A rejoinder to Brian Shorrock:

I now accept that there is no technical error in the computations carried out by Brian Shorrock. The crucial paragraph in the original article uses the words "value" and "values" in different connotations. If the author had stuck to the term "usage-value", then there would have been less risk of misinterpretation and the feeling that he had dropped a "1" off his result.

The figure of 4.5 weeks' usage-value of stock can be quite simply obtained from $0.8 \times 3 + 0.15 \times 8 + 0.05 \times 18$, where the integer values are the average stockholding (in weeks) for each ABC class. While "*it can be shown that ...*" is perhaps preferable to a large table of calculations in keeping articles brief, one line of arithmetic could surely have been included.

Ordinarily, OR analysts will contemplate stocks only in terms of quantities, leaving money values to the management accountants. However, the suggested computation is extremely useful because it nicely synthesises the two viewpoints, and I can certainly agree with the author that a manager prefers to know his stock levels in terms of money. If anything, Shorrock failed to emphasise this synthesis enough.

BRIAN DANGERFIELD
University of Salford