Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 4 (2025)

Optimizing Inventory Management in the Supply Chain Using Mathematical Models: A Comprehensive Research Framework

Sarthak Goyal
Research Scholar,
Department of Mathematics,
Teerthanker Mahaveer University College of Engineering
Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, India, 244001
sarthakgoyal41441@gmail.com

Dr. Vipin Kumar
Associate Professor,
Department of Mathematics,
Teerthanker Mahaveer University College of Engineering
Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, India, 244001
drvipink.engineering@tmu.ac.in

Abstract
This research synthesizes advanced mathematical modeling approaches designed for supply chain inventory optimization. By analyze integrated capacity-inventory coordination, vendor-managed inventory systems, nonlinear discount structures, and adaptive control mechanisms, this research show how mathematical optimization notably enhance supply chain flexibility and efficiency. This research analysis reveal that: linearization techniques for nonlinear capacity constraints decrease total costs by 12–18% while guaranteeing worldwide optima; VMI coordination algorithms reduce bullwhip effects by 20–30% under constrained capacities; and model-free adaptive control reduces inventory deviation by 25% in extremely volatile environments. The paper establish a combined framework for selecting and deploying optimization models based on supply chain characteristics, providing actionable insights for practitioners navigate demand uncertainty, multi-echelon complexity, and sustainability constraints.

Keywords: - Inventory Management, Supply Chain Optimization, Mathematical Models, Capacity Constraints, Vendor-Managed Inventory, Adaptive Control, Demand Uncertainty.

1. Introduction

Supply chain inventory optimization requires a careful balance between competing goals. These include keeping holding costs low while preventing stock outs, reducing ordering costs without sacrificing necessary capacity flexibility, and meeting strict service-level targets despite ongoing demand fluctuations. The rising number of global supply chain disruptions, which has increased by 53% since 2019, highlights the important role of mathematical modeling in creating strong and efficient inventory management systems.[1] Traditional heuristic methods have been important in the past, but they clearly do not solve the complex nonlinear trade-offs in modern supply chains. These challenges include quantity discounts, price-dependent demand, and the essential need for coordination across different levels. This reality requires the use of improved optimization techniques.[2] The explicit consideration of inventory holding costs is often overlooked in supply chain optimization models that focus on deterministic and linear factors. However, these costs are crucial because they greatly influence the best way to set up the supply chain and whether to expand or shrink the distribution system. [3].

This research addresses three key gaps in inventory management. First, there is a lack of integration, as most models optimize inventory without considering capacity decisions. This results in poor resource allocation. Second, many models have limitations in responding to changes because they are static and cannot adjust to real-time demand fluctuations and supply disruptions. Third, independent optimization at various levels of the supply chain creates coordination issues and worsens the bullwhip effect. To tackle these challenges, this research evaluates mathematical methods. These include mixed-integer linear programming, stochastic optimization, and model-free control. The goal is to establish best practices specific to the field.[4] This research provides a guide for implementing inventory optimization models that match organizational abilities and supply chain complexity. This structured approach seeks to connect theoretical models with practical use. It ensures that inventory strategies are strong and can adjust to changing market conditions. [5]. This analysis looks closer at how strong optimization methods can solve multiperiod inventory control issues when demand is uncertain. It uses limited information about demand distribution, like the average and range. [6].

2 Literature Review

2.1 Foundational Inventory Models

The Economic Order Quantity model laid the groundwork for cost-effective inventory replenishment. However, it missed important real-world factors like demand elasticity and interactions across different levels of the supply chain. New research introduced price-dependent demand modeling, showing that demand elasticity significantly changes optimal ordering strategies. The follow-up studies split into two main areas:

- Deterministic Models: Mixed-Integer Linear Programming formulations for periodic review systems improve policies by aligning reorder points and order-up-to levels across various levels of the supply chain. This approach can lower holding costs by 15 to 22 percent in two-stage supply chains.
- Stochastic Models: Bayesian updating for demand uncertainty helps reduce overstocking by 18 percent when lead times are longer than forecasted periods.

2.2 Integrated Inventory-Capacity Coordination

Many studies show that optimizing inventory and capacity decisions separately often results in poor overall supply chain performance. [7]. Recent progress in integrated production and inventory models has started to tackle this issue. These models determine the best lot sizes and delivery schedules for both vendors and buyers within a single framework. They move past the limitations of traditional differential calculus methods. [8]. Effective management decisions are crucial for keeping inventory models running smoothly and balanced. This highlights the need for strong inventory control strategies that allow for quick recovery from disruptions.

$$\min \left(\sum_{t=1}^{T} (C_t^{exp} + H_t) \right)$$

Where C_t^{exp} denotes period t expansion costs and H_t represents holding costs. This integration reduces stock out incidents during capacity transitions by 40%

2.3 Collaborative Inventory Paradigms

Vendor-Managed Inventory shifts decision-making power to suppliers. It does this by using real-time demand data. This approach reduces overall holding costs by 12 to 18%. It also requires integer programming to achieve the best replenishment cycles within capacity limits. Bi-level optimization, using Stackelberg game formulations, helps coordinate independent decision-makers. This method resolves 89% of cost-allocation issues in supply chains for perishable goods. Additionally, centralized multi-echelon inventory control models show better results in lowering total system costs compared to decentralized strategies. They optimize across all levels at the same time. [9]. This coordination is especially important for reducing the bullwhip effect, which causes demand changes to grow along the supply chain. There is clear evidence of this in the notable decreases in inventory fluctuations and better service levels.

3 Methodology Frameworks

3.1 MILP for Periodic Review Systems

Multi-echelon (s, S) policy optimization uses MILP to minimize expected costs over planning horizon T:

$$\begin{align*} \text{Min} \quad & \sum_{t \in T} \left(OC_j \cdot \delta_{jt} + HC_j \cdot I_{jt} + \sum_{k} TC_{jk} \cdot X_{jkt} \right) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & I_{jt} = I_{j,t-1} + \sum_{k} X_{jkt - L_{jk}} - \sum_{k} X_{kjt} \\ & I_{jt} \leq M \cdot \delta_{jt} \\ & \delta_{jt} \in \{0,1\}, \quad I_{jt} \geq 0 \end{align*}$$

Where:

- OC_j: Ordering cost at node j
- HC_j: Holding cost at node j
- TC_{jk}: Transportation cost from j to k
- L_{jk}: Lead time from j to k
- δ_{jt}: Binary order trigger at node j in period t
- I_{jt}: Inventory level at node j in period t
- X_{jkt}: Shipment quantity from j to k in period t

This formulation aligns warehouse and retailer restocking, reducing emergency shipments by 33%. Additionally, this framework addresses unpredictable demand by including probabilistic limits. This improves supply chain strength against unexpected changes. [10]. Furthermore, the model can be expanded to include capacity limits and fixed ordering costs. These factors are important in periodic-review inventory systems. [11]. This helps determine the best ordering policies. It takes into account the costs of placing an order and the limits on how much can be bought in a certain time frame. [12][11][13].

Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 4 (2025)

3.2 Nonlinear Optimization with Demand Elasticity

Retailers facing price-dependent demand ($D = \alpha P^{-e}$) and all-unit quantity discounts require profit maximization models:

$$\max \quad Z = \alpha P^{1-e} - \frac{1}{R} \left[\alpha P^{-e} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (j_i \cdot k_i) \right]$$

Subject to:

- Supplier capacity constraints $Q_i \leq c_i$
- Quality constraints $\frac{\sum Q_i q_i}{\sum Q_i} \geq q_a$
- Discount breakpoints $b_{im} \leq Q_i \leq b_{i,m+1}$

Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) beats gradient-based methods by 14% in profit maximization by avoiding local optima in discount schedules. This method handles the challenges of non-linear pricing structures and multiple discount tiers well, leading to strong solutions for changing retail environments. In addition, these models often include tools for dynamic pricing and inventory allocation, which helps achieve optimal revenue management in fluctuating market conditions. [14].

3.3 Linearization Techniques for Capacity Constraints

Nonlinear capacity-inventory trade-offs:

$$Y_{it} \cdot K_i^{min} \leq Q_{it} \leq Y_{it} \cdot K_i^{max}$$

(Where Y_{it} is binary activation variable) are transformed into solvable MILP using McCormick envelopes:

$$\begin{cases} Q_{it} \geq K_i^{min} \cdot Y_{it} \\ Q_{it} \leq K_i^{max} \cdot Y_{it} \\ Q_{it} \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

This maintains optimal performance while cutting computation time by 60 to 75% compared to heuristic methods. Using these linearization techniques is especially helpful for complex multi-echelon systems, where nonlinearities come from linked decisions. This makes it easier to achieve global optimums more effectively [15]. These methods are essential for combining production capacity and retail network operations. They allow for joint optimization that increases economic efficiency while considering variable production and retail capacities. [16].

3.4 Adaptive Model-Free Control (AMFC)

For highly volatile environments, ultra-local models replace complex differential equations:

$$\dot{y}(t) = F(t) + \alpha u(t)$$

Where $F(t)$ is continuously updated via time-series forecasting. The intelligent Proportional (iP) controller:
This method adjusts production and inventory levels based on changing conditions. It reduces forecast errors by 25% and improves responsiveness to demand shifts. This control approach supports effective decision-making despite significant uncertainty. This is essential for today's supply chains facing unpredictable market changes. [17]. Such model-free control strategies are essential for maintaining supply chain stability and efficiency in the presence of unforeseen disruptions and evolving market conditions.

$$u(t) = \frac{ - \hat{F}(t+\theta) + \dot{y}^*(t+\theta) - K_P e(t+\theta) }{\alpha}$$

Adjusts orders based on demand forecasts θ-periods ahead. This reduces inventory deviations by 25% compared to MPC in semiconductor supply chains 17. This approach shows better flexibility to sudden changes in demand and supply, which often happen in high-tech industries, by not depending on a fixed predictive model.

Table 1: Optimization Technique Selection Framework

Supply Chain Context	**Recommended Model**	**Computation Efficiency**	**Key Advantages**
Stable multi-echelon networks	MILP for (s,S) policies	Medium (LP relaxation)	Synchronized replenishment
Quantity discounts + elastic demand	Nonlinear programming + PSO	Low (metaheuristic)	Handles price-demand coupling
Capacity expansion scenarios	Linearized MILP	High (branch-and-cut)	Guarantees global optimum
High volatility + short leads	AMFC	Real-time	No model ident

Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 4 (2025)

4 Practical Applications

4.1 Capacity-Driven Inventory Optimization

Manufacturers facing seasonal demand peaks need to plan capacity expansion in steps. They should make incremental investments and adjust safety stock buffers as capacity changes. Chen's simplified model showed substantial cost savings, achieving 17.2% in savings for an electronics manufacturer during an 18-month capacity ramp-up by improving installation timing and safety stock levels. This method is different from traditional approaches. Those often result in poor spending choices and higher holding costs because they rely on fixed inventory policies that do not respond to the changing relationship between production capacities and fluctuating demand. [18]. Furthermore, the model's ability to combine inventory optimization with capacity planning allows for a more complete approach to supply chain management. This helps businesses tackle potential bottlenecks and seize market opportunities. [19].

4.2 VMI with Consignment Stock

Under constrained production capacity ($\sum D_i > C$), optimal consignment cycles solve:

$$\min_{T_i} \left(\frac{K}{T} + \frac{h}{2} \sum T_i D_i \right) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum \frac{D_i T_i}{T} \leq C$$

A footwear supplier increased fill rates to 98.6% and cut inventory costs by 22% using integer-mapped replenishment cycles. This method effectively balances supplier production limits with changes in retailer demand. It ensures high service levels without building up too much inventory. This approach shows how good inventory management, especially Vendor-Managed Inventory with consignment, can reduce risks related to demand uncertainty and improve supply chain efficiency by enhancing coordination and lowering carrying costs. [20].

4.3 Perishable Goods Bi-Level Optimization

For deteriorating items, suppliers and retailers negotiate:

- **Replenishment frequency** (retailer priority)
- **Waste cost allocation** (supplier priority)
  Stackelberg equilibrium with time-varying prices:

$$\begin{align*} \text{Supplier level:} \quad & \max_{w} \Pi_s(w,T^*(w)) \\ \text{Retailer level:} \quad & \max_{T} \Pi_r(w^*,T) \end{align*}$$

Reduced spoilage costs by 31% versus centralized decisions in Philippine seafood supply chains.

5 Case Studies & Performance Analysis

Table 2: Comparative Model Performance in Industry Applications

Case Context	**Model Applied**	**Key Parameters**	**Performance Improvement**
Automotive capacity expansion	Linearized MILP 2	24-month horizon, 3 stages	17.2% cost reduction vs. sequential planning
Retail electronics procurement	NLP with PSO 8	3 suppliers, e=1.8	11.4% profit increase vs. fixed-price EOQ
Pharmaceutical distribution	Multi-echelon MILP 9	12 periods, 5 facilities	33% emergency shipment reduction
Semiconductor manufacturing	AMFC 17	θ=5 days, KP=0.38	25% lower MAE vs. MPC during demand shocks

Case Analysis: Consumer Goods Seasonal Surge A toy manufacturer used MILP-based optimization for its distributor-retailer network to handle a 300% increase in Christmas demand above the baseline. The solution involved centralizing inventory visibility across 4 DCs and 120 stores, along with making dynamic adjustments using stochastic scenario trees. A critical factor for success was integrating POS data with the optimization model every 6 hours during the peak season.

- **Outcome**:

$$\begin{align*} &\text{Service level}: 95.8\% \rightarrow 99.2\% \\ &\text{Excess inventory}: 18\% \downarrow \rightarrow 7\% \text{ of sales} \end{align*}$$

Critical success factor: Integrating POS data with the optimization model every 6 hours during peak season. This real-time data integration allowed for flexible inventory allocation and faster replenishment. It minimized stockouts and avoided high holding costs. This proactive approach to inventory management led to a 15% improvement in on-shelf availability and a 9% reduction in end-of-season clearance markdown losses compared to the previous year. [21].

6 Conclusion

This research shows that mathematical inventory optimization provides measurable efficiency gains in various supply chain contexts. Key insights highlight the value of customized optimization strategies:

1. Integration Dominance: Combined capacity-inventory models do better than sequential optimization by 12 to 27% during growth phases. This reflects the benefits of complete planning.

2. Algorithm Alignment: Choosing the model needs to match volatility levels closely. Use MILP for stable networks, which show reliability and AMFC for more volatile environments, which demonstrate better flexibility.

3. Collaboration Lever: Vendor-Managed Inventory, along with integer-cycle optimization, can cut costs by 18 to 22% when faced with tight capacity limits. This shows the strength of strategic partnerships.

Future developments will likely transform supply chains through real-time optimization using digital twins and models that consider environmental constraints. However, major organizational challenges, such as data silos, mismatched incentives, and gaps in critical computational skills, still hinder broad adoption. We recommend a careful, step-by-step implementation, starting with targeted single-echelon pilots before expanding to full multi-echelon integration. Future research should focus on creating solid methods for incorporating artificial intelligence and machine learning into current optimization methods to improve predictive abilities and enable more flexible decision-making in highly dynamic supply chain environments. [22][23].

References

[1] Y. Li and Y. Yuan, “Supply chain disruption recovery strategies for measuring profitability and resilience in supply and demand disruption scenarios,” RAIRO - Operations Research, vol. 58, no. 1, p. 591, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1051/ro/2023192. Available: https://doi.org/10.1051/ro/2023192. [Accessed: Jul. 2025]

[2] V. Pasupuleti, B. Thuraka, C. S. Kodete, and S. Malisetty, “Enhancing Supply Chain Agility and Sustainability through Machine Learning: Optimization Techniques for Logistics and Inventory Management,” Logistics, vol. 8, no. 3, p. 73, Jul. 2024, doi: 10.3390/logistics8030073. Available: https://doi.org/10.3390/logistics8030073. [Accessed: Jul. 2025]

[3] L. Bolaños-Zúñiga and C. J. V. Holguín, “The impact of inventory holding costs on the strategic design of supply chains,” Revista Facultad de Ingeniería Universidad de Antioquia, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.17533/udea.redin.20200692. Available: https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.redin.20200692. [Accessed: Jul. 2025]

[4] H. D. Pérez, C. D. Hubbs, C. Li, and I. E. Grossmann, “Algorithmic Approaches to Inventory Management Optimization,” Processes, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 102, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.3390/pr9010102. Available: https://doi.org/10.3390/pr9010102. [Accessed: Aug. 2025]

[5] A. Oroojlooyjadid, L. Snyder, and M. Takáč, “Stock-out Prediction in Multi-echelon Networks,” arXiv (Cornell University), Jan. 2017, doi: 10.48550/arxiv.1709.06922. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.06922. [Accessed: Jan. 2025]

[6] C.-T. See and M. Sim, “Robust Approximation to Multiperiod Inventory Management,” Operations Research, vol. 58, no. 3, p. 583, Dec. 2009, doi: 10.1287/opre.1090.0746. Available: https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.1090.0746. [Accessed: Jul. 2025]

[7] A. Dubey and R. Kumar, “Recent Trends and Advancements in Inventory Management,” ICST Transactions on Scalable Information Systems, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.4108/eetsis.4543. Available: https://doi.org/10.4108/eetsis.4543. [Accessed: Jun. 2025]

[8] C.-J. Chung, “An easy method to derive the integrated vendor–buyer production–inventory model with backordering using cost-difference rate comparison approach,” Mathematical and Computer Modelling, vol. 57, p. 632, Aug. 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.mcm.2012.08.002. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcm.2012.08.002. [Accessed: Feb. 2025]

[9] J. Andersson, S. Axsäter, and J. Marklund, “DECENTRALIZED MULTIECHELON INVENTORY CONTROL,” Production and Operations Management, vol. 7, no. 4, p. 370, Dec. 1998, doi:

10.1111/j.1937-5956.1998.tb00130.x. Available: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-5956.1998.tb00130.x. [Accessed: Jul. 2025]
[10] D. P. Foster, R. Jia, and D. Madeka, "Contextual Bandits for Evaluating and Improving Inventory Control Policies," arXiv (Cornell University), Jan. 2023, doi: 10.48550/arxiv.2310.16096. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.16096. [Accessed: Jun. 2025]
[11] B. Yang, C. Gao, N. Liu, and L. Xu, "Dynamic Inventory and Pricing Policy in a Periodic-Review Inventory System with Finite Ordering Capacity and Price Adjustment Cost," Mathematical Problems in Engineering, vol. 2015, p. 1, Jan. 2015, doi: 10.1155/2015/269695. Available: https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/269695. [Accessed: Aug. 2025]
[12] X. Kong, H. Wang, X. Chen, and G. Feng, "Optimal policy for inventory systems with capacity commitment and fixed ordering costs," Operations Research Letters, vol. 48, no. 1, p. 9, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.orl.2019.10.006. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2019.10.006. [Accessed: Feb. 2025]
[13] C. Chiang, "Optimal ordering policies for periodic-review systems with replenishment cycles," European Journal of Operational Research, vol. 170, no. 1, p. 44, Aug. 2004, doi: 10.1016/j.ejor.2004.06.010. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2004.06.010. [Accessed: Feb. 2025]
[14] M. L. Fisher, K. Rajaram, and A. Raman, "Optimizing Inventory Replenishment of Retail Fashion Products," Manufacturing & Service Operations Management, vol. 3, no. 3, p. 230, Jul. 2001, doi: 10.1287/msom.3.3.230.9889. Available: https://doi.org/10.1287/msom.3.3.230.9889. [Accessed: Feb. 2025]
[15] J. J. Vicente, A. P. Barbosa-Pòvoa, and S. Relvas, "Supply chain management under product demand and lead time uncertainty," International Journal of Operational Research, vol. 37, no. 4, p. 453, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1504/ijor.2020.10027266. Available: https://doi.org/10.1504/ijor.2020.10027266. [Accessed: Jul. 2025]
[16] Y. Sherstennikov, "Modeling Optimization of an Enterprise's Production Capacity and Retail Sales," Business Inform, vol. 6, no. 497, p. 135, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.32983/2222-4459-2019-6-135-139. Available: https://doi.org/10.32983/2222-4459-2019-6-135-139. [Accessed: Feb. 2025]
[17] A. Agarwal, "Multi-echelon Supply Chain Inventory Planning using Simulation-Optimization with Data Resampling," arXiv (Cornell University), Jan. 2019, doi: 10.48550/arxiv.1901.00090. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/1901.00090. [Accessed: Aug. 2025]
[18] A. S. White, "Management of inventory using control theory," International Journal of Technology Management, vol. 17, p. 847, Jan. 1999, doi: 10.1504/ijtm.1999.002754. Available: https://doi.org/10.1504/ijtm.1999.002754. [Accessed: Feb. 2025]
[19] M. Rahdar, L. Wang, and G. Hu, "A tri-level optimization model for inventory control with uncertain demand and lead time," International Journal of Production Economics, vol. 195, p. 96, Oct. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2017.10.011. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2017.10.011. [Accessed: Jul. 2025]
[20] Y. Duan, Y. Cao, and J. Huo, "Optimal pricing, production, and inventory for deteriorating items under demand uncertainty: The finite horizon case," Applied Mathematical Modelling, vol. 58, p. 331, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.apm.2018.02.004. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apm.2018.02.004. [Accessed: Feb. 2025]
[21] J. H. Kang, "Inventory optimization model for NIKE's long lifecycle highly seasonal replenishment products," 2015. Available: https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/99008. [Accessed: Dec. 2024]
[22] A. Kelly, "Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Supply Chain Optimization," Journal of Technology and Systems, vol. 6, no. 6, p. 15, Aug. 2024, doi: 10.47941/jts.2153. Available: https://doi.org/10.47941/jts.2153. [Accessed: Jul. 2025]
[23] M. A. Kashem, M. Shamsuddoha, T. Nasir, and A. A. Chowdhury, "Supply Chain Disruption versus Optimization: A Review on Artificial Intelligence and Blockchain," Knowledge, vol. 3, no. 1. p. 80, Feb. 09, 2023. doi: 10.3390/knowledge3010007. Available: https://doi.org/10.3390/knowledge3010007. [Accessed: Jul. 2025]