

**Table 2** Sensitivity analysis for Example 1

$C_3$	Complete backlogging	$\alpha$						Without shortage	
		1	2.5	5.0	10	25	50		
30	TC*	5078.6 <sup>†</sup>	5312.4 <sup>†</sup>	5537.7 <sup>†</sup>	5761.9 <sup>†</sup>	5993.4 <sup>†</sup>	6243.1 <sup>†</sup>	6368.5 <sup>†</sup>	6772.4 <sup>†</sup>
	$n^*$	10 <sup>†</sup>	10 <sup>†</sup>	11 <sup>†</sup>	11 <sup>†</sup>	11 <sup>†</sup>	11 <sup>†</sup>	12 <sup>†</sup>	14 <sup>†</sup>
60	TC*	5078.6 <sup>†</sup>	5563.2	5915.4	6118.0	6409.8	6601.2	6682.7	6772.4 <sup>†</sup>
	$n^*$	10 <sup>†</sup>	11	12	12	13	13	14	14 <sup>†</sup>
90	TC*	5078.6 <sup>†</sup>	5748.1	6118.2	6361.9	6537.8	6671.4	6720.1	6772.4 <sup>†</sup>
	$n^*$	10 <sup>†</sup>	11	12	13	13	14	14	14 <sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Denotes the optimal results obtained by Chang and Dye.<sup>1</sup>

**Table 3** Sensitivity analysis for Example 2

$C_3$	Complete backlogging	$\alpha$						Without shortage	
		1	2.5	5.0	10	25	50		
30	TC*	5003.4 <sup>†</sup>	5227.0 <sup>†</sup>	5449.0 <sup>†</sup>	5664.1 <sup>†</sup>	5890.5 <sup>†</sup>	6131.0 <sup>†</sup>	6247.5 <sup>†</sup>	6425.5 <sup>†</sup>
	$n^*$	10 <sup>†</sup>	10 <sup>†</sup>	11 <sup>†</sup>	11 <sup>†</sup>	11 <sup>†</sup>	12 <sup>†</sup>	12 <sup>†</sup>	13 <sup>†</sup>
60	TC*	5003.4 <sup>†</sup>	5438.2	5764.9	5979.4	6160.2	6301.6	6363.6	6425.5 <sup>†</sup>
	$n^*$	10 <sup>†</sup>	11	11	12	12	12	13	13 <sup>†</sup>
90	TC*	5003.4 <sup>†</sup>	5582.3	5901.3	6098.2	6243.7	6351.2	6386.1	6425.5 <sup>†</sup>
	$n^*$	10 <sup>†</sup>	11	12	12	12	12	13	13 <sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Denotes the optimal results obtained by Chang and Dye.<sup>1</sup>

**Table 4** Sensitivity analysis for Example 3

$C_3$	Complete backlogging	$\alpha$						Without shortage	
		1	2.5	5.0	10	25	50		
30	TC*	3490.1 <sup>†</sup>	3622.3 <sup>†</sup>	3760.2 <sup>†</sup>	3909.7 <sup>†</sup>	4077.9 <sup>†</sup>	4276.0 <sup>†</sup>	4393.9 <sup>†</sup>	4575.2 <sup>†</sup>
	$n^*$	7 <sup>†</sup>	7 <sup>†</sup>	7 <sup>†</sup>	7 <sup>†</sup>	8 <sup>†</sup>	8 <sup>†</sup>	8 <sup>†</sup>	9 <sup>†</sup>
60	TC*	3490.1 <sup>†</sup>	3799.0	4014.5	4193.5	4343.1	4464.4	4515.8	4575.2 <sup>†</sup>
	$n^*$	7 <sup>†</sup>	7	8	8	9	9	9	9 <sup>†</sup>
90	TC*	3490.1 <sup>†</sup>	3910.8	4150.4	4311.8	4421.3	4506.5	4539.4	4575.2 <sup>†</sup>
	$n^*$	7 <sup>†</sup>	8	8	9	9	9	9	9 <sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Denotes the optimal results obtained by Chang and Dye.<sup>1</sup>

**Table 5** Sensitivity analysis for Example 4

$C_3$	Complete backlogging	$\alpha$						Without shortage	
		1	2.5	5.0	10	25	50		
30	TC*	3410.7 <sup>†</sup>	3563.7 <sup>†</sup>	3668.0 <sup>†</sup>	3810.2 <sup>†</sup>	3972.9 <sup>†</sup>	4166.4 <sup>†</sup>	4276.2 <sup>†</sup>	4451.7 <sup>†</sup>
	$n^*$	7 <sup>†</sup>	7 <sup>†</sup>	7 <sup>†</sup>	7 <sup>†</sup>	7 <sup>†</sup>	8 <sup>†</sup>	8 <sup>†</sup>	9 <sup>†</sup>
60	TC*	3410.5 <sup>†</sup>	3701.9	3917.0	4084.2	4229.1	4349.7	4397.1	4451.7 <sup>†</sup>
	$n^*$	7 <sup>†</sup>	7	8	8	8	9	9	9 <sup>†</sup>
90	TC*	3410.5 <sup>†</sup>	3819.0	4043.2	4207.8	4309.3	4388.1	4418.6	4451.9 <sup>†</sup>
	$n^*$	7 <sup>†</sup>	8	8	9	9	9	9	9 <sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Denotes the optimal results obtained by Chang and Dye.<sup>1</sup>

### Response by Dye

After a deep inspection of Professor Goyal and Giri's Viewpoint concerning Chang and Dye's model, I have the following comments. First of all, I am very grateful for their identification of the typos in the paper. Secondly, regarding

the setting of the opportunity cost, I am quite in compliance with their suggestions

Shu-Te University

C-Y Dye