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We propose and analyze a product segmentation newsvendor problem, which generalizes the phenomenon of segmentation sales of a class of perishable items. The product segmentation newsvendor problem is a new variant of the newsvendor problem, reflecting that sellers maximize profits by determining the inventory of the whole item in the context of uncertain demand for sub-items. We derive the closed-form robust ordering decision by assuming that the means and covariance matrix of stochastic demand are available but not the distributions. However, robust approaches that always trade-off in the worst-case demand scenario face a concern in solution conservatism; thus, the traditional robust schemes offer unsatisfactory. In this paper, we integrate robust and deep reinforcement learning (DRL) techniques and propose a new paradigm termed robust learning to increase the attractiveness of robust policies. Notably, we take the robust decision as human domain knowledge and implement it into the training process of DRL by designing a full-process human-machine collaborative mechanism of teaching experience, normative decision, and regularization return. Simulation results confirm that our approach effectively improves robust performance and can generalize to various problems that require robust but less conservative solutions. Simultaneously, fewer training episodes, increased training stability, and interpretability of behavior may have the opportunity to facilitate the deployment of DRL algorithms in operational practice. Furthermore, the successful attempt of RLDQN to solve the 1000-dimensional demand scenarios reveals that the algorithm provides a path to solve complex operational problems through human-machine collaboration and may have potential significance for solving other complex operational management problems.
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1 Introduction

Due to the differences in food culture between countries, the body parts of opium fish native to the North Atlantic ocean are often exported to Japan (mainly for sashimi) or canned to Europe
and America (people in Europe and America prefer canned food). As a by-product of processing, most fish heads are frozen and sold to China (where fish heads are featured in dishes such as fish head hotpot, fish head tofu, chopped pepper fish heads, and fish-head banquets).

This paper proposes the product segmentation newsvendor problem (PSNP) to generalize the phenomenon of separate sales of perishable items. Such phenomena contrast sharply with the pure bundle problem and are ubiquitous in operational practices of retail industries such as fashion, daily necessities, food, petrochemical, agriculture, etc. For example, a complete set of clothing is sold separately for tops and pants; a whole head of cattle is sold as beef, brisket, steak, etc.; shoes are purchased in pairs, but uppers, soles, heels, and laces are sold separately; purchasing bundled products (such as toothpaste and toothbrushes, skincare set) to sell separately; and so forth. Therefore, an important question for sellers facing PSNP is how to trade-off the inventory level of the whole item when the demand of the sub-item is uncertain after the whole item is divided into the same number of sub-items.

We analyze the ordering problem of PSNP in a single-period and risk-neutral environment. For this problem, we formulate it as a distributional robust model and derive a closed-form robust order quantity that requires only knowledge of the means and covariance matrices without perfect knowledge of the underlying distribution. This is important in operational practice. As the literature points out, the underlying assumption that newsvendors fully understand demand distributions has been challenged (Natarajan et al. 2018, Mamani et al. 2016). However, although robust policy fits the fact that human beings are easy obtain partial information, it always makes trade-offs in the worst case, resulting in conservative results (giving up some optimality to ensure robustness) and has been criticized by some scholars (Bertsimas and Sim 2003, Huber et al. 2019, Das et al. 2020). Echoing this point, this paper focuses on how to provide an alternative solution procedure that can effectively improve the robust performance based on the robust policy of PSNP.

Deep reinforcement learning (DRL) combines the abstract perception ability of deep learning with the decision-making ability of reinforcement learning to adapt to the environment, which holds unprecedented decision-making prospects and huge potential to surpass the state-of-the-art of humans. One of the most apparent strengths of DRL is that it uses deep neural networks to model diversity of (complex) problems without making restrictive assumptions, opening a new avenue for solving various decision-making problems (Sutton and Barto 2018, De Moor et al. 2021). Furthermore, DRL will be a complementary strategy to data-driven inventory management as it enables turning data into decision-making, paving the way for data-driven inventory management. We acknowledge, however, that DRL also has some drawbacks, such as: the learning process of DRL algorithms may not always be stable or convergent, and high computational costs are required to compensate for data inefficiencies (Gibney 2017, Silver et al. 2017, Thompson et al. 2020). An
interesting avenue to explore is to incorporate some domain knowledge (whether from previous DRL algorithms or prior experience of human decision-makers, this study discusses robust solutions from human decision making) in DRL training to develop DRL towards well-performing state/action regions and policies.

Throughout this paper, we focus on the fusion of human domain knowledge and artificial intelligence algorithms. This motivation fits with Caro et al. (2022)’s call for research on Human-Algorithm Connection. We exploit the feature that robust solutions are conservative but possibly near-optimal and propose a human-machine collaboration algorithm that incorporates the robust strategy as human domain knowledge and implements it into the Deep Q-Network (DQN) algorithm (Mnih et al. 2015) to reduce the conservatism when adopting a traditional robust strategy. More formally, we take the first-principles-based robust strategies as a teacher’s strategies and then design a human-machine coordinated mechanism of teaching experience, normative decision, and regularization return based on the teacher strategy to act on the state, action, and reward of reinforcement learning respectively. The human-machine collaboration mechanism runs through the closed-loop chain of the agent’s entire dynamic interaction with the environment, building a bridge between robust newsvendor methods and artificial intelligence algorithms. We refer to our algorithm as the robust learning algorithm. Because the general structure of our algorithm is based on the standard DQN algorithm, it is also referred to as the robust learning DQN (RLDQN) algorithm hereinafter. Remarkably, the RLDQN algorithm is different from reward shaping (see, e.g., De Moor et al. 2021, Oroojlooyjadid et al. 2021) as the teacher in the RLDQN algorithm gives guidance to the agent in the whole process of learning before, during, and after making a decision.

We demonstrate that the proposed new learning paradigm is successful by conducting a series of numerical simulation experiments with different demand distribution scenarios. (Provide an analogy, though perhaps not particularly apt: RLDQN is a product of a shotgun turned into a cannon. The robust method alone is like a shotgun; relying on a human-machine cooperation mechanism combined with the learning ability of DRL is like cannon). On the one hand, the RLDQN algorithm significantly improves robust performance, and this optimality gap is not negligible. Such performance results are exciting enough because the conservative attack on robust solutions persists even though it no longer pretends to know the demand distribution. At the same time, it can stimulate scholars to further research on robust strategies of inventory theory, thus producing profound value for the field of robust optimization. On the other hand, the RLDQN algorithm brings more efficient learning to the pure DQN algorithm. We explain from three points. First, the policy generated by the RLDQN algorithm converges to a reasonably good policy (significantly better than DQN and teacher), which is different from the previous emphasis on the convergence of the agent as a well-trained criterion. Second, the RLDQN algorithm stabilizes the training process (its variability
in average profit and Q-value is significantly reduced) and leads to fewer training episodes, i.e., less computational effort and higher data efficiency. Finally, the decision-making behaviour trend of the RLDQN algorithm is similar to that of the teacher, which helps us interpret the black-box behaviour of RLDQN assisted by the teacher (stakeholders are often reluctant to adopt decisions generated by black-box models, even technically optimal but poorly understood policies).

Notably, the core idea of human-machine collaboration involved in the RLDQN algorithm may also be valuable for solving other complex problems. The condition is that there exists a closed-form approximate solution that can be exploited as a teacher. We report this algorithm’s successful attempt to solve the high-dimensional demand scenario of PSNP (for simplicity of exposition, we call it multi-segmented product newsvendor problem (MSPNP)). The phenomenon described behind MSPNP is prevalent in many business practices. For example, some sellers will divide a fish into multiple parts so that consumers can buy a fish head, fish belly, fish back, fish bone, fish bubble, fish spring, fish mouth, fish belly, etc. In such cases, sellers need to determine the whole fish order quantity in the face of multiple random market demands for different sub-items. We show that MSPNP faces the curse of dimensionality when only the demand’s mean and covariance information is known. However, although MSPNP is computationally challenging, it can be well solved by our proposed method. The increase in demand dimension does not impact the decision potential of the RLDQN algorithm, which indirectly avoids the curse of dimensionality that plagues traditional operations research optimization methods. Consequently, we believe that our work has an excellent opportunity to advance firms to deploy DQN in their decision-making mechanisms.

The remainder of this paper is as follows. Section 2 briefly summarises the relevant literature and our contributions to it. Section 3 provides the model formulation and closed-form robust decision for PSNP. Section 4 introduces the RLDQN algorithm, and Section 5 provides numerical experiments to verify its effectiveness. In Section 6, we extend PSNP to a more complex version, MSPNP. Finally, Section 7 concludes the paper. For the sake of readability, all proofs are relegated to the appendix.

**Notation and convention.** We use standard letters (e.g., $x$) to denote scalars, bold letters (e.g., $\mathbf{x}$) to denote vectors, bold capital letters (e.g., $\mathbf{X}$) to denote matrices. We use $[n]$ to denote the running index \{1, 2, 3, ..., $n$\} for $n$ a known integer. The notation $\mathbb{R}_n$ denotes the $n$-dimensional real space and $\mathbb{R}_n^+$ denotes the non-negative orthant. The transpose of a column vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_n$ is denoted by $\mathbf{x}^T$. The trace of a matrix $\mathbf{X}$, denoted by $Tr(\mathbf{X})$, is sum of the diagonal entries of the matrix. For two vectors $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ in $\mathbb{R}_n$, the inner product is $\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{y} = x_1y_1 + \cdots + x_ny_n$, the element-wise product of the vectors is $\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y} = (x_1y_1, \cdots, x_ny_n)^T$ while the inner product between two matrices of the same dimension is denoted as $\mathbf{X} \cdot \mathbf{Y} = Tr(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{Y})$. We define $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}_n$ as the vector with all elements equal to 1, and we let $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}_n$ be the $i$-th standard basis vector. The space
of symmetric matrices of dimension $n$ is denoted by $S_n$. For any two matrices $X, Y \in S_n$, we let $X \cdot Y = \text{Tr}(XY)$ be the trace scalar product, while the relation $X \succeq Y (X \succ Y)$ implies that $X - Y$ is positive semi-definite (positive definite). We define $\text{diag} (v) \in S_n$ as a diagonal matrix with the vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_n$ on its main diagonal.

2 Literature Review

Our paper mainly contributes to three streams of literature: (1) multi-product newsvendor problem, (2) distributionally robust inventory management, and (3) DRL for solving optimization problems.

2.1 Multi-product Newsvendor Problem

Our work is closely related to the multi-product newsvendor problem (MPNP) literature. Compared with the traditional newsvendor problem, the MPNP exhibits a complex and stochastic interaction between inventory levels and sales. For this nonlinear programming problem with more decision variables and fewer constraints, Farahat and Lee (2017) showed that it seems unlikely that there is currently a general, accurate, and tractable solution. Instead, the operations management literature proposes different algorithms to solve the MPNP. Hanasusanto et al. (2014) utilized a quadratic decision programming approach to solve the optimal approximation problem of the optimal solution of a multi-product newsvendor model with risk aversion. Abdel-Malek et al. (2004) used a genetic iterative algorithm to solve the MPNP under a single constraint. Vairaktarakis (2000) studied a robust newsvendor model considering budget constraints under uncertain demand: for the piecewise demand case, a linear time optimization algorithm was proposed; it was proved to be an NP-hard problem for the discrete demand case and the solved by dynamic programming method. Our research raises a new problem called PSNP. One characteristic that distinguishes our problem from MPNP is that one decision handles multiple random demands (MPNP is multiple decisions handling multiple random demands). The phenomenon described by PSNP is similar to the literature on inventory production management in co-production systems, where multiple products are simultaneously produced in a single run (Ihsu and Bassok 1999, Boyabatli 2015, Liu et al. 2021, Transchel et al. 2016). (The yield of different sub-items in PSNP is 1.) Such literature tends to focus on providing optimality of the problem or deriving approximation algorithms when the demand distribution is known, resulting in none of them achieving an intuitive closed-form solution. Nevertheless, traditional optimization algorithms face the curse of dimensionality, limiting their practical scope. Furthermore, this assumption that policymakers fully understand demand distribution has been threatened (Natarajan et al. 2018, Mamani et al. 2016). To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first attempt to solve complex operations management problems (PSNP faces computational challenges in high-dimensional scenarios) through a human-machine collaborative approach. Put differently, we provide a closed-form solution for PSNP using only the mean and covariance information and optimize it in combination with DRL techniques.
2.2 Distributionally Robust Inventory Management

Additionally, our work relates to the literature on distributionally robust inventory management, where decisions have to be made with incomplete distribution information. The sensitivity of the newsvendor solution to the demand distribution has been studied in the distributionally robust optimization literature. Scarf (1958) first analyzed the so-called distribution-free newsvendor model. The mean and standard deviation of demand is available, but the distribution is not; the objective is to maximize the worst-case expected profit. Gallego and Moon (1993) provided extensions and a review of similar work.

In the past few decades, driven by an unstable business environment and significant advances in optimization theory, various extensions to the basic robust newsvendor problem have been successively proposed in the literature, which is widely used to solve the decision-making problem of insufficient information in operations management (see, e.g., Fu et al. 2018, Yue et al. 2006, Hanasusanto et al. 2014, Jiang and Guan 2018, Natarajan et al. 2018, Bai et al. 2020). A common feature in the extant literature on robust inventory models is an effort to provide sellers with a robust strategy. For example, Fu et al. (2018) extended the literature on robust inventory models where randomness comes only from demand by investigating robust max-min inventory decisions when both demand and price are random. Unfortunately, one of the standard criticisms of robust newsvendor problem is that it might be overly conservative since a worst-case solution is derived. Therefore, several alternatives have been proposed. Bertsimas and Sim (2003) introduced a probabilistic bound on constraint violations to adjust the conservatism of robust solutions. Long et al. (2022) presented a robust satisficing model whose goal is to maximize the robustness to uncertainty in achieving a satisfactory target. He and Lu (2021) used the minimax regret decision criterion (readers may refer to Perakis and Roels (2008) for more details) to study the price-setting problem under additive and multiplicative demand models. Wang et al. (2016) proposed a likelihood robust optimization (LRO) approach that avoids some conservatism by eliminating unrealistic distributions while maintaining the robustness of the solution for any statistically possible outcome. Chen and Xie (2021) adopted the distributionally robust approach based on the type-∞ Wasserstein distance to study the ordering strategy under random supply and demand. Nevertheless, these studies do not specify how much the new approach reduced conservatism. This study extends the literature by providing a solution procedure of integrating robust solutions and artificial intelligence that indeed have desirable performance without losing robustness, even in high-dimensional demands scenarios.
2.3 DRL for Solving Optimization Problems

Finally, our work complements a rapidly growing stream of literature on DRL. The DRL method is the integration of Reinforcement Learning (RL) (for more details on RL, we refer to Sutton et al. 1998) and Deep Neural Networks (DNN). More recently, there has been excellent progress in developing DRL to solve optimization problems in the context of operations management, inspired by some success stories in the gaming domain (see, e.g., Silver et al. 2016, Mnih et al. 2015). Gijsbrechts et al. (2021) provided a rigorous performance evaluation of DRL in three classic and intractable inventory problems: lost sales, dual sourcing, and multi-echelon inventory management. The authors demonstrated that the Asynchronous Advantage Actor-Critic (A3C) algorithm could match the performance of state-of-the-art heuristics and other approximate dynamic programming methods. Yang et al. (2021) considered a monopoly retailer selling fresh produce to customers with different perceptions of food quality in a given period, and employed the proximal policy optimization (PPO) algorithm to derive optimal pricing and information strategies. These studies provide evidence that DRL can be applied as a general technique to classical but intractable inventory problems. However, applying DRL is not effortless (Gijsbrechts et al. 2021, Boute et al. 2021). Some scholars assist agent decision-making by introducing transfer learning. For instance, Oroojlooyjaddid et al. (2021) proposed a shaped-reward DQN (SRDQN) algorithm to play a beer game and proposed a transfer learning method to speed up the learning speed of the agent. In addition, the teacher-student framework enables decision-makers to produce better results under the teacher’s guidance. The agent’s reward at this point can be altered or shaped, known as reward shaping, to reduce computational effort and make training more stable without losing performance. To date, the idea of embedding teaching into the learning process of agents is not new, but this realization remains largely silent in inventory management (Boute et al. 2021). De Moor et al. (2021) recently successfully demonstrated how potential-based reward shaping could be implemented into a DQN algorithm to manage the perishable inventory problem. They use the existing base-stock policy and a modified base-stock policy with estimates of waste (BSP-low-EW) as the teacher’s strategy to adjust the agent’s learning process. Compared with De Moor et al. (2021), our work’s major differences and non-negligible novelties can be identified as follows. First, we follow a completely different goal and are the first attempt to apply DQN to the (high-dimensional) robust newsvendor problem. Second, different from the teacher’s strategy only affecting the reward in reward shaping, we designed a human-machine collaboration mechanism consisting of teaching experience, normative decision and regularization return, which respectively acted on the state, action and reward of the agent in the process of interaction with the environment. Third, we generate auxiliary observations on the black-box behavior of DQNs. Finally, we have inconsistent insights into the results of the “when the teacher is inferior compared to unshaped DQN, reward shaping does not improve policy performance obtained by DQN” they revealed.
2.4 Our Contribution

We summarize our contributions to the literature from the following aspects.

(1) We propose a data-driven RLDQN algorithm to solve a new class of problems – PSNP. PSNP is a variant of the newsvendor problem, which describes how to determine the inventory of the whole item to balance the random demand of different sub-items. This phenomenon is prevalent in the operational practices of retail industries such as fashion, daily necessities, food industry, petrochemical industry, agriculture, etc.

(2) The RLDQN algorithm is designed under a new human-machine collaboration framework, which is the product of embedding robust solutions into the DQN algorithm (i.e., RLDQN integrates robust technology and DRL technology).

(3) RLDQN effectively improves robust policy and can generalize to problems that require robust but less conservative solutions. That is, it lowers the price of robustness and results in a more satisfactory solution. Therefore, even if there are conservative comments on robust strategies, research on tractable robust strategies is still valuable.

(4) RLDQN provides a path to solve complex operational problems through human-machine collaboration and may be a good candidate for solving other complex issues. Furthermore, the potential of DQN in operations management is still largely unexplored, and the increased training stability, fast convergence, and behavioral interpretability may partially alleviate concerns associated with DRL policies.

3 Model Formulation and Closed-form Robust Decision

In this section, we present the mathematical model of the PSNP with uncertain demand. Also, we provide the closed-form robust decision for PSNP before introducing the RLDQN algorithm.

3.1 Model Formulation

We consider a PSNP in which a risk-neutral seller needs to determine the order quantity of the whole item (e.g., fish) when facing uncertainty in random demand $D_i (i = 1, 2)$ of sub-item (e.g., fish head and body). At the beginning of the business cycle, the seller orders $q$ items at wholesale price $c$.

Only after the sub-item has been delivered, the random demand $D_i$ for the sub-item $i$ is shown and the quantity $y(D_i)$ is sold at price $p_i$. Of course, the quantity sold $y(D_i)$ can neither exceed the demand $D_i$ nor the initial stock $q$. That is, $0 \leq y(D_i) \leq \min(q, D_i)(i = 1, 2)$.

In this paper, we will assume $p_1 + p_2 > c > 0$, which means that the form of optimal sales decision is $y(D_i) = \min(q, D_i)(i = 1, 2)$, otherwise the seller has no sales motivation. Demands that are not adequately populated are lost, and the remaining copies have zero value. Given a joint probability
distribution $F$ of the random demand $D_1$ and $D_2$, the seller will choose an order quantity $q$ that maximizes the total expected profit:

$$\max_{q \in \mathbb{R}^+} E_F [\pi(q|D_1, D_2)],$$

where $\pi(q|D_1, D_2) = -cq + p_1y(D_1) + p_2y(D_2) = -cq + p_1\min(q, D_1) + p_2\min(q, D_2)$.

### 3.2 Closed-form Robust Decision

The premise of using historical data to derive demand distribution in practice is 1) historical replay and 2) high data quality. However, both of these assumptions are not necessarily practical because our knowledge of $F$ is often ambiguous, when we only have a series of historical data samples $\{D^k_i\}_{k=1}^K, i = 1, 2$ that can be collected from $F$. In this section, we address the problem by explicitly incorporating the distributional ambiguity into model (1). That is, starting from a set of historical data samples, we consider the case where only some parametric properties of the demand distribution are known (instead of pretending to know the distribution): mean vector $\mu = (E(D_1), E(D_2)) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_2$ ($\Sigma > 0$), where $\Sigma_{ii} = \sigma(D_i)^2$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\Sigma_{12} = \Sigma_{21} = \rho\sigma(D_1)\sigma(D_2)$ and $\rho$ denotes the correlation coefficient. These parameters are unified together by the moment matrix $\Xi$ (or, more accurately, the second-order moment matrix):

$$\Xi = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma + \mu\mu^T & \mu \\ \mu^T & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$  

Let $\Phi(\Xi_0) = \{D = (D_1, D_2) \in \mathbb{R}^+_2; D \succeq 0, D \text{ have moments matrix } \Xi_0 = \Xi\}$ represent the probability distribution space with above moment conditions, where all decisions of the decision maker are evaluated according to the worst-case possible distribution in $\Phi(\Xi_0)$. Therefore, given the retail price of the sub-item, the seller faces the problem of maximizing the worst-case profit by choosing an order quantity $q$. Mathematically, this is done by solving

$$\max_{q \in \mathbb{R}^+} \left\{ -cq + \inf_{(D_1, D_2) \in \Phi(\Xi_0)} E_{D_1, D_2}[p_1\min(q, D_1) + p_2\min(q, D_2)] \right\}.$$  

The key to deriving a closed-form optimal solution for Problem (3) is that we can find primal and dual solutions that achieve the same optimal value. The moment problem has a strong duality when the moment lies in the inner feasible moment cone (Boyd and Vandenberghe 2004).

Let $q_{PSNP}^{FR}$ be an robust solution to the Problem (3). For illustrative purposes, we define the following terms:

**Definition 1.** Define $H = \sqrt{p_1^2\sigma(D_1)^2 + p_2^2\sigma(D_2)^2 + 2p_1p_2\text{cov}(D_1, D_2)}$, which is a measure of the variability of random demand (where $\sigma(D_1)$ and $\sigma(D_2)$ are the standard deviation of demand $D_1$ and $D_1$, respectively), and $K = \sqrt{\frac{c}{p_1 + p_2 - c} - \frac{c}{p_1 + p_2 - c}}$, which is composed of price factors.
The following results give an explicit expression for the robust optimal order quantity and describe the conditions that need to be satisfied for this expression to be optimal.

**Theorem 1.** Let $q_{PSNP}^{PSNP}$ be the optimal robust lower bound solution for the PSNP. Then $q_{PSNP}^{PSNP}$ is greater than zero if and only if
\[
\frac{H^2}{(p_1E(D_1) + p_2E(D_2))^2} \leq \frac{p_1 + p_2 - c}{c},
\]
in which case,
\[
q_{PSNP}^{PSNP} = \frac{p_1E(D_1) + p_2E(D_2)}{p_1 + p_2} + \frac{H \cdot K}{2(p_1 + p_2)}
\]
and the worst-case profit is
\[
\pi_{wst} = -c q_{PSNP}^{PSNP} + \inf_{(D_1, D_2) \in \Phi(\Xi_0)} \frac{K}{D_1, D_2} [p_1 \min(q_{PSNP}^{PSNP}, D_1) + p_2 \min(q_{PSNP}^{PSNP}, D_2)]
\]
\[
= -\frac{c(p_1E(D_1) + p_2E(D_2))}{p_1 + p_2} - \frac{H}{4} \left( \sqrt{K^2 + 4} - K + \frac{2cK}{p_1 + p_2} \right) + p_1 E(D_1) + p_2 E(D_2).
\]

**Proof:** See EC.1.1 in the E-Companion for the detailed proof. 

**Remark 1** gives a closed-form solution to the robust order decision of PSNP. This closed-form solution leads to some useful observations:

i) For the ordering conditions, if \(p_1E(D_1) + p_2E(D_2))^2 \leq \frac{p_1 + p_2 - c}{c}\) is not satisfied, it is not recommended to invest. That is, there exist some thresholds \(\bar{H} = (p_1E(D_1) + p_2E(D_2))\frac{p_1 + p_2 - c}{c}, \bar{E}(D_1) = \frac{H}{2p_1 + 2p_2} \frac{p_1 + p_2 - c}{p_1 + p_2}, \) and \(E(D_2) = \frac{H}{2p_1 + 2p_2} \frac{p_1 + p_2 - c}{p_1 + p_2}\), if and only if \(H \leq \bar{H}, E(D_1) \leq \bar{E}(D_1)\), or \(E(D_2) \leq E(D_2)\), it is profitable for managers to adopt the ordering strategy.

ii) \(\frac{p_1E(D_1) + p_2E(D_2)}{2(p_1 + p_2)}\) represents the expected order quantity, and \(\frac{p_1E(D_1) + p_2E(D_2)}{2(p_1 + p_2)}\) represents the safety stock (to hedge the risk brought by changes in demand). Therefore, \(q_{PSNP}^{PSNP}\) can be interpreted as the expected order quantity plus safety stock. In other words, the order quantity is mean-anchored and adjusted for safety stock.

iii) \(K\) determines the order level relative to the expected order quantity. Specifically, the optimal order quantity \(q_{PSNP}^{PSNP}\) is above, equal to, or below the expected order quantity depending on whether the critical ratio (profit margin) \(\eta = \frac{p_1 + p_2 - c}{p_1 + p_2}\) is greater than, equal to or less than 0.5 respectively.

iv) When the demand distribution is deterministic (i.e., in the case \(\sigma(D_1) = 0\) and \(\sigma(D_2) = 0\), or \(H = 0\)), the seller should always order, and the order quantity is \(q_{PSNP}^{PSNP} = \frac{p_1E(D_1) + p_2E(D_2)}{p_1 + p_2}\).

Scarf (1958) obtained a min-max solution to the newsvendor problem with unit cost \(c\) and unit selling price \(p\). Note that the newsvendor problem is a special case of our problem. In this case, let \(p_1 + p_2 = p, E(D_1) = E(D_2) = E(D)\), and \(\sigma(D_1) = \sigma(D_2) = \sigma(D)\). It can be verified that our result in **Theorem 1** reduces to the Scarf formula with exactly the same ordering decisions and conditions. Therefore, our results generalize the Scarf formula to a more general setting.
Although the robust method has many attractive analytical features, the profit under the robust solution is not optimal due to its conservative nature, hindering its practical application. This paper aims to provide a potential approach that can effectively improve robust performance based on robust decision-making rather than ending with having closed-form robust decision-making. Based on this, we introduce DRL algorithms showing great sequential decision-making potential. In particular, we exploit features that the robust solution is conservative but near-optimal. We propose an RLDQN algorithm that takes the robust strategy as human domain knowledge and implements it into the DQN algorithm to reduce the conservatism when adopting the robust strategy. The following content mainly introduces and tests the RLDQN algorithm.

4 The RLDQN Algorithm

In this section, we introduce the DQN algorithm, describe the human-machine collaboration mechanism in the RLDQN algorithm, and provide the pseudocode for the RLDQN algorithm.

4.1 Deep Q-network (DQN)

DQN agent regards upstream suppliers and downstream markets as the external environment. In each time step \( t \), the agent observes the current state of the system \( s_t \in S \) (where \( S \) is the set of possible states), choose an action \( a_t \in A(s_t) \) (where \( A(s_t) \) is the set of possible actions when the system is in state \( s_t \)), and gets reward \( r_t \in \mathbb{R} \) (the reward incurred at time step \( t \), when taking action \( a_t \) in state \( s_t \)), can thus be defined as

\[
    r_t = \pi_t(a_t|D^t_1, D^t_2) = -ca_t + p_1 \min(a_t, D^t_1) + p_2 \min(a_t, D^t_2),
\]

and then the system transitions randomly into states \( s_{t+1} \in S \). This procedure is known as a Markov decision process (MDP).

In each period \( t \), the agent store the observed \( D^t_1, D^t_2, a_t, \) and \( r_t \), so the historical observation is

\[
    s_t = [(D^0_1, D^0_2, a_0, r_0), \cdots, (D^{t-1}_1, D^{t-1}_2, a_{t-1}, r_{t-1})].
\]

Also, PSNP ends up in a limited time horizon, so the problem can be modeled as a partially observed MDP (POMDP) and reinforcement learning algorithms can be applied to solve this type of problem. The state variable \( s_t \) of each period is different, and its scale increases with time, which is difficult for any reinforcement learning algorithm to handle. To address this issue, combined with the single-period characteristics of PSNP, we capture only the latest period, that is, \( m = 1 \). Therefore, the state variable of agent in time \( t \) is:

\[
    s_t = (D^{t-1}_1, D^{t-1}_2, a_{t-1}, r_{t-1}).
\]

The agent’s goal is to interact with the environment through decision-making behaviours to maximize the expected discounted value of future rewards. Based on the work of Minh et al. (2015), a deep neural network DNN is used to approximate the optimal action-value function:

\[
    Q^*(s, a) = \max_\theta E \left[ r_t + \gamma r_{t+1} + \gamma^2 r_{t+2} + \cdots | s_t = s, a_t = a, \theta \right].
\]
The optimal action value function $Q^*$ is the maximum sum of the return $r_t$ discounted by $\gamma$ at each time step $t$ by implementing the decision policy $\theta = P(a|s)$ after observing $s$ and making a decision $a$. It follows the well-known Bellman equation (Bellman 1954), i.e., if the optimal value $Q^*(s',a')$ of the observation sequence $s'$ at the next time step is known for all possible actions $a'$, then the optimal strategy is to choose an action $a'$ that maximizes the expected value of $r + \gamma Q^*(s',a')$. That is, $Q^*(s,a) = \mathbb{E}_{s'}[r + \gamma \max_{a'} Q^*(s',a')|s,a]$.

A neural network function approximator with a weight of $\theta$ is called a Q-network, and its architecture is shown in EC.2 of the E-Companion. The Q-network is trained to reduce the mean squared error in the Bellman equation by adjusting the parameter $\theta_i$ at iteration $i$, where the optimal target value $r + \gamma \max_{a'} Q^*(s',a')$ is replaced with an approximate target value using the parameter $\theta_{i-1}$ from the previous iteration.

The neural network improves its approximations of the optimal Q-values by collecting experiences and replaying them, a mechanism called experience replay. As the agent takes an action $a_t$ in state $s_t$, resulting in an immediate reward $r_t$ and a next state $s_{t+1}$, an experience is created, formally defined as $e_t = (s_t,a_t,r_t,s_{t+1})$. During learning, experience samples $(s,a,r,s') \sim U(D)$ randomly drawn from the sample pool are updated at iteration $i$ using the following loss function:

$$L_i(\theta_i) = \mathbb{E}_{(s,a,r,s') \sim U(D)} \left[ (r + \gamma \max_{a'} Q(s',a';\theta_i)) - Q(s,a;\theta_i) \right],$$

where $\theta_i$ is the weights of the neural network at iteration $i$; and $\theta_{i-1}$ is the weights of the target network. A target network is an additional neural network of which the weights are not updated during every training iteration. Instead, they are updated every $C$ training episode by putting them equal to the main network’s weights at that specific training iteration.

### 4.2 RLDQN Mechanism

The RLDQN algorithm transforms the classic DQN algorithm using the teacher’s advice. It relies on the human-machine collaboration mechanism of teaching experience, normative decision, and regularization return to act on the state, action, and reward of reinforcement learning, running through the entire closed-loop chain of the dynamic interaction between the agent and the environment. The agent-environment interaction form of the RLDQN algorithm is shown in Figure 1.

Teaching experience is analogous to education before decision-making, normative decision is analogous to education during decision-making, and regularization return is analogous to education after decision-making. The three work together to provide a whole-process guidance for the agent.

1) **Teaching experience.** Teaching experience means that the teacher’s decision and profit information of the previous period are transparent to the agent, which is equivalent to the agent receiving education before making a decision (pre-decision education). At period $t$, the agent uses
the observation of the environmental state $s'_t$ as the basis for decision-making. In addition to the market demand $D_i^{t-1}$ ($i = 1, 2$), its own decision-making $a_{t-1}$ and the corresponding return $r_{t-1}$, $s'_t$ also contains the theoretical and practical experience taught by the teacher: the closed-form robust solution $q_{t-1}$ of PSNP and the gains $R_{t-1}$ obtained in the face of the same stochastic demands. That is, $s'_t = (D_1^{t-1}, D_2^{t-1}, a'_{t-1}, r_{t-1}, q_{t-1}, R_{t-1})$, where $q_{t-1} = q_{P_{R_{t}}}^{PSNP}(D_1^{t-1}, D_2^{t-1})$ and $R_{t-1} = \pi_{t-1}(q_{t-1}|D_1^{t-1}, D_2^{t-2})$.

2) **Normative decision.** The normative decision means that the agent’s decision-making behaviour is constrained by the teacher, thereby limiting its decision-making space (decision-making education, similar to policy compression). There are two main design motivations behind this decision criterion: (1) a good deal of exploration time can be saved if the advice can focus exploration on a range of possible actions, and (2) switching from the old policy $q_t$ to the new policy $a'_{t}$ is difficult due to many practical limitations. Therefore, we need a more gentle transition from the old to the new one. The agent’s behaviour distribution obeys the $\epsilon$-greedy strategy: select random actions with probability $\epsilon$ to explore the action space; follow the existing experience with probability $1 - \epsilon$ to select the action corresponding to the maximum Q-value, that is

$$a'_t = \begin{cases} \max \left( q_t \left[ \frac{UL}{2} \right], 0 \right) + \text{random } a \in [0, UL], & \text{with a probability of } \epsilon, \\ \arg \max_a Q(s'_t, a; \theta), & \text{with a probability of } 1 - \epsilon, \end{cases}$$

where $\epsilon$ starts at an initial value and decreases linearly to a minimum value with a certain decay rate each period, and UL is the randomly explored range near the teacher. (The value of UL can be regarded as a trade-off between exploration and exploitation so that decision-makers can make appropriate judgments as needed. A value that is too small can lead to over-exploitation of the teacher’s decision-making behavior without adequately exploring more options. By contrast, it will
lead to too much space for exploration to give full play to the guiding role of the teacher. Put differently, selecting the values for UL reflects how well we perceive the teacher. A smaller UL means that we trust the teacher’s advice, and a larger UL implies that we are less dependent on the teacher and have more freedom in decision-making.) The setting of normative decisions allows the agent to learn to optimize its own policy while being able to stay close to the teacher’s policy. Doing so will help firms take the stress out of adopting a novel policy.

3) Regularization return. Regularization return means that we allow the agent’s policy to deviate from the teacher, but we impose a penalty on any such deviation (pre-decision education). In this paper, our regularization return has the form:

\[ r'_t = r_t + regular_t, \]

where \( r_t \) is the original expected return function obtained by the agent after making decision \( a'_t \) in state \( s'_t \). We influence \( r_t \) by designing a regularization function (or penalty function) \( regular_t = \begin{cases} 0, & a'_t = q_t \\ -\alpha \| a'_t - q_t \|_2^2, & a'_t \neq q_t \end{cases} \) to obtain a new expected regularized reward function \( r'_t \). The introduction of a regularization function can make the agent vigilant against policies that deviate too far from the teacher, thereby helping to guide the agent toward the desired behavior, or to prevent the behavior that will be later regretted. The setting of the regularizer coefficient \( \alpha \) should be moderate, since we are not motivating the agent to behave in line with the teacher, but only close. Therefore, our hope of training the agent is to prevent its behavior from deviating too far from the teacher while maintaining performance improvement.

4.3 The Algorithm

Centring on the human-machine collaboration mechanism of teaching experience, normative decision, and regularization return, our algorithm to get the policy \( \pi \) to solve the PSNP is provided in Algorithm 1 (for comparison but to save space, the algorithm framework of DQN is shown in EC.3 of the E-Companion.)

5 Numerical experiment: Results and Insights

5.1 Experimental Setup

This section intends to simulate environmental interaction through simulation experiments further to analyze the following aspects of the RLDQQN algorithm: 1) decision performance (effect optimization level); 2) convergence and stability (efficiency optimization level); 3) ordering behaviour (behaviour explanatory level). All instances have a per-unit market prices \( p_1 = 40 \) and \( p_2 = 60 \), and the random exploration range is set to \( UL = 40 \). In the low-profit condition \( \frac{p_1 + p_2 - c}{p_1 + p_2} \leq 0.5 \) item
Algorithm 1 (RLDQN Algorithm Architecture)

1 Procedure RLDQN
2 Initialize the PSNP environment and the basic settings of the RLDQN environments
3 for \( t = 1 : T \), do
4    Teachers make ordering decisions \( q_t \).
5    \# Robust Learning Mechanism 1: Teaching Experience
6    Observes the current states \( s_t = (D_t^{i-1}, D_t^{j-1}, a_t^{i-1}, r_t, q_t, R_t) \)
7    \# Robust Learning Mechanism 2: Normative Decision
8    With probability \( \epsilon \) select random actions to explore the action space, otherwise select
9    the action corresponding to the maximum Q-value, that is,
10    \[ a_t' = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } a_t' = q_t; \\ \arg\max_a Q(s_t, a; \theta), & \text{if } a_t' \neq q_t \end{cases} \]
11    Randomly generate market demand \( D_t^{i} \) and \( D_t^{j} \)
12    Teachers realize profit \( R_t \).
13    \# Robust Learning Mechanism 3: Regularization Return
14    The expression function of the corrected return value is \( r_t' = r_t + \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } a_t' = q_t; \\ -\alpha \|a_t' - q_t\|_2^2, & \text{if } a_t' \neq q_t \end{cases} \)
15    Execute action \( a_t' \), observe reward \( r_t' \) and observe state \( s_t' = (D_t^{i}, D_t^{j}, a_t', r_t, q_t, R_t) \)
16    Store transition \((s_t, a_t', r_t', s_t')\) in \( E \)
17    Sample random minibatch of transitions \((s_t^j, a_t^j, r_t^j, s_t^j)\) from \( E \)
18    Set \( y_j = r_t^j + \gamma \max_{a'} Q(s_t^j, a'; \theta) \)
19    Perform a gradient descent step on \((y_t - Q(s_t^j, a_t^j; \theta))^2\) and update the weight \( \theta \) of Q-net
20    Every \( C \) time steps, update the weight \( \theta' = \theta \) of Q-target
21 end for

end procedure

are purchased for \( c = 55 \) and in the high-profit condition \( \frac{p_1 + p_2 - c}{p_1 + p_2} > 0.5 \) item are purchased for \( c = 35 \).
We evaluate the expected profits of different policies by simulating \( K = 40 \) or \( K = 20 \) sample
paths of \( T = 5,000 \) periods. At period \( t \), let \( \{D_t^i(k)\}_{k=1}^K \) be a set of \( K \) samples generated
independently at random according to the distribution of \( D_t^i \), \( i = 1, 2 \). Therefore, \( E(D_t^i) \) and \( \sigma(D_t^i) \) in \( q_t \) be
defined as \( E(D_t^i) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K D_t^i(k) \) and \( \sigma(D_t^i) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{k=1}^K [D_t^i(k) - E(D_t^i)]} \), \( i = 1, 2 \). Specifically,
we consider the demand samples generated with uniform distribution (as shown in the section 5.2,
the theoretical optimal solution in this scenario is easy to obtain, so that the conservative degree
of the robust solution can be judged) and mixture distribution. Here the mixture distribution is
defined as the sub-item demand samples in each period are randomly generated from various
distributions. These distributions include: (a) \( D_t^1 \in [0, 200] \) and \( D_t^2 \in [0, 280] \); (b) \( D_t^1 \in N(100, 25^2) \)
and \( D_t^2 \in N(140, 35^2) \); (c) \( D_t^1 \in E(1/100) \) and \( D_t^2 \in E(1/140) \); (d) \( D_t^1 \in P(100) \) and \( D_t^2 \in P(140) \);
(e) \( D_t^1 \in Be(0.5, 0.5) * 2 \times 100 \) and \( D_t^2 \in Be(0.5, 0.5) * 2 \times 140 \) (Perakis and Roels 2008). Note that
sub-item demands under different distributions have the same expectation. Table 1 shows the parameters for different settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Profit margin</th>
<th>$c$</th>
<th>$p_1$</th>
<th>$p_2$</th>
<th>$K$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mixture</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mixture</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mixture</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mixture</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the demand dimension of PSNP is sufficiently small, it has a small state space, which allows us to obtain the optimal policy about the order quantity through value iteration. Tabular Q-learning would also suffice in small settings without relying on neural networks. Yet, we chose to implement DQN as it allows scaling to larger settings (see MSPNP in Section 6). The parameterized Q-valued deep neural network we constructed is a four-layer fully connected network, including an input layer, two hidden layers, and an output layer. In this neural network, the number of nodes in the input layer is equal to the length of the state vector. Therefore, there are 4 input nodes in the DQN algorithm and 6 in the RLDQN algorithm. The number of nodes in the hidden layer is set to 64, each having a ReLU activation function and abstracting the data through a transformation of nonlinear functions. In addition, the number of nodes in the output layer is equal to the interval length of possible values of actions, which is $1 + q^{UP}$ ($q^{UP}$ represents the upper limit of the action space). The optimization method of neural network parameters is the gradient descent method based on backpropagation. The underlying hyperparameter settings of RLDQN and DQN are identical, see EC.5 of the E-Companion. In passing, limited manual hyperparameter tuning can yield satisfactory results to reduce the conservatism of the robust solution. Therefore, we did not excessively try optimising the choice of hyperparameters further. Of course, if the hyperparameters have experimented with better quality, we can’t deny that we will get more satisfactory results. However, as we have mentioned, we aim to provide a solution framework for robust PSNP, not an optimal one (if one exists). We conduct all computational experiments on a computer with an Intel i7-1.80 GHz CPU, 16.0 GB RAM, and a 64-bit Windows 10 operating system. In addition, all experiments were performed in Python using TensorFlow.
5.2 Uniform Distribution Ordering Decision for PSNP

Based on introducing the robust solution as the DQN teacher, we also added the theoretical solution when the demand obeys a uniform distribution as another DQN teacher (the use of uniform distribution is common in previous experimental studies such as Benzion et al. (2010) and Schweitzer and Cachon (2000)). The reasons behind this can be explained as follows. First, the uniform distribution is simple in form, which is helpful for us to solve the theoretical optimal solution of PSNP in this situation. Second, we can compare the uniform distribution solution with the robust solution, which plays the role of self-evidence between the theoretical solutions. Third, it is helpful to illustrate the robustness of the RLDQN algorithm under different teachers. That is the impact of the choice of different teachers on the performance of the RLDQN algorithm.

To facilitate the provision of closed-form solutions, we consider the case where the demands are independent. Suppose $F_1$ and $F_2$ are the probability distribution functions of $D_1$ and $D_2$, respectively. Also, assuming $D_1 \in [a_1, b_1]$ ($0 \leq a_1 < b_1 \leq \infty$) and $D_2 \in [a_2, b_2]$ ($0 \leq a_2 < b_2 \leq \infty$). That is, $F_1(D_1) = \frac{D_1 - a_1}{b_1 - a_1}$ and $F_2(D_2) = \frac{D_2 - a_2}{b_2 - a_2}$. The optimality conditions that need to be satisfied with respect to the order quantity and their corresponding explicit solutions are shown below.

**Theorem 2.** Let $q_{T,U}^{PSNP}$ be the optimal uniform distribution ordering decision for PSNP. Then the optimality condition is

$$p_1 + p_2 - c = p_1 F_1(q_{T,U}^{PSNP}) + p_2 F_2(q_{T,U}^{PSNP}) .$$

Therefore, we have

$$q_{T,U}^{PSNP} = \frac{(p_1 + p_2 - c)(b_1 - a_1)(b_2 - a_2) + p_1 a_1 (b_2 - a_2) + p_2 a_2 (b_1 - a_1)}{p_1 (b_2 - a_2) + p_2 (b_1 - a_1)} .$$

Proof: See EC.1.2 in the E-Companion for the detailed proof.

**Remark 1.** In the period $t$, the teacher’s strategy here is $q_t = q_{T,U}^{PSNP}(a_{t1}^i, a_{t2}^i, b_{t1}^i, b_{t2}^i)$. Among them, $a_{ti}$ and $b_{ti}$ in $q_t$ be defined as $a_{ti} = \min_{k \in \{1,2,\ldots,K\}} D_{ik}^k(t)$ and $b_{ti} = \max_{k \in \{1,2,\ldots,K\}} D_{ik}^k(t)$, $i = 1, 2$.

5.3 Performance Evaluation

To evaluate the decision-making ability and performance of the RLDQN algorithm, it is compared with the teacher and DQN. Table 2 summarizes the profit of different decision-making methods when the robust teacher as benchmark.

From the teacher’s point of view, T_R is more adaptable than T_U. On the one hand, as a theoretically optimal solution under the uniform distribution, T_U’s performance is better than that of T_R (see experiments 1 to 4), which only depends on partial information. However, T_R does not exhibit much conservatism. Conversely, the profit gap between T_R and T_U is less than two percentage points. On the other hand, the performance of T_U is far inferior to that of T_R.
Table 2  Performance Levels of Different Decision-making Methods (Profit Margin of Robust Teacher T_R as Benchmark 100%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>T_R</th>
<th>T_U</th>
<th>DQN</th>
<th>RLDQN_R</th>
<th>RLDQN_U</th>
<th>T_R</th>
<th>T_U</th>
<th>DQN</th>
<th>RLDQN_R</th>
<th>RLDQN_U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4693.24</td>
<td>4758.36</td>
<td>3794.70</td>
<td>4749.23</td>
<td>4750.95</td>
<td><strong>101.39%</strong></td>
<td>80.84%</td>
<td><strong>101.21%</strong></td>
<td><strong>101.23%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4680.33</td>
<td>4760.19</td>
<td>4209.35</td>
<td>4739.86</td>
<td>4737.29</td>
<td><strong>101.71%</strong></td>
<td>89.92%</td>
<td><strong>101.27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>101.22%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2235.46</td>
<td>2259.73</td>
<td>1894.97</td>
<td>2247.02</td>
<td>2257.36</td>
<td><strong>101.09%</strong></td>
<td>84.75%</td>
<td><strong>100.66%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.98%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2265.75</td>
<td>2305.58</td>
<td>1550.04</td>
<td>2305.46</td>
<td>2301.59</td>
<td><strong>101.76%</strong></td>
<td>68.40%</td>
<td><strong>101.75%</strong></td>
<td><strong>101.58%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4883.97</td>
<td>3742.16</td>
<td>4059.56</td>
<td>5076.27</td>
<td>4357.03</td>
<td><strong>76.62%</strong></td>
<td>83.10%</td>
<td><strong>103.94%</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.21%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4887.45</td>
<td>4248.10</td>
<td>4423.89</td>
<td>4828.47</td>
<td>4828.47</td>
<td><strong>86.92%</strong></td>
<td>90.50%</td>
<td><strong>105.78%</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.79%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2389.55</td>
<td>2193.14</td>
<td>1760.15</td>
<td>2405.75</td>
<td>2470.19</td>
<td><strong>91.78%</strong></td>
<td>73.64%</td>
<td><strong>104.44%</strong></td>
<td><strong>103.37%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2463.89</td>
<td>2324.90</td>
<td>1621.87</td>
<td>2616.11</td>
<td>2541.53</td>
<td><strong>94.36%</strong></td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td><strong>106.18%</strong></td>
<td><strong>103.15%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. T_R (T_U) represents the robust (uniform distribution) teacher and RLDQN_R (RLDQN_U) represents the RLDQN algorithm formed after a robust (uniform distribution) teacher teaches DQN.

in a highly asymmetric and arbitrarily random demand scenario such as mixture distribution (see experiments 5 to 8). This reflects that the solution is highly sensitive to the distribution itself, and applying an incorrect distribution can have damaging effects (Mamani et al. 2016, Natarajan et al. 2018).

From the DQN’s perspective, while it has excelled in areas such as Atari video games (see Mnih et al. 2015), the PSNP environment is not its “comfort zone”, failing to work well. The DQN at this time has certain competitiveness (90.50% in suitable cases), but the overall advantage is poor (only 65.81% in lousy performance). This echoes the message that DQN is not a panacea. Not all scenarios are suitable for direct use of DQN, and scenarios suitable for DQN may not be superior to traditional optimization methods.

From the perspective of RLDQN, RLDQN always improves the performance of robust teachers and DQN. Under the uniform distribution, RLDQN maintains the level of the original optimization technology; that is, there is only an extremely small profit gap with the optimal solution T_U, and it will not exceed it. Under the mixture distribution, RLDQN achieves superhuman (outperforming teacher) performance in different decision-making tasks. However, it is noteworthy that in the face of high-margin products (see experiments 5 and 6), it will result in “teacher T_U is inferior to student DQN, but RLDQN_U is superior to student DQN”. This observation differs from De Moor et al. (2021), who argues that reward shaping fails to improve the policy performance achieved by DQN when the teacher is inferior compared to unshaped DQN.

Figure 2 compares the average cumulative profit for each decision-making method. We can find that with the slow progress of the training process, the RLDQN algorithm is gradually enhanced. The subsequent training process always shows a relatively stable trend of surpassing the robust teacher and DQN (average profit performance is improved while variability is significantly reduced).
In passing, different agents taught by different teachers have the opportunity to be better. Alternatively, the relative quality of teachers (but not too bad or even infeasible) does not directly determine the quality of educated students. This is also an attractive aspect of the RLDQN algorithm; that is, RLDQN is not customized to improve robust performance and can provide more possibilities for less satisfactory existing solutions.

5.4 Convergence and Stability Evaluation

It is crucial to provide a convergent and stable decision algorithm for optimization problems. This subsection evaluates the RLDQN algorithms in terms of Q-value.

Figure 3 is a three-dimensional display of the change in Q-value in the DQN and RLDQN algorithms. The rainbow colour changes from red to purple, indicating the change in Q-value from high to low. Overall, the decisions of the two algorithms are discrete and tend to choose a small number of values to order. Since RLDQN uses the signal of the teacher’s decision as a guideline to form its policy, its selection results are more focused than DQN.

Figure 4 is a two-dimensional display of the change in Q-value in the DQN and RLDQN algorithms. Specifically, we average the different choices of the DQN and RLDQN algorithms over the action space to observe their overall stability and convergence. It is challenging to adapt effectively if the DQN algorithm is directly introduced into the PSNP environment. Conversely, RLDQN can
rapidly (highly data-efficient) trend towards overall stable convergence under small fluctuations (see red and green lines). Our results shed some light on the problem of when a teacher’s (with an approximate closed-form solution) policy is available, RLDQN policies tend to converge more quickly than pure DQN models, requiring fewer training episodes or less computational effort.
Indeed, in view of the nature of the RLDQN algorithm, we can judge that the large-scale and frequent changes in the early period are the training trial stage of the agent, which is equivalent to the learning process. The training success stage is the relatively stable later period, similar to the learning results.

Figure 4 Two-dimensional Graph of Q-value changes under different experiments

5.5 Ordering Behavior Analysis

The essence of DQN is a process of learning from the environment. Learning is difficult to train, and behavior is difficult to analyze is its core difficulty. We have shown in Sections 5.3 and 5.4 that the training difficulty of RLDQN based on the teacher strategy is reduced and can quickly converge to a good result. Further, this part will provide an initial glimpse into the interpretability of RLDQN’s decision-making behavior.

Figure 5 shows the changes in the decision-making behaviour of teachers and RLDQN over 5,000 periods. Obviously, the decision-making behaviour trend of RLDQN is similar to that of the teacher, and only a relatively minor adjustment is made to the teacher’s strategy (see Table 3) to achieve improved performance (see Table 2). These observations often make sense in practice. A new strategy is also not ideal for some companies if it makes great returns but deviates too far from the old one. For example, switching from an old strategy to a new one is difficult because of many
Figure 5  Decision Behavior of RLDQN Algorithm (The even rows are the last 500 episodes of the odd rows)
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practical constraints, especially if the benefits of the new strategy are not obvious. Therefore, the similarity of the two policies enables a gentle transition from the old policy to the new one.

Remarkably, regarding the explanation of machine behaviour (Rahwan et al. 2019), due to the unclear internal mechanism of the DQN algorithm, it is like a “black box” in most cases. It is difficult or even impossible to give intuitive prying, thus affecting enterprises’ construction of the intelligent supply chain. Nevertheless, stakeholders often prefer to gain an insight into when and how decisions are being made. Alternatively, they are reluctant to adopt decisions generated black-box models, even technically optimal but incomprehensible policies. We believe that our work may support the introduction of DQN in enterprises and improve their inventory practice by using strategies currently in use as teachers. Put differently, RLDQN has the potential to address some of DQN’s interpretability challenges.

6 Multi-segmented Product Newsvendor Model

In the previous analysis, we focused on the whole item being sold in two sub-items. In fact, more flexible practices exist for sellers to sell products than the two-segment scenario. However, the seller is faced with random market demands for multiple \((\geq 2)\) different sub-items, which essentially increases the computational complexity. For brevity, we call the problem of PSNP in the high-dimensional demand scenario the multi-segmented product newsvendor problem (MSPNP).

In the remainder we let \(p = (p_1, \cdots, p_n)^T\) be the vector of sales prices (where \(p^T e > c > 0\)), \(D = (D_1, \cdots, D_n)^T\) be the vector of uncertain demands, and \(y^*(D) = \min(q, D)\) be the vector of optimal sales quantities, where ‘min’ stands for component-wise minimization. Given a probability distribution \(F\) of the random demand \(D\), the seller will choose an order quantity \(q\) that maximizes the total expected profit:

\[
\max_{q \in \mathbb{R}^+} E_F[\pi(q|D)],
\]

where \(\pi(q|D) = -cq + p^T y^*(D) = -cq + p^T \min(q, D)\).

The moment problem of Problem (6) is

\[
\max_{q \in \mathbb{R}^+} \left\{ -cq + \inf_{D \in \Phi(\Xi_0)} E_D[p^T \min(q, D)] \right\},
\]

Table 3 The Mean of Ordering Decisions for Teachers and RLDQN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T_R</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLDQN_R</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_U</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLDQN_U</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where $\Phi(\Xi_0) = \{D \in \mathbb{R}^n_+; D \geq 0, D \text{ have moments matrix } \Xi_0 = \Xi \}$ and $\Xi = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma + \mu \mu^T & \mu \\ \mu^T & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

(8) where we define $O$ as a $n$-dimensional zero matrix, and define $P_A$ as a $n$-dimensional vector, with $P_{Ai} = P_i$ if $i \in A$ and $P_{Ai} = 0$ if $i \notin A$.

Proof: See EC.1.3 in the E-Companion for the detailed proof.

Although Lemma 1 constitutes a finite CPP of the Problem [7], it involves $O(2^n)$ semi-definite inequality constraint (each of dimension $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$) and, therefore, cannot be extended with the number of sub-items (the CPP can be solved using commercial off-the-shelf solvers for a small number of items; but it is computationally intractable for a large number of items since the number of semi-definite inequality constraints is exponential in $n$). However, we can solve the lower bound of this problem for the MSPNP that only considers the mean and covariance information, although it is proved to be NP-hard (see, e.g., Hanasusanto et al. 2014) by considering only the mean and variance information of the marginal distributions. At this point, the distribution robust optimization problem for multi-product newsvendor is equivalent to solving $n$ individual Scarf (1958) problems (Natarajan et al. 2018). In contrast, the MSPNP we consider here adds a new trade-off since solving a CPP problem with $O(2^n)$ semi-definite inequality constraints cannot be avoided even in the case of demand independence. In other words, the segmented nature of the product adds to the complexity of the problem.

However, not every semi-definite inequality constraint may play a role in decision making in Lemma 1’s problem. In particular, if $n$ is vast, there may be many constraints that do not work.
By taking the dual of CPP in Lemma 1, we introduce a lower bound on the worst-case expected profit with mean and covariance information to approximate the original Problem (7). We only involve solving the CPP with a semi-definite inequality constraint of dimension \((n + 1) \times (n + 1)\), making complex problems tractable.

**Lemma 2.** A lower bound on the optimal value of the Problem (7) is can be reformulated as follows:

$$
\max_{q, Y} \left\{ -cq - <Y, \Xi_0> + p^T\mu \right\} \\
\text{s.t. } Y \succeq \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & p^T \\ p & 2p^Teq \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y \succeq 0.
$$

Proof: See EC.1.4 in the E-Companion for the detailed proof.

According to Lemma 2, we can provide a closed-form robust lower bound solution to the Problem (7). The following theorem demonstrates this result.

**Theorem 3.** For Problem (7), the optimal robust lower bound solution \(q^{\text{MSPNP}}_{T,R}\) can be obtained as following:

$$
q^{\text{MSPNP}}_{T,R} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{p^T\mu}{p^Te} + \sqrt{\frac{\tau^T (pp^T \circ \Sigma) e}{2p^Te}} \left( \sqrt{\frac{p^Te-c}{c}} \right) - \sqrt{\frac{\tau^T (pp^T \circ \Sigma) e}{p^T\mu}} \frac{\sqrt{p^T e-c}}{c}, \\
0,
\end{cases}
$$

where \(\circ\) is the Hadamard product operator.

Proof: See EC.1.5 in the E-Companion for the detailed proof.

**Remark 2.** In the period \(t\), the teacher’s strategy here is \(q_t = q^{\text{MSPNP}}_{T,R}(D_t)\).

Theorem 3 degenerates to Theorem 2 when \(n = 2\). In addition, if the demands are independent (i.e., \(\sigma(D) = 0\)), then \(\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma \circ \sigma)\).

The following theorem provides the solution of MSPNP when the demands follow an independent uniform distribution.

**Theorem 4.*** Suppose \(F(D) = \frac{D-a}{b-a}\) and let \(q^{\text{MSPNP}}_{T,U}\) be the optimal uniform distribution ordering decision for the MSPNP. Then the optimality condition is

$$
p^Te - c = \left[ pF(q^{\text{MSPNP}}_{T,U}) \right]^T e.
$$

Therefore, we have

$$
q^{\text{MSPNP}}_{T,U} = \frac{p^Te - c + \left( \frac{p-a}{b-a} \right)^T e}{\left( \frac{p}{b-a} \right)^T e}.
$$
Proof: See EC.1.6 in the E-Companion for the detailed proof.

**Remark 3.** Solving closed-form solutions based on optimality conditions can be tricky (i.e. the curse of dimensionality) even if the exact distribution of demands is known. In addition, at period $t$, the teacher’s strategy here is $q_t = q_{T,J}^{MSPNP}(a^t,b^t)$.

In what follows, we evaluate the effectiveness of the RLDQN algorithm under MSPNP by designing different numerical experiments. We randomly select the unit selling price $p_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$) of each sub-item in the range $[10, 100]$, and select the unit purchasing cost $c = 0.35 \times P^T e$ for high-margin and $c = 0.55 \times P^T e$ for low-margin conditions (to be consistent with the definition of high and low margins in Section 5). We take four scales of $n = 10, 100, 500,$ and $1000$ for testing, and the expected profits of different policies by simulating $K = 40$ or $K = 20$ sample paths of $T = 5,000$ periods. At period $t$, let $\{D^t_i(k)\}_{k=1}^K$ be a set of $K$ samples generated independently at random according to the distribution of $D^t_i$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. Therefore, $E(D^t_i)$ and $\sigma(D^t_i)$ be defined as $E(D^t_i) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K D^t_i(k)$ and $\sigma(D^t_i) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K [D^t_i(k) - E(D^t_i)]}$; $a^t_i$ and $b^t_i$ be defined as $a^t_i = \min_{k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, K\}} D^t_i(k)$ and $b^t_i = \max_{k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, K\}} D^t_i(k)$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. Specifically, we consider the demand samples generated with uniform distribution and mixture distribution. The eight experimental scenarios considered are the same as in Section 5, namely: (1) experiment 1: uniform distribution, high-margin, $K = 40$; (2) experiment 2: uniform distribution, high-margin, $K = 20$; (3) experiment 3: uniform distribution, low-margin, $K = 40$; (4) experiment 4: uniform distribution, low-margin, $K = 20$; (5) experiment 5: mixture distribution, high-margin, $K = 40$; (6) experiment 6: mixture distribution, high-margin, $K = 20$; (7) experiment 7: mixture distribution, low-margin, $K = 40$; and (8) experiment 8: mixture distribution, low-margin, $K = 20$. The parameter settings of different distributions are shown in Table 4. Note that the parameter values of the distribution are randomly generated while satisfying the relationship (see Perakis and Roels 2008) in the table. Additionally, the selling prices of sub-items are also randomly generated. This will accommodate as many real-world cases as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Range from which parameters are drawn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>random $a \in (0, 100)$, random $b \in (100, 400)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>$\mu = m = b/2$, $\sigma^2 = v^2 = (\mu/4)^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exponential</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{\lambda} = m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisson</td>
<td>$\mu = m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>$(0.5, 0.5) \times 2 \times m$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 presents the numerical results of different decision algorithms on the average cumulative profit margin under high-dimensional demand, where the profit margin calculation is based on the
robust teacher. We can see that the performance level of robust teachers in the case of mixture distribution (experiments 5 to 8) is significantly better than that of uniform distribution teachers. This reveals that robust ideas not only allow us to derive closed-form expressions of the order policy structure and related parameters, but, more importantly, exploit their advantages in dynamically approximating some complex distributions (such as the mixture distribution in this paper), which can greatly facilitate their application in existing systems. In addition, we can find that as the demand dimension $n$ increases, the competitiveness of DQN is still weak. This shows that the pure DQN algorithm is not ideal for decision-making in the MSPNP environment, even though it uses deep neural networks to model complex problems and avoids the curse of dimensionality of numerical approaches, e.g., dynamic programming methods such as value or policy iteration (Boute et al. 2021). Put differently, DQN has difficulty adapting to the newsvendor environment. However, the data-driven RLDQN algorithm, which combines the advantages of robust teacher and DQN, not only has a strong prospect for decision optimization (significantly improved robust performance and DQN performance), but also does not face the curse of dimensionality (from the perspective of training time, about 149 seconds when $n = 10$ and about 813 seconds when $n = 1000$).

### Table 5
Average Profit Margins for Different Decision Algorithms (Robust Teacher T_R as Benchmark 100%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T_U</td>
<td>100.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DQN</td>
<td>78.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RLDQN_R</td>
<td>100.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RLDQN_U</td>
<td>100.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T_U</td>
<td>101.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DQN</td>
<td>93.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RLDQN_R</td>
<td>100.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RLDQN_U</td>
<td>100.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T_U</td>
<td>100.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DQN</td>
<td>97.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RLDQN_R</td>
<td>100.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RLDQN_U</td>
<td>100.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T_U</td>
<td>100.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DQN</td>
<td>95.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RLDQN_R</td>
<td>100.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RLDQN_U</td>
<td>100.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 presents a summary of our numerical studies. First, the performance of the two teachers performed well under the uniform distribution and underperformed under the mixture distribution. Second, DQN based on deep reinforcement learning is not satisfactory in any scenario. Finally, the designed RLDQN algorithm can always maintain a good decision advantage. In a nutshell,
we believe that introducing the DQN method into supply chain decision-making and optimization requires a relatively stable environment (reflected in the stable demand data flow that obeys the distribution) and a field experience. Put another way, when applying DQN to inventory management problems, adding the theoretical decision-making knowledge of human teachers helps DQN adapt to the environment, thereby reducing its learning difficulty, improving learning efficiency and data efficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Uniform</th>
<th>Mixture</th>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>DQN</th>
<th>RLQDN</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>DQN</th>
<th>RLDQN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 100</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 500</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 1000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. T means teacher, ✓ means good effect, and x means bad effect.

7 Conclusions and Discussions

This paper presents and studies the product segmentation newsvendor problem, a newsvendor problem in which the whole item can be divided into different sub-items for sale. Given the first and second moment information, we provide a robust closed-form solution to this problem. However, robust methods derived from the worst-case always face the challenge of solution conservatism. Therefore, we introduce a new paradigm called RLDQN, which combines robust and artificial intelligence technology to improve robust performance (or reduce the price of robustness). We show how the RLDQN algorithm uses the robust strategy as a teacher to design a human-machine collaborative way of teaching experience, normative decision, and regularization return, and ultimately provide managers with more satisfying decisions than robust solutions.

Our paper yields some key managerial insights. First, from the perspective of traditional optimization techniques, the robust newsvendor strategy has the opportunity to improve performance. Therefore, research on tractable robust strategies remains valuable even in conservative comments on robust solutions. Doing so activates a large body of existing articles on providing robust policies and further stimulates robust policy research in inventory theory. Second, from the perspective of emerging artificial intelligence technologies, integrating human domain knowledge into the training process of the DQN algorithm can bring more effective learning. Although DQN has shown its powerful learning and sequential decision-making capabilities in Atari video games and other fields, it is difficult to adapt to the newsvendor environment directly. It also requires experience in one
area, that is, adding the knowledge of human teachers. With the guidance of a human teacher, RLDQN converges more easily to a reasonably good strategy (requiring fewer training episodes, i.e., less computational effort or higher data efficiency) than DQN does. At the same time, we observe that the RLDQN algorithm stabilizes the training process (with significantly reduced variability in average profit performance), and its decision behaviour is similar to humans, which may help firms gain trust in the black box DQN algorithm acquisition strategy. We believe that this insight is essential in practice because the exploration of artificial intelligence technology in the supply chain field has always attracted the attention of enterprises and researchers from all walks of life, which has been demonstrated in various works (e.g., Boute et al. 2021, Oroojlooyjadid et al. 2021).

This research could lead to further work in several directions. A natural extension is the supply chain layout problem and cooperative management mechanism analysis considering the introduction of the RLDQN algorithm at multiple decision positions. Although humans already have mechanisms and methods for cooperative management, it will be interesting to see whether the original cooperative management mechanism of the supply chain will still play a role when the structure and nature of the supply chain are changed due to the introduction of robots to participate in decision-making. A more detailed and comprehensive numerical study will further clarify the performance of the RLDQN algorithm, especially if real-world data can be obtained for experiments. In addition, our proposed robust learning idea may be a good candidate for solving other complex problems (for example, the distributionally robust multi-item newsvendor problem and the distributionally robust multi-location newsvendor problem, all of which are NP-hard).
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**Endnote**

1 In fact, an enormous number of precise and imprecise approaches based on distribution assumptions (common ones such as normal and uniform distribution) have been proposed for classical inventory management problems. However, the classical approach becomes intractable or impotent once the demand is more random or the profit function more complex. Of course, vanilla
robust newsvendor methods are distribution-free, but sellers may prefer less conservative strategies that are intuitive and understandable. Consequently, this further motivates this paper’s interest in improving robust performance.

Due to the non-smooth \textit{argmax} function used by the DQN algorithm and the non-convexity of deep neural networks, we fail to provide a theoretical proof of convergence for the RLDQN algorithm, even though it works well in numerical experiments.

We assume that costs other than procurement costs are normalized to zero (see, e.g., Lahiri and Dey 2013). We can verify that the form of the closed-form solution is consistent in processing costs or different costs.

Although incorporating a residual term is straightforward, we prefer to suppress it here for notation clarity. In fact, we have verified in unshown work that the analysis can easily be modified to include residual \( s_1 \) and \( s_2 \) by replacing \( p_1, p_2 \) and \( c \) with \( p_1 - s_1, p_2 - s_2 \), and \( c - s_1 - s_2 \).

The proof idea of Theorem 1 is not novel. Instead, we refer to Fu et al. (2018).

The order condition fully reflects an essential element of the supply and demand relationship (mean and variance reflect market demand, the cost reflects supply, and the sales price essentially builds a controlling factor between supply and demand).
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