

*Article history* : Received December 6 2010. Accepted January 28 2011.

$b - (b - a)^+$  for  $(a)^+ = \max(a, 0)$ . The celebrated form of solution for the optimal quantity to the classic newsvendor problem read as

$$q^* = \arg \max_q \pi = F_D^{-1}\left(\frac{p-c}{p}\right) \quad (1.1)$$

where  $F_D^{-1}$  denotes the inverse function of the well-defined cumulative distribution function  $F$  of  $D$ . The ratio  $\frac{p-c}{p}$  sometimes is referred to a critical ratio. This paper considers a newsvendor selling  $N$  products in a supply chain while procuring them from a supplier, the problem is often modelled as a non-cooperative game. The expected profit functions for the retailer can be written as

$$\pi_r(q, w) = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i E \min(q_i, D_i) - w_i q_i, \quad (1.2)$$

while the one for the supplier is

$$\pi_s(q, w) = \sum_{i=1}^N (w_i - c_i) q_i. \quad (1.3)$$

The retailer determine an optimal order quantity  $q = (q_1, \dots, q_N)$  within a strategic space  $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  while the supplier determine an optimal wholesale price  $w = (w_1, \dots, w_N)$  within a strategic space  $W \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  for maximizing their own profits.  $c$  represents the unit production cost. Through the rest of the paper, we use bold face letter for vector representation, e.g.,  $c = (c_1, \dots, c_N)$ . The non-cooperative game between two vertical players in a supply chain is

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} \max_{q \in Q} \pi_r(q, w) \\ \max_{w \in W} \pi_s(q, w) \end{array} \right] \quad (1.4)$$

In certain situations, the order quantities and wholesale prices need to be confined to particular conditions. For example the constraint conditions can be generalized to, for example, a minimum service level  $q > R_i$  [3], or resource limitation  $\sum_{i \in C_j} q_i < C_j$  [1, 6] for multiple product newsvendor problems. In this paper, we consider the resource constraint,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N q_i \leq \bar{C}. \quad (1.5)$$

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

For ease of derivation, the expected sales  $S(q_i) = E[\min(q_i, D_i)]$  rewrite to  $E[D_i - (D_i - q_i)^+]$ . By using integral by part, we can further write

$$\begin{aligned} S(q_i) &= \int_0^\infty x f_i(x) dx - \int_{q_i}^\infty (x - q_i) f_i(x) dx \\ &= q_i F_i(q_i) - \int_0^{q_i} F_i(x) dx + q_i (1 - F_i(q_i)) \\ &= q_i - \int_0^{q_i} F_i(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

The problem (1.4) with constraint (1.5) can be solved by the Lagrangian,

$$L_r(q, w, \lambda) = \pi_r(q, w) + \lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^N q_i - \bar{q} \right). \quad (2.1)$$

The best response function for the retailer has been solved by the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker condition, that is,

$$q_i(w_i, \lambda) = F_i^{-1} \left( \frac{p_i - w_i - \lambda}{p_i} \right) \quad (2.2)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N q_i - \bar{C} \leq 0 \quad (2.3)$$

$$\lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^N q_i - \bar{C} \right) = 0 \quad (2.4)$$

Since the supplier possesses the freedom to pricing its goods, the supply chain game is deemed a Stackelberg game with supplier as the leader and the retailer as the follower. Substituting the best follower response function  $q$ , the supplier profit (1.3) becomes

$$\pi_s(q, w, \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^N (w_i - c_i) F_i^{-1} \left( \frac{p_i - w_i - \lambda}{p_i} \right), \quad (2.5)$$

and the corresponding first order condition

$$\frac{\partial \pi_s}{\partial w_i} = F_i^{-1} \left( \frac{p_i - w_i - \lambda}{p_i} \right) - (w_i - c_i) \nabla F_i^{-1} \left( \frac{p_i - w_i - \lambda}{p_i} \right) = 0 \quad (2.6)$$

Define  $w'_i = \frac{p_i - w_i - \lambda}{p_i}$  and  $g_i(w'_i) = (p_i - c_i - \lambda - p_i w'_i) \nabla F_i^{-1}(w'_i)$ . Equ. (2.6) becomes a fixed point problem

$$w'_i = F(g_i(w'_i)) = F_i \circ g_i(w'_i), \quad (2.7)$$

where the operator  $\circ$  represents the function composition.

### 3. MAIN RESULTS

Before proving the nature of equilibriums, we need some definitions. A function  $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has *increasing difference* in  $(x, y) \in X \times Y \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  if for all  $x' \geq x$  and  $y' \geq y$ ,  $f$  satisfies

$$f(x', y') - f(x, y') \geq f(x', y) - f(x, y).$$

The definition of increasing difference implies that the incremental gain or payoff to choosing a higher  $x$  is greater when  $y$  is larger. A game is a *supermodular game* if the strategy spaces are compact and the best response function  $u(s_i, s_{-i})$  is continuous and has increasing difference in  $(s_i, s_{-i})$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** [11] *Given a twice differentiable function  $f$ , it has increasing difference in  $(x, y)$  if and only if  $\frac{\partial^2 f(x, y)}{\partial x \partial y} \geq 0$ .*

**Lemma 3.2.** [11] *A supermodular game admits at least one pure strategy Nash equilibrium.*

The existence of Nash equilibriums have been proved in many reports by either the convexity or supermodularity of payoff functions[7, 4, 9, 10].

It is also essential to apply fixed point theorems for proving the existence of Nash equilibriums, for example, Brouwer, Kakutani and Tarski's fixed point theorems [2].

**Theorem 3.1.** *The game (1.4) admits at least one pure strategy Nash equilibrium, if  $F$  is non-decreasing.*

*Proof.* Consider the game (1.4) with the fixed point problem (2.7). The composition mapping  $F \circ g$  is continuous and it maps a convex and compact set  $W$  into a closed convex subset of  $W$ . By the Kakutani fixed point theorem, there exists a point  $w^0 \in W$  such that  $w^0 \in F \circ g(w)$ .  $\square$

In order to prove uniqueness, we the following definitions. A mapping  $f : W \rightarrow W$  is a contraction if there exists a Lipschitz constant  $0 < k < 1$ , such that

$$\|f(x) - f(y)\| \leq k\|x - y\|, \forall x, y \in W.$$

This Lipschitz condition amounts to the condition  $\|f'(w)\| < 1$  for all  $w \in W$ . It is well-known that a contraction has a unique fixed point.

Define the coefficient of relative risk aversion  $\epsilon(w)$  as  $\frac{-\nabla^2 F(w)}{\nabla F(w)}$  and it is a measure of risk attitude which is relative to the strength of preference [5].

**Theorem 3.2.** *If the accumulative distribution function  $F$  for the uncertain demand is well-defined and*

$$\nabla^2 F_i < \frac{g_i}{1 + p_i g_i}, \forall w_i \in W, \quad (3.1)$$

*the game (1.4) has a unique solution.*

*Proof.* Taking derivative to the composition (2.7),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla(F_i \circ g_i)(w_i)\| &= \|(\nabla g_i \cdot (\nabla F_i) \circ g_i)(w_i)\| \\ &= \|((-p_i \nabla F_i^{-1} + g_i \nabla^2 F_i^{-1}) \cdot (\nabla F_i) \circ g_i)(w_i)\| \\ &\leq \|(-p_i \nabla F_i^{-1} + g_i \nabla^2 F_i^{-1})\| \cdot \|((\nabla F_i) \circ g_i)(w)\| \end{aligned}$$

By the Lagrange inversion theorem and Lagrange-Bürmann formula, the derivative of an inversion reads as

$$\nabla(F^{-1})(w) = \frac{1}{\nabla F(F^{-1}(w))}.$$

Let  $F^{-1}(w) = a$ . Given  $\nabla^2 F < 0$ , therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{-p_i}{\nabla F_i(a)} + \frac{g_i}{\nabla^2 F_i(a)} \right\| &\leq 1, \text{ and} \\ \|\nabla F_i\| \|g_i(w)\| &\leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

It is necessary that

$$\left\| -p_i g_i + \frac{g_i}{\nabla^2 F_i(a)} \right\| \leq 1, \forall a \in W.$$

If the condition (3.1) holds,  $\|\nabla(F_i \circ g_i)(w_i)\| < 1$ . Therefore the game has a unique solution.  $\square$

**Acknowledgements.** The authors would like to thank the referees for comments which improve the manuscript. This research was partially supported by grant NSC-98-2410-H-327-002 from the National Science Council of Taiwan.

## REFERENCES

1. L.L. Abdel-Malek and R. Montanari. On the multi-product newsboy problem with two constraints. *Computers & Operations Research*, 32(8):2095–2116, 2005.
2. K.C. Border. Fixed Point Theorems with Applications to Economics and Game Theory. *Cambridge Books*, 1990.
3. J.D. Dana Jr and N.C. Petruzzi. Note: The newsvendor model with endogenous demand. *Management Science*, 47(11):1488–1497, 2001.
4. G. Debreu. A social equilibrium existence theorem. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 38(10):886, 1952.
5. J.S. Dyer and R.K. Sarin. Relative risk aversion. *Management Science*, 28(8):875–886, 1982.
6. S.J. Erlebacher. Optimal and heuristic solutions for the multi-item newsvendor problem with a single capacity constraint. *Production and Operations Management*, 9(3):303–318, 2000.
7. K. Jerath, S. Netessine, and S.K. Veeraraghavan. Revenue management with strategic customers: Last-minute selling and opaque selling. *Management Science*, 56(3):430–448, 2010.
8. M. Khouja. The single-period (news-vendor) problem: literature review and suggestions for future research. *Omega*, 27(5):537–553, 1999.
9. P.J. Lederer and L. Li. Pricing, production, scheduling, and delivery-time competition. *Operations Research*, 45(3):407–420, 1997.
10. P. Majumder and H. Groenevelt. Competition in remanufacturing. *Production and Operations Management*, 10(2):125–141, 2001.
11. D.M. Topkis. Equilibrium points in nonzero-sum  $n$ -person submodular games. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 17:773, 1979.