

Worst-Case Analysis of Decoupled Policies for Multi-Location Inventory Control Problems

Yohan John*, Vade Shah*, James A. Preiss, Mahnoosh Alizadeh, and Jason R. Marden

Abstract—The difference in performance between centralized and decentralized control strategies crucially informs design choices in real-world control systems. Although computing and executing centralized control algorithms is often more costly than decentralized methods, their performance enhancements may far outweigh these costs. In this work, we study the value of centralization within the context of the well-known inventory control problem, where a planner seeks to identify optimal inventory levels that meet stochastic demand while minimizing ordering costs, holding costs, and shortage costs. We consider multilocation systems in which the inventories are coupled through a single ordering channel and the associated ordering cost function belongs to one of two classes of nonlinear cost functions that often arise in practical settings. For each of these classes, we derive constant-factor competitive ratios between the optimal coupled and decoupled policies and show they are almost tight. We then demonstrate that online algorithms also achieve tight competitive ratios for this problem. We conclude with numerical simulations that validate these results.

Index Terms—

I. INTRODUCTION

Inventory control is a cornerstone problem in operations research and optimal control. In its classic formulation, a planner manages the inventory of a single item that is depleted by a random demand process over time. The objective is to balance the competing costs of holding excess inventory, placing orders, and incurring stockouts or backlogs when demand exceeds available supply. Decades of research on the problem have focused on characterizing optimal policies—rules for placing orders that minimize expected costs—under various assumptions on the demand process and cost functions. Perhaps surprisingly, for typical problem settings, extremely simple policies are known to achieve optimal or near-optimal performance [1], [14].

The multilocation inventory problem [2], [7], [16] generalizes this setting by considering multiple locations, each with its own demand process and associated costs. When the systems are *decoupled*, i.e., when the demands and costs for each system are independent, the problem reduces to a collection of independent single-location problems, allowing optimal or near-optimal performance through decoupled policies [1], [16]. However, in *coupled systems* where the cost and/or demand in one location is dependent on another, the problem is

no longer decomposable. Several works have characterized optimal [2], [5], [6], [12], [16] or near-optimal [7], [8] policies for various kinds of coupled multilocation systems. Even in simple settings, however, this coupling can induce significant complexity in the resulting policy.

This work focuses specifically on multilocation systems that are coupled through their ordering cost, wherein one central order is placed for inventory across all locations. Motivated by ideas of ‘economies of scale’ between inventories [3], [13], we focus especially on the setting where these ordering cost functions are nonlinear. A salient motivation for the questions studied in this work is a problem of industrial refrigeration. In cold storage facilities, multiple rooms must be kept below critical temperature thresholds to preserve perishable goods. These facilities can be thought of as multilocation inventory systems where the ‘inventory level’ corresponds to the temperature in each room and ‘demands’ arise from random heat loads due to ambient conditions, removal/addition of goods, and door openings. When the temperature surpasses a certain threshold, ‘holding costs’ arise due to the decreased efficiency of the thermodynamic cycle, ‘backlog costs’ are incurred due to potential spoilage, while ‘ordering costs’ arise from cooling the room to maintain a safe temperature. Importantly, cooling multiple rooms simultaneously is more energy-efficient because compressors, the primary cooling devices, operate most efficiently at maximum capacity. This introduces economies of scale, coupling the rooms through the energy costs associated with cooling. However, despite the potential advantages of coordination, cold storage facilities are still largely controlled by traditional, simple, decoupled policies, and it is unclear to what extent these policies exploit (or fail to exploit) these economies of scale.

In this work, we study *how well simple, decoupled policies perform in coupled multilocation inventory systems* like the refrigeration example above. In particular, we focus on systems where demand and holding/backlog costs are independent across locations, but ordering costs are a (possibly nonlinear) function of the cumulative order quantity across all locations in each period. Our first set of contributions establish that **simple decoupled policies achieve tight constant-factor approximations of optimal coupled policies for broad classes of nonlinear ordering cost functions**. Then, we go a step further and ask whether there exist even simpler methods that achieve constant-factor approximations. Using known results from the literature [10], [11], our second set of results demonstrates that easily computable **online algorithms achieve constant-factor approximations of optimal policies**

* denotes equal contribution.

Identify applicable funding agency here. If none, delete this.

Y. John (yohanjohn@ucsb.edu), V. Shah, M. Alizadeh, and J. R. Marden are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of California, Santa Barbara, CA. J. A. Preiss is with the Department of Computer Science at the University of California, Santa Barbara, CA.

for multilocation systems with nonlinear ordering costs. We conclude by validating these results in numerical simulations, demonstrating that while the simple decoupled policies and online algorithms significantly outperform the derived worst-case bounds in practice, they are still far from optimal. To the best of the authors' knowledge, these constant-factor suboptimality bounds for simple policies are the first of their kind.

II. MULTILLOCATION INVENTORY PROBLEM

In this section, we describe our model of the multilocation inventory problem and present some illustrative examples for simple systems. In the multilocation inventory problem, one seeks to meet stochastic demand while balancing ordering costs, holding costs, and backlog costs across multiple locations. Consider the M -dimensional linear dynamics

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + u_k - w_k, \quad (1)$$

where $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^M$ is the level of inventory at each location at stage k , $u_k \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^M$ is the control input (ordering), and w_k is a M -dimensional random variable that represents stochastic demand. We assume that each w_k^i is finite-mean, independent, and has bounded support, where we use the superscript $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ to index the relevant quantity for the i^{th} location.

At each stage, we face two competing costs: the cost of ordering, which we represent as $c(z)$, and the cost of holding inventory or experiencing backlogged demand which we represent as $r(z)$. We assume that the ordering cost is a function of the total order quantity across all the individual systems, i.e., $c(z)$ is a shorthand notation for $c(\sum_{i=1}^M z^i)$, and that c is lower semicontinuous and nonnegative¹. Additionally, we assume that the holding costs are additively separable, i.e., $r(z) = \sum_{k=1}^M r^i(z^i)$, where r^i is convex and $r^i(z^i) \rightarrow \infty$ as $|z^i| \rightarrow \infty$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. The average costs over an N -period horizon are given by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (c(u_k) + r(x_k + u_k - w_k)) \right]. \quad (2)$$

For the infinite-horizon problem, we average costs by taking the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We adopt the shorthand notation $P = (c, r, W)$ to completely describe a multilocation inventory system, where the dimension of W , an M -by- N random variable whose (i, k) -th element is w_{k-1}^i , indicates the number of inventories and the length of the horizon.

We define a policy $\pi = \{\mu_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ as a sequence of functions $\mu_k : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^M$ that map a state x_k to a feasible control

$u_k \geq 0$. The expected cost for a given policy π and initial condition x_0 is given by

$$J_\pi(x_0 | P) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(c(\mu_k(x_k)) + r(x_k + \mu_k(x_k) - w_k) \right) \right] \quad (3)$$

with appropriate modifications for the infinite-horizon setting. The goal of this work is to compare the expected costs of optimal and decoupled policies in the multilocation inventory problem (3). Formally, an *optimal* policy π_* for a given system P is one which incurs expected cost less than or equal to all other policies for all initial conditions, i.e.,

$$\pi_* \in \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} J_\pi(x_0 | P), \quad \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^M$$

where Π is the set of all policies. A policy π is said to be *decoupled* if μ_k is component-wise separable for all k , i.e., $\mu_k(z_k) = \{\mu_k^1(z_k^1), \dots, \mu_k^M(z_k^M)\}$; otherwise, it is *coupled*. Importantly, the optimal policy may be coupled, meaning that the control decisions for one location may be a function of the state of another.

A. Motivating Example

In this section we present some numerical examples to illustrate the structure of optimal policies under linear and nonlinear ordering cost functions. In all examples we consider $M = 2$ inventories, integer-valued parameters, a finite horizon $N = 2$, holding/backlog cost $r(z) = \max\{0, z\} + 10 \max\{0, -z\}$, and stochastic demand w_k that takes values zero or one with equal probability. We define linear ordering costs as functions of the form $c(z) = mz$ where $m \geq 0$. We choose $m = 2$ for these examples.

We begin with two remarks that explain notable features of the optimal policy under linear ordering costs. First, because Eq. (2) is coupled only through the ordering cost function, for linear ordering costs the problem decouples into M independent single-location problems. As a result, the optimal policy in this case is also decoupled as can be seen in Fig. 1. Second, it is well-known in the inventory control literature that single-location problems with linear ordering costs lead to so-called *base-stock* policies being optimal [1]. Base-stock policies are characterized by a single scalar, the order-up-to level S_k , at each stage k . The policy consists entirely of ordering up to S_k in states $x_k \leq S_k$ and ordering nothing in the remaining states. Fig. 1 shows that the optimal policy for each location is a base-stock policy where $S_0 = 1$.

Fig. 2 shows that the optimal policy for a nonlinear ordering cost, in this case

$$c(z) = \begin{cases} mz, & z \in \{0, 1\} \\ 2mz, & z \in \{2, 3, 4\}, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

can be coupled and have quite general structure. Note that in the $x_0^1 = x_0^2 = 0$ state it is optimal to order 1 unit in either location (but not both) so the two locations are indistinguishable, i.e., there is symmetry about the anti-diagonal.

¹We require lower semicontinuity to guarantee the existence of optimal policies [4], [15]. We assume that the ordering cost is an unweighted sum of the order amount at each location, but all of our results extend to the setting where the ordering cost is $c(\sum_{i=1}^M \alpha^i z^i)$ for some $\alpha > 0$.




Fig. 1. Optimal policy at time step $k = 0$ for linear ordering cost.




Fig. 2. Optimal policy π_* at time step $k = 0$ for nonlinear ordering cost.

In this paper we will characterize the sub-optimality of decoupled policies under nonlinear ordering cost functions. Fig. 3 shows the policy that results from neglecting the coupling in Eq. (2) and solving the single-location problems separately under the same nonlinear ordering cost function in Eq. (4). Fig. 4 shows the cost-to-go from each state when using the optimal policy from Fig. 2 and the decoupled policy from Fig. 3. Our main results will be to provide tight bounds on the worst-case cost increase of using decoupled policies under several classes of nonlinear ordering cost functions.

III. POLICY COMPARISON

In this section, we compare the performance of optimal and decoupled policies in the multilocation inventory problem (2) for various kinds of ordering cost functions. All of our results apply to both the finite- and infinite-horizon settings unless stated otherwise.




Fig. 3. Decoupled policy π_d at time step $k = 0$ for nonlinear ordering cost.




Fig. 4. Cost-to-go of optimal and decoupled policies at each initial state for nonlinear ordering cost.

A. Sector-bounded ordering cost

Our first set of results concerns multilocation inventory problems whose ordering cost belongs to the class of sector-bounded functions. A function c is *sector-bounded* if

$$lz \leq c(z) \leq hz$$

for all z and for some $0 < l \leq h$.

Let $\Pi_B \subset \Pi$ denote the set of all base-stock policies. Our first result, Theorem 1, establishes a bound between optimal and base-stock policies for systems with sector-bounded ordering cost functions:

Theorem 1. *For any M -location inventory problem $P = (c, r, W)$ where c is sector bounded for some $h \geq l > 0$, the optimal base-stock policy $\pi \in \Pi_B$ satisfies*

$$\frac{J_\pi(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)} \leq \frac{h}{l}, \quad \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^M \quad (5)$$

Furthermore, this bound is ε -tight in the sense that there exists some problem P' and initial condition x'_0 such that

$$\frac{J_\pi(x'_0 | P')}{J_{\pi_*}(x'_0 | P')} \geq \frac{h}{l + \varepsilon}.$$

Proof. We proceed constructively. Taking $c_l(z) = lz$, let π_l denote the optimal (decoupled) policy for the multilocation system $P_l = (c_l, r, W)$. We have that

$$\frac{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)} \leq \frac{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P_l)} \leq \frac{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P_h)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P_l)} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{h}{l}$$

where $P_h = (c_h, r, W)$ with $c_h(z) = hz$. Here, (a) follows from the fact that since the same policy π_l is enacted on both P_l and P_h , the only differences in their overall costs must result from differences in their ordering costs which are bounded by the sector.

To establish the tightness of this result, we provide an example of a generic multilocation inventory problem in the Appendix such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the expected cost of any base-stock policy is at least $\frac{h}{l + \varepsilon}$ greater than the expected cost of the optimal policy for some initial condition. Furthermore, we show that if this problem has an infinite horizon, then this bound holds for every initial condition. \square

Theorem 1 establishes a bound on the performance of decoupled policies for systems with sector-bounded cost functions by demonstrating that a specific decoupled policy π_l achieves this bound. Importantly, π_l is a base-stock policy, meaning that solving for this policy requires solving only M single-location problems with identical linear ordering costs. Furthermore, the second part of the Theorem shows that in the worst case, no base-stock policy achieves a strictly smaller ratio than $\frac{h}{l}$, implying that π_l is not only reasonable to implement but also optimal among base-stock policies.

This statement, however, applies only to worst-case instances. For typical problems with nonlinear ordering costs, it is natural to ask whether there is a significant difference in expected costs between single-location optimal base-stock policies and base-stock policies jointly optimized for the entire system. For finite horizon problems and non-stationary base-stock policies, making precise quantitative comparisons between coupled and decoupled approaches is difficult. However, in the infinite horizon setting with stationary base-stock policies, the analysis becomes tractable. Let $\Pi_{SB} \subset \Pi_B$ denote the set of all stationary base-stock policies, i.e., base-stock policies where $\mu_k(z) = \mu(z)$ for all k . For any problem P , we seek to compare the optimal stationary base-stock policy

$$\pi_\star \in \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi_{SB}} J_\pi(x_0 | P)$$

for the system P against π_{sb} , the collection of single-location optimal stationary base-stock policies π^1, \dots, π^M , i.e.,

$$\pi^i \in \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi_{SB}} J_\pi(x_0 | P^i),$$

where $P^i = (c, r^i, W^i)$. The next Theorem establishes the equivalence of these policies in the infinite horizon setting:

Theorem 2. *For any infinite-horizon M -location inventory system $P = (c, r, W)$ where the support of the demand w_k^i is nonnegative for all k and i , $J_{\pi_\star}(x_0 | P) = J_{\pi_{sb}}(x_0 | P)$ for all x_0 .*

Proof. The proof is given in the Appendix. \square

Theorem 2 highlights a key property of stationary base-stock policies in infinite horizon problems: when demand is nonnegative (as is typically the case), solving for base-stock policies individually for each system performs as well as jointly optimizing them across all systems. This eliminates the need to solve a coupled problem for M base-stock levels, which may be computationally intractable via dynamic programming. Note that while Theorem 1 makes a similar claim regarding the worst-case performance of base-stock policies, the statement in Theorem 2 is stronger, as it holds for every problem instance. Moreover, although we present this result within the context of sector-bounded ordering cost functions, it holds for any nonnegative ordering cost function, including those discussed in the following sections.

B. Affine ordering cost

In this section we consider affine ordering cost functions of the form

$$c(z) = K\mathbb{1}(z) + mz \quad (6)$$

where $K > 0, m \geq 0$, and $\mathbb{1}(z) = 1$ if $z > 0$ and 0 otherwise. Affine cost functions represent the situation where there is some fixed cost K associated with ordering any amount of inventory along with the standard per-unit cost m . It is well-known in the literature that the optimal policy for a single-location system with an affine ordering cost is a so-called (s, S) policy, where

$$\mu_k(x_k) = \begin{cases} S_k - x_k & x_k \leq s_k \\ 0 & x_k > s_k \end{cases}$$

with $s_k \leq S_k$. A base-stock policy corresponds to the special case where $s_k = S_k$ for all k . Thus, we define the set of all (s, S) policies as $\Pi_S \subset \Pi$, where $\Pi_B \subset \Pi_S$. Theorem 3 establishes a bound between optimal and decoupled policies for systems with affine cost functions:

Theorem 3. *For any M -location inventory system $P = (c, r, W)$ with an affine ordering cost function c , there exists a decoupled policy $\pi \in \Pi_S$ such that*

$$\frac{J_\pi(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_\star}(x_0 | P)} \leq M \quad \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^M. \quad (7)$$

Furthermore, this bound is ε -tight.

Proof. Let π_s denote the decoupled policy that applies the single-location optimal (s, S) policy for each location separately. Let $j \in \arg \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, M\}} J_{\pi^i}(x_0 | P^i)$ denote the single location that incurs the maximum expected cost under π_s for the initial condition x_0 . Then, we have that

$$\frac{J_{\pi_s}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_\star}(x_0 | P)} \leq \frac{J_{\pi_s}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi^j}(x_0 | P^j)} \leq \frac{M J_{\pi^j}(x_0 | P^j)}{J_{\pi^j}(x_0 | P^j)} = M.$$

To establish the tightness of this bound for the policy π_s , consider a multilocation control system P with demand

$$w_k^i = \begin{cases} 1, & k = i - 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

holding/backlog cost $r^i(z_k^i) = \delta \max\{0, z_k^i\} + p \max\{0, -z_k^i\}$, and ordering cost $c(z) = K\mathbb{1}(z)$, where $p \gg K$ and $\delta = \frac{2K\varepsilon}{M(M-1)}$. It is readily verified that the optimal single-location policy for location i places an order for exactly 1 unit of inventory in period $i-1$ and orders nothing in all other periods. On the other hand, the optimal coupled policy places an order for 1 unit of inventory for each system at time $k = 0$ and orders nothing in all other periods. This yields the ratio

$$\frac{J_{\pi_s}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_\star}(x_0 | P)} = \frac{MK}{K + \sum_{i=1}^M (i-1)\delta} = \frac{M}{1 + \varepsilon}$$

for the initial condition $x_0 = 0$. Note that this example holds for both the finite and infinite-horizon problems, since N is not part of the analysis. \square

Here, we take a moment to recount our results so far. For linear ordering cost functions, the decoupled and optimal policies are identical, and for sector-bounded functions, the suboptimality of the decoupled base-stock policy is bounded by the parameters of the sector. However, in the affine setting, the worst-case bound, which is achieved by a simple (s, S) policy, is precisely M . Importantly, once the cost function is no longer continuous through the origin, the worst-case performance of a decoupled policy scales with the number of inventories. In the following section, we observe that the effects of startup costs persist when we consider affine-bounded cost functions.

C. Affine-bounded ordering cost

In this section we bound the sub-optimality of decoupled single-location control policies for *affine-bounded* ordering cost functions, i.e.,

$$K_l \mathbb{1}(z) + lz \leq c(z) \leq K_h \mathbb{1}(z) + hz$$

where we assume² $K_h \geq K_l > 0$ and $h \geq l > 0$. The analogous result to Theorem 1 is the following:

Theorem 4. *For any M -location inventory system $P = (c, r, W)$ with affine-bounded ordering cost c , there exists a decoupled policy $\pi \in \Pi_S$ such that*

$$\frac{J_\pi(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)} \leq M \max \left\{ \frac{K_h}{K_l}, \frac{h}{l} \right\}, \quad \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^M. \quad (8)$$

Furthermore, this bound is ε -tight.

Proof. Define $c_l(z) = K_l \mathbb{1}(z) + lz$ and $c_h(z) = K_h \mathbb{1}(z) + hz$. Let π_s denote the decoupled policy that applies the optimal single-location (s, S) policy for the system $P^i = (c_h, r^i, W^i)$ to each location i , and let π_l , π_* , and π_h denote the optimal policies for the systems $P_l = (c_l, r, W)$, P , and $P_h = (c_h, r, W)$, respectively.

First, we apply some trivial bounds on the ratio of the expected costs between π_s and π_* :

$$\frac{J_{\pi_s}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)} \leq \frac{J_{\pi_s}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P_l)} \leq \frac{J_{\pi_s}(x_0 | P_h)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P_l)}.$$

We further bound the last expression by

$$\frac{J_{\pi_s}(x_0 | P_h)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P_l)} \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{M J_{\pi_h}(x_0 | P_h)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P_l)} \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{M J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P_h)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P_l)}$$

where (b) follows from Theorem 3 and (c) follows from the fact that π_l is suboptimal for P_h . All that remains is to bound the difference in costs between the systems P_h and P_l when π_l is applied. Consider performing the cost transformation described in the Appendix on the systems P_l and P_h . We can use Eq. (14) to write

$$\frac{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P_h)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P_l)} = \frac{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | \hat{P}_h) + h\gamma}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | \hat{P}_l) + l\gamma} = \frac{\alpha + K_h\beta + h\gamma}{\alpha + K_l\beta + l\gamma}$$

²Note that for the case of $h = l = 0$, the upper bound is MK_h/K_l by the same argument.

where $\alpha \geq 0$ represents expected holding/backlog costs, $\beta = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{1}(\sum_{i=1}^M u_k^i) \geq 0$, and $\gamma = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^M w_k^i \right] \geq 0$. We proceed by considering two cases:

1) $K_l h \leq K_h l$: It can be shown that this implies

$$\frac{\alpha + K_h\beta + h\gamma}{\alpha + K_l\beta + l\gamma} \leq \frac{K_h}{K_l}.$$

2) $K_l h > K_h l$: It can be shown that this implies

$$\frac{\alpha + K_h\beta + h\gamma}{\alpha + K_l\beta + l\gamma} < \frac{h}{l}.$$

Therefore, in either case the ratio is less than $\max \{K_h/K_l, h/l\}$.

To establish the tightness of this result, it is straightforward to extend the example in Theorem 3 to the affine-bounded setting. Suppose the cost function were instead $c(z) = K_h \mathbb{1}(z)$ if $z \neq M$ and K_l otherwise. Then, for $x_0 = 0$, we have $\frac{J_{\pi_s}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)} = M \frac{K_h}{K_l + \varepsilon}$. One can also construct an example for which $\frac{J_{\pi_s}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)} = M \frac{h}{l + \varepsilon}$, but for brevity, we do not include it here. \square

Theorem 4 establishes a bound on the performance of decoupled policies for systems with affine-bounded cost functions by demonstrating that a specific decoupled policy π_s , a collection of (s, S) policies, can always achieve this bound.

IV. ONLINE ALGORITHMS

Identifying an optimal policy for an inventory control problem, even in the single-location setting, can be computationally demanding. However, for finite-horizon single-location problems with linear holding/backlog costs and linear or affine ordering costs, there exist efficient *online algorithms* that achieve constant-factor competitive ratios relative to the optimal policy. In this section, we extend these results to multilocation systems with the nonlinear ordering costs considered above. Notably, these algorithms maintain constant-factor competitive ratios even in the absence of the usual assumption that the demand sequences $\{w^i\}_{k \geq 0}$ are independent over time.

A. Sector-bounded ordering cost

In [10], the authors propose a marginal cost accounting scheme as an alternative to dynamic programming. They present the “dual-balancing policy” π_{db} which is an online algorithm for single-location control with linear ordering costs and holding/backlog costs of the form $r(x) = a(\max\{0, x\}) + b(\max\{0, -x\})$ where $a, b \geq 0$. Under this policy, at each time step, one orders a quantity that balances the expected holding costs over the entire remaining time horizon with the expected one-step backlog costs. The intuition behind this balancing is that ordering too little can always be remedied in the subsequent time step, but ordering too much cannot be corrected. In [10], they prove the following competitive ratio for the dual-balancing policy:

Theorem 5 (2-approximation [10]). *For any single-location control system $P^i = (c, r^i, W^i)$ with linear ordering cost*

c , we have the following sub-optimality bound for the dual-balancing policy:

$$\frac{J_{\pi_{\text{db}}}(x_0 | P^i)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P^i)} \leq 2, \quad \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^M. \quad (9)$$

Ordering costs are handled via the cost transformation described in the Appendix. Therefore, the policy π_{db} is not a function of the particular linear ordering cost, and Theorem 5 holds for any linear ordering cost with $m \geq 0$. As a result, we have the following for the multilocation control setting where the multilocation dual-balancing policy π_{db} refers to independently applying π_{db} to each of the M inventories:

Corollary 6. *For any M -location inventory system $P = (c, r, W)$ with sector-bounded ordering cost c , we have the following sub-optimality bound for the (decoupled) multilocation dual-balancing policy π_{db} :*

$$\frac{J_{\pi_{\text{db}}}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)} \leq \frac{2h}{l}, \quad \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^M. \quad (10)$$

Proof. The proof is handled in two stages. First,

$$\frac{\frac{1}{2}J_{\pi_{\text{db}}}(x_0 | P^h)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P^l)} \leq \frac{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P^h)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P^l)} \leq \frac{h}{l}$$

where we use Theorem 5 for the first inequality. The second stage is trivial:

$$\frac{\frac{1}{2}J_{\pi_{\text{db}}}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)} \leq \frac{\frac{1}{2}J_{\pi_{\text{db}}}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P^l)} \leq \frac{\frac{1}{2}J_{\pi_{\text{db}}}(x_0 | P^h)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P^l)}.$$

□

B. Affine ordering cost

In [11], the authors propose the “randomized cost-balancing policy” π_{rb} which is an online algorithm for single-location inventory control with affine ordering cost as in Eq. (6) and holding/backlog costs as in the previous section. Under this policy, at each time step, one follows a probabilistic ordering rule so as to balance the expected holding costs over the remaining horizon, the one-step expected backlog cost, and the fixed cost K . See [11] for the details. They are able to prove the following competitive ratio for the randomized cost-balancing policy:

Theorem 7 (3-approximation [11]). *For a single-location control system $P^i = (c, r^i, W^i)$ with affine ordering cost c , we have the following sub-optimality bound for the randomized cost-balancing policy:*

$$\frac{J_{\pi_{\text{rb}}}(x_0 | P^i)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P^i)} \leq 3, \quad \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^M. \quad (11)$$

We have the expected result when applying π_{rb} independently for each location in a multilocation setting:

Corollary 8. *For an M -location inventory system $P = (c, r, W)$ with an affine ordering cost function c , we have the following sub-optimality bound for the multilocation randomized cost-balancing policy π_{rb} :*

$$\frac{J_{\pi_{\text{rb}}}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)} \leq 3M, \quad \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^M. \quad (12)$$

Proof. The proof is straightforward using Theorem 3 and Theorem 7:

$$\frac{\frac{1}{3}J_{\pi_{\text{rb}}}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)} \leq \frac{J_{\pi_s}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)} \leq M.$$

□

C. Affine-bounded ordering cost

Combining the result of the previous section with our prior result for decoupled policies under affine-bounded ordering cost functions yields the expected result:

Corollary 9. *For an M -location inventory system $P = (c, r, W)$ with an affine-bounded ordering cost function c , we have the following sub-optimality bound for a randomized cost-balancing policy:*

$$\frac{J_{\pi_{\text{rb}}}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)} \leq 3M \max \left\{ \frac{K_h}{K_l}, \frac{h}{l} \right\}, \quad \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^M. \quad (13)$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Corollary 6 so we only show the first stage:

$$\frac{\frac{1}{3M}J_{\pi_{\text{rb}}}(x_0 | P^h)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P^l)} \leq \frac{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P^h)}{J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P^l)} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{K_h}{K_l}, \frac{h}{l} \right\}$$

where we use Corollary 8 for the first inequality. □

V. SIMULATIONS

In this section we evaluate the sub-optimality of the proposed decoupled policies and online algorithms via numerical simulation. We use the sector-bounded ordering cost function

$$c(z) = \begin{cases} hz, & z \leq z' \\ lz + z'(h-l), & z > z' \end{cases}$$

and the affine-bounded ordering cost function

$$c(z) = \begin{cases} K\mathbb{1}(z) + hz, & z \leq z' \\ K\mathbb{1}(z) + lz + z'(h-l), & z > z'. \end{cases}$$

We consider $M = 2$ inventories, state space $x \in [-2, 8]$, discretization $\Delta x = 0.5$, a finite horizon $N = 20$, and stochastic demand $w_k \in \{0, 0.5, 1, 1.5\}$ where $w_k \sim \text{Bin}(3, 0.5)$. We perform 1e4 Monte Carlo simulations with uniformly randomized initial conditions to compare decoupled dynamic programming-based policies and online algorithms with the optimal policy. Fig. 5 shows a violin plot of the cost ratios $J_{\pi_l}(x_0 | P)/J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)$, $J_{\pi_{\text{db}}}(x_0 | P)/J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)$ where the decoupled policy is the base-stock policy that is optimal for the system $P_l = (c_l, r, W)$ with $c_l(z) = lz$, and the online algorithm is the dual-balancing policy. Note that it is possible for individual trajectories to incur less cost under the decoupled and online policies compared to the optimal policy. For the decoupled policy, the mean ratio is 1.13 and the max ratio is 1.27. For the online algorithm, the mean ratio is 1.16 and the max ratio is 1.30. Our worst-case bounds are $h/l = 2$ for the decoupled policy and $2h/l = 4$ for the online algorithm. While the empirical performance is far from the worst-case bounds, we do see substantially increased




Fig. 5. Cost ratios for decoupled and online policies under sector-bounded ordering cost. We consider holding/backlog cost $r(z) = 0.1 \max\{0, z\} + 10 \max\{0, -z\}$ and cost function parameters $l = 2, h = 4, z' = 6$.




Fig. 6. Cost ratios for decoupled and online policies under affine-bounded ordering cost. We consider holding/backlog cost $r(z) = 0.2 \max\{0, z\} + 10 \max\{0, -z\}$ and cost function parameters $l = 1, h = 2, z' = 6$.

cost. Interestingly, for this choice of parameters, the online algorithm performs nearly as well as the decoupled policy.

Fig. 6 shows a violin plot of the cost ratios $J_{\pi_s}(x_0 | P) / J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)$, $J_{\pi_b}(x_0 | P) / J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)$ where the decoupled policy is the (s, S) policy that is optimal for each single-location system $P_h^i = (c_h, r^i, W^i)$ with $c_h(z) = K_h \mathbb{1}(z) + hz$, and the online algorithm is the randomized cost-balancing policy. For the decoupled policy, the mean ratio is 1.14 and the max ratio is 1.45. For the online algorithm, the mean ratio is 1.47 and the max ratio is 2.94. Our worst-case bounds are $M \max\{K_h/K_l, h/l\} = 4$ and $3M \max\{K_h/K_l, h/l\} = 12$, respectively. Once again the empirical performance does not attain the worst-case bounds; however, the sub-optimality of both policies is evident.

VI. CONCLUSION

APPENDIX

A. Cost Transformation

In this section, we briefly recap a useful cost transformation from the inventory control literature [9], [10]. Consider

rewriting the ordering cost $c(u_k)$ as $c(x_{k+1} - x_k + w_k)$ using the dynamics (1). For stationary ordering cost functions c with a linear term $m \sum_{i=1}^M u_k^i$, the transformed cost \hat{c} that neglects the linear term, i.e., sets $m = 0$, can be seen to neglect a cost of $m \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^M w_k^i$ which is only a function of the stochastic demand. Therefore, we have the following relationship between the expected cost of a given policy π under the original costs $P = (c, r, W)$ and the transformed costs $\hat{P} = (\hat{c}, r, W)$:

$$J_{\pi}(x_0 | P) = J_{\pi}(x_0 | \hat{P}) + m \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^M w_k^i \right]. \quad (14)$$

B. Tightness example for Theorem 1

Proof. Consider a multilocation system P with demand $w_k^i \sim \text{Unif}(1, 1 + \delta)$ for all i, k and holding/backlog cost $r^i(z_k^i) = \delta \max\{0, z_k^i\} + p \max\{0, -z_k^i\}$, where $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{2(l+1)}$ and $p \gg h$. The cost function is given by

$$c(z) = \begin{cases} lz & z \in Q \\ hz & z \notin Q, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where $Q = \{M, M(1 + \delta), M(1 + 2\delta)\}$. We assume that the distribution η over the initial condition is such that $x_0^i \sim \text{Unif}(-\delta, 0)$.

We begin by deriving a lower bound on the expected cost of some base-stock policy π_b . The policy is arbitrary aside from the assumption that $\sum_{k=0}^{\tau} S_k^i \geq \tau + 1$ (equivalently, $\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} u_k^i \geq N - x_0^i$) for all i and for all $\tau \in \{0, \dots, N - 1\}$; it is easily verifiable that any policy that does not satisfy this condition is suboptimal since it incurs backlog costs with probability 1. We can rewrite the dynamics as

$$x_{k+1}^i = \begin{cases} S_k^i - w_k^i & x_k^i < S_k^i \\ x_k^i - w_k^i & x_k^i \geq S_k^i, \end{cases}$$

from which it is clear that the state x_k^i is distributed as the sum of at most k $\text{Unif}(0, \delta)$ random variables with a shifted mean for all $k \geq 0$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{i=1}^M \max\{S_k^i - x_k^i, 0\} = M(1 + 2\delta) \right] = 0,$$

so every unit of inventory ordered according to π_b incurs an ordering cost of h with probability 1. Thus, for any initial condition x_0 satisfying $-\delta < x_0^i < 0$ for all i ,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\pi_b}(x_0 | P) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} c(u_k) + r(x_k + u_k - w_k) \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} c(u_k) \right] = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^M h \cdot u_k^i \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^M Nh = MNh. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we upper bound the cost of a policy we call π_q which simply places an order for the minimum value of $q \in Q$ such

that $q + \sum_{i=1}^M x_k^i \geq M(1 + \delta)$. It is clear that π_q incurs an ordering cost of l per unit of inventory, but it also incurs some additional holding costs. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\pi_q}(x_0 | P) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} c(u_k) + r(x_k + u_k - w_k) \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} l \cdot M(1 + 2\delta) + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^M 2\delta \\ &\leq MN(1 + 2\delta)l + 2MN\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Since π_q is not necessarily the optimal policy, we have that

$$\frac{J_{\pi_b}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_*}(x_0 | P)} \geq \frac{J_{\pi_b}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_q}(x_0 | P)} \geq \frac{h}{l(1 + 2\delta) + 2\delta} = \frac{h}{l + \varepsilon}$$

for all x_0 where $x_0^i \in (-\delta, 0)$.

To extend this result to the infinite horizon and to any distribution with bounded support over initial conditions, we modify π_q to order $\sum_{i=1}^M u_k^i = \max\{1 + \delta - x_k^i, 0\}$ units of inventory if any $x_k^i \in (-\infty, -\delta] \cup [\delta, 1 + \delta)$. Thus, in exactly one timestep, $x_k^i \geq 1 + \delta$ for all i . For any location where $x_0^i \geq 1 + \delta$, it follows that $x_k^i \leq \delta$ in at most $k = \lfloor x_0^i \rfloor$ timesteps. Hence, for all timesteps $k \geq k' = \max_i \lfloor x_0^i \rfloor$, the behavior of the system under π_q from any initial condition resembles its behavior for initial conditions $(-\delta, 0)$ as described above. Furthermore, for all $k \geq k'$, the lower bound on the cost of π_b remains the same. The cumulative costs of both π_b and π_q for $k \leq k'$ are finite, so the ratio of the average costs as $N \rightarrow \infty$ is the same as in the analysis above, yielding $\frac{J_{\pi_b}(x_0 | P)}{J_{\pi_q}(x_0 | P)} \geq \frac{h}{l + \varepsilon}$. \square

C. Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $x_0^i = 0$ and $S^i \geq 0$ for all i . Given that the support of the demand w_k^i is nonnegative, we can write the problem of searching for an optimal stationary base-stock level as

$$\min_{S \in \mathbb{R}^M} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=0}^N \left(c \left(\sum_{i=1}^M (S^i - x_k^i) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^M r^i (S^i - w_k^i) \right) \right].$$

From the dynamics and the policy, we have that for all $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} u_k^i &= S^i - x_k^i \\ &= S^i - (x_{k-1}^i + u_{k-1}^i - w_{k-1}^i) \\ &= S^i - (x_{k-1}^i + S^i - x_{k-1}^i - w_{k-1}^i) = w_{k-1}^i. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can rewrite the optimization problem as

$$\min_{S \in \mathbb{R}^M} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[c \left(\sum_{i=1}^M (S^i - x_0^i) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^M r^i (S^i - w_0^i) \right] + \sum_{k=1}^N \left(c \left(\sum_{i=1}^M (w_{k-1}^i) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^M r^i (S^i - w_k^i) \right) \right).$$

The expected ordering cost terms are a fixed constant for all $k \geq 1$, and the total cost incurred in the first period is finite. Hence, we can equivalently rewrite the problem as

$$\min_{S \in \mathbb{R}^M} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^M r^i (S^i - w_k^i) \right].$$

This problem can be rewritten as M independent single-location inventory control problems. By applying the same transformations as above, it is easy to verify that these independent problems are identical to those that S_d solves. Since the two problems are identical, their expected costs are also identical.

To extend the analysis to the case where $x_0 \neq 0$, observe that for any initial condition where $x_0^i \leq 0$, a stationary threshold policy will order up to the base-stock level in one period, so the finite costs associated with this order can be eliminated. Similarly, for any initial condition where $x_0^i > 0$, the inventory level either reaches 0 in a finite amount of time with positive probability, in which case the finite costs associated with these periods can be eliminated, or the inventory level never reaches 0 with probability 1, in which case neither policy will consider this system. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Kenneth J Arrow, Theodore Harris, and Jacob Marschak. Optimal Inventory Policy. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 250–272, 1951.
- [2] Joseph L Balintfy. On a Basic Class of Multi-Item Inventory Problems. *Management science*, 10(2):287–297, 1964.
- [3] Saif Benjaafar, David Chen, and Yimin Yu. Optimal policies for inventory systems with concave ordering costs. *Naval Research Logistics (NRL)*, 65(4):291–302, 2018.
- [4] Dimitri Bertsekas and Steven E Shreve. *Stochastic Optimal Control: The Discrete-Time Case*, volume 5. Athena Scientific, 1996.
- [5] Gary Eppen. Centralized Ordering Policies in a Multi-Warehouse System with Lead Times and Random Demand. *Multi-level production/inventory control systems*, pages 51–67, 1981.
- [6] Nesim Erkip, Warren H Hausman, and Steven Nahmias. Optimal Centralized Ordering Policies in Multi-Echelon Inventory Systems with Correlated Demands. *Management Science*, 36(3):381–392, 1990.
- [7] Awi Federgruen and Paul Zipkin. Approximations of Dynamic, Multilocation Production and Inventory Problems. *Management Science*, 30(1):69–84, 1984.
- [8] Dieter Hochstaedter. An Approximation of the Cost Function for Multi-Echelon Inventory Model. *Management Science*, 16(11):716–727, 1970.
- [9] Ganesh Janakiraman and John A Muckstadt. Inventory control in directed networks: A note on linear costs. *Operations Research*, 52(3):491–495, 2004.
- [10] Retsef Levi, Martin Pál, Robin O Roundy, and David B Shmoys. Approximation algorithms for stochastic inventory control models. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 32(2):284–302, 2007.
- [11] Retsef Levi and Cong Shi. Approximation algorithms for the stochastic lot-sizing problem with order lead times. *Operations Research*, 61(3):593–602, 2013.
- [12] Baoding Liu and Augustine O Esogbue. *Decision Criteria and Optimal Inventory Processes*, volume 20. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [13] Evan L Porteus. On the Optimality of Generalized (s, S) Policies. *Management Science*, 17(7):411–426, 1971.
- [14] Herbert Scarf, K Arrow, S Karlin, and P Suppes. The Optimality of (S, s) Policies in the Dynamic Inventory Problem. *Optimal pricing, inflation, and the cost of price adjustment*, pages 49–56, 1960.
- [15] Manfred Schäl. Average Optimality in Dynamic Programming with General State Space. *Mathematics of operations Research*, 18(1):163–172, 1993.

- [16] Arthur F. Veinott Jr. Optimal Policy for a Multi-Product, Dynamic, Nonstationary Inventory Problem. *Management science*, 12(3):206–222, 1965.