). The inequality follows from the fact that $y_{i-1}^* \leq y_{i-1}$; $x_1^* < z_1 \leq x_1$; $x_t^* \leq x_t$ for $t = i+1, i+2, \dots, n$; and $r_t' \geq r_t$ for all i .

Let $\epsilon = \min(z_1 - x_1^*, x_j^* - x_j)$. It follows from the preceding discussion that $\epsilon > 0$. In addition, as we now show,

$$(7) \quad x_1 - x_1^* \geq \epsilon; y_t - y_t^* \geq \epsilon \text{ for } t = i+1, \dots, j-1; \text{ and } x_j^* - x_j \geq \epsilon.$$

The first and last inequalities follow from the definition of ϵ . The intermediate inequalities follow from the first inequality and

$$(8) \quad y_t - y_t^* = y_{i-1} - y_{i-1}^* - \sum_{k=1}^t (r_k - r_k') + \sum_{k=1}^t (x_k - x_k^*) \geq x_1 - x_1^*.$$

Now define an alternative production schedule x' by $x' = x^* + \epsilon(u_1 - u_j)$, where u_k is the k^{th} coordinate unit vector, i.e., the k^{th} coordinate of u_k is +1 and all other coordinates are zero. We show that x' is feasible for p' as follows. Using (6), (8), the definition of ϵ , the hypotheses of the theorem, and the feasibility of x and x^* respectively for p and p' , we have

$$(9) \quad \underline{x}_1' \leq x_1^* < x_1^* + \epsilon = x_1' \leq z_1 \leq x_1 - (\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_1') \leq \bar{x}_1'$$

and

$$\underline{x}_j' \leq \underline{x}_j \leq x_j \leq x_j^* - \epsilon = x_j' < x_j^* \leq \bar{x}_j'.$$

Thus since $x_t' = x_t^*$ for $t \neq 1, j$, x' satisfies (3). Also for $1 \leq t < j$,

$$\begin{aligned} y_t' &\leq y_t^* < y_t^* + \epsilon = y_t' \leq y_t + x_1^* - x_1 + \epsilon \\ &\leq y_t + x_1^* - z_1 - (\bar{y}_t - \bar{y}_t') + \epsilon \\ &\leq x_1^* - z_1 + \bar{y}_t' + \epsilon \leq \bar{y}_t'. \end{aligned}$$

For all other t , $y_t' = y_t^*$, so that x' satisfies (2) and (5).

Thus x' satisfies (1).

In the following we denote by $D^+f(x)$ and $D^-f(x)$ respectively the right and left hand derivatives of a function f at the point x . When the function is convex, as will be the case in the succeeding discussion, we may be assured that the right and left hand derivatives exist.

Using the convexity of c_t and h_t and (7) we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(x^*, r') - g(x', r') &= c_1(x_1^*) - c_1(x_1^* + \epsilon) \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} [h_k(y_k^*) - h_k(y_k^* + \epsilon)] + c_j(x_j^*) - c_j(x_j^* - \epsilon) \\ &\geq \epsilon [-D^-c_1(x_1^* + \epsilon) - \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} D^-h_k(y_k^* + \epsilon) + D^+c_j(x_j^* - \epsilon)] \\ &\geq \epsilon [-D^-c_1(x_1) - \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} D^-h_k(y_k) + D^+c_j(x_j)] . \end{aligned}$$

In view of this inequality we may establish property (ii) by showing that

$$(10) \quad -D^-c_1(x_1) - \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} D^-h_k(y_k) + D^+c_j(x_j) \geq 0.$$

To prove (10) we show first that the schedule $x(\delta) = x - \delta(u_1 - u_j)$ is feasible for p provided that $0 \leq \delta \leq \epsilon$. Assuming for the moment that we have done this, we note that x is optimal for p and therefore that

$$\frac{g(x(\delta), r) - g(x, r)}{\delta} \geq 0 \text{ for } 0 < \delta \leq \epsilon.$$

Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$, the above inequality becomes (10).

It remains to establish the feasibility of $x(\delta)$. Using (6), (8), (9), the definition of ϵ , the hypotheses of the theorem, and the feasibility of x and x^* respectively for p and p' , we have

$$\bar{x}_1 \leq x_1 - z_1 + x_1' \leq x_1 - \epsilon \leq x_1(\delta) \leq x_1 \leq \bar{x}_1$$

and

$$\bar{x}_j \leq x_j \leq x_j(\delta) \leq x_j + \epsilon \leq x_j^* \leq \bar{x}_j' \leq \bar{x}_j.$$

Also for $1 \leq t < j$,

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &\leq y_t' - z_1 + x_1 \leq y_t' - z_1 + y_t - y_t^* + x_1^* \\ &\leq y_t - z_1 + x_1^* \leq y_t - \epsilon \leq y_t(\delta) \leq y_t \leq \bar{y}_t. \end{aligned}$$

For $t \neq i, j$, $x_t(\delta) = x_t$ and for $t < i$ and $t \geq j$, $y_t(\delta) = y_t$, so that $x(\delta)$ is feasible for p as claimed.

To establish (iii) we observe from the definition of ϵ that all but the i^{th} and j^{th} coordinates of $(x'-x)$ and (x^*-x) , and of $(x'-z)$ and (x^*-z) are identical. Also all but the i^{th} through the $(j-1)^{\text{th}}$ coordinates of $(y'-y)$ and (y^*-y) are the same. On the other hand the i^{th} and j^{th} coordinates of (x^*-x) and (x^*-z) , and the i^{th} through the $(j-1)^{\text{th}}$ coordinates of (y^*-y) are all non-zero. But at least one of these coordinates in $(x'-x)$, $(x'-z)$, or $(y'-y)$ is zero, which proves (iii).

Case 2: $y_{i-1}^* > y_{i-1}$

Let j be the largest integer less than i for which $x_j^* > x_j$. Such an integer must exist for otherwise

$$y_{i-1}^* = \sum_{t=1}^{i-1} (x_t^* - r_t') \leq \sum_{t=1}^{i-1} (x_t - r_t) = y_{i-1}$$

if $i \geq 2$ and $y_0^* = y_0 = 0$ if $i = 1$, which is a contradiction.

Let $\epsilon = \min(z_i - x_i^*, x_j^* - x_j, y_{i-1}^* - y_{i-1})$. Clearly $\epsilon > 0$. In addition

$$(11) \quad x_j^* - x_j \geq \epsilon; \quad y_t^* - y_t \geq \epsilon \quad \text{for } j \leq t \leq i-1; \quad x_i - x_i^* \geq \epsilon.$$

The first and last inequalities follow from the definition of ϵ . It remains only to observe that for $j \leq t \leq i-1$,

$$y_t^* - y_t = y_{i-1}^* - y_{i-1} - \sum_{k=t+1}^{i-1} (x_k^* - x_k) + \sum_{k=t+1}^{i-1} (r_k' - r_k) \geq y_{i-1}^* - y_{i-1} \geq \epsilon$$

which establishes (11).

We define an alternative schedule x' for p' by $x' = x^* + \epsilon(u_1 - u_j)$. The proof that x' satisfies (3) is precisely the same as for case 1. Now for $j \leq t < i$, we have using (11), the hypotheses of the theorem, and the feasibility of x and x^* respectively for p and p' that

$$y_t^i \leq y_t \leq y_t^* - \epsilon = y_t^i < y_t^* \leq \bar{y}_t^i,$$

while for all other t , $y_t^* = y_t^i$, so that x' satisfies (2) and (5).

Thus property (1) is established.

If we now employ (11) and the convexity of the c_t and h_t , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} g(x^*, r') - g(x', r') &= c_j(x_j^*) - c_j(x_j^* - \epsilon) \\ &+ \sum_{k=j}^{i-1} [h_k(y_k^*) - h_k(y_k^* - \epsilon)] + c_1(x_1^*) - c_1(x_1^* + \epsilon) \\ &\geq \epsilon [D^+ c_j(x_j^* - \epsilon) + \sum_{k=j}^{i-1} D^+ h_k(y_k^* - \epsilon) - D^- c_1(x_1^* + \epsilon)] \\ &\geq \epsilon [D^+ c_j(x_j) + \sum_{k=j}^{i-1} D^+ h_k(y_k) - D^- c_1(x_1)] . \end{aligned}$$

In order to verify property (11) it therefore suffices to show that

$$(12) \quad D^+ c_j(x_j) + \sum_{k=j}^{i-1} D^+ h_k(y_k) - D^- c_1(x_1) \geq 0 .$$

Let $x(\delta) = x - \delta(u_1 - u_j)$. We show that $x(\delta)$ is feasible for p provided that $0 \leq \delta \leq \epsilon$. The fact that $x(\delta)$ satisfies (3) follows

from the same argument used in case 1. For $j \leq t < i$, we have from (11), the hypotheses of the theorem, and the feasibility of x and x^* respectively for p and p' that

$$\bar{y}_t \leq y_t \leq y_t(\delta) \leq y_t^* \leq \bar{y}_t' \leq \bar{y}_t, \quad ,$$

and $y_t(\delta) = y_t$ for all other t . Thus, $x(\delta)$ is feasible for p .

Since x is optimal for p ,

$$\frac{g(x(\delta), r) - g(x, r)}{\delta} \geq 0 \quad \text{for } 0 < \delta \leq \epsilon.$$

Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$, we obtain (12).

The proof that x' satisfies (iii) is exactly the same as for case 1 upon interchanging the roles of i and j . This completes the proof.

In order to state and prove our next theorem it will be convenient to introduce notation for the cumulative production and requirements schedules associated respectively with the production and requirements schedules x and r . In particular let

$$X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) \quad \text{and} \quad R = (R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n).$$

Theorem 2

Suppose that $p \equiv (-r, \bar{x}, \underline{x}, \bar{y}, \underline{y})$ and $p' \equiv (-r', \bar{x}, \underline{x}, \bar{y}, \underline{y})$ are feasible parameter sets and that $R' \geq R$. If $x(x')$ is optimal for $p(p')$, then there is an $x'(x)$ that is optimal for $p'(p)$ and that satisfies $X' \geq X$.

Proof:

The proof of the first assertion in the theorem (i.e., if x is optimal for p , etc.) consists in showing that for any schedule x^* that is feasible for p' and for which $X^* \not\geq X$, there is an alternative schedule x' that has the properties (i), (ii), (iii) (let $z = x$ in (iii)) given in the proof of theorem 1. Once this construction is justified, the first assertion of the theorem follows from an obvious adaptation of the corresponding part of the proof of theorem 1. It remains, therefore, to develop a procedure for constructing a schedule x' with the properties (i), (ii), (iii).

Since $X^* \not\geq X$, there is an integer i for which $X_i^* < X_i$. Let i be the smallest such integer. Denote by j the smallest integer greater than i for which $X_j^* \geq X_j$. The integer j exists because by (5)

$$X_n^* - X_n = R_n' - R_n \geq 0.$$

Let $\epsilon = \min[x_i - x_i^*, x_j^* - x_j, \min_{1 \leq k < j} (y_k - y_k^*)]$. We have $\epsilon > 0$ since

$$x_i - x_i^* = (X_i - X_{i-1}) - (X_i^* - X_{i-1}^*) > 0$$

$$x_j^* - x_j = (X_j^* - X_{j-1}^*) - (X_j - X_{j-1}) > 0 \text{ and}$$

$$y_k - y_k^* = (X_k - R_k) - (X_k^* - R_k') > 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k < j.$$

Now define the alternative schedule x' for p' by $x' = x^* + \epsilon(u_i - u_j)$. Thus $y_k' = y_k^* + \epsilon$ for $k = 1, i+1, \dots, j-1$ and $y_k' = y_k^*$ otherwise. Using these calculations it follows easily that x' satisfies (i).

It is now possible to show that (ii) and (iii) hold using precisely the same argument as that used to establish the same properties in case 1 of the proof of theorem 1. This completes the proof of the first assertion of the theorem. The proof of the second assertion of the theorem follows in a similar manner.

4. A Parametric Programming Procedure

Theorem 1 plays a central role in this section in the development of procedures for finding optimal production schedules. Our techniques are especially useful when we seek optimal production schedules for several different parameter sets. This is because we use the information gained in determining an optimal production schedule for one parameter set in an efficient way to reduce the computations needed to find an optimal production schedule for a different parameter set.

In order to simplify the exposition in this section, it is convenient to impose the following assumption:

P: $c_1(x_1)$ and $h_1(y_1)$ are each piecewise-linear functions with the endpoints of each of the intervals on which the functions have linear segments being integers also.

The basic result on which the computational procedures of this section rest is

Theorem 3

Suppose that $p = (-r, \bar{x}, \underline{x}, \bar{y}, \underline{y})$ and $p' = (-r', \bar{x}', \underline{x}', \bar{y}', \underline{y}')$ are feasible parameter sets with integral coordinates, that $(p-p')$ is

a unit vector, that P holds, and that $x(x')$ has integral coordinates and is optimal for $p(p')$.

(a) If $(\bar{y}', y') = (\bar{y}, y)$, then there is an $x'(x)$ that is optimal for $p'(p)$ and that has the property that $(x'-x) + (\bar{x}-\bar{x}') + (\underline{x}-\underline{x}')$ is a unit vector.

(b) If $(\bar{y}-\bar{y}') + (y-y') = u_k$ for some k , then there is an $x'(x)$ that is optimal for $p'(p)$ and for which either $(x'-x) = u_j - u_1$ for some $1 \leq k < j$, or $(x'-x) = 0$. ^{1/}

We defer the proof of the theorem briefly in order to explore some of its implications. The value of part (a) is that when we are given an x that is optimal for p , we can find an x' that is optimal for p' (where the upper and lower bounds on inventory levels are unchanged) by considering only the n production schedules obtained by separately adding each of the n unit vectors to $x - (\bar{x} - \bar{x}') - (\underline{x} - \underline{x}')$. On the other hand if we are told that x' is optimal for p' , part (a) assures us that we need compare only the n production schedules obtained by separately subtracting each of the n unit vectors from $x' + (\bar{x} - \bar{x}') + (\underline{x} - \underline{x}')$.

Example 1:

If $x = (3, 0, 1)$ is optimal for p where $r = (-2, 6, 0)$, $\bar{x} = (3, 3, 3)$, $\underline{x} = 0$, $\bar{y} = (5, 7)$, and $y = (0, -2)$, and if p' is such that $r' = (-1, 6, 0)$ and $(\bar{x}', \underline{x}', \bar{y}', y') = (\bar{x}, \underline{x}, \bar{y}, y)$, then one of the three production

^{1/}

In this part u_k has $n-1$ coordinates while u_1 and u_j have n coordinates.

schedules $(4,0,1)$, $(3,1,1)$, $(3,0,2)$ is optimal for p' . In order to find which one is optimal we first eliminate the infeasible schedule(s) - in this case $(4,0,1)$ - and then compute the cost associated with each of the remaining schedules.

Example 2:

Suppose in example 1 that we let p be defined as before and let $\underline{x}' = (0,1,0)$ and $(-r', \bar{x}', \bar{y}', \underline{y}') = (-r, \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \underline{y})$. (Observe that these definitions require us to interchange the roles of p and p' since $(p'-p)$ is a unit vector.) Then one of the three production schedules $(2,1,1)$, $(3,0,1)$ $(3,1,0)$ is optimal for p' . Of these schedules, only the second is infeasible.

Part (b) of the theorem states in part that if we have at hand an x that is optimal for p , if one of the upper or lower limits on inventory is reduced, and if none of the other parameters is changed, then we can find an x' that is optimal for p' by comparing the $k(n-k)$ schedules $x + u_j - u_i$, $i \leq k < j$, and the schedule x . This comparison is almost as easy to perform as that in part (a), even though superficially the number of comparisons may seem to be as high as $\frac{n^2}{4} - 1$ (when $k = n/2$) rather than $n-1$ as in part (a). The reason for this is that the optimal values of i and j may be chosen independently. This is because whatever the choice of i and j , the inventory on hand at the end of period k is $y_k - 1$ when $x + u_j - u_i$ is the production schedule. The first k periods and the last $n-k$ periods can therefore be thought of as two separate sub-problems for the purposes of this computation. Similar remarks apply when we are given an x' that is optimal for p' .

To summarize, theorem 3 provides a simple procedure for finding an optimal x' for p' once we are given an optimal x for p provided that $\pm(p-p')$ is a unit vector. The procedure generalizes easily to situations in which $\pm(p-p')$ is not a unit vector but where the other hypotheses of the theorem are retained. The technique is to successively add and subtract unit vectors from p until p' is obtained. Optimal schedules are found in order for each intermediate parameter set using theorem 3. Formally, denote by $p^1, p^2, \dots, p^{m-1}$ the sequence of intermediate parameter sets produced in the process of successively modifying p by adding and subtracting unit vectors. Upon letting $p^0 = p$ and $p^m = p'$, we see that each $p^i (1 \leq i \leq m)$ is obtained by adding to or subtracting from p^{i-1} a suitable unit vector. ^{1/}

If we have at hand an x^0 that has integral coordinates and that is optimal for $p^0 (=p)$, we can determine in order of sequence $x^1, x^2, \dots, x^m$ of optimal production schedules for $p^1, p^2, \dots, p^m$ respectively. Each $x^i (1 \leq i \leq m)$ is formed from x^{i-1} by applying the appropriate part of theorem 3.

^{1/} The choice of the p^1 is essentially arbitrary. Thus, if optimal production schedules are needed for several parameter sets, it may be desirable to define the sequence $\{p^i\}$ so as to include these sets. This may necessitate adding and subtracting the same unit vector in the course of the computations. This creates no difficulties but does increase the number of intermediate parameter sets and hence the amount of computation. For a sequence $\{p^i\}$ in which no unit vector is both added and subtracted, the number of intermediate parameter sets will be

$$m-1 = \sum_{i=1}^n |p_i^1 - p_i| - 1.$$

Two questions remain unanswered by the above discussion. First, how can we find a p^0 for which an optimal x^0 is easily determined? Second, what can be done if we find an intermediate parameter set p^1 , say, that is infeasible?

We defer discussion of the second question until after we have proved theorem 3. One answer to the first question is to define p^0 so that only one feasible production schedule exists. That schedule is necessarily optimal and provides a starting point for the computations. Two illustrations of this idea are given below. Let

$$\bar{x}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^1 \bar{x}_j \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{x}_1 = \sum_{j=1}^1 \underline{x}_j .$$

Start 1:

Suppose that $x^0 \geq 0$ is an arbitrary production schedule with integral coordinates for which $x_n^0 = R_n'$. In many cases it will be natural to let x^0 be a "good guess" at an optimal solution. If we choose $\underline{x}^0 = x^0 = \bar{x}^0$, $r^0 = r'$, $\bar{y}_1^0 = \max(\bar{y}_1', y_1^0)$ and $y_1^0 = \min(\underline{y}_1', y_1^0)$ for all i , then x^0 is the only feasible production schedule for $p^0 = (-r^0, \bar{x}^0, \underline{x}^0, \bar{y}^0, y^0)$.

Start 2:

Suppose that $x^0 = \underline{x}'(\bar{x}')$ and that r^0 is such that $r^0 \leq r' (r^0 \geq r')$ and $R_n^0 = X_n'(\bar{x}_n')$. Let $\bar{x}^0 = \bar{x}'(\underline{x}^0 = \underline{x}')$, $\bar{y}_1^0 = \max(\bar{y}_1', y_1^0)$ and $y_1^0 = \min(\underline{y}_1', y_1^0)$ for all i . Again x^0 is feasible and no other schedules have this property.

The above starting points are intended to be suggestive and naturally do not exhaust all the possibilities. For example, an obvious counterpart of start 1 is to set $\underline{y}^0 = \bar{y}^0 = \bar{\bar{y}}^0$.

We now give a

Proof of theorem 3-part a:

We consider only the case where an optimal x is given for p . The proof of the other case is similar and is therefore omitted.

By the first assertion of theorem 1 - and this is the key point - there is an x' that is optimal for p' and that satisfies $x' \geq z$, where $z = x - (\bar{x} - \underline{x}') - (\underline{x} - \underline{x}')$. The remainder of the proof consists in showing that $g(x', r')$ is linear in x' for all feasible x' for which $x' \geq z$. The theorem follows easily from this fact.

It is convenient to let $Z_i = \sum_{j=1}^1 z_j$ for all i . We show that

$$(13) \quad R'_n = Z_n + 1.$$

There are two cases, $r' > r$ and $r' = r$. In the former event

$$R'_n = R_n + 1 = X_n + 1 = Z_n + 1.$$

In the latter case

$$R'_n = R_n = X_n = Z_n + 1.$$

In view of (2), (3), (13), and the fact that $x' \geq z$, we have

$$(14) \quad \max(\underline{x}'_i, z_i) \leq x'_i \leq \min(\bar{x}'_i, z_i + 1) \quad \text{for } i=1, 2, \dots, n$$

and

$$(15) \quad \max(\bar{y}_i, Z_i - R_i') \leq X_i' - R_i' \leq \min(\bar{y}_i, Z_i - R_i' + 1) \quad \text{for } i=1, 2, \dots, n-1.$$

Since p , p' , and x have integral coordinates, the upper and lower limits in (14) are integers, and they differ at most by one. A similar remark is applicable to (15). Hence by P , there are numbers $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n$ such that

$$g(x', r') = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i'$$

for all feasible $x' \geq z$. Denote by S the set of all indices i for which there is a feasible $x' \geq z$ with $x_i' > z_i$. For these i , $x' = z + u_i$ is also feasible. The set S is not empty, because otherwise no feasible x' would exist by theorem 1, contradicting an hypothesis of theorem 3. Now let i be an integer in S for which a_i is a minimum. Clearly $x' = z + u_i$ is then optimal, which proves part (a).

Before proving part (b) we digress to establish a lemma that will enable us to sharpen the results of theorem 1. Consider the problem of finding a vector x^* that minimizes a convex function $f(x)$ subject to the constraints

$$(16) \quad a_i x \leq b_i, \quad i=1, 2, \dots, n.$$

where the a_i and x are vectors and the b_i are scalars. Let S be the set of indices i for which $a_i x^* < b_i$. Also consider the same problem where we replace the b_i by b_i' , i.e., (16) becomes

$$(17) \quad a_i x \leq b_i', \quad i=1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Lemma 1

(a) If $b'_i = b_i$ for $i \notin S$ and $b'_i \geq a_i x^*$, for $i \in S$, then x^* minimizes $f(x)$ subject to (17).

(b) If $b'_j < b_j$ for some $j \notin S$, and if $b'_i = b_i$ otherwise, then there is an x' that minimizes $f(x)$ subject to (17) for which $a_j x' = b'_j$ (provided that (17) is feasible).

(c) If $b'_j > b_j$ for some $j \notin S$ and if $b'_i = b_i$ otherwise, then there is an x' that minimizes $f(x)$ subject to (17) for which $b_j \leq a_j x' \leq b'_j$.

Proof:

We begin with part (a). Suppose the contrary, that is x' satisfies (17) and $f(x') < f(x^*)$. Since x^* satisfies (17), so does $x'' = \alpha x' + (1-\alpha)x^*$ for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. Denote by B the set of indices i for which $a_i x' > b_i$. Clearly B is not empty for otherwise x^* could not minimize $f(x)$ subject to (16). Let

$$\alpha = \min_{i \in B} \frac{b_i - a_i x^*}{a_i (x' - x^*)}.$$

Observe that $0 < \alpha < 1$. Also for $i \notin B$,

$$a_i x'' = \alpha a_i x' + (1-\alpha) a_i x^* \leq \alpha b_i + (1-\alpha) b_i = b_i$$

and for $i \in B$

$$\begin{aligned} a_i x'' &= \alpha a_i x' + (1-\alpha) a_i x^* = \alpha a_i (x' - x^*) + a_i x^* \\ &\leq (b_i - a_i x^*) + (a_i x^*) = b_i. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore x'' satisfies (16) and

$$f(x'') \leq \alpha f(x') + (1-\alpha)f(x^*) < \alpha f(x^*) + (1-\alpha)f(x^*) = f(x^*),$$

which contradicts the optimality of x^* .

We also prove part (b) by contradiction. Thus suppose that x' minimizes $f(x)$ subject to (17), that $a_j x' < b'_j$, and that $f(x') < f(x)$ for all x satisfying (17) for which $a_j x = b'_j$. Let

$$x'' = \alpha x' + (1-\alpha)x^* \text{ where } \alpha = \frac{b_j - b'_j}{b_j - a_j x'}.$$

Clearly $a_j x'' = b'_j$ and $a_i x'' \leq b'_i$ for $i \neq j$. Also $f(x') \geq f(x^*)$. Therefore

$$f(x'') \leq \alpha f(x') + (1-\alpha)f(x^*) \leq f(x')$$

which is a contradiction. This completes the proof. The proof of part (c) is similar and is omitted.

As an example of the way in which part (a) of the lemma can be applied to our problem, suppose that the production schedule x is optimal for p and that, say $\bar{y}_1 < y_1$. Then x is also optimal for all $\bar{y}_1$ for which $\bar{y}_1 \leq y_1$. Analogous remarks apply to variations of $\bar{y}_1$, $\bar{x}_1$, and $\bar{x}_1$. The usefulness of parts (b) and (c) of the lemma will become apparent in our proof of part (b) of theorem 3.

Proof of theorem 3-part b:

As usual, we consider only the case where an optimal x is given for p .

As a preliminary we show that there is an x' that is optimal for p' and that satisfies

$$(18) \quad y'_k \leq y_k$$

and

$$(19) \quad x'_1 \leq x_1 \quad \text{for } i=1,2,\dots,k.$$

The property (18) follows from parts (a) and (b) of lemma 1. As a consequence if $\bar{y}'_k > y_k$, we may instead let $\bar{y}'_k = y_k$ without loss of optimality.

The proof that (19) holds for the revised parameter set consists in showing that for any x^* that is feasible for p' (revised) and for which (19) does not hold, there is an alternative schedule x' that has the properties (i), (ii), (iii) (let $z = x$ in (ii)) given in the proof of theorem 1. Once this construction is justified, (19) follows from an obvious adaptation of the corresponding part of the proof of theorem 1.

Suppose x^* does not satisfy (19). Then there is an integer i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, for which $x^*_i > x_i$. We consider two cases, $y^*_{i-1} < y_{i-1}$ and $y^*_{i-1} \geq y_{i-1}$.

Case 1: $y^*_{i-1} < y_{i-1}$.

Let j be the largest integer smaller than i for which $x^*_j < x_j$. Such an integer must exist for if not

$$y^*_{i-1} = \sum_{t=1}^{i-1} (x^*_t - r_t) \geq \sum_{t=1}^{i-1} (x_t - r_t) = y_{i-1},$$

which is a contradiction.

Let $\epsilon = \min(x_1^* - x_1, y_{i-1} - y_{i-1}^*, x_j - x_j^*)$. Clearly $\epsilon > 0$ and

$$(20) \quad x_1^* - x_1 \geq \epsilon; \quad y_t - y_t^* \geq \epsilon \quad \text{for } t = j, j+1, \dots, i-1 \quad \text{and} \quad x_j - x_j^* \geq \epsilon.$$

Consider the alternative production schedule x' defined by $x' = x^* + \epsilon(u_j - u_1)$. It is easy to show that x' is feasible for p' by using (20) and the feasibility of x and x^* respectively for p and p' .

Now in the usual way

$$\begin{aligned} g(x^*, r) - g(x', r) &= c_j(x_j^*) - c_j(x_j^* + \epsilon) \\ &+ \sum_{t=j}^{i-1} [h_t(y_t^*) - h_t(y_t^* + \epsilon)] + c_1(x_1^*) - c_1(x_1^* - \epsilon) \\ &\geq \epsilon [-D^- c_j(x_j) - \sum_{t=j}^{i-1} D^- h_t(y_t) + D^+ c_1(x_1)] \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The final inequality follows from the fact that for $0 \leq \delta \leq \epsilon$, $x(\delta) = x - \delta(u_j - u_1)$ is feasible for p and $g(x(\delta), r) \geq g(x, r)$.

We have now established properties (i) and (ii). Property (iii) follows using the same argument given in proving theorem 1.

Case 2: $y_{i-1}^* \geq y_{i-1}$

Let j be the smallest integer greater than 1 and not exceeding k for which $x_j^* < x_j$. The integer j exists because if not,

$$y_k^* = y_{i-1}^* + \sum_{t=1}^k (x_t^* - x_t) > y_{i-1} + \sum_{t=1}^k (x_t - x_t) = y_k,$$

which contradicts (18).

Let $\epsilon = \min(x_1^* - x_1, x_j - x_j^*)$. Clearly $\epsilon > 0$ and

$$(21) \quad x_1^* - x_1 \geq \epsilon; \quad y_t^* - y_t \geq \epsilon \quad \text{for } t=1, i+1, \dots, j-1; \text{ and } x_j - x_j^* \geq \epsilon.$$

The alternative schedule $x' = x^* + \epsilon(u_j - u_1)$ is feasible for p' as can be shown using (21). Also

$$\begin{aligned} g(x^*, r) - g(x', r) &= c_1(x_1^*) - c_1(x_1^* - \epsilon) \\ &+ \sum_{t=1}^{j-1} [h_t(y_t^*) - h_t(y_t^* - \epsilon)] + c_j(x_j^*) - c_j(x_j^* + \epsilon) \\ &\geq \epsilon [D^+ c_1(x_1) + \sum_{t=1}^{j-1} D^+ h_t(y_t) - D^- c_j(x_j)] \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The final inequality follows from the fact that for $0 \leq \delta \leq \epsilon$, $x(\delta) = x - \delta(u_j - u_1)$ is feasible for p and $g(x(\delta), r) \geq g(x, r)$. This establishes properties (i) and (ii). Property (iii) follows in the usual way.

Employing theorem 1, lemma 1, (18), and (19), we see that there is an x' with the property that

$$y_{k-1} \leq y'_k \leq y_k$$

and

$$x_{i-1} \leq x'_i \leq x_i \quad \text{for } i=1, 2, \dots, k,$$

and

$$x'_i \geq x_i \quad \text{for } i=k+1, \dots, n.$$

But by the hypotheses of theorem 3, $g(x', r)$ is linear in x' for all x' satisfying the above constraints, i.e., there are numbers $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n$ such that

$$g(x', r) = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x'_i.$$

Let S_1 be the set of indices i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, for which there is a feasible x' with $x'_i < x_i$. Let S_2 be the set of indices j , $k < j \leq n$, for which there is a feasible x' with $x'_j > x_j$. Since there is a feasible x' either S_1 and S_2 are empty, in which case $x' = x$ is feasible for p' , or S_1 and S_2 are non empty.

Now if we fix y'_k at any feasible value between $y_k - 1$ and y_k , we may minimize $g(x', r)$ by finding an integer i in S_1 for which a_i is a maximum and an integer j in S_2 for which a_j is a minimum and letting $x' = x + (y'_k - y_k)(u_j - u_i)$. Then $g(x', r) = g(x, r) + (y'_k - y_k)(a_j - a_i)$. Thus to minimize $g(x', r)$ we let $y'_k = y_k$, i.e., $x' = x$, if $a_j \geq a_i$, and let $y'_k = y_k - 1$, i.e., $x' = x + u_j - u_i$, if $a_j < a_i$. This completes the proof.

An Algorithm for Automatic Computation

We now describe a procedure that starts with an x that is optimal for $p = (-r, \bar{x}, \underline{x}, \bar{y}, \underline{y})$ and that has integral coordinates. The algorithm then proceeds to find an x' that is optimal for $p' = (-r', \bar{x}', \underline{x}', \bar{y}', \underline{y}')$ and that has integral coordinates, or discovers that p' is not feasible. The algorithm involves three phases. In phase 1 the inventory and production constraints are relaxed, one at a time, until an optimal $\tilde{x}$ is found for the corresponding parameter

set $\tilde{p} = (-r, \tilde{x}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{y})$ that has the property that $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \geq (\bar{x}', \bar{y}')$ and $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \leq (x', y')$. No infeasibilities can arise in phase 1. The second phase involves moving r "toward" r' . This is done so that at all times each intermediate requirements schedule $\hat{r}$, say, is such that $\tilde{x}_n - \hat{r}_n \leq 0$. This phase terminates with an $\hat{x}$ that is optimal for $\hat{p} = (-r', \hat{x}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{y})$, provided that $\hat{p}$ is feasible. A discussion of how infeasibilities are dealt with in phase 2 is deferred briefly. The third phase involves tightening the production and inventory constraints until p' is reached. If at any step in this final phase, an infeasible parameter set is found, then p' is not feasible.

We remark that with start 1, phase 2 (and often phase 3) is omitted. On the other hand with start 2, phase 1 (and often phase 3) is not needed.

An important simplification is possible in phases 1 and 3 whenever a production or inventory constraint is not binding. The idea is to take advantage of part (a) of lemma 1. For example if in phase 1 we find an $\tilde{x}$ that is optimal for $\tilde{p} = (-r, \tilde{x}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{y})$ and, say, $\tilde{y}_1 < \tilde{\bar{y}}_1 < \bar{y}'_1$, then we may immediately let $\tilde{\bar{y}}_1 = \bar{y}'_1$ and still be assured that $\tilde{x}$ is optimal for the revised $\tilde{p}$. Similarly, if we find in phase 3 an $\hat{x}$ that is optimal for $\hat{p} = (-r', \hat{x}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{y})$, and, say, $\hat{x}_1 < \hat{x}'_1, x'_1$, then we may immediately let $\hat{x}_1 = \min(\hat{x}'_1, x'_1)$ without disturbing the optimality of $\hat{x}$. These shortcuts avoid numerous applications of theorem 3 and are well worth using.

It remains to develop a means for dealing with infeasibilities in phase 2. In particular suppose that we seek an x that is optimal for $p = (-r, \bar{x}, \underline{x}, \bar{y}, \underline{y})$. We assume that p is feasible and has integral

coordinates, and that P holds. Our approach to solving this problem, hereafter called problem A, is to construct a modified problem, called problem B, in which the parameter set is $\tilde{p} = (-r, \tilde{\underline{x}}, \underline{x}, \tilde{\overline{y}}, \overline{y})$ where $\tilde{\underline{x}}, \tilde{\overline{y}}$, and $\tilde{y}$ are arbitrary but not effective bounds. In problem B the cost function is

$$\tilde{g}(x, r) = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{c}_i(x_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \tilde{h}_i(y_i)$$

where

$$\tilde{c}_i(x_i) = \begin{cases} c_i(x_i) & , \underline{x}_i \leq x_i \leq \overline{x}_i \\ c_i(\overline{x}_i) + M(x_i - \overline{x}_i) & , \overline{x}_i < x_i \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{h}_i(y_i) = \begin{cases} h_i(\underline{y}_i) - M(y_i - \underline{y}_i) & , y_i < \underline{y}_i \\ h_i(y_i) & , \underline{y}_i \leq y_i \leq \overline{y}_i \\ h_i(\overline{y}_i) + M(y_i - \overline{y}_i) & , \overline{y}_i < y_i \end{cases}$$

and M is a large positive constant. Notice that if x is feasible for p , then x is also feasible for $\tilde{p}$; furthermore, $\tilde{g}(x, r) = g(x, r)$.

Let

$$a = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} D^- c_i(\overline{x}_i) ,$$

$$b^- = \max_{1 \leq i < n} D^- h_i(\overline{y}_i), \quad b^+ = \max_{1 \leq i < n} -D^+ h_i(\underline{y}_i) ,$$

$$\overline{c}_i = \max_{\underline{x}_i \leq x_i \leq \overline{x}_i} c_i(x_i), \quad \underline{c}_i = \min_{\underline{x}_i \leq x_i \leq \overline{x}_i} c_i(x_i) ,$$

$$\overline{h}_i = \max_{\underline{y}_i \leq y_i \leq \overline{y}_i} h_i(y_i), \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{h}_i = \min_{\underline{y}_i \leq y_i \leq \overline{y}_i} h_i(y_i) .$$

Let M be any number for which $(\bar{h}_n = \underline{h}_n = 0)$

$$M > \max \{a, b^-, b^+, \sum_{i=1}^n [\bar{c}_i + \bar{h}_i - \underline{c}_i - \underline{h}_i]\} .$$

Since M is greater than a, b^-, b^+ , the $\tilde{c}_i$ and $\tilde{h}_i$ are convex functions. Hence, the modified cost functions satisfy P .

It follows from theorem 3 and the discussion thereafter that there exists an x that has integral coordinates and that is optimal for problem B. We now show that either x is feasible (and hence optimal) for problem A or that problem A has no feasible production schedule.

The proof is by contradiction. Suppose that x is not feasible for problem A, but that x^* (say) is feasible for that problem. Then for some i , $y_i \geq \bar{y}_i + 1$, $y_i \leq \underline{y}_i - 1$, or $x_i \geq \bar{x}_i + 1$ since the $y_i, \underline{y}_i, \bar{y}_i, x_i$, and $\bar{x}_i$ are integers. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}(x, r) &\geq M + \sum_{i=1}^n (\underline{c}_i + \underline{h}_i) > \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{c}_i + \bar{h}_i) \\ &\geq g(x^*, r) = \tilde{g}(x^*, r) \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the optimality of x for problem B. The proof is complete.

In carrying out the computations, it is not necessary to know a suitable value of M . Instead, when a collection of new schedules is examined, as in applying theorem 3, one proceeds as follows. First locate the "least infeasible" schedules in the class being examined, i.e., the schedules for which the sum of the amounts by which the x_i and y_i respectively exceed the $\bar{x}_i$ and $\bar{y}_i$, and the amount by which the y_i fall below the $\underline{y}_i$, is minimal. Then, letting $M = 0$, choose a minimal cost schedule from among those located using $\tilde{g}$ as the cost function.

References

1. Bowman, E. H., "Production Scheduling by the Transportation Method of Linear Programming", Operations Research, Vol. 4, No. 1 (February, 1956), 100-103.
2. Johnson, S. M., "Sequential Production Planning Over Time at Minimum Cost", Management Science, Vol. 3, No. 4 (July, 1957), 435-437.
3. Karlin, S., "Dynamic Inventory Policy with Varying Stochastic Demands", Management Science, Vol. 6, No. 3 (April, 1960), 231-258.
4. Karush, W., "On a Class of Minimum Cost Problems", Management Science, Vol. 4, No. 2 (January, 1958), 136-155.
5. Klein, M., "Some Production Planning Problems", Naval Research Logistics Quarterly, Vol. 4, No. 4 (December, 1957), 269-286.
6. Manne, A. S., "A Note on the Modigliani-Hohn Production Smoothing Model", Management Science, Vol. 3, No. 4 (July, 1957), 371-379.
7. Veinott, A. F. Jr., and H. M. Wagner, "Optimal Capacity Scheduling", I and II, Operations Research, Vol. 10, No. 4 (July-August, 1962), pp. 518-546.
8. Wagner, H. M., and T. M. Whitin, "Dynamic Problems in the Theory of the Firm", Naval Research Logistics Quarterly, Vol. 5, No. 1 (March, 1958), 53-74.
9. Wagner, H. M., "A Postscript to Dynamic Problems in the Theory of the Firm", Naval Research Logistics Quarterly, Vol. 7, No. 1 (March, 1960), 7-12.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST
CONTRACT Nonr-225(53)
(NR-042-002)

Armed Services Technical Information Agency Arlington Hall Station Arlington 12, Virginia	10	Chief of Ordnance U. S. Army Research and Development Division Washington 25, D. C. Attn: ORDTB	1	Chief, Los Angeles Air Proc. Dist. San Bernardino Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Bendix Bldg. 1206 S. Maple Street Los Angeles, California	1
AF Plant Representative Evendale Plant General Electric Company P. O. Box 91 Cincinnati 15, Ohio	1	Chief Office of Ordnance Research Duke University, Duke Station Durham, North Carolina	1	Chief San Francisco Air Procurement Dist. Sacramento Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division 1515 Clay Street Oakland 12, California	1
AF Plant Representative Office Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area General Electric Company P. O. Box 91 Cincinnati 15, Ohio	1	Chief, Surveillance Branch Ballistics Research Lab. Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland Attn: Mr. Bruno	1	Chief Atlanta Air Procurement Dist. Warner Robins Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division 441 West Peachtree Street N. E. Atlanta, Georgia	1
Ames Research Center Moffett Field, California Attn: Technical Library	1	Chief of Naval Materiel Code M533, Room 2236 Main Navy Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.	1	Boston Air Force Contract Management District Attn: Chief, Quality Control Div. AF Systems Command Boston Army Base Boston 10, Massachusetts	1
Atlanta Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Div., WRHAQ 41 Exchange Place Atlanta 3, Georgia	1	Chief of Naval Operations Operations Evaluation Group (OP-03EG) The Pentagon Washington 25, D. C.	2	Chief St. Louis Air Procurement Dist. Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division 1114 Market Street St. Louis 1, Missouri	1
Ballistics Section Test Branch, A & A Division Yuma Test Station Yuma, Arizona Attn: J. M. Anderson	1	Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: QC Division	1	Chief Indianapolis Air Procurement Dist. Mobile Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division 54 Monument Circle Indianapolis 6, Indiana	1
Bureau of Aeronautics (AV-4422) Department of the Navy Room 2194, W Building Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. H. R. Thoman	1	Chief, Bureau of Yards & Docks Materiel Division Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. W. Wolman, Code A600	2	Chief Rochester Air Procurement Dist. Middletown Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division 20 Symington Place, P. O. Box 1669 Rochester 3, New York	1
Bureau of Ships, Code 334 Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. A. S. Warthen	6	Chief, Bureau of Ordnance Department of the Navy (Ad3) Washington 25, D. C.	1	Chief Cleveland Air Procurement Dist. Mobile Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division 1279 W. Third Street Cleveland 13, Ohio	1
Bureau of Supplies & Accounts Code CW Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.	1	Chief, Bureau of Ordnance Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Code ReUg-3	1	Chief Dallas Air Procurement Dist. San Antonio Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Wilson Building - Room 338 Dallas 1, Texas	1
Central Contract Management Region Attn: Directorate, Quality Control Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	1	Chief, Bureau of Ordnance Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Code ReUg-3	1	Chief Statistical Engineering Lab. National Bureau of Standards Washington 25, D. C.	1
Chicago Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Div., OCHQA 5555 South Archer Avenue Chicago 38, Illinois	1	Chief, Bureau of Ordnance Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: W. S. Koontz (QoF)	1	Chief Phoenix Air Procurement Dist. San Bernardino Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division P. O. Box 1548 Old San Diego Station 4325 Pacific Highway San Diego 10, California	1
Cleveland Air Procurement Dist. 1279 West Third Street Cleveland 13, Ohio Attn: Quality Analysis Section	1	Chief, Bureau of Ordnance Quality Control Division (QCC) Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Dr. W. R. Pabst, Jr.	1	Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 346 Broadway New York 13, New York Attn: Dr. J. Laderman	1
Computation Division Directorate of Management Analysis DCS Controller, HQ, USAF Washington 25, D. C.	3	Chief Arizona Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Div. 2875 Sky Harbor Blvd. Phoenix, Arizona	1	Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office Navy No. 100 Fleet Post Office New York, New York	2
Chief, Dayton Air Procurement Dist. Mobile Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Building 70 - Area "C" Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	1	Chief San Diego Air Procurement Dist. San Bernardino Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division P. O. Box 1548 Old San Diego Station 4325 Pacific Highway San Diego 10, California	1		
Chief, Procurement-Maintenance Engineering Division Fort Monmouth, New Jersey Attn: Procurement Data Branch SIGEL-PMP-1	1				

Contract Nonr-225(53)
September 1962

Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1000 Geary Street San Francisco 9, California	1	Commander U. S. N. O. T. S. Pasadena Annex 3202 E. Foothill Blvd. Pasadena 8, California	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Torpedo Station (QEL) Newport, Rhode Island	1
Commanding Officer Rock Island Arsenal Rock Island, Illinois Attn: R & D Division	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot (QEL) Crane, Indiana	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Torpedo Station Keyport, Washington Attn: Technical Library Quality Evaluation Lab.	1
Director for Quality Assurance U. S. Army Chemical Center and Chemical Corp. Material Command Army Chemical Center Attn: Asst. for Quality Evaluation Maryland	2	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot Banger (QEL) Bremerton, Washington	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Underwater Ordnance Station Newport, Rhode Island Attn: Technical Library	1
Commanding Officer U. S. Army Chemical Procurement District 290 Broadway New York 7, New York Attn: Quality Surety Division Quality Assurance Section	1 1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot (QEL) St. Juliens Creek Portsmouth, Virginia	1	Commanding Officer & Director U. S. Naval Boiler and Turbine Lab. Naval Base Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	1
Commanding Officer Diamond Ordnance Fuze Lab. Attn: Mr. N. S. Leibman Room 100, Building 52 Connecticut Ave. and Van Ness Street Washington 25, D. C.	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Ammunition and Net Depot (QEL) Seal Beach, California	1	Commanding Officer and Director U. S. Navy Electronics Lab. San Diego 52, California	1
Commanding Officer Diamond Ordnance Fuze Lab. Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Library, Rm. 211, Bldg. 92	1	Commanding General U. S. Army Ord. Arsenal, Frankford Attn: Mr. N. J. Miller (6120) Bldg. 235-1 Philadelphia 37, Pa.	1	Commander Material Laboratory New York Naval Shipyard, Naval Base Brooklyn 1, New York Attn: A. Walner	1
Commanding Officer Diamond Ordnance Fuze Lab. Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Library, Rm. 211, Bldg. 92	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory Corona, California Attn: Clayborn L. Graves, Code 65	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Navy Mine Defense Lab. Panama City, Florida	1
Commanding Officer Diamond Ordnance Fuze Lab. Washington 25, D. C. Attn: H. Walter Price Chief, Branch 62.0	1	Commander U. S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory Surveillance Dept. MED Corona, California	1	Commanding Officer & Director U. S. Navy Underwater Sound Lab. Fort Trumbull New London, Connecticut	1
Commanding Officer Dugway Proving Ground Dugway, Utah Attn: Harry S. Slocane Material Testing (TD&A)	1	Commander U. S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory White Oak Silver Spring, Maryland Attn: Mr. R. E. Hightower Mr. P. B. Morgan Dr. H. Ellingson	1 1 1	Commander Mobile Mobile Air Materiel Area Attn: QC Division Directorate of Procurement & Production Brookley Air Force Base Alabama	1
Commanding General Ordnance Ammunition Center Joliet, Illinois Attn: ORDLY AR-V	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Magazine (QEL) Concord, California	1	Commander Southern Air Materiel Area, Pacific Attn: Quality Control Office Clark AFB, APO 74 San Francisco, California	1
Commanding Officer S. C. Supply Agency 225 South 18th Street Philadelphia 3, Pennsylvania Attn: Chief, SIGSU-H3d	2	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Mine Depot (QEL) Yorktown, Virginia	1	Commander Air Materiel Force, Pacific Area Attn: Quality Control Office FEAMCOM Air Base, APO 323 San Francisco, California	1
Commander U. S. Naval Air Development Center Johnsville, Pennsylvania	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Propellant Plant Indian Head, Maryland Attn: Mr. Fred Frishman	1	Commander Northern Air Materiel Area, Pacific Attn: Quality Control Office FEAMCOM Air Base, APO 323 San Francisco, California	1
Commander U. S. Naval Air Missile Test Center Point Mugu, California Attn: Chief Scientist	1	Commander U. S. Naval Proving Ground Dahlgren, Virginia Attn: Technical Library	1	Commander San Bernardino Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement and Production Norton AFB, California	1
Commanding Officer Naval Construction Battalion Center Code 620 Davisville, Rhode Island	1	Commander U. S. Naval Ordnance Test Station China Lake, California Attn: R. Gardner - E. Fay	1 1	Commander Warner Robins Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement & Production Robins AFB, Georgia	1
Commanding Officer Naval Construction Battalion Center Gulport, Mississippi	1	Commander U. S. Naval Ordnance Test Station China Lake, California Attn: Dr. D. S. Villars Dr. F. E. McVay	1 1	Commander Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement and Production Tinker Air Force Base Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	1
Commanding Officer Naval Construction Battalion Center Code 92 Port Hueneme, California	1	Commander U. S. Naval Test Station China Lake, California Attn: Technical Library	1		
Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot (QEL) Navy No. 66 Fleet Post Office San Francisco, California	1				

Contract Nonr-225(53)
September 1962

Commander Rome Air Force Depot Attn: Directorate of Supply and Services Griffiss AFB, New York	1	Eastern Contract Management Region Attn: Directorate, Quality Control Olmed AFB, Pennsylvania	1	Military Medical Supply Agency 3rd Avenue and 29th Street Brooklyn 32, New York Attn: Mr. Leon Jozwiak	1
Commander Air Materiel Force, European Area Attn: Quality Control Office APO 10 New York, New York	1	Engineering Statistics Group Research Division New York University New York 53, New York	1	N. A. C. A. 1512 H. Street, N. W. Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Div. of Res. Information	1
Commander Air Technical Intelligence Center Attn: (AFIN-4CI) Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	1	Engineering Statistics Unit Chemical Corps Engineering Agency Army Chemical Center, Maryland Attn: Mr. T. M. Vining, Chief	1	Newark Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Division 218 Market Street Newark, New Jersey	1
Commander Air Materiel Command Attn: Quality Control Office, MCQ Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	10	Federal Telephone and Radio Co. 100 Kingsland Road Clifton, New Jersey	1	New York Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Division 111 East 16th Street New York 3, New York	1
Commander Middletown Air Materiel Area Attn: Assistant for Quality Directorate of Maintenance Engineering Olmed Air Force Base Middletown, Pennsylvania	1	Military Clothing & Textile Supply Agency Philadelphia Quartermaster Center U. S. Army 2800 So. 20th Street Philadelphia 1, Pa. Attn: Policy Office, Technical Division	1	Office, Asst. Secretary of Defense (R&E) Room 3E106B, The Pentagon Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Technical Library	1
Commander Middletown Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement & Production Olmed Air Force Base Middletown, Pennsylvania	1	Headquarters San Bernardino Air Materiel Area U. S. Air Force Wester AFB, California Attn: Chief, Planning & Control Offices	1	Operations Analysis Office Headquarters, Pacific Air Forces U. S. Air Force, APO 953 Attn: C. E. Thompson Senior Analyst San Francisco, California	1
Commander Middletown Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement & Production Olmed Air Force Base Middletown, Pennsylvania	1	Headquarters U. S. Army Signal Equipment Support Agency Fort Monmouth, New Jersey Attn: SIGFM/ES-PPE	1	Office, Chief of Engineers Department of the Army Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Procurement Division Military Supply	2
Commander Memphis Air Force Depot Mallory Air Force Station Attn: Directorate of Supply and Services 3300 Jackson Avenue Memphis 1, Tennessee	1	Headquarters, Defense Supply Agency DSAA-PI Inspection and Quality Control Division Washington 25, D. C.	1	Office of Operation Analysis DCS/Operations Elgin AFB, Florida	1
Commander San Antonio Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Office, SBQ Norton AFB, California	2	Industrial Division Office, Chief of Ordnance Department of the Army Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. Seymour Lorber	1	Office of the Chief (R&D), U. S. Army Arlington Hall Station Arlington, Virginia Attn: Dr. I. R. Hersher, Jr.	1
Quality Control Office (SAQ) Hq, San Antonio Air Materiel Area Kelly AF Base, Texas	1	Inspection and Quality Control Division Office, Asst. Secretary of Defense (S&L) Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. John J. RJordan Mr. Irving B. Altman	1	Officer in Charge U. S. Navy Central Torpedo Office Newport, Rhode Island Attn: Mr. G. B. Habiolt	1
Commander San Antonio Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate Special Weapons Kelly AF Base, Texas	1	Library Institute for Defense Analyses Communications Research Division Von Neumann Hall Princeton, New Jersey	1	Ordnance Corps Industrial Engineering Div. Diamond Ordnance Fuze Lab. Washington 25, D. C.	1
Commander Ogden Air Materiel Area Attn: Quality Control Division Directorate of Procurement and Production Hill AFB, Utah	1	Library Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research College of Engineering New York University University Heights New York 53, New York	1	Ordnance Mission White Sands Proving Ground Las Cruces, New Mexico Attn: Mr. Paul G. Cox	1
David Taylor Model Basin Applied Mathematics Lab. (Code 820) Washington 7, D. C. Attn: Dr. Julius Lieblein	1	Librarian Numerical Analysis Research University of California Los Angeles 24, California	1	Philadelphia Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Division 1411 Walnut Street Philadelphia 2, Pennsylvania	1
Detroit Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Div. MOHDQ W. Warren Avenue & Lenoxy Blvd. Detroit 32, Michigan Attn: MOHDQPG	1	Logistics Research Division Attn: MCFR Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	1	Physical Research Branch Evans Signal Lab., SCEL Belmar, New Jersey Attn: Mr. Joseph Weinstein	1
Director National Security Agency Attn: REMP-1 Fort George G. Meade Maryland	1	Logistics Research Project George Washington University 707 22nd Street, N. W. Washington 7, D. C.	1	The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California Attn: Library	1
Director, Development Division Field Command Armed Forces Special Weapons Project Albuquerque, New Mexico	1	Milwaukee Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Div. 770 N. Plankinton Avenue Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin	1	Report Library University of California Los Alamos Scientific Lab. P. O. Box 1663 Los Alamos, New Mexico	1

Rocket Development Group Redstone Arsenal Huntsville, Alabama Attn: Lt. E. L. Bombara	1	Professor R. E. Beckwith Graduate School of Business Administration University of Southern California Los Angeles 7, California	1	Dr. Francis Dresch Stanford Research Institute 333 Ravenswood Avenue Menlo Park, California	1
San Francisco Air Procurement Dist. Attn: Quality Control Division Oakland Army Terminal, Bldg. 1 West Grand & Maritime Oakland 14, California	1	Professor J. N. Berntson Western Reserve University Cleveland, Ohio	1	Professor Archeson J. Duncan Department of Industrial Engineering Johns Hopkins University Baltimore 18, Maryland	1
Scranton Ordnance Plant 136 Cedar Avenue Scranton, Pennsylvania Attn: Mr. Carl D. Larsen Chief Inspector	1	Mr. Carlton M. Beyer Office of Guided Missiles Office of Asst. Secretary of Defense (R&E) Washington, D. C.	1	Professor Mayer Dwyer Department of Mathematics Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois	1
Standards Branch Procurement Division DCS Logistics, U. S. Army Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. Elias Williams, Jr.	1	Professor Z. W. Birnbaum Laboratory of Statistical Research Department of Mathematics University of Washington Seattle 5, Washington	1	Professor D. A. S. Fraser Department of Mathematics University of Toronto Toronto 5, Canada	1
Statistical Laboratory University of California Berkeley 4, California	1	Professor Russell Bradt Department of Mathematics University of Kansas Lawrence, Kansas	1	Mr. William E. Gilbert, Chief Mathematical Statistics Branch Atomic Energy Commission Washington 25, D. C.	1
Superintendent U. S. Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California Attn: Library	1	Professor Irving W. Burr Department of Mathematics Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana	1	Mr. Leon Gifford Operations Research Inc. 8605 Cameron Street Silver Springs, Maryland	1
Technical Information Officer Naval Research Laboratory Washington 25, D. C.	6	Mr. G. Burrows Knolls Atomic Power Lab. Schenectady, New York	1	Mr. Bernard P. Goldsmith Associate Professor Northeastern University 360 Huntington Avenue Boston 15, Massachusetts	1
Technical Operation, Inc. and C. O. R. G. Hq. Continental Army Command Fort Monroe, Virginia	1	Dr. A. Charnes The Technological Institute Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois	1	Professor Leo A. Goodman Statistical Research Center University of Chicago Chicago 37, Illinois	1
U. S. Naval Avionics Facility Indianapolis 18, Indiana Attn: Library	1	Mr. W. H. Claiworthy Bettis Plan, Westinghouse Electric Corporation Box 1468 Pittsburgh 30, Pennsylvania	1	Dr. J. Greenwood 430 Great Falls Street Falls Church, Virginia	1
U. S. Naval Engineering Experiment Station Annapolis, Maryland Attn: Mr. F. R. l'elPriore	1	Professor Paul Clifford New Jersey State Teachers College Montclair, New Jersey	1	Professor Donald Gaver Westinghouse Research Labs. Evan Road Churchill Boro Pittsburgh 35, Pennsylvania	1
U. S. Naval Inspector of Ordnance 400 S. Belger Street Mishawaka, Indiana	1	Professor W. G. Cochran Department of Statistics Harvard University Cambridge, Massachusetts	1	Professor Frank M. Gryn, Jr. University College Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey	1
U. S. Naval Inspector of Ordnance Eastman Kodak Company 50 W. Main Street Rochester 14, New York	1	Professor C. C. Cokerham Institute of Statistics State College Section North Carolina State College Raleigh, North Carolina	1	Dr. Donald Guthrie Stanford Research Institute 333 Ravenswood Avenue Menlo Park, California	1
Western Contract Management Region Attn: Directorate, Quality Control Mira Loma AF Station, California	1	Professor Edward P. Coleman Engineering Department University of California Los Angeles 24, California	1	Dr. Theodore E. Harris The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California	1
Dr. Adam Abruzzi Dept. of Economics and Engineering Stevens Institute of Technology Hoboken, New Jersey	1	Miss Gertrude M. Cox Institute of Statistics North Carolina State College Raleigh, North Carolina	1	Dr. Leon H. Harback Dept. of Industrial Engr. & Operations Research College of Engineering New York University New York 53, New York	1
Dr. Max Astrachan Department of Logistic The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California	1	Dr. Joseph Daly U. S. Census Bureau Washington 25, D. C.	1	Professor W. Hirsch Institute of Mathematical Sciences New York University New York 5, New York	1
Professor T. W. Anderson Department of Mathematical Statistics Columbia University New York 27, New York	1	Professor Cyrus Derman Department of Industrial Engineering Columbia University New York 27, New York	1	Mr. Eugene Hixson Code 600.1 CSFC, NASA Greenbelt, Maryland	1
Professor Fred C. Andrews Mathematics Department University of Oregon Eugene, Oregon	1	Mr. H. F. Dodge Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey	1		
Professor Robert Bechhofer Sibley School of Mech. Engineering Cornell University Ithaca, New York	1				

Contract Nony-225(53)
September 1962

Dr. Paul G. Hoel
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Los Angeles 24, California

1

Professor Harold Hotelling
Associate Director
Institute of Statistics
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

1

Professor L. Hurwicz
School of Business Administration
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

1

Dr. James R. Jackson
Management Sciences Research Project
65 Administration Building
University of California
Los Angeles 24, California

1

Dr. W. C. Jacob
Agronomy Department
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

1

Professor W. D. Jones
Department of Statistics
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

1

Mr. J. P. Kearney
Quality Control Division
General Services Administration
Room 6316, Region 3 Building
Washington 25, D. C.

1

Professor Oscar Kempthorne
Statistics Laboratory
Iowa State College
Ames, Iowa

1

Professor Solomon Kullback
Department of Statistics
George Washington University
Washington 7, D. C.

1

Dr. Carl F. Kossack
IBM Corporation
2601 So. Main Street
Houston 2, Texas

1

Mr. Howard Laitin
3705 W. Artesia
Torrance, California

1

Dr. E. L. LeClerc, Chief
Biometrical Services
Agricultural Research Service, USDA
Beltsville, Maryland

1

Professor Sebastian B. Littauer
411 Engineering Building
Columbia University
New York 27, New York

1

Dr. Eugene Lukacs
Department of Mathematics
Catholic University
Washington 17, D. C.

1

Dr. Robert Lundegard, Head
Logistics and Mathematical Statistics
Branch
Code 436
Office of Naval Research
Washington 25, D. C.

3

Dr. Clifford J. Maloney
Division of Biological Standards
National Institute of Health
Bethesda 14, Maryland

1

Professor Frank Massey
School of Public Health
University of California
Los Angeles 24, California

1

Professor G. W. McElmath
Department of Industrial Engineering
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

1

Dr. Paul Meyer
Department of Mathematics
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

1

Dean Paul E. Mohn
School of Engineering
University of Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

1

Mr. R. B. Murphy
Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc.
463 West Street
New York 14, New York

1

D. E. Newham
Chief, Industrial Engineering Division
Comptroller
Hqrs., San Bernardino Air Materiel Area
Horton Air Force Base, California

1

Professor J. Neyman
Department of Statistics
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

1

Mr. Fred Okano
National Aeronautics & Space Administration
Reliability & Systems Analysis Office
Room A-151
1520 "H" Street, N. W.
Washington 25, D. C.

1

Professor E. R. Ott
Department of Mathematics
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

1

Mr. Cyril Peckham
Project Globe
University of Dayton
Dayton, Ohio

1

Dr. Richard Post
Department of Mathematics
San Jose State College
San Jose, California

1

Professor P. H. Randolph
Purdue University
Department of Industrial Engineering
Lafayette, Indiana

1

Professor George J. Resnikoff
Department of Industrial Engineering
Illinois Institute of Technology
Chicago 16, Illinois

1

Dr. Paul R. Rider
Chief Statistician
Aeronautical Research Lab., WADC
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio

1

Professor Herbert Robbins
Mathematical Statistics Department
Columbia University
New York 27, New York

1

Dr. Harry G. Romig
351 Alina Road Drive
Pacific Palisades, California

1

Dr. Harry Rosenblatt
Statistical Research Division
Bureau of Census
Washington 25, D. C.

1

Professor Murray Rosenblatt
Department of Mathematics
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island

1

Professor Herman Rubin
Department of Statistics
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

1

Professor Norma Rudy
Statistics Department
Sacramento State College
Sacramento, California

1

Miss Marion M. Sandomire
2281 Cedar
Berkeley 9, California

1

Professor I. Richard Savage
School of Business Administration
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

1

Professor L. J. Savage
Mathematics Department
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

1

Professor Henry Scheffé
Department of Statistics
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

1

Professor Robert Schlaifer
Graduate School of Business
Administration
Harvard University
Boston 63, Massachusetts

1

Brigadier General W. F. E. Schrader
c/o Lt. Col. S. T. C. Curlewis
Office of the Military Attache
Australian Embassy
2001 Connecticut Ave., N. W.
Box 4637
Washington 8, D. C.

1

Professor Seymour Sherman
Department of Mathematics
Wayne State University
Detroit 2, Michigan

1

Mr. Walter Shewhart
Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc.
Murray Hill, New Jersey

1

Dr. Rosalind Silgroves
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York 27, New York

1

Dr. Milton Sobel
Statistics Department
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

1

Professor Frank Spitzer
Department of Mathematics
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

1

Mr. Arthur Stein
Cornell Aeronautical Lab., Inc.
P. O. Box 235
Buffalo 21, New York

1

Professor W. Allen Wallis
Office of the President
University of Rochester
Rochester 20, New York

1

Dr. Harry Weingarten
United States Arms Control and
Disarmament Agency
Washington 25, D. C.

1

Dr. Irving Weiss
The Mitre Corporation
Bedford, Massachusetts

1

Contract Nonr-225(53)
September 1962

Professor J. S. Rustagi College of Medicine University of Cincinnati Cincinnati, Ohio	1	Dr. M. G. Kendall C.E.I.R., U.K., Ltd. Turris Building Great West Road Brentford, Middx.	1	Professor Eduardo Valenzuela República 517-CIEF Santiago, Chile	1
Captain Burton L. Weller AFPR Office Martin Aircraft Corporation Denver, Colorado	1	Director, Institut de Statistique 9, Quai Saint Bernard Paris V, France	1	Mr. Cesareo Villegas Instituto de Matematicas y Estadística Av. J. Herrera y Reissig Montevideo, Uruguay	1
Professor Mason Wescott Editor, Industrial Quality Control Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey	1	Dr. Rudolph Huser Institut für Angewandte Mathematik Universität Bern Hochschulstrasse Bern, Switzerland	1	Professor G. S. Watson Department of Mathematics University of Toronto Toronto 5, Ontario Canada	1
Professor S. S. Wilks Department of Mathematics Princeton University Princeton, New Jersey	1	Professor Arnfinn Hoyland Department of Mathematics University of Oslo Blindern, Norway	1		
Professor J. Wolfowitz Department of Mathematics Cornell University Ithaca, New York	1	Professor A. Walther Technische Hochschule Darmstadt, Germany	1		
Dr. William W. Woiman National Aeronautics and Space Admin. Code MER, Bldg. T-2, Room U301 700 Jackson Place, N.W. Washington 25, D. C.	1	<u>Other Foreign Addresses</u>			
Dr. Max A. Woodbury Department of Mathematics College of Engineering New York University New York 53, New York	1	Professor Maurice H. Boltz University of Melbourne Carlton N. 3 Victoria, Australia	1		
Professor Marvin Zelen Mathematics Research Center U. S. Army University of Wisconsin Madison 6, Wisconsin	1	Professor Tosio Kitagawa Mathematical Institute Faculty of Science Kyusyu University Fukuoka, Japan	1		
Mrs. Dorothy M. Gilford Director, Mathematical Sciences Division Office of Naval Research Washington 25, D. C.	1	Kenichi Koyanagi Managing Director Union of Japanese Scientists & Engineers 2, 1-chome, Cyobashi Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan	1		
<u>Distribution via ONF London</u>		Dr. Lal Verman Director Indian Standards Institute New Delhi, India	1		
Commanding Officer Branch Office Navy No. 100 Fleet Post Office New York, New York		Professor P. C. Mahalanobis Indian Statistical Institute 203 Barrackpore Trunk Road Calcutta 35, India	1		
Dr. William R. Buckland 22 Ryder Street London S. W. 1 England	1	H. T. Mathew, SRC Unit India Statistical Institute 8 King George Road New Delhi, India	1		
Professor R. Fortet Institut Henri Poincaré 9, Quai Saint Bernard Paris V, France	1	Professor Sigeki Moriguti Syoon Muramatsu 6 Suginami-ku, Tokyo, Japan	1		
Dr. Geoffrey Gregory 10 Morris Avenue Box Hill North E 12 Victoria Australia	1	R. G. Narasimhan SRC Unit Calcutta Indian Statistical Institute 9B Esplanade East Calcutta 1, India	1		
A. Hald Feresovej 83 Virum, Denmark	1	H. D. Shourie Director National Productivity Council Golf Links New Delhi, India	1		
Dr. H. C. Hamaker Phillips Research Laboratories Eindhoven, Netherlands	1	P. V. Sivaramkrishnan SRC Unit, Indian Statistical Institute Queens Road, Government Offices Building Bombay, India	1		
Mr. I. D. Hill Statistical Advisory Unit Ministry of Aviation Shell-Mex House Strand, London, W. C. 2	1	Srinagabhushana SQU Unit Bangalore c/o SKSJ Technological Inst. Bangalore 1, India	1		

Contract No. 225(53)
September 1962

Professor G. E. P. Box Department of Statistics University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin	1	Miss Theresa Fricke Research Institute University of Dayton Dayton 9, Ohio	1	Commanding General U. S. Army Ordnance Special Weapons Ammunition Command Dover, New Jersey	1
Professor Ralph A. Bradley Department of Statistics Florida State University Tallahassee, Florida	1	Professor J. V. Harrison Quality Control Course Director School of Logistics Area A, P. O. Box - Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	1	Commanding General U. S. Army Ordnance Tank Automotive Command 1501 Board Street Detroit 9, Michigan	1
Professor W. T. Federer Cornell University Department of Plant Breeding Biometrics Unit Ithaca, New York	1	Mr. Peter K. Kuffner The Hallcrafters Company 5th & Kogtner Avenues Chicago 24, Illinois	1	Commanding General, U. S. Army Ordnance Weapons Command C. G. Rock Island Arsenal Rock Island, Illinois Attn: Technical Library	1
Professor H. P. Goode Department of Industrial and Engineering Administration Cornell University Ithaca, New York	1	Dean E. A. Trabant School of Engineering University of Buffalo Buffalo, New York	1	Director Army Ballistic Missile Agency U. S. Army Ordnance Missile Command Redstone Arsenal, Alabama	1
Professor Paul Meier Department of Statistics University of Chicago Chicago, Illinois	1	Capt. W. H. Keen, USN Department of the Navy Office of Naval Research/Code 400 Washington 25, D. C.	1	Director Army Rocket & Guided Missile Agency U. S. Army Ordnance Missile Command Redstone Arsenal, Alabama Attn: Chief, R&D Division	1
Professor W. L. Smith Statistical Department University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, North Carolina	1	Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1030 East Green Street Pasadena 1, California Attn: Dr. A. R. Laufer	1	Director Army Rocket & Guided Missile Agency U. S. Army Ordnance Missile Command Redstone Arsenal, Alabama Attn: Engineering Requirements Coordination OFF	1
Professor M. B. Wilk Statistics Center Rutgers - The State University New Brunswick, New Jersey	1	Mathematics Branch Army Research Office, OCRD Department of the Army Washington 25, D. C.	1	Director Feltman Research & Engineering Labs. Picatinny Arsenal Dover, New Jersey	1
Mr. William Milne Department of National Defense Inspection Services 75 St. Patrick Street Ottawa, Ontario Canada	1	Chief U. S. Army R&D Liaison Group APO 757 New York, New York Attn: Scientific Advisor	1	Director Major Item Supply Management Agency Latterkenney Ordnance Depot Chambersburg, Pennsylvania	1
Mr. C. F. Hobbs Systems Analysis Section Army Development Establishment 255 Argyle Avenue Ottawa, Ontario Canada	1	Librarian Army Logistics Management Center Fort Lee, Virginia	2	Director U. S. Army Ordnance Supply Analysis Agency Metuchen, New Jersey	1
Professor W. F. Freiburger Mathematics Department Brown University Providence, Rhode Island	1	Commanding General U. S. Army Combat Development Experiment Center Fort Ord, California Attn: Stanford Research Institute	1	Chief, Storage & Maintenance Div. Directorate for Quality Control MOSA Richmond, Virginia	1
Professor Robert Thrall Department of Mathematics University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	1	Technical Library U. S. Military Academy West Point, New York	1	Commanding Officer Headquarters, Ordnance Mission White Sands Missile Range Las Cruces, New Mexico Attn: ORDBS-OM-TIO-TL	1
Dr. Herman Goldstone IBM Research Box 218 Yorktown Heights, New York	1	Combat Operations Research Group Hq. Continental Army Command Fort Monroe, Virginia	1	Commanding Officer Watervliet Arsenal Watervliet, New York	1
Dr. F. J. Murray U. S. Army Research Box CM, Duke Station Durham, North Carolina	1	Senior Scientist Human Research Unit No. 1 Continental Army Command Fort Knox, Kentucky	1	Commanding Officer Radford Arsenal Radford, Virginia Attn: Chief, Inspection Div., ORDCB	1
Professor Jack Klefer Department of Mathematics Cornell University Ithaca, New York	1	Director Research Analysis Corp. 6935 Arlington Road Bethesda, Md.	1	Director U. S. Army Corps Of Engineers Engineer Research and Development Laboratories Fort Belvoir, Virginia	1
Dr. John Tischendorf Allentown Laboratory Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc. Allentown, Pennsylvania	1	Human Resources Research Office George Washington University Box 3596 Washington 7, D. C.	1	Office of the Quartermaster General Operational Mathematics Branch Washington 25, D. C.	1
Mr. Martin B. Broude Quality Control Division General Services Administration, FSS Room 6915, Region 3 Bldg. Washington 25, D. C.	1	Commanding General U. S. Army Ordnance Ammunition Command Joliet, Illinois Attn: Technical Library	1		

Commanding General U. S. Army Transportation Material Command Box 209, Main Office St. Louis, Missouri	1	Commanding Officer QM Research & Engineering Field Evaluation Agency Ft. Lee, Virginia	1	Electronic Systems Division Attn: Quality Control L. G. Hanson Field Bedford, Massachusetts	1
Technical Library U. S. Army Electronic Proving Ground Fort Huachuca, Arizona	1	Chief, Technical Evaluation Branch Army Research Office, DRD U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Washington 25, D. C.	1	Rome Air Force Depot Management Requirements Div. Management Analysis Section Griffiss Air Force Base, New York	1
Technical Library U. S. Army Signal Research and Development Laboratories Fort Monmouth, New Jersey	1	Mathematics Research Center University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin	1	Rome Air Force Depot Griffiss Air Force Base, New York Attn: RQ	2
Commanding Officer U. S. Army Signal Electronics Research Unit P. O. Box 205 Mountain View, California	1	Librarian U. S. A. Artillery & Missile School Fort Sill, Oklahoma	1	Rome Air Force Depot Griffiss Air Force Base, New York Attn: ROPQ	1
Commanding General U. S. Army Chemical Center Corps Engineering Command Army Chemical Center, Maryland Attn: Mr. T. M. Vining	1	Commanding General Command and General Staff College Fort Leavenworth, Kansas	1	Dayton Air Force Depot Dayton 20, Ohio Attn: MDQ	2
Director U. S. Army Chemical Research and Development Laboratories Army Chemical Center, Maryland Attn: Technical Library	1	Commanding Officer Ft. Monmouth Arsenal /ORDBB-TMS/ Dover, New Jersey	1	Dayton Air Force Base Dayton 20, Ohio Attn: MDMQ	1
Commanding Officer U. S. Army Chemical Corps Proving Ground Dugway, Utah	1	Commanding Officer Ordnance Materials Research Office Wurtsmith Arsenal Wurtsmith 72, Massachusetts	1	Dayton Air Force Depot Dayton 20, Ohio Attn: MDQ	1
Commanding Officer New York Chemical Procurement Dist. 180 Varick Street New York 14, New York Attn: Quality Surety Division	1	Commanding Officer 9550 Technical Service Unit Army Liaison Group, Project Michigan Willow Run Research Center Ypsilanti, Michigan	1	Aeronautical Systems Division Attn: Quality Control Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio	1
Mathematics Division Air Force Office of Scientific Research Washington 25, D. C.	1	Director Lincoln Laboratory Lexington, Massachusetts	1	2709 Air Force Vehicle Control Group Attn: Quality Control Div. Memphis, Tennessee	1
Director Canadian Army Operational Research Estab. Department of National Defense Ottawa, Ontario, Canada Attn: B. A. Richardson C. A. De Cando e CA ORE/S/2300-1975/4	1	Applied Mathematics Labs. National Bureau of Standards Washington 25, D. C.	1	Ogden Air Procurement District Attn: Quality Control Div. Hill Air Force Base, Utah	1
Statistics Department George Washington University Washington 6, D. C.	1	Technical Information Service Attn: Reference Branch P.O. Box 62 Oak Ridge, Tennessee	1	Richmond Air Procurement District Attn: Quality Control Div. P. O. Box 8868 Richmond 25, Virginia	1
Personnel Research Branch Personnel Research & Procedures Div. The Adjutant General's Office Washington 25, D. C.	1	Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons Quality Control Division /PQC/ Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.	1	Commander U. S. N. O. T. S. Pasadena Annex 3204 E. Foothill Blvd. Pasadena 8, California	1
Director Jet Propulsion Laboratory 4800 Oak Grove Drive Pasadena 3, California	1	Geography Department The George Washington University Washington 6, D. C. Attn: Professor R. D. Campbell	1	Chief, Bureau of Yards & Docks Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Code A63D	2
National Institute of Health U. S. Public Health Service Bethesda, Maryland	1	Superintendent U. S. Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California Attn: Library	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Naval Aviation Facility 21st St. & Arlington Avenue Indianapolis, Indiana	1
Headquarters Air Force Systems Command /SCZKQ/ Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Dayton, Ohio	5	Program Director Mathematical Sciences Program National Science Foundation Washington 25, D. C.	1	Bureau of Naval Weapons Branch Representative Eastman Kodak Co. 121 Lincoln Avenue Rochester 11, New York	1
Director Walter Reed Army Institute of Research Walter Reed Army Medical Center Washington 25, D. C.	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Transportation Research Command Fort Eustis, Virginia Attn: Research Reference Center	1	Additional copies for project leaders and assistants, office file, and reserve for future requirements	70
Scientific Director QM Research & Engineering Command U. S. Army Natick, Massachusetts	1	Headquarters, United States Air Force Attn: AFCEA Washington 25, D. C.	1		
Commandant AM Food & Container Inst for Armed Forces U. S. Army 1819 W. Pershing Road Chicago 9, Illinois	1	Ogden Air Procurement District Attn: Quality Control Div. Ogden Air Force Base, Florida	1		

Contract Nonr-225(53)
September 1962
(495)