Response to Jaber and Bonneys' comments

As acknowledged in Jaber and Bonney's (JB) response,¹ the two major issues are: (1) Is the JBM² model correct? (2) Do JBM and ZLM³ produce different results?

On the first issue, JB¹ do not refute our claim that the original JBM² is mathematically incorrect, but justify it by pointing out that an 'approximation' disclaimer was explicitly stated in their paper. We therefore would like to retract our claim that the original JBM is incorrect, and would merely state that our model³ removes the 'approximation' in JBM.

On the second issue, JB¹ do not refute our claim that the ZLM exact expression is hardly more complicated than JBM's² approximate expression, but they present more than one page of mathematical derivations to reach the conclusion that 'Arguably, in most practical cases, (the ZLM and

JBM expressions differ by) a negligible value.' We do not see the need to disagree with this conclusion.

Hefei University of Technology, Anhui,

People's Republic of China

City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Y-W Zhou

H-S Lau

References

- 1 Jaber MY and Bonney M (2001). Comments on Zhou and Lau's reply. *J Opl Res Soc* **52**: 591–592.
- 2 Jaber MY and Bonney M (1996). Optimal lot sizing under learning considerations: the bounded learning cases. *Appl Math Model* **20**: 750–755.
- 3 Zhou YW and Lau H-S (1998). Optimal production lot-sizing model considering the bounded learning case and shortages backordered. *J Opl Res Soc* **49**: 1206–1211.