BSc Thesis: Scheduling policies for a repair shop problem

Dopheide, J.J. Student Number: 371175 July 3, 2016

Econometrics and operations research Supervisor: Oosterom, C.D. van First Reader: Dekker, R.

Abstract

In this paper we take another look at the $Myopic(\mathbf{R})$ scheduling policy proposed by Liang et al. (2013). The $Myopic(\mathbf{R})$ policy is much more time efficient, coming with a small loss of optimality. This policy is useful when one repair shop for every machine type is combined to one central repair shop. The other case Liang et al. (2013) look at is the base case, where one repair shop per fleet is used.

In this paper multiple search methods are proposed to find the optimal costs for both the base case as the central repair shop case under the $Myopic(\mathbf{R})$ policy. These search methods are based on the convexity of the cost functions of the base case and the CRS case. which is proven for the first and conjectured for the second. The proposed methods show great improvement in calculation time.

In Liang et al. (2013) it is shown that the CRS is preferred over the base case for certain a certain factor α . We show for which values the cost minima of the base case and the CRS case are in equilibrium., which means that we know when it is benificial to use which repair shop strategy.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Notation	2
3	Methodology	3
	3.1 Base Case	3
	3.1.1 Convexity	4
	3.1.2 Search methods	6
	3.2 Central Repair Shop	8
	3.2.1 Myopic(\mathbf{R}) policy	9
	3.2.2 Global balance equations	10
	3.2.3 Search methods	11
	3.3 BC/CRS-equilibrium	12
4	Results	12
	4.1 Base Case	13
	4.2 Central Repair Shop	14
	4.3 BC/CRS-equilibrium	15
5	Conclusion	16
6	Discussion and further research	16
7	Appendix	19

1 Introduction

In a production line, the manufacturing of products is often partitioned into several stages where in every stage a different kind of machine is used. Within each stage the same type of machine is used. All the machines together in one stage are then called a fleet. Machines break down from time to time and have to be repaired. When a machine is down the operation targets cannot be met, so until the machine is repaired, the manufacturing plant experiences downtime-costs. To decrease the downtime-costs, it can be useful to have spare machines in stock, so the broken ones can be replaced immediately, and the production process is not interrupted. These spares are accompanied by holding costs per type of machine. Therefore, it is of interest to determine a good balance between the number of spares and the long-term expected downtime, so the costs for production are at its minimum. Also, the repair shop structure is of importance. A manufacturer could use a different repair shop per fleet, or a general repair shop for all the different fleets together (with a higher service (repair) rate). Sahba et al. (2013) shows that a central repair shop can be more efficient.

Sahba et al. (2013) looks at the option where there are spares kept per fleet, but also the case where there is a general stock where all fleets can draw resources from. This last case is beyond the scope of this research. When using a central repair shop, the scheduling of the repairs is of importance as well. This is caused by the fact that the downtime costs for every machine is different. The machine that the decreases the downtime costs the most when repaired relatively to the repair time, has to be repaired first to save as much as possible.

In this paper the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) policy proposed by Liang et al. (2013) will be re-examined. The Myopic(\mathbf{R}) policy is very useful, since, according to the results in Liang et al. (2013), the computational time decreases drastically compared to time required to find the optimal solution, while outcomes do not differ a lot from the optimal solution. The minimum costs are determined by searching over different number of spares in stock per machine type, and calculating the system costs for those numbers. The costs of the central repair shop while using the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) will be compared to the one repair shop per fleet case.

Since the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) policy is introduced to decrease computational time, it is of interest to use a clever way of finding the optimal number of spares as well, to decrease the computational time even more. In Liang et al. (2013) the way to find the optimal number of spares is undefined and therefore we assume that they used complete enumeration, which is slow. Very few literature could be found regarding keeping spare inventory for breaking down machines. This is said in Liang et al. (2013) as well. Therefore the purpose of this research is to make sure we find the optimal value of stock and find a method to decrease the computational time of finding the optimal number of spares kept in stock per fleet.

Intuitively, the system cost function for the number of spares is first non-increasing and then increasing. This means that there is a global minimum for the system costs. This intuitive assumption is supported by the fact that adding spares has a constant increase in costs, since the holding costs per machine type are constant. Furthermore, increasing the number of spares, causes a decrease in probability of having less machines operational than required, and therefore the downtime costs are non-increasing. Taylor and Jackson (1954) results show that probability of machines is the number of spare machines in the one repair shop per fleet case is strictly decreasing descending in their graphs, which may be the case in the central repair shop case as well. This assumption has to be checked and may be the basis for a clever search algorithm to find the optimal number of spares per fleet. We will prove that for the multiple repair shop case the cost function is indeed convex and use this result to propose two fast ways of finding the optimal number of spares per fleet. We will show by graphs that the (marginal) cost functions in the central repair shop case are also convex for the cases we examine and will propose search methods for finding the optimal number of spares.

Also, Liang et al. (2013) show that a central repair shop is more cost efficient than separate repair shops under the assumption of higher repair rates per fleet. In their paper they assumed when two fleets are repaired in the same repair shop, their repair times increase with factor two. We assume that the central repair shop case is indeed beneficial over the base case when all the repair rates are multiplied by factor *r* when *r* repair shops are combined in one repair shop. Another purpose of this research is to find out for what factor α the central repair shop is not preferred over the base case any more. In other words, we want to find out for which factor α the optimal system costs for the central repair shop and the separate shops are in equilibrium.

It is of interest to find this equilibrium to know for which production lines a central repair shop should be used, and for which lines a separate repair shop is beneficial. Also a hybrid method could be used, such that some machine types are repaired in the same repair shop and others have its own repair shop or are combined in another separate repair shop.

2 Notation

To reproduce the case where we use a different repair shop per fleet of machines and the central repair shop case while using the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) scheduling policy, we first introduce notation. We use similar notation asLiang et al. (2013). From now on we will refer to the repair shop per fleet as the base case (BC), and to the combined repair shop as the central repair shop (CRS).

We consider *r* different fleets with identical machines types *i*, *i* = 1, 2, .., *r* within each fleet. The number of required machines within a fleet to operate at full strength is denoted as N_i . Since we allow to keep spares per fleet as well, the number of spares kept in stock per fleet is defined as S_i . The total number of machines of type *i* owned by the manufacturer equals $N_i + S_i$.

The number of machines that is operational and active at time *t* is defined as $W_i(t)$, where $0 \le W_i(t) \le N_i$. The number of functional machines that are kept in stock at time *t* is defined as $I_i(t)$, where $0 \le I_i(t) \le S_i$. Since we will always operate at the highest operation level, such that all functional will be used if possible. This means that $I_i(t) = 0$ when $W_i(t) < N_i$. The total number of functional machines is defined as $A_i(t) = W_i(t) + I_i(t)$. When A_i is equal or larger than N_i , fleet *i* operates at full strength. When A_i is smaller than N_i the fleet has $N_i - A_i$ down machines.

When there are less machines operational than required to operate at full strength $(W_i(t) < N_i)$, the manufacturer experiences less production than is optimal. This results in less turnover/profit, which means that the manufacturer experiences extra costs. Therefore we define b_i as the costs per time unit per machine that is down. The total holding costs per time unit is $h_i \times S_i$, where h_i are the holding costs per time unit per machine. The downtime costs and holding costs are assumed to be constant per machine type.

We say that a system *i* is in state n_i , when there are n_i machines functional. A machine from fleet *i* is repaired with a rate μ_i and a machine breaks down with rate λ_i . The break down rate is state dependent, since the expected time till the first break down is

dependent on the number of machines that are in use. The break down rate in state n_i equals $\lambda_i \cdot \min\{n_i, N_i\}$.

3 Methodology

3.1 Base Case

We will first look into the BC. The BC can be modeled as a birth-and-death process. A birth takes place when a machine is repaired and a death takes place when a machine breaks down. Therefore a birth takes place with rate μ_i and a death takes place with λ_i .

In the BC every fleet has its own repair shop. This means that the probability of having *n* functional machines in fleet *i*, is independent of the number of machines functional in fleet *j*, where $i \neq j$. Therefore, we can consider this model as *r* different queuing systems. Every repair shop has its own state space *S* that consists of the numbers 1, 2, ..., $N_i + S_i$, corresponding to the number of functional machines in every state. Since the fleets are independent in the BC we will solve the different systems one by one, and from now on we drop the subscript *i* for notational convenience.

Now we can define the probability that the system is in state n and we define the probability of being in state n while having S spares in stock as follows. Because the state space is dependent on the number of spares S_i , the state probabilities are dependent on S_i as well. Therefore, we use the following notation:

$$p(n|S) = \frac{\frac{\mu^{n}}{\lambda^{n} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} \min\{i,N\}}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S} \frac{\mu^{n}}{\lambda^{n} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} \min\{i,N\}}}$$
(1)

We need to construct the cost function, because we want to minimize the total production costs, such that:

$$C_{BC}^* = \sum_{i=1}^r C_i(S_i^*)$$

is minimal.

The state probabilities in equation 1 are an important part here. The cost function is defined as follows:

$$C(S) = h \cdot S + b \sum_{n=0}^{N} (N-n)p(n|S)$$
(2)

The first term are the total holding costs for the machines kept in stock, and the second term are the costs for the down machines. We need to minimize this function for every fleet i to determine the minimum costs.

To find the optimal value of *S*, for which the function C(S) is at its minimum, we compute the costs for different values of *S*. In Liang et al. (2013) the search method is undefined and therefore we assumed that they used complete enumeration with a predefined maximum value of *S*. The choice of this maximum *S* is also undefined. The choice of a maximum S^{max} is hard, because taking S^{max} large, means that a lot of different options have to be considered and computed, when complete enumeration is used. This takes a lot of computation time. Taking S^{max} small, might cause that the global minimum of the cost function is not included in the interval, such that $S^* \notin \{0, 1, ..., S^{max}\}$. Therefore the optimal *S* cannot be found when S^{max} is too small. This means that it is of great interest to find out if there are other possibilities to find S^* .

3.1.1 Convexity

As mentioned in Section 1, we want to show that the cost function is convex in the BC. Convexity in general for an integer function $y : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$ is defined as follows:

$$y(x+1) - y(x) \le y(x+2) - y(x+1)$$

We will prove that the function given in 2 is convex.

of the equation and next the right hand side.

Theorem 1: The cost function of the base case is convex, or equivalently:

$$C(S+1) - C(S) \le C(S+2) - C(S+1)$$
(3)

To prove this theorem we will first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 1: The probability function of the system being in state *n* given a stock *S* is convex in *S*:

$$p(n|S+1) - p(n|S) \le p(n|S+2) - p(n|S+1) \quad \forall n$$
(4)

<u>Proof of Lemma 1</u>: For notational convenience we will first introduce $\phi_n = \frac{\mu^n}{\lambda^n \cdot \left(\frac{n!}{\prod_{i=N+1}^{n!} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n-N}(N)\right)}$ such that Equation 1 becomes $p(n|S) = \frac{\phi_n}{\sum_{i=0}^{N+S} \phi_n}$. First we will work out the left hand side

LHS:

$$\begin{split} p(n|S+1) - p(n|S) &= \frac{\phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n} - \frac{\phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S} \phi_n} \\ &= \frac{\phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n} - \frac{\frac{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n}}{\frac{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n}} \cdot \frac{\phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S} \phi_n} \\ &= \frac{\phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n} - \frac{\frac{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n} \\ &= \frac{\left(1 - \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n}\right) \cdot \phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n} \\ &= \frac{\left(\frac{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S} \phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n} - \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n}\right) \cdot \phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n} = \frac{\left(-\frac{\phi_{N+S+1}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n}\right) \cdot \phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1} \phi_n} \end{split}$$

RHS:

$$p(n|S+2) - p(n|S+1) = \dots = \frac{\left(-\frac{\phi_{N+S+2}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1}\phi_n}\right) \cdot \phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+2}\phi_n} = \frac{\left(-\frac{\phi_{N+S+2}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+2}\phi_n}\right) \cdot \phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1}\phi_n}$$

3 METHODOLOGY

We now have to show that:

$$\frac{\left(-\frac{\phi_{N+S+1}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S}\phi_n}\right)\cdot\phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1}\phi_n}\leq\frac{\left(-\frac{\phi_{N+S+2}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+2}\phi_n}\right)\cdot\phi_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1}\phi_n}$$

Or equivalently:

$$-\frac{\phi_{N+S+1}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S}\phi_n} \le -\frac{\phi_{N+S+2}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+2}\phi_n}$$
(5)

To show this inequality we need to substitute ϕ_n back into the equation:

$$-\frac{\phi_{N+S+1}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S}\phi_n} = -\frac{\frac{\mu^{N+S+1}}{\lambda^{N+S+1}\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+1}\min\{i,N\}}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S}\frac{\mu^n}{\lambda^n\cdot\prod_{i=1}^n\min\{i,N\}}}$$
$$= -\frac{(\frac{\mu}{\lambda})^{N+S+1}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S}(\frac{\mu}{\lambda})^n\cdot\left[\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+1}\min\{i,N\}}{\prod_{i=1}^n\min\{i,N\}}\right]}$$
(6)

$$\leq -\frac{\left(\frac{\mu}{\lambda}\right)^{N+S+1}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S}\left(\frac{\mu}{\lambda}\right)^{n} \cdot \left[\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+2}\min\{i,N\}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n+1}\min\{i,N\}}\right]}{\left(\frac{\mu}{\lambda}\right)^{N+S+1}}$$
(7)

$$\leq -\frac{(\overline{\lambda})^{N+S+2}}{\frac{\lambda}{\mu}\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+2}\min\{i,N\} + \sum_{n=0}^{N+S}(\frac{\mu}{\lambda})^{n} \cdot \left[\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+2}\min\{i,N\}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n+1}\min\{i,N\}}\right]}$$
(8)
$$= -\frac{(\frac{\mu}{\lambda}) \cdot (\frac{\mu}{\lambda})^{N+S+1}}{\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+2}\min\{i,N\} + \sum_{n=0}^{N+S}(\frac{\mu}{\lambda})^{n+1} \cdot \left[\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+2}\min\{i,N\}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n+1}\min\{i,N\}}\right]}$$
$$= -\frac{(\frac{\mu}{\lambda})^{N+S+2}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1}(\frac{\mu}{\lambda})^{n} \cdot \left[\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+2}\min\{i,N\}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n}\min\{i,N\}}\right]}$$
$$= -\frac{\frac{\mu^{N+S+2}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+1}\frac{\mu^{n}}{\lambda^{n}\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{n}\min\{i,N\}}} = -\frac{\phi_{N+S+2}}{\sum_{n=0}^{N+S+2}\phi_{n}}$$

The inequality between 6 and 7 is explained by the fact that:

$$\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+1}\min\{i,N\}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n}\min\{i,N\}} = \frac{\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+2}\min\{i,N\}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n+1}\min\{i,N\}}}{\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+2}\min\{i,N\}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n+1}\min\{i,N\}}} \cdot \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+1}\min\{i,N\}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n}\min\{i,N\}} \\
= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+2}\min\{i,N\}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n+1}\min\{i,N\}} \cdot \frac{\min\{n+1,N\}}{\min\{N+S+2,N\}} \\
\leq \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N+S+2}\min\{i,N\}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n+1}\min\{i,N\}}$$

The inequality between 7 and 8 is explained by the fact that the term $\frac{\lambda}{\mu} \prod_{i=1}^{N+S+2} \min\{i, N\}$ is always positive, since $\lambda, \mu, N > 0$. Therefore inequality 5 holds and **Lemma 1** (4) is proven. \Box

Lemma 1 will be useful for proving Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1:

$$C(S+1) - C(S) = \left(h(S+1) + b\sum_{n=0}^{N} (N-n)p(n|S+1)\right) - \left(hS + b\sum_{n=0}^{N} (N-n)p(n|S)\right)$$
$$= h + b\sum_{n=0}^{N} (N-n)\left[p(n|S+1) - p(n|S)\right]$$
(9)

$$\leq h + b \sum_{n=0}^{N} (N-n) \left[p(n|S+2) - p(n|S+1) \right]$$
(10)

$$= \left(h(S+2) + b\sum_{n=0}^{N} (N-n)p(n|S+2)\right) - \left(h(S+1) + b\sum_{n=0}^{N} (N-n)p(n|S+1)\right)$$
$$= C(S+2) - C(S+1)$$

The inequality between 9 and 10 holds, because of Lemma 1. This proofs Theorem 1 (3) that the cost function of the BC is convex. \Box

The convexity of the BC cost function will be very useful in proposing a method that reduces the computation time for finding the optimal value of S, and still guarantees that we find S^* , the number of spares in stock for which the operation costs are at its global minimum.

Figure 1: Cost functions for two fleets with its own repair shops (BC)



In Figure 1 an example of the cost function is shown. The convexity is very clear for these two functions.

3.1.2 Search methods

The first method we propose to find S^* uses the property of a convex function, that when it starts increasing, it will never decrease anymore. The algorithm computes the costs for every *S*, until the cost function value starts increasing. This means that the previous iteration corresponds to the number of spares *S* at which the production costs are at its minimum. The pseudo-code for this algorithm is as follows:

Set $C(0) \rightarrow \inf$
Set $S \to 0$
repeat
$ k \rightarrow S+1$
Compute $C(S)$
until $C(S) > C(S-1)$;
$C^* \rightarrow C(S-1)$
$S^* \rightarrow S - 1$
Return S^* , C^*

In Figure 1 we show an example of the cost functions for two fleets (corresponding to the first row of results in Appendix 7). If we use complete enumeration, and we set S_{max} for both fleets at 20, 40 function evaluations have to be computed. Since the minima are at $S_1 = 9$ and $S_2 = 6$, the algorithm we propose only uses 19 function evaluations. Another advantage is that it costs more time to solve a system of equations when the number of equations and variables increase. When *S* is large, there are more states in which the system can be and therefore there are more variables and equations. Therefore it is beneficial to compute the cost function only for small values of *S*, which is done in the proposed method.

Another search method that is proposed is the Fibonacci search method. The Fibonacci is similar to the well-known golden search algorithm, but is suitable for an integer function such as the cost function 2 in Section 3.1. The Fibonacci search algorithm is a four point search method that shrinks a start interval iteratively wherein the minimum of the cost function will be. In the end the interval consists of four function values and the minimum will be searched over these four values, and S^* will be the corresponding stock to this minimum.

The advantage of this method is that function evaluations get reused, just as in the golden search method, which saves computation time. The downside of this search method is that it needs an upper bound. We did not look into how to find a upper bound that guarantees that the minimum will indeed lie within the interval.

The pseudo-code of the algorithm is shown on the next page. We define F_i as the i^{th} Fibonacci number and F_n as the smallest Fibonacci number greater than the preset upper bound. The new upper bound of the interval will be F_n , such that the minimum is searched in the interval $[0, F_n]$.

Pseudo Code Base Case 2

```
Set L \to 0
Set U \to F_n
Set C_L, C_U \rightarrow \inf
Set S_1 \rightarrow F_{n-2}
Set S_2 \rightarrow F_{n-1}
Compute C_1 \rightarrow C(S_1)
Compute C_2 \rightarrow C(S_2)
for j = 3, ..., n - 1 do
    if C_1 < C_2 then
         Set U \to S_2
         Set C_U \rightarrow C_2
         Set S_2 \rightarrow S_1
         Set C_2 \rightarrow C_1
         Set S_1 \rightarrow L + F_{n-j}
         Compute C_1 \rightarrow C(S_1)
    else
         Set L \to S_1
          Set C_L \rightarrow C_1
         Set S_1 \rightarrow S_2
         Set C_1 \rightarrow C_2
         Set S_2 = U - F_{n-j}
         Compute C_2 = C(S_2)
    end
end
if C<sub>L</sub> equals inf then
| Compute C_L \rightarrow C(L)
end
if C<sup><i>L</sup> equals inf then
| Compute C_U \rightarrow C(U)
end
Set C^* \rightarrow \min(\{C_L, C_1, C_2, C_U\})
Set S^* to corresponding S
Return C^*, S^*
```

3.2 Central Repair Shop

In the Central Repair Shop case (CRS), all machines are repaired at the same shop, but with a higher repair rate. For now we assume that $\mu_i = r \cdot \mu_i^{BC}$. Since every machine is repaired at the same shop, the state probabilities for every fleet are not independent anymore. This means that the problem becomes much larger and costs more time to solve.

Let us first define the vector $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, ..., n_r)$, which states the number of functional machines of every fleet. We also define vector $\mathbf{S} = (S_1, S_2, ..., S_r)$, which states the number of spares kept in stock per fleet. Our goal is to find the optimal vector \mathbf{S} for which the operation costs for the CRS are at its minimum. Therefore we need to minimize the cost function, which is slightly different in the CRS compared to the BC, due to the dependence between the fleets:

3 METHODOLOGY

$$C^* = \min_{\mathbf{S}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^r C_i(\mathbf{S}) \right\}$$

where,

$$C_i(\mathbf{S}) = h_i \cdot S_i + b_i \sum_{n=0}^{N_i} (N_i - n) p_i(n)$$

The minimum costs depend on the scheduling policy that is used in the CRS. The scheduling policy states which machine type is going to be repaired when not all machines are functional. Liang et al. (2013) propose the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) policy, which is faster than the optimal scheduling, and has a low cost difference with the optimal scheduling policy.

3.2.1 Myopic(R) policy

The Myopic(**R**) policy chooses to repair the machine type first for which the cost difference relatively to its repair and breakdown rate, between repairing and not repairing this machine is the largest. This cost rate difference is dependent on the number of type *i* machines in stock in a certain state. Therefore we define x_i as the inventory position of machine type *i*. The cost difference rate is defined as follows for $x_i > 0$:

$$\Delta c_i^R(x_i) = -b_i \sum_{m=x_i+1}^{N_i+x_i} p_i^R(m)$$
(11)

The probability $p_i^R(m)$ is the probability that m machines will break during the look ahead time. The look ahead time in the Myopic(**R**) policy is the repair time. Liang et al. (2013) show that for $0 \le x_i \le m$:

$$p_{i}^{R}(m) = \frac{\frac{N_{i}!}{(N_{i}-m+x_{i})!} \frac{\mu_{i}}{\lambda_{i}} \frac{(N_{i}\lambda_{i})^{x_{i}}}{(N_{i}\lambda_{i}+\mu_{i})^{x_{i}}}}{\prod_{i=0}^{m-x_{i}} (N_{i} + \frac{\mu_{i}}{\lambda_{i}} - j)}$$
(12)

When $x_i = 0$, there can be precisely N_i functional machines, or less. When $x_i = 0$ and there are exactly $n_i = N_i$ machines functional, the costs are defined as:>

$$c_i^R(x_i) = -b_i \cdot \frac{(N_i \lambda_i)}{N_i \lambda_i + \mu_i}$$
(13)

When $x_i = 0$ and the system is not fully operational, such that $n_i < N_i$, the expected downtime rate costs are defined as:

$$c_i^R(x_i) = -b_i \tag{14}$$

For every state **n** we can determine which machine has the lowest expected downtime cost rate difference. The machine type that corresponds to this minimum for $\frac{\mu_i \cdot \Delta c_i^R(x_i)}{\lambda_i}$ is the machine that will be repaired in this state. As can be seen, we compensate for the repair and break down rate in this fraction, such that we look at the relative downtime costs. Since we now know which machine will be repaired in every state we can compute the global balance equations:

3.2.2 Global balance equations

To find the long-term state probabilities, we compose a system of equations.

The left hand side of the equation (first line) is the rate that the process leaves state $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, ..., n_r)$.

The first term of the right hand side (second line) is the rate that the process enters state $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, ..., n_r)$ by a break down of any of the machines.

The second term of the right hand side (third line) is the rate that the process enters state $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, ..., n_r)$ by a repair.

$$\left[\sum_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i(n_i) + \mu(\mathbf{n})\right] P(\mathbf{n}) =$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} \left[\lambda_i(n_i+1) \cdot P(\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{e}_i)\right] +$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} \left[\mu(\mathbf{n}-\mathbf{e}_i) \cdot I_i \cdot P(\mathbf{n}-\mathbf{e}_i)\right]$$

where \mathbf{e}_i is a unit-vector.

Where

$$\lambda_i(n_i) = \min\{n_i, N_i\} \cdot \lambda_i$$

is the failure rate of a type *i* machine given that there are min $\{n_i, N_i\}$ <u>functional and active</u> machines.

Where

$$\mu(\mathbf{n}) = \begin{cases} \mu_i, & \text{if not all machines are functional} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where *i* is the to be repaired machine based on the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) scheduling policy in Section 3.2.1.

Where

$$I_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if type } i \text{ machine in function } \mu(.) \text{ is scheduled for repair} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

At last we add the normalizing equation, such that the total probability equals one:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}} P(\mathbf{n}) = 1$$

We will solve this system by using the MATLAB function for solving a system of equations.

3.2.3 Search methods

Intuitively the CRS cost function is convex, just as the BC cost function. When the multiple stocks S_i increase, the downtime costs are expected to be decreasing descending, and therefore expected to be convex in **S**. The holding costs increase linear, so are convex in **S** as well. Since the sum of two convex function is also convex, the the CRS cost function has to be convex as well if the assumption on the downtime costs holds. We could not prove this assumption for the CRS, since it is too complex for the time span we have.





Therefore we checked this assumption by numerical experiments. In Figure 2 the cost function is shown for the experiment corresponding to the first row of the results in Appendix 7. As we expected we can see in both graphs clear convex behavior. Although we do not know for sure if convexity holds in every case, we propose an algorithm which will decrease the computational time drastically if this assumption indeed holds.

The algorithm is the same as the first proposed method in the BC for a given stock for all the fleets except for fleet 1, so for a given $S_2, ..., S_r$. This means the *stop at first increase*-method is used in one dimension. In the other dimensions we use complete enumeration to guarantee convergence to the Myopic(**R**) optimum.

If the cost function of the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) is convex, this method will converge. Since we have no proof of the convexity of this function, there is no guarantee that the optimal vector \mathbf{S} will be found. Therefore this algorithm is a heuristic for the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) policy in the CRS.

Another method we propose, is also based on the assumption of convexity in the cost function. It is almost the same as the previous, but were we first only used the *stop at first increase*-method in one direction, we will now use it in all directions. This method is also known as the *coordinate descent*-method.

The algorithm will search for an optimal value for S_i given S_j , $\forall j \neq i \in R$, where $R = \{1, 2, ..., r\}$. We will use the line search method from Section 3.1.2 to find S_i^* . When the optimal value for S_i is found, another direction *i* will be chosen, and another optimum will be searched for along the new line. The process will repeat itself until no more improvement is found. The algorithm will search in the following order of directions: i = 1, 2, ..., r, 1, 2, ..., r...

A slight adjustment has to be notified according to the line search method, because we used to start at the search at $S_i^0 = 0$, such that we only have to increase S_i to find the minimum costs. Now that $S_i^0 \ge 0$ in each line search, the optimum can be on either sides of the current S_i . We propose to first look if a decrease is found when S_i is increased, and if not so, we search in the other direction along the line.

The downside of this method that it does not guarantee convergence to the minimum, even for convex functions. The upside is that this method will be faster since the information from the previous line-search will be used in the next.

3.3 BC/CRS-equilibrium

In the BC there is one repair shop per machine type, and in the CRS there is only one repair shop. This means that the CRS has more repairs to handle than the BC, since the break down rate per shop in the BC is $n_i \cdot \lambda_i$, $\forall i$, and in the CRS this rate equals $\sum_{i=1}^r n_i \cdot \lambda_i$. The CRS can only handle one machine at the time and the BC at most r different machines at the same time.

For trivial reasons, the BC will therefore be lower in operational costs when $\mu_i^{CRS} = \mu_i^{BC}$. Keeping the repair rates at the same in the BC and the CRS, does not make sense, since you will just lose workforce. In Liang et al. (2013), they use $\mu_i = 2 \cdot \mu_i^{BC}$, when r = 2. Therefore we assume that they used $\alpha = r$ in $\mu_i^{CRS} = \alpha \cdot \mu_i^{BC}$. This makes sense when for example in every shop there is an equal number of repairmen, and the types of machines do not require a specific skill set. The total workforce is then combined in the central repair shop resulting in $\alpha = r$.

There are also a lot of reasons to argue the $\alpha = r$ assumption. For example, if a machine type does need a specific skill to be repaired, combining workforce from other repair shops in one central repair shop will result not in $\mu_i = r \cdot \mu_i^{BC}$, since the workforce from a repair shop j, where $j \neq i$, cannot repair machine i at the same rate as the workforce from repair shop i.

Because the $\alpha = r$ assumption may be argued, we are going to look for which value of α the operation costs in the CRS are equal to the costs in the BC. We will do this to search over different values of α using the golden search method. For r = 2, we use the initial interval of $\alpha = [1,2]$, because at $\alpha = 1$ the BC is preferred over the CRS and as shown by Liang et al. (2013) the CRS is preferred when $\alpha = 2$, with r = 2. Furthermore the function we evaluate is the absolute value of the difference between the CRS and BC operation costs ($f(\alpha) = |C_{BC} - C_{CRS}(\alpha)|$, where $C_{CRS}(\alpha)$ is the cost function of the CRS, with $\mu_i = \alpha \cdot \mu_i^{BC}$). Since intuitively we know the minimum of this function equals 0, the stopping criterium we use is $f(\alpha) < 10^4$. We also set the maximum number of iterations on 25.

4 Results

Before we take a look at the results of the several , we have to introduce numerical examples. We will use the same instances as Liang et al. (2013) use. We consider a production line with r = 2 fleets, with the following parameters:

- Setting $h_1 = 1$, we consider the following holding cost rates for fleet 2: $h_2 = \{0.9, 0.7, 0.5\};$
- We consider the following down time cost rate to holding cost rations: $\frac{b_1}{h_1} = \frac{b_2}{h_2} = \{20, 30\};$
- The fleet sizes are: $(N_1, N_2) \in \{(10, 5), (10, 10, (10, 15), (50, 25), (50, 50), (100, 50)\};$

- When $N_1 = 10,100 \ (N_1 = 50)$, we set $\mu_1 = 2 \ (\mu_1 = 1)$, and we consider $\frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2} \in \{2, 1, \frac{2}{3}\}$;
- As an approximate measure of the repair shop utilization, we set u = λ₁N₁/μ₁ = λ₂N₂/μ₂ ∈ {0.45, 0.35, 0.25} corresponding to high, medium and low levels of repair shop utilization.

This results in a total of $3 \times 2 \times 6 \times 3 \times 3 = 324$ instances which have to be computed for all methods. The results can be found in Appendix 7.

The results of these numerical experiments did agree with the results in Liang et al. (2013), except for the *coordinate descent*-method. This is caused by the fact that it is a heuristic that does not always converge to the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) optimum. For that reason the *coordinate descent*-method has its own cost and optimal stock columns in the tables with results.

4.1 Base Case

When we use complete enumeration we have to set an S^{max} to find the optimal number of spare machines. For the BC we used an $S^{max} = 50$ for both fleets, which we assumed to be an arbitrarily large enough number.

In Section 3.1 we propose two search methods for finding the optimal stock *S* for the BC making use of the convexity of its cost function. In Appendix 7 the extensive results can be found.

To find out the performance of the method we look at the relative computation time difference as a measure, where T_{CE} is the computation time for using complete enumeration, where T_S is the computation time of the proposed *stop at first increase*-method, and where T_F is the computation time of the Fibonacci-method:

$$\Delta_S^{CE} = \frac{T^{CE} - T^S}{T^{CE}}$$
$$\Delta_F^{CE} = \frac{T^{CE} - T^F}{T^{CE}}$$
$$\Delta_S^F = \frac{T^F - T^S}{T^F}$$

Table 1: Summary of BC results

	min. (%)	mean (%)	median (%)	max. (%)
Δ_S^C	8.9	86.2	91.5	93.9
$\Delta_F^{\tilde{C}}$	61.11	83.1	84.3	99.4
Δ_S^F	-1192.5	-11.2	4.6	29.6

Table 1 summarizes the relative performance of the search methods in the BC. The results indicate that the proof of convexity makes it possible to decrease the calculation time drastically.

4.2 Central Repair Shop

The computation time for the instances with N_1 , N_2 being large, will be large, since the number of variables and equations in the system of equations of Section 3.2.2 increases. When we use complete enumeration we have to set an S^{max} to find the optimal number of spare machines. Since we have limited time, we chose to look at the results of Liang et al. (2013) and chose an S^{max} based on their findings. We decided that S_i^{max} should be constant for a given N_i . The values for S_i^{max} can be found below.

			(N	$(1, N_2)$		
	(10,5)	(10,10)	(10,15)	(50,25)	(50, 50)	(100, 50)
S_1^{max} S_2^{max}	20 16	20 20	20 22	25 25	25 25	25 31

To determine the performance of the several search methods in the CRS while using the Myopic(**R**) policy, we propose the following measures:

$$\Delta_{S1}^{CE} = \frac{T^{CE} - T^{S1}}{T^{CE}}$$
$$\Delta_{CD}^{CE} = \frac{T^{CE} - T^F}{T^{CE}}$$
$$\Delta_{CD}^{S1} = \frac{T^{S1} - T^{CD}}{T^{S1}}$$

Here is T_{CE} the computation time of finding the minimum while using complete enumeration again, T_{S1} the *stop at first increase*-method in one dimension and T_{CD} the coordinate descent method where the *stop at first increase*-method is used in every dimension.

Due to the time constraints not all results for the complete enumeration could be obtained. The last 40 instances are not created. In 44 out of 324 cases the same minimum as with the methods that did converge. These are therefore not included in the measures. For the other two methods all proposed instances are obtained and therefore included in Δ_{CD}^{S1} .

	min. (%)	mean (%)	median (%)	max. (%)
Δ_{S1}^{CE}	44.5	82.2	85.8	91.8
$\Delta_{CD}^{\breve{C}E}$	84.4	96.8	98.3	99.7
Δ_{CD}^{SI}	50.2	85.5	88.1	96.9

Table 2: Summary of CRS - Myopic(\mathbf{R}) policy results

Table 2 summarizes the relative performance of the search methods in the BC. The results indicate that the two heuristics save a lot of computation time.

The *stop at first increase*-method in one direction converged in for all instances, which suggests that cost function for the CRS is also convex.

The coordinate descent method does not converge to the optimal stock S^* for all instances. In 44 out of 324 the method did not converge and higher costs were found. This is caused by the fact that in some cases no improvement of costs could be found in any direction *i*, but only in a direction where you adjust S_i and S_j with $i \neq j$ at the same time. We only summarize the relative increase for the 44 instances that did not converge, and not include the instances for which the coordinate descent method did converge. The relative positive deviations from the minimum are summarized in Table 3.

min. (%)	mean (%)	median (%)	max. (%)
1.7	0.4	0.2	1.7

Table 3: Deviation from the minimum costs

The results indicate that the coordinate descent method does not deviate much from the minimum costs for the $Myopic(\mathbf{R})$ policy and save a lot of computation time.

4.3 BC/CRS-equilibrium

To find the equilibria we used the *stop at first increase*-method, since it converges the fastest to the Myopic(**R**) optimum. Due to time constraints, and the long computation times, even for the *stop at first increase*-method, we did not compute all values of α . We did compute *al pha* for $(N_1, N_2) \in \{(10, 5), (10, 10), (10, 15), (50, 25)\}$. The obtained values for α can be found in Appendix 7.

The average value of α equals 1.601. The results showed that their was a high correlation between the utilization factor u and the equilibrium factor α . The correlation between α and u equals 0.972. This is also shown in the scatter plot in Figure 3 and in Table 4 we give the mean values of α for different utilization factors:

Figure 3: Scatter plot showing the relation between utilization rate and equilibrium factor



Table 4: Mean alpha for different utilization rates

u	0.25	0.35	0.45
ā	1.399	1.601	1.803

5 Conclusion

We can conclude that due to the proof of convexity of the BC cost function smart search methods can be used to decrease the calculation time significantly for finding the minimum production line costs. The *stop at first increase*-method performs better than the Fibonacci search method in most of the cases, with a computation time decrease of respectively 86.2% and 83.1%. The better performance of the *stop at first increase*-method is mostly faster due to the fact that the optimal stock for the Myopic(**R**) policy is small for most instances and therefore this method does not use many iterations to find the minimum costs. Also, this method always converges to minimum costs. When a large stock is needed for to assure minimum costs, the Fibonacci method is preferred. The disadvantage of the Fibonacci method is that a maximum possible stock has to be set. This maximum number of spares is unknown, and therefore we do not know if the minimum will lie in the preset interval $[0, S^{max}]$. The *stop at first increase*-method is therefore preferred. If there would be a method to estimate the optimal stock, a hybrid method could be beneficial. Then the Fibonacci method will be used when the expected optimal stock is large.

For the Myopic(**R**) policy we proposed two heuristics to find the minimum costs. The first method will converge to the minimum if the cost function is convex, which seems very likely according the results, because in all the proposed instances the method converged. The average decrease in time is 82.2%. The second method we proposed has an even smaller average computation time (a decrease of 96.8 %), but does not converge in some cases (13.5%). The cost difference with the optimal value is on average 0.4% for the not converged cases. This means that the loss is really small and therefore the coordinate descent method has a great performance, since it saves lot of computation time. In Liang et al. (2013) an average loss of 0.66% was considered as close enough to the optimum. Due to this fast search method another 0.0005% is added, which can be considered as an insignificant increase.

Finding the equilibria where the BC has the same costs as the CRS with the Myopic(**R**) scheduling policy, has shown that the utilization rate is highly correlated with the factor α . We think this is caused by the fact that a high utilization makes combining repair shops less beneficial, and the assumption that a high factor α corresponds to the CRS being a less profitable substitute for the BC. Combining shops with a high utilization is less profitable since combining makes sense when the workforce in one shop can be used for repairing other machine types. If the workforce is already occupied all the time with repairing the machine type of its shop, it cannot be used for repairing other machines types.

6 Discussion and further research

Although improvements are made, there are several limitations to this research. Due to time constraints there was a lack code optimizing. This means that the computation times could have been lower, influencing the result. On the other hand, it is expected that this will reduce the computation times for all methods and that the relative difference will be approximately the same.

Also, not all instances were considered in this research due to the same time constraint as mentioned before. This means that we cannot use our recommendations for all instances.

For the complete enumeration, Fibonacci- and the *stop at first increase*-method in one direction for the CRS case, a maximum value for *S* had to be set before solving the problem. We did not find a way to find an upper bound for *S* such that convergence to the minimum is guaranteed. In further research it will be useful to find a way to set an *S*^{max} that assures convergence.

For the CRS we set S^{max} by looking at the results from Liang et al. (2013). This means that if we had to choose S^{max} without this knowledge, and we would have chosen another value, it could have been lower, meaning we would not find the minimum, or it could have been higher and the computation time difference in Section 4.1 and 4.2 would be even greater and the proposed *stop at first increase*-method in the BC and the coordinate descent method in the CRS are even more preferred.

Another thing that has to be looked in, is what happens when the utilization increases. The results suggest that the CRS will not be an improvement anymore when the single repair shops have a higher utilization, since the factor α might be greater than 2 when the utilization factor for the single repair shops increase.

References

- Liang, W. K., Balcioglu, B., and Svaluto, R. (2013). Scheduling policies for a repair shop problem. Annals of Operations Research, 211(1):273–288.
- Sahba, P., Balcioglu, B., and Banjevic, D. (2013). Spare parts provisioning for multiple *k*-out-of-*n*: G systems. *IIE transactions*, 45(9):953–963.
- Taylor, J. and Jackson, R. (1954). An application of the birth and death process to the provision of spare machines. *OR*, 5(4):95–108.

REFERENCES

Equilibrium 734 568 384 751 597 $\begin{bmatrix} 1,71\\ 1,72\\ 5,45\\ 5,57\\ 5,75\\ 5$ 409 419 813 592 827 827 625 625 414 414 827 619 115 593 З T_{CD} 2.905 0.979 0.367 0.367 0.354 0.354 0.354 0.357 0.962 0.591 0.197 .655 .378 0.188 0.263 9 S_2 LO, Myopic(R) Ś 8.628 5.167 19.055 5.142 16.144 24.468 11.743 7.264 26.331 12.292 7.404 13.151 7.199 4.51 14.066 7.525 4.563 14.426 7.798 4.64 20.783 10.272 6.405 6.405 22.826 10.871 6.454 23.879 11.071 6.564 10.413 6.013 3.94911.198 3.984 11.855 6.766 5.616 18.039 5.644 19.467 9.688 Costs 8.26 5.071 6.434 4.0416.389 8.618 9.157 17.296 l6.305 3.528 8.663 7.194 26.86612.44 5.725 9.03 15.317 _ T_S 21.037 20.739 20.803 $\begin{array}{c} 20.674\\ 20.988\\ 20.757\\ 20.757\\ 20.758\\ 20.758\\ 20.772\\ 20.772\\ 20.772\\ 20.772\\ 20.772\\ 20.617\\ 20.617\\ \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 20.646\\ 20.71\\ 20.65\\ 20.65\\ 20.658\\ 20.598\\ 20.678\\ 20.683\\ 20.683\\ 20.683\\ 20.683\\ 20.683\\ 20.683\\ 20.661\\ 20.683\\ 20.661\\ 20.689\\ 20.779\\ 20.675\\ 20.675\\ 20.675\\ 20.675\\ 20.675\\ 20.675\\ 20.675\\ 20.675\\ 20.675\\ 20.661\\ 20$ $\begin{array}{c} 20.617\\ 21.303\\ 21.002\\ 20.608\\ 20.847\\ 20.92\\ 20.92\\ 20.813\\ 20.813\\ \end{array}$ 20.665 20.818 20.688 20.707 46.542 47.581 46.642 46.409 T_{CE} 21.97 20.662 20.75 20.693 20.71 l6.462 20.674 Myopic(R) S_2 Ś 8.628 5.167 18.832 Costs 5.142 16.144 7.40413.151 7.199 10.272 6.405 3.949 11.198 24.46811.743 12.267 7.264 26.279 4.51 14.025 7.525 4.563 10.74 6.454 23.879 11.049 6.564 10.413 9.03 5.25 18.788 9.156 5.368 15.317 8.26 5.071 16.26 8.528 8.663 5.24 7.194 26.807 12.292 14.41 7.671 4.64 20.783 22.826 6.013 6.434 3.984 11.854 6.766 4.04 16.389 8.618 5.616 18.046 9.157 5.644 19.467 9.688 5.725 17.296 $\begin{array}{c} 0.005\\ 0.003\\ 0.003\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.002\\ 0.003\\ 0.$ T_F T_S 0.033 0.025 0.022 0.022 0.022 0.021 0.0010 0.021 0.020 T_{CE} Base Case S2 Ś 13.463 7.886 24.811 13.463 7.886 42.835 42.835 19.903 11.264 42.835 19.903 11.264 6.999 22.309 6.999 22.309 11.996 27.314 14.929 8.774 22.122 13.46319.903 11.264 11.996 Costs 7.314 4.929 8.774 7.314 2.54812.548 7.886 22.309 6.999 7.685 30.5 15.826 9.082 4.929 22.122 2.548 22.122 ł7.317 24.811 24.811 11.996 38.354 17.685 9.979 38.354 17.685 9.979 38.354 9.979 30.5 5.826 8.772 7.317 2 <u>∞</u> ∞ ∞ 44448888888888899999999999999999 Q & & & & & & & ĥ, 888888 5 $\begin{array}{c} 0.7 \\$ 2.0 0.7 0.5 4 52 PARAMETERS ١đ $\begin{array}{c} 0.15\\ 0.045\\ 0.035\\ 0.035\\ 0.07\\ 0.07\\ 0.07\\ 0.075\\ 0.075\\ 0.075\end{array}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\begin{array}{c} 0.00\\ 0.01\\ 0.01\\ 0.02\\ 0.02\\ 0.02\\ 0.02\\ 0.01\\$ 0.27 0.21 0.1 Ł 0.07 60.0 20.0

ດດດດ

Table 5: The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) policy with the computation times of the several search methods and the equilibrium factor α .

 $^{2}_{2}$

ź

Appendix 7

9.156 5.368

5.826

x x x x

0.05 0.07 0.05

010

5 0 0 9.082 30.5

18.812

L.648 8.98 5.218 4.72

46.438 46.503 46.362 46.974 Table 6: The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) policy with the computation times of the several search methods and the equilibrium factor α .

Equilibrium	α	1.836 1.604	1.388	1.643	1.423	1.638 1 43	1.768	1.374	1.788	1.606	1.407	1.626	1.432	1.824	1.369	1.842	1.622	1.849	1.643	1.43	1.74	1.344	1.757	1.572	1.771	1.601	1.406	1.555	1.338	1.59	1.376	1.836	1.412	1.796	1.43	1.813	1.632	1.806	1.621	1.839	1.615	1.854	1.645	1.851	1.633
	T_{CD}	5.919 1.404	0.693	1.386	1.705	0.692	1.652	0.68 0.306	1.899	0.699	0.29	0.453	0.303	5.702 1 52	0.58	5.804	1.584	3.71	0.994	0.595	1.609	0.297	1.56	0.672	1.618	0.715	0.311	1.374	0.592	5.668 1.363	0.555	6.044 1 284	0.588	3.422 1 4E	0.63	3.178	0.893	1.464	0.631	11.143	2.762	9.831	1.594	2.586	1.204 0.803
ic(R)	S_2	16 6	314	90	n o	4 0	6.	4 C	10	4	~ ~	ŧ ω	7	17	, m	18	r 4		ь	ε	10	5 1	10	4 (10	4	c1 8	7	6	7 20	б	20	ŝ	10	0 01	×	ς α	14	ŝ	18	× ۱	15 #	n u		4 σ
Myopi	S_1	ი 4	ωo	ы С со с	ء 16	r 6		20	1 ന	ŝ	1 10	- 4	7	ი 4	ŝ	9	4 0	0 1	9	<i>с</i> о с	ς, τ	1 11	б	ς Γ	14	<i>с</i> о (с л в	04	ε	v 4	ς,	¢г	ŝ	<i>с</i> о с	10	ß	4 C	1 00	40	4 IO	40	r 6	9 6	16	00
	Costs	26.729 12.129	7.305 30.026	12.764	7.380 29.349	12.884 7.549	14.641	7.493 4.586	16.004	7.88	4.649 14 715	8.159	4.741	22.457 10 575	6.493	25.137	11.125	26.682	11.524	6.68	11.98	4.006	12.995	6.729 4.048	13.859	6.946	4.114	8.962	5.682	20.184 9.391	5.716	21.991 9 92	5.81	18.583	5.593	19.691	9.314 5.32	19.144	9.042 5.747	28.08	12.722	30.975	13.05 7.468	29.815	12.737 7.383
	TS	14.803 8.411	6.146 20.668	8.605	6.176 25.133	8.54 6 131	6.776	4.871	7.382	4.908	4.604 e 005	0.093 5.667	4.642	14.641 8.476	6.113	19.395	8.397	21.971	9.839	6.333	6.452 4 767	4.64	6.897	4.898	7.235	5.086	4.629	8.384	6.103	16.596 8.466	6.104	8 284	6.088	11.557	6.832	12.251	7.419	12.973	7.415	22.368	13.143	29.868	12.49 8 986	36.873	8.966
R)	T_{CE}	46.577 46.593	46.477 46 346	46.539	4/.18/ 46.801	46.609 46.746	46.559	46.537 46.408	46.813	46.467	46.492 46.207	40.39/ 46.446	46.493	47.375 46.608	46.391	46.534	47.13 46.415	46.361	46.668	46.795	46.456 46.418	46.645	51.212	46.511 46.405	46.908	46.308	46.369 46.470	46.508	46.438	46.741 46.501	46.521	46.412 56.175	46.807	71.409	82.633	71.362	71.234 71.389	70.987	71.718	71.562	71.475	71.346	71.088 77 976	103.103	84.735 70.934
lyopic(S_2	16 6	3 16 3	9.00	e 9	4 0	6.	4 c	10	4	~ ~	+ m	7	17	. რ	18	r 0	5	ъ	e ç	10	5 1	10	ഗറ	16	4	c1 8	7	6	70	б	70	. с	u 10	0.01	6	40	14	<i>с</i> о с	18	r -	17	9 0		4 σ
N	S_1	r0 4	с, г	Б. С. С.	ء 16	۲ c		2 12	1 ന	ς,	1 17	< 4	7	n 4	ι m	9	4 0	, 41	9	<i>с</i> о с	ς, τ	10	3	c1 r	14	с о	с и и	04	ε	n 4	3	94	ŝ	რ ი	10	4	ς α	1 00	4 c	ر 1 ال	40	0 10	n N	16	9 60
	Costs	26.729 12.129	7.305 29.889	12.764	7.380 29.349	12.884 7.549	14.641	7.493 4.586	16.004	7.88	4.649 14 715	8.159	4.741	22.457 10 575	6.493	25.137	11.125	26.682	11.524	6.68	11.98 6 358	4.006	12.995	6.72 4 0.48	13.859	6.946	4.114 18 154	8.962	5.682	20.184 9.391	5.716	21.991 9 888	5.81	18.583	5.593	19.67	9.218 5.32	19.144	9.042 5.747	28.08	12.722	30.839	12.952 7.468	29.815	12.7 <i>3</i> 7 7.383
_	T_F	0.004 0.003	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.005	0.002	0.004	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.004	0.004	0.005	0.004	0.005	0.007	0.003	0.003
	T_S	0.004 0.002	0.001	0.002	0.004	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.001	0.005	0.004	0.005	0.004	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.004	0.001	0.004	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.005	0.002	0.005	0.002	0.005	0.001
se Case	T_{CE}	$0.034 \\ 0.017$	0.018	0.016	0.018	0.018	0.017	0.02	0.017	0.017	0.016	0.02	0.024	0.018	0.017	0.017	0.02	0.018	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.024	0.017	0.016	0.018	0.017	0.024	0.018	0.018	0.016	0.018	0.025	0.019	0.019	0.019	0.026	0.022	0.021	0.028	0.025	0.019	0.018	0.019	0.026	0.019
Ba	S_2	18 9	υx	9 6 I	c 81	6 L	6	9 0	0.0	9	m a	9	ŝ	9 9	n no	18	6 и	18	6	ഗ	<i>в</i> 4	n N	6	90	6	9	ωğ	6 6	s,	9 9	ъ	9 o	ŝ	11	იი	11	9 m	, =	90	21	10 1	21	۳ 10 1	51,	5
	S_1	18 9	υğ	9 6 I	0 18 18	σĽ	6	9 0	0 6	9	m a	9	ŝ	9 18	ŝ	18	6 и	18	6	ഗ	<i>6</i> 4	n N	6	9 0	6	9	ωğ	o <u>1</u> 6	n,	9 9	ß	9 8	ŝ	6 9	0 m	6	<u>ب</u> و	6	90	18	6 и	18	о и	18	ט פ
	Costs	51.585 23.065	12.859	23.065	51.585	23.065 17 859	27.289	14.16 8.126	27.289	14.16	8.126	2/.209 14.16	8.126	20.637	11.506	46.155	11 506	46.155	20.637	11.506	24.079	7.17	24.079	7 17	24.079	12.494	7.17	18.21	10.152	40.725	10.152	40.725	10.152	32.515	9.235	32.515	9.235	32.515	16.242	54.062	23.514	54.062	13.015	54.062	23.514 13.015
	b_2	22	22	228	22	22	14	14	14	14	14	1 1	14	92 Y	38	56	26 26	8.8	56	29	010	10	10	10	10	10	9 9	6 4	40	4 4	40	4 4	40	18	18	18	20 X	18	18	25	22	12	22	121	22
	p_1	808	808	888	8 8	808	50	202	28	20	50	20	20	88	8 8	80	80	88	80	80	20	50	20	50	20	20	20	808	80	<u>8</u> 8	80	2 x	80	50	50	20	2 2	50	50	8	80	8 8	808	888	88
	h_2	0.9 0.9	0.9	6.0	0.0 0.9	0.9 0.9	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.0 0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0 0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0 0.0	0.5	0.5	0.5 0.5	0.5	0.0 10.10	0.5	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.0	6.0	0.9 0.9
	h_1			·															1	,																									
rers	μ_2			100	νm	ი ი	. — ,		- 6	6	0 0	იო	ŝ			7	0 0	1 ന	б	ς, η			7	C1 (1 m	с (ς, -			2 12	0	ი ი	ŝ			7	20	1 ന	ŝ	о н		- 61	60	1 ന (ოო
RAME.	μ_1	00	00	100	1 11	00	101	00	10	6	64 6	10	7	00	10	7	0 0	1 01	7	20	00	10	7	C1 (10	0	C1 C	10	6	2 12	0	2 12	101	64 6	10	7	20	10	61 (10	610	10	60	101	0 0
PAI	λ_2	0.045 0.035	0.025	0.07	0.135	0.105	0.045	0.035	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.105	0.075	0.045	0.025	0.09	0.07	0.135	0.105	0.075	0.045	0.025	0.09	0.07	0.135	0.105	0.075	0.035	0.025	0.09	0.05	0.135	0.075	0.03	0.017	0.06	0.047 0.033	0.09	0.07	0.03	0.023	0.06	0.047	0.09	0.07
	lγ	0.09 0.07	0.05	0.07	cn.n	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.0	0.07	0.05	0.0	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.0	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.07
	N_2	10	10	10	9 0	10	10	9 9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	01 C	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	01 01	10	01 C	10	15 15	12	15	15 15	12	15	12	15	15	15 15	11	15
	$^{\rm I}N$	$10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\$	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	01 0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10

7 APPENDIX

ž
JL (
ğ
ſ
nn
bri
il.
ъ
Je
1 th
anc
ds i
ро
het
ä
Ľ
sea
al
ver
se
he
oft
ŝ
ш
ц.
E.
Itai
Ъ
on
ec
th
ith
R
icy
pol
R) pol
ic(R) pol
opic(R) pol
Myopic(R) pol
ne Myopic(R) pol
I the Myopic(R) pol
and the Myopic(R) pol
C and the Myopic(R) pol
e BC and the Myopic(R) pol
the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
sts for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
al costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
uimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
ninimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
g minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
ting minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
and ing minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic (\mathbf{R}) pol
sponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
rresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(${\bf R})$ pol
nd corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(${\bf R})$ pol
s and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(${\bf R})$ pol
ers and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
neters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
rameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
he parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
: The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
e 7: The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol
able 7: The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) pol

Equilibrium	α	1.798 1.602	1.421	1.629	1.43	1.825 1.638	1.43	1.84	1.401	1.856	1.635	1.422	1.86 1.65	1.428	1.767	1.55	1.349	1.786	1.387	1.803	1.618	1.415	1.822	1341	1.841	1.598	1.38	1.631	1.417	1.814	1.608	1.834	1.643	1.434 1.83	1.642	1.445	1,61	1.393	1.864	1.651	1.864	1.646	1.433	1.583	1.377	1.814	1.414	1.825	1.439
_	T _{CD}	3.376 1.525	0.735	3.016 1.216	0.623	0.655	0.438	11.025	1.089	9.885	1.856	0.833	3.464 1.36	0.832	2.558	1.038	0.558	2.62/	0.474	2.92	0.948	0.714	8.493	2.074 0.973	8.68	1.893	0.832	9.200 1.791	0.819	51.142	18.71 8.348	62.868	17.843	8.32 22 054	9.119	8.297	33.678	12.694	186.174	28.734 10.802	39.777	16.122	8.258	18.199	8.291	57.264 18.080	8.381	26.851	8.246
ic(R)	S_2	11 5	ς,	0 4	61	იო	0	۲ I	4	20	9	n a	юıc	o m	, II	ß	0;	=	ŧς	11	4	0	19	- 4	21	~	<i>ო</i> 8	2 %	б	12	4 C	11 4	4	64	ŝ	6 2	8 r	. со	20	90	<i>o</i> 0	4	ωţ	о С	0	ц 13	0 0	ы С	0 0
Myop	S_1	ю N	ч.	4 ω	61	/ 4	61	n 4	۲m	9	ы	ωį	n P	о (f	ŝ	7	00		00	14	ю	0	ທ •	4 (*	ഹം	4	n v	o io	б	40	<i>n</i> c	1 0	ŝ	c4 C	n S	2	04	ι ω	6	ഗര	21 م	~	40	0 N	10	4 0	0 0	10	4 64
	Costs	16.237 8.151	4.982	17.408 8.267	4.808	17.871 8.267	4.733	24.123 11 219	6.818	26.676	11.601	6.738	28.04 11 611	6.652	12.558	6.442	4.03	13.786	4 075	14.861	7.107	4.147	18.777	701.6	21.065	9.514	5.746	10.085	5.847	21.353	9.274 5.304	23.907	9.8	5.408 73.667	9.941	5.556	31.098 12.685	7.463	35.602	13.518 7.562	34.727	13.61	7.76	17.800 8.055	4.704	20 8 505	4.782	21.267	0.0 1 4.898
	T_S	11.332 7.393	6.839	12.043 7.426	6.777	12.684 7.409	6690	23.272	9.078	29.379	12.395	8.952	35.562 13 887	9.016	9.762	7.014	6.732	10.664 7.1	7.16	11.447	7.246	6.736	20.551	8 967	27.626	12.099	9.217	20.02/ 12.139	9.019	234.25	137.177	280.985	148.786	137.988 376 783	154.573	138.098	736 737	176.888	587.464	234.55 176 805	797.076	238.872	178.851	143,316	137.492	255.476 147 300	137.578	298.332	136.928
:(R)	T_{CE}	71.523 71.219	71.113	71.052	72.317	70.887	70.906	71.57	71.208	70.961	71.939	71.088	71 592	70.877	71.432	71.412	71.194	78 607	71 14	71.327	71.24	71.344	71.015	71 326	72.205	71.344	72.843	71.018	71.178	1453.104	1451.782	1457.404	1453.618	1516.766 1460 257	1456.937	1431.981	1433.031	1436.603	1440.878	1484.539 1431.683	1437.15	1430.218	1440.094	1438.788	1436.616	1433.632	1454.054	1458.475	1504.906
Myopie	S_2	5 11	6	11 4	21	იო	0	19	< 4	20	~	რ ი	xo ur	s m	. 11	ß	64	Ц и	n r	11	4	0	19	- 4	21	~	ლ წ	1 œ	ŝ	12	4 C	12 1	4	6 4	ŝ	2 7	77	. m	22	9 0	e 9	4	ωţ	ы С	5	л 13	0 0	ഗ	0 0
	S_1	ю 0	00	იო	21	- 4	21	Ω4	۴m	9	4	ωį	5 y	о (f)	ŝ	7	00	ກເ	10	14	ю	0	ro-	4 (*	ഹം	4	ŝ	04	ŝ	4 0	n c	ر ۱ ار	ŝ	7 12	n N	с і і	04	t m	4	n u	ر 21 ک	~	4 (0 N	5	4 6	0 01	10	t 7
	Costs	16.237 8.151	4.982	17.404 8.267	4.808	17.871 8.267	4.733	24.123 11 219	6.818	26.676	11.498	6.738	28.04 11.611	6.652	12.558	6.442	4.03	13.786	4 075	14.861	7.107	4.147	18.777	701 701	21.065	9.514	5.746	23.14/ 10.063	5.847	21.353	9.2/4 5.304	23.879	9.8	5.408 23.662	9.941	5.556	31.US	7.463	35.53	13.518 7 562	34.727	13.61	7.76	17.800 8.055	4.704	20 8 505	4.782	21.267	0.0 1 4.898
_	T_F	.003	.003	.002 002	.002	.003 003	.003	-004 003	003	.003	.003	.002	500	003	.003	.003	.003	500	500	003	.003	.003	003	500	.003	.003	.003	003	.003	-006		900	.005	005	.006	.006	900	.005	600.	800.	2000.	.005	900.	002	.005	900	900	900	
	s'	10 0	0	0 0 0 0	10	0 0	0.0	2 C	20	9	33	5 0 0	2 2	10	20	0	5 0 0	2 2		20	10 0	10	5 0 0		2 E	10	2	20	0	80	4 C	1 80	4 0	4 x	0	20		5 4 0	9	900	0 0 0	90	00	v 4	0	800	0 1 2	6	0 4 0 0
	L	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	000	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	70.0	0.0	0.01	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0
e Case	T_{CE}	0.019 0.019	0.027	0.018	0.017	0.019	0.029	0.021	0.019	0.018	0.019	0.022	0.026	0.020	0.02	0.019	0.019	0.017	0.018	0.019	0.019	0.019	0.019	0.02	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.025	0.019	0.048	0.054	0.037	0.033	0.035	0.035	0.035	0.037	0.034	0.034	0.044	0.034	0.039	0.042	0.034	0.045	0.041	0.034	0.046	0.034
Bas	S_2	11 6	ς,	11	с, ;	11	с, 5	12	o n	21	10	ۍ ا	10	ç ir	, II	9	ť,	11 9	0 m	, 11	9	ς	51	5 r	21	10	ۍ ۵	10	ß	13	- 4	13 4	~	4 (5	45	10	9	24	10	24 0	10	9 9	5 12	4	13	- 4	13	^ 4
	S_1	69	<i>с</i> о о	0 מ	ŝ	ه م	ωģ	8 8 0	n IO	18	6	n ç	8 <u>1</u> 0	л LC	6	9	ς α	י פ	Der	6	9	ε	<u>8</u>	ט ת	18	6	n ç	<u>0</u> 6	ŝ	16	- 4	± 16	~ `	4 4	5	4 6	9 =	9	28	11	28 o	11	9 ;	0] h	4	16	, 4	16	< 4
	Costs	28.857 14.484	8.245	28.857 14.484	8.245	28.857 14.484	8.245	48.081 20.986	11.627	48.081	20.986	11.627	48.081 20.986	11.627	25.198	12.725	7.255	25.198	7 255	25.198	12.725	7.255	42.101	10.239	42.101	18.459	10.239	42.101 18.459	10.239	43.973	18.27 9.697	43.973	18.27	9.697 43 973	18.27	9.697 77 717	110.70	13.495	67.511	25.61 13.405	67.511	25.61	13.495		8.685	39.744	8.685	39.744	10.4 8.685
	b_2	$14 \\ 14 \\ 14 \\ 14 \\ 14 \\ 14 \\ 14 \\ 14 \\$	14	14 14	14	14	14	26	26	26	56	28 i	2 y	3 6	10	10	10	01 E	9.0	10	10	10	40	1	4 6	40	40	1 0	40	18	<u>x</u>] x	18	18	x 18	18	18	72	22	72	22	12	72	27	14	14	14	14	14	14
	b_1	2 S	50	88	50	28	20	08 8	8 8	80	80	88	2 2 2	88	50	20	50	2 2	2 6	5	20	50	80	8 8	80	80	88	8 8	80	50	2 2	88	50	2 2	50	50	8 8	80	80	80	8 8	80	80	88	5	50	88	50	50
	h_2	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0 0.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0 1	с С	0.5	0.5	0.0 1	0.5	0.5	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	9.0 9.0	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
	h_1		·		,		,									-					1									, -,							→					-						, -,	
ERS	μ_2		- 0	2 10	00	ოო	<i>с</i> о т			0	0	0 0	ი ი	о (f		-	- (n n	4 C	I ന	ю	ю.			- 0	0	~ ~	იო	б	0.5	0.0 0.10	- 1		- с -	1.5	1.5	0. L 0. L	0.5	1		1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	0.5			1.5	1.5
AMET	μ_1	00	00	2 10	00	2 10	00	0 n	1 0	10	0	00	2 12	10	10	7	00	51 C	10	10	0	0	00	1 C	10	0	00	10	0							, -,			-			-	 .					, -,	
PAR	λ_2	0.03 0.023	0.017	0.06 0.047	0.033	0.0 0.07	0.05	0.03	0.017	0.06	0.047	0.033	0.09	0.05	0.03	0.023	0.017	0.06	0.033	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.017	0.06	0.047	0.033	60.0 0.07	0.05	0.009	0.007	0.018	0.014	0.07	0.021	0.015	200.0	0.005	0.018	0.014	0.027	0.021	0.015	0.007	0.005	0.018	0.01	0.027	0.015
	λ_1	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.009	0.007	0.009	0.007	0.005	0.007	0.005	200.0	0.005	0.009	0.007	600.0	0.007	0.005	200.0	0.005	0.009	0.005	0.009	0.005
	N_2	15 15	15	15	15	15 15	15	ប ដ	12	15	15	; 15	ប ក	d K	15	15	15	υ Γ	d fi	12	15	15	15	υĘ	15	15	15	с С	15	25	ປ ແ	3 13	25	52 K	32	25	0 K	3 13	25	52 K	រស	25	52	0 K	52	55 25	3 23	25	52
	N_1	10 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	010	10	10	10	10	10	101	10	10	10	10	10	20	00 00	8.6	50	202	20	20	000	20	50	20	8 6	50	20	20	50	50	8 6	50	50

7 APPENDIX

3	
rυ	
5	
fac	
R	
Ξ.	
br	
÷Ξ	
Ę	
e	
Ę	
р	
an	
ds	
ğ	
et	
E	
Ч	
are	
se	
al	
'er	
jē,	
e.	
th	
of	
S	
Ĕ	
ц.	
uo	
ati	
пţ	
đ	
no	
õ	
μĚ	
Ę	
ζit.	
2	
E.	
bo	
s) po	
c(R) po	
pic(R) po	
[yopic(R) po	
Myopic(R) po	
he Myopic(R) po	
I the Myopic(R) po	
ind the Myopic(R) po	
C and the Myopic(R) po	
BC and the Myopic(R) po	
he BC and the Myopic(R) po	
r the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) po	
for the BC and the Myopic(R) po	
ts for the BC and the Myopic(R) po	
costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) po	
Il costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) po	
mal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) po	
nimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) po	
minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) po	
g minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(${\bf R})$ po	
ting minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) po	
nding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(${\bf R})$ po	
ponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) po	
esponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(${\bf R})$ po	
prresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) po	
\mathfrak{l} corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) po	
nd corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(${\bf R})$ po	
s and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) po	
ers and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) po	
teters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) po	
ameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) po	
arameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the $Myopic(R)$ po	
parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the $Myopic(R)$ po	
he parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) po	
: The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) po	
$\stackrel{\scriptstyle 2}{\scriptstyle 8}$: The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) po	
ble 8: The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) po	
Table 8: The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) po	

iquilibrium	α	1.845 1.589	1.37 1.857	1.629 1.413	1.859 1.651	1.434	1.761 1.542	1.338	1.776	1.389	1.789	1.617	1.435 1 824	1.553	1.331	1.839 1 E02	1.384	1.845	1.629	1.433 NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	A N A	NA	NA	AN NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	AN NA	NA NA
- E	T _{CD}	142.7 30.486	12.312	34.537 10.615	38.698 21.374	10.536	40.665	5.441	42.916	5 446	47.306	18.104	5.444 122 768	30.936	12.632	122.759	12.548	144.192	23.814	100.01	61.413	31.786	408.325	31.966	116.756	48.369	32.081 845.849	152.886	44.434	117.487	38.929	062.022	36.177	267.105 72.143	32.441	293.744	32.054	110.147	32.03	228.07	64.997	235.591	57.658	272.762	63.033 21.596
ic(R)	S_2	21	з 24	0 Δ	r n	()	5 12	5	13 1	00	13	ഗ	2 LC	1	4	° 24	04	25	90	د 1	n N	2	14	4 C	14	<i>с</i> о с	7 7	~	с ç	99	ŝ	o io	с; с	4 L	5	16	0 0	5 C	4 c	15	ഗ	ء 16	ഗ	2 16	ю d
Myopi	S_1	r0 4	e a	4 ω	19 6	m	m 0	5	4,0	0 C	un 1	с (с гс	o 4	ŝ	9 -	ŧ თ	4	90	r 4	9.00	2	س -	4 C	15	ഗ	9 9	4	ε	9	с ;	# ¹	4 (50 00	5	4,	n 1	13	4 c	1 ന	~ ~	14	<i>с</i> о с	л Ю	ю N
	Costs	25.84 10.999	0.629 29.549	11.785 6.7	31.833	6.858	13.928 6.689	4.104	15.746 7.73	4 157	17.334	7.755	4.241 20.146	9.185	5.752	23.116 0.070	5.837	25.83	10.91	5.95 4 23.176	9.436	5.335	26.485	5.446	26.308	10.173 7 201	33.007	12.839	7.499 28.364	13.778	7.604	13.876	7.787	19.261 8.173	4.729	21.985 8.60	6.000 4.812	23.739	9.076 4 936	15.275	6.865	4.123 17.364	7.289	4.179 19.244	7.695 4.269
—	T _S	95		5 X	8 Z	12	12 18	3	28	88	3 =	14		: 66	24	88	R 18	12	25.6	с К С	3 2%	90	84	3 6	22	 ຄ.8	88	1	4 1	3 58	202	1 81	687		8	สเ	84	86	25 G	34	8 F	5 4 	82 E	286	55
		423.0 232.7	176.1613.5	231.9 177.9	682.5 234.5	176.5	198.0 141.2	138.0	230.1	156.3	271.8	153.	137.0	227.9	175.4	519.4	175.8	586.3	234.7	5.071 7.887	685.7	661.7	1511.6	719.2	1790.0	730.2	020.4 2185.0	1133.6	3002 0	1130.4	842.7	1144.7	846.8	1171.8 697.1	670.5	1396.2	/14.1 669.1	1659.	728.6	1042.3	691.0	1217.0	701.5	0000.0 1396.5	716.7 686.6
R)	T_{CE}	456.349 459.665	452.622	452.176 459.618	453.468 1452.33	481.335	451.736 459.158	1453.82	459.363	1450.02 457 846	508.839	452.977	453.584 452 221	461.705	459.107	451.773 476.205	±/0.303 452.765	455.059	458.207	107.0cf 484.042	437.687	408.392	7407.7	410.266	478.192	395.971	4/4.04/ 453.788	103.699	159.275	7198.31	127.738	163.141	123.998	196.873 126.786	150.837	180.545	7151.04	163.711	151.416	394.873	432.689 475 200	412.284	7442.23	#03.969 229.082	7345.35 587.133
Ayopic(2	11	0 4 1 - 1	 	1	1	ы ы ы ы	5	ю, ш	0 C	14	1. 1.	~ - ~ -	1	4		0 4	5	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	€ 1 Γ	10	2	4.	4 C	- 4-	с с о	1 0 1 1	7	сц г л	2 -	6	5 7	3	4 L	2	91	0.01	6 7	4 c	10	500	19	ີ ເ	1 80	50
V	5.10	10 4 i	1) 0 0	4 ω	19 6		с п си	5	4,	0 r	14	с (ы г. С	, 4	ŝ	9 -	+ m	2	ഗ	υ4 Γ	• m	2	ۍ ۲	4 C	15 -	ഗര	1 IO	, 4	-1 m	~ ro	с, <u>г</u>	<u>+</u> ~	40		5	4,	n 0	12	4 c	1 m	~ ~	1 4 1	<i>с</i> о с	7 4	60
	sts 5	84	67 64	85 6.7	33	28	80 ²⁸	04	46	95	56	55	41 46	85	52	16	37	83	48	76	36	35	85	6 9	80	73	92	39	66	29	40 X	26	87	23	29	85	2 6	14	76 36	313	9 <u>6</u> 2	0 1 9	68	6 EI	95 69
_	° –	10.9	29.5	11.7	31.8	9.9	13.5	4.1	15.7	, 4 	11	2.2	2.4.2	- 6- 	5.7	23.1	- LC	25	10.1	2. C 1. C	4.6	5.5	26.4	10.C	26.3	[0]	32.5	12.8	4.7.5	13.7	9.6	13.8	1.2	2.6I 8.18	4.7	21.9	0.4	23.7	0.6	15.2	9.6 9.7	17.3	2.4	19.2	4.2
	T_F	0.007	c00.0	0.008	0.01	0.007	0.006	0.005	0.006	00000	0.006	0.005	0.005	0.006	0.005	0.007	0.008	0.009	0.006	0.007	0.007	0.006	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.012	0.007	0.006	0.011	0.008	0.007	0.007	0.00%	0.007	0.00	0.006	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.006	0.007	0.006 0.009
	T_S	0.019 0.006	0.017	0.009 0.005	0.016	0.003	$0.008 \\ 0.004$	0.003	0.01	0.001	0.013	0.004	0.003	0.006	0.004	0.016	0.004	0.018	0.016	0.017	0.005	0.003	0.011	0.00	0.014	0.005	0.021	0.008	0.004	0.017	0.008	0.01	0.004	0.005	0.003	0.015	0.005	0.018	0.007	0.013	0.005	0.012	0.005	0.013	0.01 0.005
Case	T_{CE}	0.048	0.033	0.035 0.04	0.033	0.04	0.041 0.033	0.034	0.042	0.033	0.033	0.046	0.034	0.039	0.034	0.04	0.065	0.038	0.033	0.045	0.041	0.05	0.04	0.044	0.04	0.049	0.041 0.042	0.048	0.039	0.047	0.041	0.04	0.041	0.052	0.04	0.047	0.043 0.043	0.051	0.04	0.04	0.045	0.052	0.061	0.042 0.061	$0.051 \\ 0.047$
Base	S_2	24 10	6 24	10	24 10	9	7 13	4	13	- 4	13	r .	4 4	10	9	24	9 9	24	10	<u>م</u> ک	5	4	16	- 4	16	r -	5 4 28	11	9 ç	9 []	9 9	11 70	9	16 7	4	16	< 4	16	L 4	16	r •	4 16	~ •	4	r 4
	S_1	28 11	o 28	11 6	28 11	9	7	4	16	· 4	16	~ ·	4 X	1 =	9	58	9	28	Ξ,	9 Y	2	4	16	~ 4	16	r •	4 82	Ξ	9 g	9 []	9 9	9 []	9	16 7	4	16	- 4	16	~ 4	16	r -	+ 16	~ •	4	C 4
	Costs	60.854 22.969	12.083 60.854	22.969 12.083	60.854 22.969	12.083	35.516 14.53	7.673	35.516 14 52	14.00 7.673	35.516	14.53	7.673 54.196	20.329	10.671	54.196 20.220	20.02 10.671	54.196	20.329	10.671	18.723	9.772	47.393	9.777	47.393	18.723	71.349	26.082	13.57 71 340	26.082	13.57	26.082	13.57	42.405 16.752	8.743	42.405	10.732 8.743	42.405	16.752 8 743	37.416	14.781 7 715	37.416	14.781	37.416	14.781 7.715
—	b2	56	26 56	56	56	56	0 0	10	10	01 (10	10	0 Q	6 0	40	6	¢ 4	40	66	0 1 %	18	18	18	x x	18	18	2 19	22	22	22	22	12	22	4 7	14	14	± 1	14	14	10	10	10	10	010	10
	b_1	80 80	88	88	808	80	88	20	50	98	50	50	88	80	80	80	88	80	88	2 8	38	20	88	2 2	5	50	98	80	80	88	80	8 8	80	2 20	50	50	88	20	20	38	50	88	50	88	20
	h_2	0.7	0.7	0.7 0.7	0.7	0.7	0.5 0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0 0.0	0.5	0.5	0.5 7 C	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0 0	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	9.0 0.9	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
	h_1											·							,			1				. .							 ,										, ,		
ERS	μ_2	0.5	0.0 1		1.5 1.5	1.5	0.5	0.5			1.5	1.5	ບ. ເ ເ	0.5	0.5			1.5	1. 1.5	υ. Γ	0.5	0.5			1.5	1.5 1.5	0.5	0.5	0.5		u	1.5	1.5	0.5 0.5	0.5			1.5	1.0 1.0	0.5	0.5	0.0 T	,	1.5	1.5 1.5
RAMET	μ_1											·										1				. .							 ,										, ,		
PAF	λ_2	0.009	c00.0 0.018	$0.014 \\ 0.01$	0.027	0.015	0.009 0.007	0.005	0.018	0.01	0.027	0.021	0.015	0.007	0.005	0.018	0.01	0.027	0.021	0.005	0.004	0.003	0.009	0.005	0.014	0.011	0.005	0.004	0.003	0.007	0.005	0.011	0.008	0.004	0.003	0.009	0.005	0.014	0.011	0.005	0.004	00.0	0.007	0.014	0.011 0.008
	$^{1}\gamma$	0.009	c00.0	0.007 0.005	0.009	0.005	0.009 0.007	0.005	0.009	0.005	600.0	0.007	0.005	0.007	0.005	0.009	0.005	0.009	0.007	500.0	0.007	0.005	0.009	0.007	0.009	0.007	cnn.n	0.007	0.005	0.007	0.005	0.007	0.005	0.007	0.005	0.009	0.005	600.0	0.007	0.009	0.007	600.0	0.007	c00.0	0.007 0.005
	N_2	25 25	3 13	52 52	25 25	52	52 52	25	25	0 Ľ	32	25	52 K	25	25	52 512	52	25	22 1 2	2 G	20	50	00	2 02	20	50	20 20	20	50	20	20	20	50	2 2	20	20	20	50	20	20 8	20	20	50	20	50
	$^{\rm I}N$	20	20 20	20 20	20	20	8 8	50	50	000	20	20 1	02 02	20	50	20	R 03	50	20	0 2 0	20	50	00	0, 00	20	20	20 20	20	50	20	20	20	50	202	20	20	2 2	50	20	20	50	20	20	20	50

0	
5	
Ĕ	
a	
ſ	
Ц	
-2	
pı	
H	
Ξ.	
Ę	
ŝ	
ř	
<u>t</u>	
no.	
aı	
s	
° č	
Ĕ	
et	
E	
Ē	
5	
g	
š	
ГГ	
H	
ž	
ŝ	
ē	
Ę.	
ff	
0	
es	
Ĕ	
÷Ħ	
Ē	
ō	
ati	
ıtć	
Б.	
ਸ਼	
5	
0	
e	
Ŧ	
Εŀ	
5	
>	
S.	
÷3	
ilo	
iloq (
R) poli	
c(R) poli	
pic(R) poli	
opic(R) poli	
1yopic(R) poli	
Myopic(R) poli	
ne Myopic(R) poli	
the Myopic(R) poli	
d the Myopic(R) poli	
and the Myopic(R) poli	
and the Myopic(R) poli	
BC and the Myopic(R) poli	
e BC and the Myopic(R) poli	
he BC and the Myopic(R) poli	
r the BC and the Myopic(R) poli	
or the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
s for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
sts for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
l costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
hal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
imal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
inimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli-	
minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
$\boldsymbol{\xi}$ minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) poli	
ng minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
ding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli-	
nding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
ponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) poli	
sponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli-	
responding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
or responding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic (R) poli	
corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(${\bf R})$ poli	
id corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) poli	
and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
's and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
ers and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
eters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
meters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
ameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli-	
arameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli-	
he parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
: The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(\mathbf{R}) poli	
Θ . The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(R) poli	
de 9: The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic (\mathbf{R}) poli	
able 9: The parameters and corresponding minimal costs for the BC and the Myopic(${f R}$) poli	

Equilibrium	ø	NA NA	NA	AN NA	NA	NA	NA	AN	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	AN	NA	NA	NA	NA NA	AN NA	AN	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	AN	NA	NA	AN	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	AN AN	AN	NA	NA	NA	NA	AN	NA	NA	NA	NA
_	T_{CD}	657.395 113.569	50.962	139.936	48.977	748.54	44 8 V 8 V 8 V 8 V 8 V 8	1406.957	384.294	206.195	1905.323	346.776	200.048 560 754	293.285	205.682	3611.345	769.067	284.681	#/0./11C	250.007	923.979	474.948	201.787	1151.379	383.28 106.61	1515.413	423.573	198.111	515.749	CCC.762	3328.369	664.514	309.986	3626.5	238.861	1016.454	389.848	1109 568	388.14	134.207	1191.978	339.79	1389 161	410.312	134.171	2771.842	300 013	2898.722	617.324	274.42	3547.839	024.00 274.351
oic(R)	S_2	24	4 5	3 ⁸⁰	4	29	~ 7	14	n 10	7	14	4 0	N 4	H cC	0	23	r (n E	9 v	о m	9	ß	ς	14	ດເ	16 4	ы	7	ۍ n	4 c	24	4	4 6	7 5	. ന	4	n o	υĽ	n P	0	16	n	17	9	7	1 J3		77 #	8	4	30	04
Myop	S_1	ი 4	ŝ	04	ю	r ı	0 9	04	ŝ	7	9	4 (л ц	j in	0	9	4 (n o	0 0	0 00	24	4	4	4 (n c	14	б	7	13	4 c	م 1	4	ŝ	οư	о с	22	~ 0	n a	0 0	10	40	n c	۹ LC	19	7	۳,	4 (1	с 9	4	ю	~ 1	იო
	Costs	21.547 9.404	5.76	9.983	5.848	27.901	040.01	23.463	9.467	5.344	26.829	10.068	004-00 26 507	10.212	5.616	33.291	12.881	16.7	700.00/ 13 816	219.01	37.81	13.915	7.793	19.533 6.206	8.208	22.283	8.702	4.822	24.021	4 9/17	27.551	11.159	6.659	31.943 11 988	6.744	34.79	12.501	0.912 15.163	6.82	4.131	17.419	7.404	4.100 19 486	8.001	4.278	21.407	9.31 5 766	24.874	10.105	5.855	28.14	5.988
	T_S	2121.188 1124.063	871.006	1125.408	860.553	3280.902	1134.423 868 145	7289.758	4285.679	4045.347	8650.188	4322.545	4001.085	4429.782	4049.498	11625.762	6792.306	51/0.887	400.0401	5129 143	18458.255	6473.239	4894.465	6335.898	4002.047 3830.701	7456.536	4092.109	3912.275	8744.257	3816 170	11000.213	6326.519	4879.284	14181.968	4865.622	17243.773	6381.68	4914./5/ 5790 198	3934.552	3810.101	6644.105	4060.736	7753 176	4204.113	3825.521	10130.069	6211.038 4031 183	13109.551	6261.44	4890.508	16330.898	4928.95
ppic(R)	T_{CE}	7543.511 7542.011	7563.225	7574.397	7543.598	7626.718	7563 568	34139.736	34131.012	34318.437	34655.968	33440.684	33427.998 23876 064	33777.683	33861.641	33894.042	34509.803	33926.595	33060 574	₩NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA NA	AN	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	AN AN	AN	NA	NA	NA	NA	AN	NA	NA	NA	AN AN
My	S_2	24	4 6	3 ⁸⁰	4	31	~ 7	14	ß	7	15	4 (N 4	H (C)	2	23	r (ωĘ	3 r	< (f)	9	ß	ε	15	ດເ	16 4	ß	7	9.	4 c	24	~	4 6	7	. ന	8	90	υĘ	n P	0	16	n c	1 8	9	7	133	~ <	27 #	8	4	30	04
	S_1	r0 4	θv	04	С	<u>ю</u> г	0 4	04	ŝ	7	ß	4 (л <u>г</u>	j n	2	9	4	n 0	0 נו		24	~	4	n n	nc	14	б	7	12	4 C	4 IO	4	ŝ	oи	о с	21	90	n a	0	10	40	n c	14	5	7	n.	4 (1	с 9	4	ю	r 1	იო
	Costs	21.547 9.404	5.76	9.983	5.848	27.885	CF0.01	23.463	9.467	5.344	26.825	10.068	767.07	10.212	5.616	33.291	12.881	16.7	77 21	7,615	37.81	13.915	7.793	19.53	8.208	22.283	8.702	4.822	24.01	4 947	27.551	11.159	6.659	31.943 11 988	6.744	34.776	12.497	0.912	6.82	4.131	17.419	7.404	4.100	8.001	4.278	21.407	9.31 5.766	24.874	10.105	5.855	28.14	10.70 1
_	T_F	0.011	0.01	0.007	0.007	0.008	0.00	0.000	0.009	0.008	0.008	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.012	0.011	0.01	0.008	110.0	0000	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.014	0.012	600.0	0.009	0.008	0.00	600.0	0.011	0.011	0.009	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.01	600.0	0.012	0.009	0.01	10.0	0.013	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.014	0.01	0.008	0.008	0.011	2000 U
	T_S	0.03	0.005	0.00 0.00	0.005	0.024	600.0	0.021	0.01	0.006	0.018	0.008	c00.0	0.009	0.005	0.039	0.011	0.007	0.013 0.013	0.01	0.037	0.011	0.006	0.019	0.005	0.016	0.008	0.004	0.027	0.005	0.03	0.011	0.006	0.014	0.006	0.033	0.011	0.018	0.007	0.004	0.024	0.008	0.017	0.007	0.005	0.029	10.0	0.038	0.01	0.006	0.028	110.0
ie Case	T_{CE}	0.044 0.04	0.048	0.042	0.051	0.04	0.050	0.05	0.062	0.05	0.056	0.052	0.086	0.05	0.065	0.051	0.059	0.053	0.06	0.048	0.06	0.06	0.052	0.069	4c0.0	0.052	0.056	0.068	0.066	0.053	0.065	0.05	0.058	0.047	0.062	0.05	0.063	0.052	0.059	0.05	0.065	0.049	0.068	0.068	0.051	0.062	0.05	0.048	0.049	0.058	0.049	0.055
Bas	S_2	28	900	9 🎞	9	58	19	16	~	4	16		4 4	2	4	28	11	9 0	9 =	9	28	11	9	16		16 4	~	4	16		58 ⁴	11	9 0	28	9	28	Ξ,	0 17	5	4	16		14	5	4	58	11 9	28 a	11	9	58	1 4
	S_1	28 11	900	9 🎞	9	58	11 9	19	~	4	19		4 01	5	4	32	11	9 6	5 5	9	32	11	9	19	~ <	19 #	~	4	19	~ ~	32 4	11	90	11 32	9	32	Ξ,	0 10	~	4	19		1 4	~	4	32	11 9	32 o	11	9	32	1 9
	Costs	56.329 20.591	10.713	20.591	10.713	56.329	160.02	50.85	19.111	9.822	50.85	111.91	27.872	19.111	9.822	75.062	26.46	75.62	700.07	13.67	75.062	26.46	13.62	45.861	9 702 8	45.861	17.14	8.793	45.861	8 703	67.552	23.714	12.192	266.70	12.192	67.552	23.714	40.872	15.17	7.764	40.872	15.17	40.872	15.17	7.764	60.041	20.969	60.041	20.969	10.763	60.041	20/202 10 763
	b_2	40 04 04	40	1 0	40	40	40	9 8	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	72	21	28	15	12	12	72	72	14	14 14	1 T	14	14	14	14 14	26	56	29 2	8 Y	32	56	29 2	90 10	10	10	10	01 0	101	10	10	40	04	0 1 04	40	40	49	₹4
	p_1	808	80	8 8	80	80	8	20	8	20	20	22	25	202	50	80	80	200	8 8	88	80	80	80	50	25	020	20	20	88	25	3 8	80	80	8 8	88	80	80	200	8	20	20	22	88	5	20	88	2 2	8 8	80	80	80	202
	h_2	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0 0.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.0	6.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.1	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.7	2.0	0.7	0.7	0.7	2.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0 1	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0 0.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	ດ ດີເຊ
	h_1				1					1	1					1						1					-	1	, ⊢,			1	,			1	,				,				1				-	1	,	
ETERS	μ2	0.5	0.5		1	1.5	с, г С п			1	0	00	7 6	о (С		1		- (10	10	1.00	Э	с .			- 0	10	7	ς, τ	n a	о с	1	- 0	210	10	С	ς, η	υ -		1	00	210	4 63	о (С	ю			- 1	10	1	ς, η	აო
PARAM	2 µ1	1 1 1	33 1	1 1	1 1	4	1 6	1 C	10	5 2	8	4	10	10	10	9 2	12	ດ 	0.4	10	5	1 2	5)9 20	24	10	4	11 2	00	1 c	0	17 2	0 2 2 2	8 4	10	2 2	11	0 0 7 0	10	12	8	4.5	10	12	5 2	60	20	0.00	4 2	11 2	5 5	1 r 1 c
	K	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.00	0.01			0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.02	0.02	0.01	0.0		0.0	0.01	0.0	0.0	70 O	0.0	0.00	0.0	[0:0		0.02	0.02		0.0	0.0	0.0	E0:0		0.02	0.01	0.0		0.0	0.01	0.0	0.02	000
	γ_1	0.005	0.005	0.007	0.005	200.0	0.00	0.009	0.007	0.005	500.0	0.007	200.0	0.007	0.005	500.0	0.007	0.005	200.0	0.005	0.00	0.007	0.005	200.0	0.005	0.009	0.007	0.005	200.0	0.001	0.005	0.007	0.005	0.007	0.005	600.0	0.007	0.009	0.007	0.005	500.0	100.0	200.0	0.007	0.005	200.0	0.007	0.009	0.007	0.005	200.0	0.005
	N_2	50	50	8 8	50	65 5	000	8 6	20	50	50	<u> </u>	000	8 6	20	50	20 i	02 0	86	86	20	50	20	00	000	6 6	50	50	6	000	20	50	20 1	000	8 6	50	20 1	000	20	20	20	0 0 0 0	6.6	20	50	00	000	20 G	50	50	20 1	0.0
	N_1	50	50	20 R	50	<u>6</u>	8 6	8 OO	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	81	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	01 E	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	80	100	100	100	30

7 APPENDIX