

# Validity of Heavy Traffic Steady-State Approximations in Open Queueing Networks

David Gamarnik\*  
IBM

Assaf Zeevi†  
Columbia University

December 8, 2018

## Abstract

We consider a single class open queueing network, also known as a Generalized Jackson Network (GJN). A classical result in heavy traffic theory asserts that the sequence of normalized queue length processes of the GJN converge weakly to a Reflected Brownian Motion (RBM) in the orthant, as the traffic intensity approaches unity. However, barring simple instances, it is still not known whether the stationary distribution of RBM provides a valid approximation for the steady-state of the original network. In this paper we resolve this open problem by proving that the re-scaled stationary distribution of the GJN converges to the stationary distribution of the RBM, thus validating a so-called “interchange-of-limits” for this class of networks. Our method of proof involves a combination of Lyapunov function techniques, strong approximations, and tail probability bounds that yield tightness of the sequence of stationary distributions of the GJN.

**Short Title:** Steady-state approximations in open queueing networks

**Keywords:** diffusion approximations, stationary distribution, weak convergence, Lyapunov functions, Markov processes, reflected Brownian motion

**2000 AMS Subject Classification (Primary):** 60J25, 60J65, 60K25

## 1 Introduction

Jackson networks are one of the most fundamental objects in the theory of stochastic processing networks, owing to the remarkable simplicity of the product form stationary distribution of the queue lengths. Product form results have since been established for wider classes of open and closed queueing networks, however, these results typically hinge on exponential distributions being imposed on the interarrival and service times. Relaxing these assumptions to i.i.d. interarrival and

---

\*T.J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598, e-mail: [gamarnik@watson.ibm.com](mailto:gamarnik@watson.ibm.com)

†Graduate School of Business, NY 10027, e-mail: [assaf@gsb.columbia.edu](mailto:assaf@gsb.columbia.edu)

service times with general distributions significantly complicates the analysis, and, barring special cases, does not lead to closed form expressions for the steady-state queue lengths distribution. From an application standpoint, however, such assumptions typically constitute a more adequate model of “real world” systems. Consequently, the study of open single class queueing networks with Bernoulli type routing and i.i.d. interarrival and service times, hereafter referred to as Generalized Jackson Networks (GJN), has been the focus of vigorous academic research.

In the absence of closed form solutions for the steady-state queue length distribution in GJN, efforts have mostly centered on the development of various bounds and approximations. Most notably, much of the recent work on single and multiclass queueing networks has focused on *fluid models* for stability analysis, *diffusion approximations* for performance analysis, and the relationship between the two methods and objectives. Below we provide a brief overview of these developments in the context of GJN.

In terms of diffusion approximations, Reiman’s seminal paper [33] proved that as the traffic intensity approaches one, the normalized vector of queue length processes converges in distribution to a Brownian motion which is reflected at the boundaries of the positive orthant. The normalization in Reiman’s heavy-traffic limit theorem corresponds to the functional central limit theorem, i.e., time is accelerated linearly and space is compressed by a square-root factor. The limit process, known as Reflected Brownian Motion (RBM), was first constructed in earlier work of Harrison and Reiman [19]. The main appeal of the RBM process is that it provides a parsimonious (two moment) mesoscopic approximation of the underlying discrete dynamics in the GJN. Reiman’s theorem provides a rigorous justification for the use of RBM as an approximation to the original (appropriately normalized) queue length process in the GJN.

To approximate the steady-state behavior of the network, it is first necessary to derive conditions under which both the GJN and RBM admit a stationary distribution. To this end, Sigman [35] and Down and Meyn [16] were the first to prove that the GJN possesses a unique stationary distribution if and only if the traffic intensity at every station is less than unity. A similar result was later proved by Dai [13] using a remarkable connection between the stochastic and fluid models of queueing networks; see also Stolyar [37]. (Fluid limits of GJN were first characterized by Johnson [23] and Chen and Mandelbaum [10],[11].) Despite the fact that the stability conditions in GJN have such a simple form, exact computation of the stationary distribution is not possible except in the case of product form networks.

It turns out that the stability condition for RBM is quite similar to that of the underlying GJN. In particular, it was shown by Harrison and Williams [20] that a (unique) stationary distribution exists for the RBM, roughly speaking, if and only the “traffic intensity” at each station is less than unity (a precise definition will be given in the following section). For further details and references

the reader is referred to the survey paper by Williams [38]. Although the stationary distribution of an RBM cannot be typically computed in closed form, with the exception of special cases involving a skew-symmetry condition (see, e.g., [20] and further discussion in section 4.4), it can be solved for numerically. This computation typically exploits the partial differential equation, also known as the basic adjoint relation, that characterizes the stationary distribution. The algorithms of Dai and Harrison [14] and Shen et al. [36] build on this idea and describe different approaches to compute the stationary distribution by numerically solving the basic adjoint partial differential equation.

Given the apparent solidarity between GJN and its associated RBM approximation, as well as the fact that steady-state computations can be more easily performed for the latter, it has become commonplace to approximate the steady-state of GJN with that of the associated RBM. It is important to note that this approximation *is not* rigorously justified, and in particular does not follow from Reiman’s [33] heavy-traffic process level approximation. To date, this correspondence has only been established in some specific problem instances, starting with Kingman’s seminal work [28, 29] on the  $GI/GI/1$  queue. Specifically, Kingman proved that the distribution of the diffusion-scaled stationary waiting time converges to an exponential distribution, which is identical to the steady-state of the RBM obtained as a process limit from the normalized queue length. (For extensions of this result that cover dependent input processes see, e.g., [34].) In the context of a single station multiclass queueing network with feedback, the workload process, after diffusion scaling, also converges to a one-dimensional RBM. The steady-state mean value of this RBM is known to be equal to the expected workload in the original model under diffusion scaling. Thus, in this example the validity of the RBM steady-state approximation is established thanks to the fact that both of the above expectations can be computed in closed form. Finally, Kaspi and Mandelbaum [24] proved that in a *closed* GJN the scaled steady-state vector of queue lengths converges in distribution to the steady-state distribution of the associated RBM. While these results are suggestive of the fact that a similar conclusion may also hold for open GJN, the recent book of Chen and Yao [12] mentions that this remains an open problem. Resolving this question would constitute an important stepping stone on route to proving the validity of RBM steady-state approximations in other classes of queueing networks.

The main goal of the present paper is to establish the conjectured correspondence between the steady-state of GJN and its Brownian approximation. In particular, we prove that the stationary distribution of the vector of queue lengths in the GJN, under diffusion scaling, converges to the stationary distribution of the associated RBM as the traffic intensity approaches unity (see Theorem 8). This result establishes the validity of an “interchange of limits” argument. Specifically, by first taking heavy-traffic limits one arrives at an RBM approximation from which, by letting time go to infinity, one obtains the steady-state approximation to the GJN. What we show is that this order of limits can be interchanged. In particular, we prove that the same stationary distribution




Figure 1: The interchange-of-limits diagram establishing the validity of heavy-traffic steady-state approximations.

is obtained by first passing to steady-state in the GJN, and subsequently applying diffusion scaling and letting the system utilization approach one. This argument is represented symbolically in the diagram given in Figure 1, where  $Q^n(t)$  represents the queue length process in heavy-traffic, and  $Z(t)$  represents the associated RBM. Using the above, we also prove that the normalized moments with respect to the stationary distribution of the GJN converge to the respective steady-state moments of the RBM (see Corollary 2). Finally, we establish the above interchange argument for the sojourn times (see Theorem 10), thus proving a steady-state version of Reiman’s [33] “snapshot principle.”

The main technical subproblem that we solve in order to establish our main result is that of tightness of the normalized queue length vector in steady-state. Roughly speaking, we show that as the traffic intensity  $\rho_j \rightarrow 1$  in every station  $j = 1, \dots, J$ , the family of scaled queue length vectors  $((1 - \rho_j)Q_j(t))_j$  is tight (see Theorem 7). This establishes the existence of a probability measure which is a weak limit of this family. It is then a matter of simple argument to show that this measure must be the unique stationary distribution of the associated RBM. Proving tightness of the family of normalized steady-state queue lengths hinges on the following ingredients: i.) existence of a pathwise solution to the Skorohod problem (the oblique reflection mapping); ii.) existence of a “fluid-scale” linear Lyapunov function for the workload; and iii.) probability bounds for strong approximations of the primitive processes, i.e., arrivals, services and routing.

On route to our main result, we derive exponential bounds on the stationary distribution of general Markov processes admitting a suitable Lyapunov function (see Theorems 5 and 6). While such bounds are excessive for purposes of proving tightness of the stationary distribution under diffusion scaling, they are potentially quite useful for performance analysis of GJN. (For recent work that derives tail bounds in the heavy-tailed context for GJN, and more general classes of monotone separable networks, see [1].) These bounds and their derivation are in the spirit of the results obtained by Meyn and Tweedie in several papers and summarized in their book [32].

Unlike the aforementioned results of Meyn and Tweedie [32] (see also the queueing application in Dai and Meyn [15]), our work does not use an infinitesimal drift characterization of the Markov process in question. Rather, we derive our bounds on the basis of the behavior of the Markov process on “large” time scales. This approach is more intuitive, supports a more direct application of the theory to the GJN context, and circumvents several technical issues. In terms of strong approximations, we rely on similar ideas to those used by Horváth [22], however our main focus is on establishing uniform integrability of diffusion-scaled processes. The blend of methods we employ might be of independent interest, and in a parallel ongoing work we use these techniques to derive explicit upper and lower bounds on steady-state queue lengths in GJN under both heavy-tailed and light-tailed assumptions on the primitives.

The main technical assumption we impose on the primitives of the GJN is the following. Both the distribution of interarrival and service times are assumed to have a finite conditional exponential moment generating function (a precise definition is given in what follows). We note that “standard” heavy-traffic limit theory, including Reiman’s theorem, typically only assumes the existence of a second moment for the interarrival and service time distributions. In that sense our conditions are clearly much stronger than necessary. Nevertheless, these conditions facilitate the mathematical derivations and moreover lead to novel exponential tail bounds on the steady-state of the GJN (see Theorem 6). Note that the RBM corresponding to the heavy-traffic limit of the underlying GJN has a steady-state with exponential tails; see [20]. This suggests that the existence of exponential moments for the GJN primitives should result in a more accurate RBM-based steady-state approximation. To this end, it is worth noting that even in the simple case of the  $GI/GI/1$  queue with heavy-tailed service times, the RBM exponential steady-state is known to provide a poor approximation of the Pareto-like stationary distribution of the original queue length process. In Section 5 we discuss briefly conditions under which we believe our analysis should extend to the case of GJN with primitives having Pareto-like distributions.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides background and preliminaries on GJN, the Skorohod mapping, and heavy-traffic approximations. Section 3 derives bounds on the stationary distribution of general state-space Markov chains using Lyapunov arguments. Section 4 details the main results. Specifically, the main theorem is stated in Section 4.2. Concluding remarks are given in Section 5, and all proofs are collected in Appendix A.

## 2 The Queueing Network Model and its Heavy-Traffic Approximation

The set up and notation follow closely that in Chen and Yao [12, §7]. We use  $I$  to denote a  $J \times J$  identity matrix, and  $e$  the  $J$ -dimensional vector of ones. (All the vectors are assumed to be column vectors, unless otherwise stated.) Put  $e^i$ , to be the  $i$ 'th unit vector in  $\mathbb{R}^J$ . The transposed of a matrix  $P$  (vector  $e$ ) will be denoted  $P'$  ( $e'$ ). For every  $z \in \mathbb{R}^J$  the norm  $\|z\|$  corresponds to the  $L_1$  metric:  $\|z\| = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq J} |z_j|$ . Given a random variable  $X$  and a probability measure  $\nu$ ,  $X \sim \nu$  means  $X$  is distributed according to  $\nu$ . For a sequence of probability measures  $\nu_n, n = 1, 2, \dots$ ,  $\nu_n \Rightarrow \nu$  is used to denote weak convergence of  $\nu_n$  to a limit probability measure  $\nu$ . A similar notation is used to denote weak convergence of a sequence of random variables or processes.

### 2.1 Generalized Jackson networks: Model description and probabilistic assumptions

**Description of the network and probabilistic assumptions.** The network consists of  $J$  stations denoted for simplicity by  $1, 2, \dots, J$ . Jobs arrive from external sources to each station according to independent renewal processes with interarrival times given by  $a_j(0), a_j(1), a_j(2), \dots$  for  $j = 1, \dots, J$ . The interarrival times  $a_j(1), a_j(1), \dots$  are assumed to have a common distribution  $F_{A,j}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, J$ . The first interarrival time  $a_j(0)$  is assumed to have the same distribution function, only conditioned on the event  $a_j(0) \geq a_{0,j}$  where  $a_{0,j} \geq 0$  measures the time elapsed since the last arrival prior to time  $t = 0$ . This is a given deterministic or random value and is considered to be part of the data. Thus the distribution of the arrival process is completely specified by a pair  $(F_{A,j}, a_{0,j})$ . Put  $a_0 := (a_{0,1}, \dots, a_{0,J})$ . Also, let  $\alpha_j = 1/\mathbb{E}[a_j(1)]$  be the external arrival rate into station  $j$ , and put  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_J)$  to be the vector of external arrival rates. It is not excluded that  $\alpha_j = 0$  for some stations  $j$  meaning there is no external arrival into these stations. We denote by  $\mathcal{J} = \{j : \alpha_j > 0\}$ . Let  $A_j(t) = \sup\{n : \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} a_j(i) \leq t\}$  denote the corresponding counting renewal process. For every  $t_2 \geq t_1 \geq 0$  we put  $A_j(t_1, t_2) := A_j(t_2) - A_j(t_1)$ . The coefficient of variation  $\text{var}[a_j^2(1)]/\alpha_j^2$  is denoted by  $c_{a,j}^2$ , for  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ .

Denote by  $v_j(0), v_j(1), \dots$  the sequence of service times received by jobs in station  $j$  and  $V_j(n) = \sum_{0 \leq l \leq n} v_j(l)$ . The service times  $v_j(1), v_j(2), \dots$ , are assumed to be i.i.d. with a distribution function  $F_{S,j}$ . As in the case of interarrival times, the first service time  $v_j(0)$  is assumed to follow the same distribution, only conditioned on  $v_j(0) \geq v_{0,j}$ . Here  $v_{0,j} \geq 0$  is a (possibly random) value which stands for the cumulative service time elapsed for the job currently in service in station  $j$  at time  $t = 0$ . This value is considered a part of the data. For consistency we assume that  $v_{0,j} > 0$  only if the queue length in station  $j$  at time 0 is positive. We let  $S_j(t) = \sup\{n : V_j(n) \leq t\}$  denote

the associated renewal process and let  $m_j = \mathbb{E}[v_j(1)]$  denote the mean service time in station  $j$ . Then,  $\mu_j = 1/m_j$  is the service rate in station  $j$ , and  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_J)$  is the vector of service rates. We let  $M$  be the diagonal matrix with  $m = (m_1, \dots, m_J)$  as diagonal entries. The coefficient of variation  $\text{var}[v_j^2(1)]\mu_j^2$  is denoted by  $c_{s,j}^2$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, J$ .

We assume that both the interarrival and service times have a finite moment generating functions in some neighborhood of the origin. Moreover, to handle the residual service and interarrival times, we assume the following condition holds: there exists  $\theta^* > 0$  such that for every  $j$

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp(\theta^*(a_j(1) - z)) | a_j(1) > z \right] < \infty, \quad (1)$$

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp(\theta^*(v_j(1) - z)) | v_j(1) > z \right] < \infty, \quad (2)$$

where  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  in (1) and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$  in (2). In particular,  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\theta^* a_j(1))]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\theta^* v_j(1))]$  are finite as well.

The routing decisions at each station are assumed to be of Bernoulli type and parameterized by a sub-stochastic  $J \times J$  matrix  $P = (p_{jk})_{1 \leq j, k \leq J}$ . The entries of  $P$  satisfy  $p_{ij} \geq 0$ , for every  $i$ ,  $\sum_j p_{ij} \leq 1$  and the spectral radius of  $P$  is strictly less than unity. For each station  $j$  let  $\psi^j = \{\psi^j(1), \psi^j(2), \dots\}$  be an i.i.d sequence of routing decisions with common distribution  $P_j$ , where  $P_j$  is the  $j$ -th column of  $P$ . Specifically,  $\mathbb{P}(\psi^j(l) = e^k) = p_{jk}$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\psi^j(l) = 0) = 1 - \sum_{1 \leq k \leq J} p_{jk}$ , the latter indicates the fact that the completed job leaves the network. Let  $R^j(0) = 0$  and  $R^j(n) = \sum_{1 \leq l \leq n} \psi^j(l)$ . Then the  $k$ -th component,  $R_k^j(n)$ , of  $R^j(n)$  is the total number of jobs (out of  $n$ ) who upon completing their service at station  $j$  are routed to station  $k$ .

Let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_J)$  denote the unique solution to the traffic equation  $\lambda = \alpha + P'\lambda$ . That is  $\lambda = [I - P']^{-1}\alpha$ . Then  $\rho = M^{-1}\lambda = M^{-1}[I - P']\alpha = (\rho_j)_{1 \leq j \leq J}$  is the vector of traffic intensities. We let  $\rho^* = \max_j \rho_j$  denote the bottleneck traffic intensity. We will primarily consider the case when

$$\rho^* < 1. \quad (3)$$

This is also referred to as the stability condition for GJN, a terminology which is justified by Theorem 2 below.

**Systems dynamics.** The number of jobs which are either in service or waiting in station  $j$  at time  $t$  is denoted by  $Q_j(t)$ ; adhering with standard terminology we refer to  $Q_j = (Q_j(t) : t \geq 0)$  as the *queue length process* at station  $j$ . Put  $Q = (Q_1, \dots, Q_J)$ . Let  $B_j(t)$  denotes the cumulative time that station  $j$  was busy processing work during the interval  $[0, t]$ . In particular,  $0 \leq B_j(t) \leq t, B_j(0) = 0$ . Put  $B_j = (B_j(t) : t \geq 0)$  and let  $B = (B_1, \dots, B_J)$ ; we refer to this as the *busy time process*. Let  $I_j(t) = t - B_j(t)$  denote the cumulative idle time at station  $j$  in the interval  $[0, t]$ . Put  $I_j = (I_j(t) : t \geq 0)$  and let  $I = (I_1, \dots, I_J)$  denote the *idle time process*. At every station  $j$  the jobs



are assumed to be processed in First-In-First-Out (FIFO) fashion.

The following equations that describe the system dynamics tie together the processes introduced above

$$Q_j(t) = Q_j(0) + A_j(t) + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq J} R_j^k(S_k(B_j(t))) - S_j(B_j(t)), \quad (4)$$

$$I_j(t) = \int_0^t 1\{Q_j(s) = 0\}ds, \quad (5)$$

for all  $t \geq 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ . We consider the centered process  $X = (X_j(t) : t \geq 0)$  with

$$\begin{aligned} X_j(t) = & Q_j(0) + (\alpha_j + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq J} \mu_i p_{ij} - \mu_j)t + (A_j(t) - \alpha_j t) \\ & + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq J} p_{ij}(S_i(B_i(t)) - \mu_i B_i(t)) - (S_j(B_j(t)) - \mu_j B_j(t)) \\ & + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq J} \left( R_j^i(S_i(B_i(t))) - p_{ij} S_i(B_i(t)) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ , and the process  $Y_j = (Y_j(t) : t \geq 0)$  where

$$Y_j(t) = \mu_j I_j(t) = \mu_j(t - B_j(t)). \quad (7)$$

The process  $X_j$  is often referred to as the “free process” which summarizes the net input of jobs to station  $j$ . The process  $Y_j$  summarizes system idleness in normalized units. Alternatively, this process “regulates” the queue lengths from taking negative values, by increasing whenever the queue length process is zero. The dynamics in (4)-(5) can now be represented in the following succinct form

$$Q(t) = X(t) + [I - P']Y(t) \geq 0 \quad (8)$$

$$Y(0) = 0 \quad \text{and } Y(t) \text{ is non-decreasing in } t \quad (9)$$

$$\int_0^t Q_j(\tau) dY_j(\tau) = 0, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, \quad 1 \leq j \leq J. \quad (10)$$

The equations (8)-(10) describe the system dynamics  $(Q, Y)$  as the solution to the *Skorohod reflection problem* associated with the GJN. A formal definition of the Skorohod problem is given in Section 2.2 below.

**A Markovian representation.** We now provide a Markov process representation for the underlying queue length processes. The queue length process  $Q$  is clearly not Markovian because of the residual interarrival and service times. To create a Markovian structure we augment the state descriptor as follows. For each time  $t \geq 0$  and  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , we let  $\hat{a}_j(t)$  denote the time elapsed since the most recent arrival to station  $j$  that occurred prior to time  $t$ . That is,  $\hat{a}_j(t) := t - \sum_{n \leq A_j(t)} a_j(n)$ , and we put  $\hat{a}(t) = (\hat{a}_1(t), \dots, \hat{a}_J(t))$ , where by definition  $\hat{a}_j(t) = 0$  for  $j \notin \mathcal{J}$  for all  $t$ . Similarly,



$\hat{v}_j(t)$  denotes the time elapsed since the commencement of the most recent service prior to time  $t$  at station  $j$ , or if the server is idle at time  $t$  this variable is equal to zero. Put  $\hat{v}(t) = (\hat{v}_1(t), \dots, \hat{v}_J(t))$ . The *extended* process  $\bar{Q} = (\bar{Q}(t) : t \geq 0)$  with  $\bar{Q}(t) = (Q(t), \hat{a}(t), \hat{v}(t))$  is a Markov process. That is, for every  $t_1 > t \geq 0$  and every  $(z, a, v) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^J \times \mathbb{R}_+^{2J}$ , the distribution of  $\bar{Q}(t_1)$  conditioned on  $\bar{Q}(t) = (z, a, v)$  is independent of  $\bar{Q}(t')$  for all  $t' < t$ . (In fact, the process  $\bar{Q}$  is known to be a strong Markov process; see [12] for further details.) By definition  $\bar{Q}(0) = (Q(0), \hat{a}(0), \hat{v}(0)) = (Q(0), a_0, v_0)$ . For brevity, we denote the extended state space of the process  $\bar{Q}$  by  $\mathcal{X} := \mathbb{Z}_+^J \times \mathbb{R}_+^{2J}$ . The probability distribution of the strong Markov process  $\bar{Q}(t)$  for every  $t \geq 0$  is completely specified by  $(Q(0), a_0, v_0, F_{A,j}, F_{S,j}, P)$ . We denote this 5-tuple by  $\Xi$  and call it the parameter vector for the corresponding Generalized Jackson Network. For brevity, we often refer to the underlying GJN simply as  $\Xi$ . A probability distribution  $\pi$  on  $\Xi$  is defined to be stationary if  $\bar{Q}(0) \sim \pi$  implies that  $\bar{Q}(t) \sim \pi$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . We will then say that the queueing network is in steady state and call  $\pi$  a stationary distribution of the GJN, noting that such a distribution is not necessarily unique. We will also say that the network is *stable* if there exists at least one stationary distribution  $\pi$ .

## 2.2 The Skorohod mapping, fluid model and stability of GJN

This subsection reviews some results concerning the Skorohod problem and fluid analysis of GJN that will be useful in what follows. The presentation is based on Chapter 7 in [12].

**Skorohod problem and the oblique reflection mapping.** Let  $\mathcal{D}[0, \infty)$  denote the space of right-continuous functions with left limits taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^J$ , suppressing the index  $J$  for convenience. Since all limit processes considered in this paper have continuous sample paths, it is not necessary to introduce the Skorohod topology, and it suffices to consider the space  $\mathcal{D}$  endowed with the uniform topology; see [6] for further discussion. We now cite a general result, originally derived in Harrison and Reiman [19] in the context of reflected Brownian motion, that supports the representation of GJN dynamics given in (8)-(10); the version below is adapted from [12, Theorem 7.2].

**Theorem 1. (Oblique Reflection Mapping)** *For every function  $x \in \mathcal{D}[0, \infty)$  such that  $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^J$ , there exists a unique pair of non-negative functions  $(y, q) = (\Psi_1(x), \Psi_2(x)) \in \mathcal{D}[0, \infty)$  such that  $y_j(t)$  is a non-decreasing function for every  $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ ,  $y_j(0) = 0$ , and  $(x, y, q)$  jointly satisfy*

$$q(t) = x(t) + [I - P']y(t) \tag{11}$$

$$\int_0^t q_j(\tau) dy_j(\tau) = 0, \text{ for all } t \geq 0 \text{ and } j = 1, 2, \dots, J. \tag{12}$$

Moreover the mappings  $\Psi_1, \Psi_2 : \mathcal{D}[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}[0, \infty)$  are Lipschitz continuous, in particular, for

every  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{D}[0, \infty)$  and every  $t \geq 0$

$$\sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \|q_1(\tau) - q_2(\tau)\| \leq R_1 \sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \|x_1(\tau) - x_2(\tau)\| \quad (13)$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \|y_1(\tau) - y_2(\tau)\| \leq R_2 \sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \|x_1(\tau) - x_2(\tau)\|, \quad (14)$$

where  $R_1, R_2 > 0$  depend only on the matrix  $P$ .

**Remarks:**

1. The processes  $q$  and  $y$  are referred to as the *reflected process* and the *regulator process*, respectively. For further details and explicit identification of the Lipschitz constants  $R_1, R_2$ , see, e.g., the recent book by Whitt [39, §14.2.3].

2. The existence and uniqueness of the pathwise solution to the Skorohod problem hinges on the matrix  $P$  being substochastic. This, in turn, implies that the *reflection matrix*  $I - P'$  is Minkowskii, i.e., has all positive diagonal elements, non-positive off-diagonal elements, and inverse in which all entries are non-negative.

**The fluid model and stochastic stability.** Given any  $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^J$  let  $x_z(t) = z + (\alpha - (I - P')\mu)t$  and let  $(y, q) = (\Psi_1(x), \Psi_2(x))$ . The triplet  $(x, y, q)$  is called a *fluid model* of the GJN. Let  $w = e'[I - P']^{-1}$ . Note that each coordinate  $w_1, \dots, w_J$ , of the vector

$$\begin{aligned} w &= e'[I - P']^{-1} \\ &= e'[I + P' + (P')^2 + (P')^3 + \dots] \end{aligned}$$

is greater than one. Consider the process

$$(w'q(t) : t \geq 0). \quad (15)$$

It is well known that  $w'q(t)$  is Lipschitz continuous (see [12]). The process  $(w'q(t) : t \geq 0)$  can be interpreted, essentially, as the total amount of “fluid work” present in the system at time  $t$ . An important property of the fluid model is the amount of time needed to drain existing work from the system when all exogenous inflows are “turned off” at time  $t$ . For the fluid model of a GJN network we have the following result, which can be found, for example in [12].

**Proposition 1. (Fluid stability of GJN)** *The vector valued function  $q(t)$  is differentiable everywhere on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  except for a set of points which has a Lebeasgue measure zero. Moreover,  $w'\dot{q}(t) \leq -\min_{1 \leq j \leq J} \mu_j(1 - \rho_j)$  whenever  $q(t) \neq 0$  and  $q(t)$  is differentiable. As a result, if condition (3) holds then for any initial fluid level  $q(0) = z$  there exists*

$$\tau \leq \frac{w'z}{\min_{1 \leq j \leq J} \mu_j(1 - \rho_j)} \quad (16)$$

such that  $q(t) = 0$  for all  $t \geq \tau$ .

The function  $w'q(t)$  serves as a Lyapunov function for the GJN network. In particular, the result articulated above asserts that the fluid model is stable, as it drains in finite time from any initial fluid level. Given the results of Dai [13] and Stolyar [37] linking stochastic and fluid stability, Proposition 1 can be used to establish stability of the underlying GJN. To this end, Sigman [35], Down and Meyn [16], Dai [13], and Dai and Meyn [15] prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 2. (Stochastic stability of GJN)** *Suppose condition (3) holds for the GJN  $\Xi$ . Then, there exists a stationary distribution  $\pi$  for the Markovian process  $\bar{Q}(t)$ . Under additional technical regularity (for example assumptions A1-A3 in [15]), the stationary distribution is unique and for every starting state  $\bar{Q}(0) = (z, a, v) \in \mathcal{X}$ , the distribution of  $\bar{Q}(t)$  converges to  $\pi$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .*

The Lyapunov function  $w'q(\cdot)$  and the fluid model of the GJN will play an important role in deriving our main results in what follows.

### 2.3 Heavy traffic limits and reflected Brownian motion

**The GJN in heavy-traffic.** We now introduce the Generalized Jackson Network in the parameter regime corresponding to heavy-traffic assumptions. We consider a sequence of networks with traffic intensities  $\rho_j^n, n = 1, 2, \dots$ , each approaching unity at the same rate as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . To arrange for that, we first consider a network such that the traffic intensity  $\rho_j = 1$  in every station  $j$ , and denote this network by  $\Xi$ . (At this point the reader should recall that  $\Xi$  encodes the 5-tuple given in Section 2.1 that parameterizes the GJN.) In particular,  $\lambda = [I - P']^{-1}\alpha = \mu$ . Fix a vector of strictly positive constants  $\kappa^0 = (\kappa_1^0, \dots, \kappa_J^0)$ . Then, we consider a sequence of networks  $\{\Xi^n\}$  in which: i.) the service times  $v_j$  (as well as the residual service times), and routing decisions  $\psi^j$  have the same distribution as in the original network  $\Xi$ ; ii.) the interarrival times for the  $n$ 'th network in the sequence are defined to be  $a_j^n = a_j(1 - \kappa_j^0/\sqrt{n})$ , and the residual interarrival times remains unchanged. Hence the vector of arrival rates is given by  $\alpha^n = (\alpha_1^n, \dots, \alpha_J^n)$ . As a result, the vector of effective arrival rates is  $\lambda^n = [I - P']^{-1}\alpha^n$ , which we write as  $[I - P']^{-1}\alpha - n^{-\frac{1}{2}}[I - P']^{-1}\kappa^0 = \lambda - n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\kappa$ , where  $\kappa := [I - P']^{-1}\kappa^0 = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_J)$ . Then

$$\rho_j^n = (1 - \kappa_j/\sqrt{n}), \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, J. \quad (17)$$

Equivalently  $\sqrt{n}(1 - \rho_j^n) = \kappa_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, J$ . We also obtain for the bottleneck traffic intensity  $\rho^{*n} = (1 - \kappa^*/\sqrt{n})$ , where  $\kappa^* = \min \kappa_j$ . The GJN in heavy-traffic refers to the sequence of Generalized Jackson Networks  $\{\Xi^n\}$ , and the corresponding sequences of processes are denoted  $A^n(t), B^n(t), I^n(t), X^n(t), Q^n(t), Y^n(t)$ . Note that the processes  $S(t)$  and the routing processes do not depend on  $n$ , so we use the notations  $S(t), R^j(l)$  for these elements in the network  $\Xi^n$ . The sequence of stationary distributions corresponding to  $\Xi^n$  will be denoted by  $\{\pi^n\}$  henceforth. These distributions exist by Theorem 2 due to the fact that condition (3),  $\rho^{*n} = \max_j \rho_j^n < 1$ , holds for

all  $n$ . When the stationary distributions are not unique we denote by  $\{\pi^n\}$  an arbitrary sequence of stationary distributions corresponding to  $\{\Xi^n\}$ .

**Reflected Brownian motion in the orthant.** The importance of the heavy-traffic regime stems from the ability to approximate the underlying queue lengths and workload processes by a Reflected Brownian Motion (RBM) which we define below.

**Definition 1. (Reflected Brownian Motion in the Orthant)** *Let  $z \in \mathbb{R}^J$ ,  $P$  be a substochastic  $J \times J$  matrix, and let  $W = (W(t) : t \geq 0)$  be a  $J$ -dimensional Brownian motion with initial state  $z$ , drift vector  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^J$  and covariance matrix  $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{J \times J}$ . Then, the reflected Brownian motion (RBM) with parameters  $(\beta, \Gamma, I - P')$  and initial state  $z$  is the unique solution to the Skorohod problem (11), (12) with input process  $W$ . In particular, the RBM  $Z = (Z(t) : t \geq 0)$  is given by  $Z = \Psi_1(W)$ , and the non-decreasing regulator process  $Y = (Y(t) : t \geq 0)$  is given by  $Y = \Psi_2(W)$ . Thus, the pair  $(Z, Y)$  satisfies*

$$Z(t) = W(t) + [I - P']Y(t) \quad (18)$$

$$\int_0^t Z_j(s) dY_j(s) = 0, \text{ for all } t \geq 0 \text{ and } j = 1, 2, \dots, J. \quad (19)$$

The RBM process  $Z$  has the following behavior: in the interior of the non-negative orthant  $\mathbb{R}_+^J$  it evolves like a Brownian motion with drift  $\beta$  and diffusion matrix  $\Gamma$ ; and when the process hits the  $j$ 'th face,  $F_j = \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^J : x_j = 0\}$ , it is reflected instantaneously toward the interior of the orthant in the direction determined by the  $j$ 'th column of the matrix  $I - P'$ . Roughly speaking, the  $j$ 'th component of the regulator process  $Y$  measures the cumulative “effort” in maintaining the Brownian motion confined to the non-negative orthant.

The stationary distribution of the RBM (when it exists) is one of the primary focuses of the present paper. To that end, the following result, established in [20], will be important in what follows.

**Theorem 3. (RBM stationary distribution)** *The RBM  $(\beta, \Gamma, I - P')$  possesses a stationary distribution  $\pi_{\text{RBM}}$  if and only if  $[I - P']^{-1}\beta < 0$ . When this distribution exists, it is unique. Moreover, for every initial distribution, the marginal distribution of RBM converges weakly to  $\pi_{\text{RBM}}$  as time diverges to infinity.*

**Heavy-traffic scaling and diffusion limits.** For the sequence of GJN,  $\{\Xi^n\}$ , defined earlier, put

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{X}^n(t) &= X^n(nt)/\sqrt{n} \\ \hat{Q}^n(t) &= Q^n(nt)/\sqrt{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The above correspond to a *diffusion scaling* of the free process  $X$  and the queue length process  $Q$ . In particular, the normalization in (20) corresponds to accelerating time and compressing space in accordance with the Functional Central Limit Theorem (FCLT). The following theorem, due to Reiman [33], is one of the most fundamental results in the theory of diffusion approximations of queueing networks. The theorem was originally proven under the assumption that  $Q^n(0) = 0$ , however, the more general result stated below also holds true (see, for example [12]).

**Theorem 4. (Process limit weak convergence of GJN to RBM)** *Consider a sequence of GJN,  $\{\Xi^n\}$ , with  $\rho^n$  satisfying (17), and assume that  $Q^n(0)/\sqrt{n} \Rightarrow Z(0)$ , where  $Z(0)$  is distributed according to some probability measure  $\pi_0$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+^J$ . Then, for every  $t > 0$  the sequence of processes  $(Q^n(nt')/\sqrt{n} : 0 \leq t' \leq t)$  converges weakly to the RBM  $(Z(t') : 0 \leq t' \leq t)$  with respect to the topology of uniform convergence in  $\mathcal{D}[0, t]$ . The RBM has initial distribution  $Z(0) \sim \pi_0$ , and it has parameters  $(\beta, \Gamma, I - P')$ , where the drift vector is given by  $\beta = -(I - P')M^{-1}\kappa$ , and the entries of the covariance matrix  $\Gamma$  are given by*

$$\Gamma_{k\ell} = \sum_{j=1}^J \mu_j [p_{jk}(\delta_{k\ell} - p_{j\ell}) + c_{s,j}^2(p_{jk} - \delta_{jk})(p_{j\ell} - \delta_{j\ell})] + \alpha_k c_{a,k}^2 \delta_{k\ell}$$

where  $\delta_{jk} = 1$  if  $j = k$  and is zero otherwise.

**Remarks:**

1. The limiting covariance structure can be inferred from (48) in Section A; for further details see [12, Theorem 7.29].

2. Note that the expression for the RBM drift vector implies that  $[I - P']^{-1}\beta = -M^{-1}\kappa < 0$ , which is the condition for the existence and uniqueness of the stationary distribution of RBM, and corresponds to the condition  $\rho_n^* < 1$  in  $\Xi^n$ .

3. An important point concerning the RBM approximation is that it can give rise to closed form solutions for its stationary distribution, while the underlying GJN may be intractable in that regard. Harrison and Williams [20, 21] provide necessary and sufficient conditions under which the stationary distribution of RBM is separable with exponentially distributed marginals. An example that illustrates this is given in Section 4.

### 3 Lyapunov Functions and Steady-state Bounds for Markov Processes

#### 3.1 Background and definitions

Let  $Q = (Q(t) : t \geq 0)$  be a continuous time Markov process defined on a complete metrizable state space  $\mathcal{X}$ , which for our purposes is Euclidean space, equipped with Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}$ . Let  $\mathbb{P}_x$  be the probability distribution under which  $\mathbb{P}(Q(0) = x) = 1$ , and put  $\mathbb{E}_x[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot | Q(0) = x]$ , i.e., the expectation operator w.r.t. the probability distribution  $\mathbb{P}_x$ . Let  $\mathbb{P}_\pi$  denote the probability distribution under which  $Q(0)$  is distributed according to  $\pi$ , and put  $\mathbb{E}_\pi[\cdot]$  to be the expectation operator w.r.t this distribution. A probability distribution  $\pi$  defined on  $\mathcal{B}$  is said to be a *stationary distribution* if for every bounded continuous function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi[f(Q(0))] = \mathbb{E}_\pi[f(Q(t))], \quad (21)$$

for all  $t \geq 0$ . The following definition plays an important role in our analysis.

**Definition 2. (Lyapunov function)** A function  $\Phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is said to be a Lyapunov function with drift size parameter  $-\gamma < 0$ , drift time parameter  $t_0 > 0$ , and exception parameter  $K$ , if

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X} : \Phi(x) > K} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_x \Phi(Q(t_0)) - \Phi(x) \right\} \leq -\gamma. \quad (22)$$

A function  $\Phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is defined to be a geometric Lyapunov function with a geometric drift size  $0 < \gamma < 1$ , drift time  $t_0$ , and exception parameter  $K$ , if

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X} : \Phi(x) > K} \left\{ (\Phi(x))^{-1} \mathbb{E}_x \Phi(Q(t_0)) \right\} \leq \gamma. \quad (23)$$

Given any function  $\Phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $t \geq 0$ , let

$$\phi(t) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \Phi^{-1}(x) \mathbb{E}_x \Phi(Q(t)). \quad (24)$$

It is not excluded that  $\phi(t) = \infty$ , however the interesting case of course is when  $\phi(t)$  is finite. Given  $\theta > 0$  let

$$L_1(\theta, t) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \exp(\theta(\Phi(Q(t)) - \Phi(x))) \right], \quad (25)$$

and

$$L_2(\theta, t) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ (\Phi(Q(t)) - \Phi(x))^2 \exp(\theta(\Phi(Q(t)) - \Phi(x))^+) \right], \quad (26)$$

for  $t \geq 0$ .

### 3.2 Bounds on the stationary distribution

Lyapunov functions provide a useful tool for obtaining bounds on stationary distributions of Markov chains and processes. In this subsection we are set to do just that. The bounds we derive are very similar to the ones obtained in various forms and under a variety of assumptions by Meyn and Tweedie, summarized in their book [32].

**Theorem 5.** *Suppose the Markov process  $(Q(t) : t \geq 0)$  possesses a stationary distribution  $\pi$  and suppose  $\Phi$  is a geometric Lyapunov function with parameters  $\gamma, t_0, K$ . Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi[\Phi(Q(0))] \leq \frac{\phi(t_0)K}{1-\gamma} . \quad (27)$$

Note that in the theorem above it is not assumed that the stationary distribution  $\pi$  is unique. The claimed bounds hold for *every* stationary distribution  $\pi$ . The bound of course is only meaningful when  $\phi(t_0)$  is finite.

We now apply Theorem 5 to establish bounds on the tail of the stationary distribution.

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $(Q(t) : t \geq 0)$  be a Markov process with a stationary distribution  $\pi$ , and suppose  $\Phi$  is a Lyapunov function with parameters  $\gamma, t_0, K$ . Assume in addition that there exists  $\theta > 0$  such that*

$$\theta L_2(\theta, t_0) \leq \gamma. \quad (28)$$

*Then  $\exp(\theta\Phi(\cdot))$  is a geometric Lyapunov function with geometric drift size parameter  $1 - \gamma\theta/2$ , drift time parameter  $t_0$ , and exception parameter  $e^{\theta K}$ . Consequently, for every  $s > K$*

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi(\Phi(Q(0)) > s) \leq (1 - \gamma\theta/2)^{-1} L_1(\theta, t_0) \exp(-\theta(s - K)). \quad (29)$$

#### Remarks.

1. At first glance the division by  $1 - \gamma\theta/2$  above may seem erroneous since in principle this expression can be negative. We now show that condition (28) rules this out. From the definition of  $L_2(\cdot, \cdot)$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} L_2(\theta, t_0) &\geq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}_x[(\Phi(Q(t_0)) - \Phi(x))^2] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (\mathbb{E}_x[\Phi(Q(t_0)) - \Phi(x)])^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \gamma^2, \end{aligned}$$

where: (a) follows from Jensen's inequality; and (b) follows from the definition of  $\gamma$ , in particular,

$$\sup_{x: \Phi(x) > K} \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi(Q(t_0)) - \Phi(x)] \leq -\gamma.$$



The condition (28) then implies that  $\gamma\theta \leq 1$ .

2. The upper bound in (29) can be optimized by selecting  $\theta > 0$  to be the largest possible value satisfying (28). Of course if the largest such  $\theta$  is equal to zero then the bound is trivial.

## 4 Main Results

Throughout this section we consider a sequence of Generalized Jackson Networks  $\Xi^n$  in heavy traffic, and the associated Markov process  $\bar{Q}^n(t) = (Q^n(t), \hat{a}^n(t), \hat{v}^n(t))$  introduced in Section 2; the latter two coordinates denote the vectors of residual interarrival times and service times, respectively.

### 4.1 Tightness of stationary distributions

In this section we establish tightness of the sequence of stationary distributions corresponding to the normalized state process  $\{Q^n(nt)/\sqrt{n}\}$ . Key to this result are the tail bounds derived for general Markov processes in Section 3. To appeal to these results, we consider the workload function defined in (15), whose key properties are given in Proposition 1. The next result establishes that this workload function has the requisite attributes to serve as a Lyapunov function for the sequence of GJN's in heavy-traffic.

**Proposition 2.** *There exist constants  $t_0, c_0 > 0$  which depend only on the parameters of the network  $\Xi$  and are independent of  $n$ , such that for all sufficiently large  $n \geq 1$*

$$\sup_{(z,a,v): w'z > c_0\sqrt{n}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ w'Q^n(nt_0) | \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right] - w'z \right\} \leq -\sqrt{n}, \quad (30)$$

*In addition, there exists  $\theta_0 > 0$  which depends only on  $\Xi$  such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(z,a,v) \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\theta_0(w'Q^n(nt_0) - w'z)^+) | \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right] < \infty, \quad (31)$$

*and*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(z,a,v) \in \mathcal{X}} n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ (w'Q^n(nt_0) - w'z)^2 \exp(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\theta_0(w'Q^n(nt_0) - w'z)^+) | \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right] < \infty. \quad (32)$$

The immediate implication of the above result is the following.

**Proposition 3.** *For all sufficiently large  $n$ , the function  $\Phi(z, a, v) = w'z$  is a Lyapunov function with drift size parameter  $-\sqrt{n}$ , drift time parameter  $nt_0$  and exception parameter  $c_2\sqrt{n}$ . In addition*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_1(\theta_0/\sqrt{n}, nt_0) < \infty \quad (33)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} L_2(\theta_0/\sqrt{n}, nt_0) < \infty \quad (34)$$

Armed with this result we now use Theorem 6 to establish the sought tightness of the sequence of stationary distributions corresponding to the sequence of normalized GJN's.

**Theorem 7.** *There exist constants  $C_1, c_1 > 0$  which depend only on  $\Xi$  such that for all sufficiently large  $n$  the sequence of stationary distributions  $\pi^n$  of the networks  $\{\Xi^n\}$  satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi^n}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}w'Q^n(0) > s) \leq C_1 \exp(-c_1 s), \quad (35)$$

for all  $s > 0$ .

Since  $1 - \rho^{*n} = \kappa^*/\sqrt{n}$ , the theorem implies that each individual queue  $Q_j^n(t)$  behaves in steady state as  $O(\frac{1}{1-\rho^{*n}})$  as  $\rho^{*n} \rightarrow 1$ .

Recall that a sequence of real valued random variables  $X_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , is said to be tight if for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists sufficiently large constant  $C > 0$  such that  $\sup_n \mathbb{P}(|X_n| > C) < \epsilon$ . Refer to [6] for more detailed definitions and applications of this important concept. The following corollary is a consequence of the theorem above.

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $\bar{Q}^n(0) = (Q^n(0), \hat{a}^n(0), \hat{v}^n(0))$  be distributed according to  $\pi^n$ . Then the sequence of  $\mathbb{R}^J$ -valued random vectors  $\{Q^n(0)/\sqrt{n}\}$  is tight.*

## 4.2 Interchange of limits

We are now in position to prove the sought interchange of limits indicated in the schematic diagram in Figure 1. Let  $\hat{\pi}^n$  denote the stationary distribution of the rescaled process  $\hat{Q}^n(t) = Q^n(nt)/\sqrt{n}$ , where as above  $(Q^n(t) : t \geq 0)$  denotes the queue length process for the GJN with traffic intensity  $\rho^n$ . With respect to  $\pi^n$  we have by Theorem 2, that under some mild assumptions for each fixed  $n$  the distribution of  $Q^n(t)$  converges weakly to  $\pi^n$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . On the other hand, Reiman's diffusion approximation stated in Theorem 4 asserts that starting with the original GJN and taking heavy-traffic limits, i.e., letting  $\rho^n \uparrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the normalized queue length process  $(\hat{Q}^n(t) : t \geq 0)$  converges weakly to an  $(\beta, \Gamma, I - P)$ -RBM  $(Z(t) : t \geq 0)$  identified in Section 2. Subsequently, letting  $t \rightarrow \infty$  one obtains a steady-state approximation for the original network given by the distribution  $\pi_{\text{RBM}}$ . We now prove that the above limits can be interchanged, i.e., first taking the limit as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and letting the GJN reach steady-state, then taking heavy-traffic limits; the resulting process converges to a weak limit and this limit is  $\pi_{\text{RBM}}$ . This validates the steady-state heavy-traffic approximation which is built on the distribution of the approximating RBM.

To prove the interchange of limits, recall the assertion of Corollary 1. In the space of probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}^J$  endowed with topology of weak convergence, the tightness result of this corollary implies that there exists at least one limit point,  $\pi^*$ , for the sequence  $\{\hat{\pi}^n\}$ , and this limit is

a probability measure. Our main result stated below asserts that such a limit is unique and is identical to the unique stationary distribution of the associated RBM.

**Theorem 8.** *The sequence  $\{\hat{\pi}^n\}$  converges weakly to  $\pi_{\text{RBM}}$ , where  $\pi_{\text{RBM}}$  is the unique stationary distribution of the  $(\beta, \Gamma, I - P)$ -RBM.*

Thus, we have that the probability distribution of  $\{Q^n(0)/\sqrt{n}\}$  converges weakly to  $\pi_{\text{RBM}}$  when  $Q^n(0)$  is distributed according to  $\pi^n$ . This establishes the validity of the commuting diagram depicted in Figure 1.

Given our assumptions on the primitives, in particular the existence of a (conditional) moment generating function in the neighborhood of zero, it stands to reason that the queue length process under diffusion scaling should be uniformly integrable. Moreover, we expect the interchange argument to hold for all moments of the normalized queue length process. The following result asserts that this is indeed the case.

**Corollary 2.** *There exists a vector  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_+^J$  with all coordinates being strictly positive, such that the family of random variables  $\{\exp(\theta' Q^n(0)/\sqrt{n})\}$  is uniformly integrable, where  $Q^n(0) \sim \pi^n$  for each  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Consequently, for all  $p \geq 1$*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi^n}[n^{-1/2}Q^n(0)]^p \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\text{RBM}}}[Z(0)]^p \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $\pi_{\text{RBM}}$  is the stationary distribution of the RBM  $(Z(t) : t \geq 0)$  with parameters  $(\beta, \Gamma, I - P')$ .

We note that the above result is particularly useful given that current numerical algorithms for analysis of the steady-state of RBM, see [14] and [36], are mostly effective in the computation of stationary moments (as opposed to the full distribution).

### 4.3 Extension to sojourn times

Given a job which arrives externally into station  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , we will say that this job has the visit vector  $h \in \mathbb{Z}_+^J$  if it visits station  $i$  precisely  $h_i$  times before leaving the network. Of course not every visit vector is feasible. That is, there may not exist a job with visit vector  $h$  for all  $h \in \mathbb{Z}_+^J$ . For example, in a tandem queueing system with two stations and no feedback, only  $h = (1, 1)$  is feasible. As in [33], we let  $D_{j,h}(t)$  be the sojourn time of the first job which arrives into station  $j$  after time  $t$  and has a visit vector  $h$ . Given a state  $\bar{Q}(t) = (z, a, v) \in \mathcal{X}$  of the Markov process at time  $t$ , the distribution of  $D_{j,h}(t)$  is independent from  $\bar{Q}(t'), t' < t$ . Thus we may consider the random variable  $D_{j,h}(z, a, v)$  which is a function of the state  $(z, a, v)$ . The following result is then an immediate consequence of the above observation.

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $\pi$  be the stationary distribution of the Markov process  $\bar{Q}(t)$ . Then for every station  $j$  and feasible visit vector  $h \in \mathbb{Z}_+^J$ , the process  $D_{j,h}(t) := D_{j,h}(\bar{Q}(t))$  is stationary.*

In the queueing system  $\Xi^n$  let  $D_{j,h}^n(t)$  denote  $D_{j,h}^n(\bar{Q}^n(t))$ . The weak convergence of the processes  $D_h^n(nt)/\sqrt{n}$  defined in the queueing network  $\Xi^n$  to an RBM was established by Reiman [33]. The result is stated there under the assumption that the queueing network is initially empty  $Q^n(0) = 0$ . The techniques used by Reiman allow one to obtain a stronger result which we will use in the present paper. We do not give a full proof of this stronger version, but just highlight the necessary adjustments to the basic arguments given in Reiman [33].

**Theorem 9.** *Consider a sequence of GJN,  $\{\Xi^n\}$ , in heavy traffic. Suppose  $Q^n(0)/\sqrt{n}$  converges weakly to some limiting distribution  $\pi_0$ . Then for every station  $j$  and every feasible  $h$ , the process  $(D_{j,h}^n(t')/\sqrt{n} : 0 \leq t' \leq nt)$  converges weakly to  $(h'MZ(t') : 0 \leq t' < \infty)$ , where  $Z(t)$  is the  $(\beta, \Gamma, I - P')$ -RBM with  $Z \sim \pi_0$ .*

We now state our main result for the sojourn times in steady-state. The proof is immediate by combining Theorems 8 and 9.

**Theorem 10.** *Consider the sequence of GJN,  $\{\Xi^n\}$ , in heavy-traffic. Suppose  $\bar{Q}^n(0) \sim \pi^n$ . Then for every station  $j$  and every feasible  $h \in \mathbb{Z}_+^J$  the convergence*

$$\frac{D_{j,h}^n(0)}{\sqrt{n}} \Rightarrow h'(\mu_1^{-1}Z_1(0), \dots, \mu_J^{-1}Z_J(0))$$

*holds, where  $Z(0) \sim \pi_{\text{RBM}}$ .*

#### 4.4 Product form RBM

As established in [20], in special cases described below the stationary distribution of RBM has an explicit product form exponential distribution. Our main result, Theorem 8, can then be used to validate closed form steady-state approximations for certain classes of GJN in heavy traffic. In this subsection we illustrate this application of our main theorem.

The following result follows from a more general theorem on RBM in steady state, established by Harrison and Williams [20]; see also [12] Theorem 7.12.

**Theorem 11. (Product form RBM stationary distribution)** *Given a  $(\beta, \Gamma, I - P')$ -RBM, suppose  $[I - P']^{-1}\beta < 0$  and in addition*

$$2\Gamma = [I - P']D^{-1}\Lambda + \Lambda D^{-1}[I - P], \quad (36)$$

where  $D$  is the diagonal matrix with elements  $(1 - p_{jj}), 1 \leq j \leq J$  and  $\Lambda$  is the diagonal matrix with elements  $\Gamma_{jj}, 1 \leq j \leq J$ . Then the stationary distribution  $\pi_{\text{RBM}}$  has a product form density

$$f(z_1, \dots, z_J) = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq J} \eta_j \exp(-\eta_j z_j), \quad (z_1, \dots, z_J) \in \mathbb{R}_+^J$$

where  $\eta = -2\Lambda^{-1}D[I - P']^{-1}\beta$ .

It can be checked that condition (36), which is also referred to as the *skew symmetry condition*, holds when  $c_{a,j}^2 = c_{s,j}^2 = 1$ . In particular, this includes the classical Jackson network case. Consider the GJN,  $\{\Xi^n\}$ , in heavy traffic, and recall that  $\beta = -[I - P']M^{-1}\kappa$  with  $\kappa = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_J)$ . Using this we have  $\eta_j = 2\Gamma_{jj}^{-1}(1 - p_{jj})\mu_j\kappa_j$ . Combining with Theorem 8 we obtain the following theorem which gives an explicit expression for the limiting steady-state distribution of GJN in heavy traffic.

**Theorem 12.** *Consider a sequence of GJN,  $\{\Xi^n\}$ , in heavy traffic. Suppose condition (36) holds. Then the sequence of stationary measures  $\pi^n$  satisfies*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\pi^n} \left( \frac{Q^n(0)}{\sqrt{n}} > z \right) = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq J} \exp \left( -2\Gamma_{jj}^{-1}(1 - p_{jj})\mu_j\kappa_j z_j \right),$$

for every  $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^J$ .

Recalling that  $\rho_j = 1 - \kappa_j/\sqrt{n}$ , we can informally express the assertion of the above limit theorem as

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi} \left( (1 - \rho_j)Q_j(0) > z_j, \forall j \right) \approx \prod_{1 \leq j \leq J} \exp \left( -2\Gamma_{jj}^{-1}(1 - p_{jj})\mu_j z_j \right),$$

when  $\rho_j \approx 1$ , for all  $j = 1, \dots, J$ , where  $\pi$  is a stationary distribution of GJN. Thus, for certain classes of GJN for which the skew symmetry condition holds we obtain a simple approximation to the steady-state on the basis of the product form RBM stationary distribution.

## 5 Concluding Remarks

We considered a Generalized Jackson Network (GJN) in heavy traffic and proved that the stationary distribution of the GJN under diffusion scaling converges to the stationary distribution of the associated Reflected Brownian Motion, thus resolving the open problem of so called “interchange of limits” for this class of open queueing networks. There are several interesting questions which remain unresolved and are worth pursuing in future research.

1. The bounds on the stationary distribution of the queue lengths in GJN obtained in the present paper are not explicit, i.e., their dependence on the stochastic primitives is not articulated

in full detail. The techniques used in the paper can be applied, in principle, to obtain more explicit expressions. We are currently pursuing such results in ongoing work, deriving explicit upper and lower bounds on the steady-state of GJN.

**2.** The assumptions adopted in the present paper are certainly not the tightest possible. In particular, it should be possible to carry out a similar analysis when one only assumes finite  $2 + \delta$  moments, for any  $\delta > 0$ , for the interarrival and service times. (These conditions are very close to being necessary and sufficient for the functional Central Limit Theorem to hold, and thus for proving heavy-traffic process limits.) The Lyapunov approach we develop in the current paper can be adjusted to provide polynomial tail bounds under such assumptions; in essence a  $p$ 'th moment of the primitives would yield existence of the  $(p - 1)$ 'st moment of the stationary queue length (see, e.g., [15]). This would be used in conjunction with strong approximation coupling inequalities that are available under polynomial moment conditions on the primitives, the weakest being the existence of a  $2 + \delta$  moment. In the present paper we assume exponential moments and consequently obtain exponential tail bounds on the steady-state distribution of the GJN.

**3.** The main results in our current paper hinge on the use of a simple linear Lyapunov function. There is a long history of applying Lyapunov function methods for purposes of performance analysis, specifically for multiclass queueing networks; see [5], [5], [2], [3], [4], [30], [31], [27]. It should be noted, however, that in almost all the existing literature, Markovian-type queueing networks are considered. The extension of these bounds to general type queueing networks has not been explored to date.

**4.** This paper presents what is, in our view, a very interesting link between diffusion approximations of queueing networks and Lyapunov function methods. The latter have been traditionally used to establish stability and obtain performance bounds for queueing networks, as well as diffusion limits that correspond to the underlying queueing model (see, e.g., [17] for an example of the latter). To the best of our knowledge, such methods have not yet been applied to queueing networks to establish properties of their diffusion approximations (for example to ascertain tightness of the sequence of steady-state distributions, as is established in the current paper). The proof technique introduced in this paper opens up the possibility of establishing similar results for other models where: i.) process-level diffusion approximations have been established; ii.) the stationary distribution of both the underlying queueing model and the associated diffusion limit is known to exist; and no rigorous link between i.) and ii.) is known. Notable examples of such systems are feedforward (acyclic) queueing networks and certain instances of multiclass networks for which stability conditions are known and Brownian approximations have been rigorously established. Proving an interchange of limits for these classes of queueing networks is an interesting direction of future research that may benefit from the results we develop in the current paper.

**Acknowledgements.** The authors wish to thank Sean Meyn and Peter Glynn for many interesting and fruitful discussions.

## A Proofs

### A.1 Proofs of the main results

**Proof of Theorem 5.** By definition of a geometric Lyapunov function (23), we have that for every  $x \in \mathcal{X}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_x[\Phi(Q(t_0))] &\leq \max \left\{ \gamma\Phi(x), \phi(t_0)\Phi(x)1\{\Phi(x) \leq K\} \right\} \\ &\leq \gamma\Phi(x) + \phi(t_0)K.\end{aligned}$$

Fix  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and put  $\Phi_k(x) := \Phi(x) \wedge k$ . Then, if  $\Phi_k(x) \leq k$

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_k(x) - \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi_k(Q(t_0))] &= \Phi(x) - \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi_k(Q(t_0))] \\ &\geq \Phi(x) - \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi(Q(t_0))] \\ &\geq (1 - \gamma)\Phi(x) - \phi(t_0)K \\ &\geq -\phi(t_0)K.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if  $\Phi_k(x) > k$  then,

$$\Phi_k(x) - \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi_k(Q(t_0))] \geq k - \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi_k(Q(t_0))] \geq 0.$$

Thus,  $\Phi_k(x) - \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi_k(Q(t_0))]$  is bounded from below by  $-\phi(t_0)K$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . It is also bounded from above by  $k$ . Now, the Monotone Convergence Theorem implies that  $\mathbb{E}_x\Phi_k(Q(t_0)) \uparrow \mathbb{E}_x\Phi(Q(t_0))$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . So,  $\Phi_k(x) - \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi_k(Q(t_0))] \rightarrow \Phi(x) - \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi(Q(t_0))]$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Since  $\Phi_k(x) - \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi_k(Q(t_0))]$  bounded below, we can appeal to Fatou's Lemma to conclude that

$$\int (\Phi(x) - \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi(Q(t_0))]) \pi(dx) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int (\Phi_k(x) - \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi_k(Q(t_0))]) \pi(dx) = 0, \quad (37)$$

where the equality follows from stationarity of  $\pi$ . On the other hand, by definition of the Lyapunov function we have that

$$\Phi(x) - \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi(Q(t_0))] \geq (1 - \gamma)\Phi(x) - \phi(t_0)K.$$

Integrating both sides with respect to  $\pi$  and using (37) we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi\Phi(Q(0)) \leq \frac{\phi(t_0)K}{1 - \gamma}$$

which concludes the proof. ■



**Proof of Theorem 6.** Let  $\theta > 0$  satisfy (28). Introduce the function  $\Upsilon : \mathcal{X}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  defined as

$$\Upsilon(x_1, x_2, y) := \exp(y(\Phi(x_2) - \Phi(x_1))) .$$

Using a second order Taylor's expansion around  $y = 0$  we have for some  $0 < \theta' \leq \theta$

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon(x_1, x_2, \theta) &= 1 + \theta(\Phi(x_2) - \Phi(x_1)) + \frac{\theta^2}{2}(\Phi(x_2) - \Phi(x_1))^2 \exp(\theta'(\Phi(x_2) - \Phi(x_1))), \\ &\leq 1 + \theta(\Phi(x_2) - \Phi(x_1)) + \frac{\theta^2}{2}(\Phi(x_2) - \Phi(x_1))^2 \exp(\theta(\Phi(x_2) - \Phi(x_1))^+). \end{aligned}$$

We now fix arbitrary  $x$  such that  $\Phi(x) > K$ , set  $x_1 = x, x_2 = \Phi(t_0)$  and take the expectation of both sides above to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x[\Upsilon(x, Q(t_0), \theta)] &\leq 1 + \theta \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi(Q(t_0)) - \Phi(x)] + \frac{\theta^2}{2} \mathbb{E}_x[\Phi(Q(t_0)) - \Phi(x)]^2 \exp(\theta(\Phi(Q(t_0)) - \Phi(x))^+) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 1 - \gamma\theta + \frac{\theta^2}{2} L_2(\theta, t_0) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 1 - \gamma\theta/2, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from (22) and the definition of  $L_2$ , and (b) follows from (28). Note, that the condition  $\Phi(x) > K$  is equivalent to  $\exp(\theta\Phi(x)) > \exp(\theta K)$ . Thus  $\exp(\theta\Phi(x))$  is a geometric Lyapunov function with parameters  $\gamma\theta/2, t_0, \exp(\theta K)$ . This concludes the proof of the first part of Theorem 6.

To prove the second part observe that for the constructed Lyapunov function

$$\phi(t_0) = \sup_x \mathbb{E}[\exp(\theta(\Phi(Q(t_0)) - \Phi(x)))] = L_1(\theta, t_0). \quad (38)$$

We use Markov's inequality, (38) and the bound (27) of Theorem 5, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\pi(\Phi(Q(0)) > s) &= \mathbb{P}_\pi\left(\exp(\theta\Phi(Q(0))) > \exp(\theta s)\right) \\ &\leq \exp(-\theta s) \mathbb{E}_\pi[\exp(\theta\Phi(Q(0)))] \\ &\leq \exp(-\theta s) \frac{L_1(\theta, t_0) \exp(\theta K)}{1 - \gamma\theta/2} \\ &\leq (1 - \gamma\theta/2)^{-1} L_1(\theta, t_0) \exp(-\theta(s - K)). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the second part of the theorem.  $\blacksquare$

**Proof of Proposition 2.** The key to the proof is the following result.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $(X^n(t) : t \geq 0)$  be the net input process for the GJN,  $\Xi^n$ , and let  $(x_z^n(t) : t \geq 0)$*

denote its fluid counterpart starting at state  $z$  (i.e.,  $x_z^n(0) = z$ ). Then, there exists  $\theta_1 > 0$  such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(z,a,v) \in \mathcal{X}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} \|X^n(t) - x_z^n(t)\| \mid \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right] < \infty \quad (39)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(z,a,v) \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} \exp(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \theta_1 \|X^n(t) - x_z^n(t)\|) \mid \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right] < \infty \quad (40)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(z,a,v) \in \mathcal{X}} n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} \|X^n(t) - x_z^n(t)\|^2 \exp(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \theta_1 \|X^n(t) - x_z^n(t)\|) \mid \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right] < \infty. \quad (41)$$

The proof of this lemma is given in Section A.2.

From (8),(9) and (10), it follows that  $(Y^n(\cdot), Q^n(\cdot))$  jointly solve the Skorohod problem for the unreflected net input process  $X^n(\cdot)$ . That is  $Y^n(\cdot) = \Psi_1(X^n(\cdot))$ ,  $Q^n(\cdot) = \Psi_2(X^n(\cdot))$ . Let  $(y^n, q^n) = (\Psi_1(x_z^n), \Psi_2(x_z^n))$  be the solution of the Skorohod problem for the linear function  $x_z^n(\cdot)$ . Fix  $\theta > 0$  and  $t_0 > 0$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{-1/2} \theta (w' Q^n(t_0 n) - w' z)^+ \\ & \leq n^{-1/2} \theta (w' Q^n(t_0 n) - w' q^n(t_0 n))^+ + n^{-1/2} \theta (w' q^n(t_0 n) - w' z)^+ \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \theta \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0 n} |w' Q^n(t) - w' q^n(t)| \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} C_1 \theta n^{-1/2} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0 n} \|Q^n(t) - q^n(t)\| \\ & \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} R_1 C_1 \theta n^{-1/2} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0 n} \|X^n(t) - x_z^n(t)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

In the above (a) follows from Proposition 1, from which we have that for every  $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^J$

$$w' q^n(t_0 n) \leq \left( w' z - \min_{1 \leq j \leq J} \mu_j (1 - \rho_j^n) t_0 n \right)^+ = \left( w' z - \min_{1 \leq j \leq J} \mu_j t_0 \kappa^* \sqrt{n} \right)^+. \quad (43)$$

Thus the second term on the RHS of the first inequality above is identically zero. The inequality (b) follows from setting  $C_1 = \max w_j$ , and (c) follows from (13) of Theorem 1. Thus, setting  $\theta_0 = \theta_1 / (R_1 C_1 \sqrt{t_0})$ , where  $\theta_1$  is identified in Lemma 1, concludes the proof of (31) and (32) for arbitrary choice of  $t_0$ .

We now concentrate on proving (30). From (42) and (39) of Lemma 1 we have that there exists a constant  $C_2 > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ |w' Q^n(t_0 n) - w' q^n(t_0 n)| \mid \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right] & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0 n} |w' Q^n(t) - w' q^n(t)| \mid \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right] \\ & \leq C_2 \sqrt{t_0 n}, \end{aligned}$$

holds for all  $(z, a, v) \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $t_0 > 0$  and all sufficiently large  $n$ , where we have substituted  $t_0 n$  for  $n$  in (39). Combining the above with (43) we obtain that for every  $t_0 > 0$ ,  $(z, a, v) \in \mathcal{X}$ , and all

sufficiently large  $n$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[w'Q^n(t_0n)|\bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v)\right] &\leq \max\left\{C_2\sqrt{t_0n}, C_2\sqrt{t_0n} + w'z - \min_{1 \leq j \leq J} \mu_j t_0 \kappa^* \sqrt{n}\right\} \\ &= w'z + \max\left\{C_2\sqrt{t_0n} - w'z, C_2\sqrt{t_0n} - \min_{1 \leq j \leq J} \mu_j t_0 \kappa^* \sqrt{n}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

We now set  $t_0$  as a function of  $C_2, \kappa^*$  and  $\min_j \{\mu_j\}$ , so that  $C_2\sqrt{t_0} - \min_{1 \leq j \leq J} \mu_j t_0 \kappa^* \leq -1$ . This is always feasible for large enough value of  $t_0$  since the expression above is quadratic in  $\sqrt{t_0}$  with negative coefficient in front of  $(\sqrt{t_0})^2$ . For said  $t_0$  we obtain  $C_2\sqrt{t_0n} - \min_{1 \leq j \leq J} \mu_j t_0 \kappa^* \sqrt{n} \leq -\sqrt{n}$ . Then we set  $c_0 = C_2\sqrt{t_0} + 1$ . Consequently, for values of  $z$  such that  $w'z > c_0\sqrt{n}$ , we have that  $C_2\sqrt{t_0n} - w'z \leq -\sqrt{n}$ . We conclude that for our constants  $t_0, c_0$  and  $C_2$  we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[w'Q^n(t_0n)|\bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v)\right] \leq w'z - \sqrt{n}$$

whenever  $w'z > c_0\sqrt{n}$ . This proves (30). ■

**Proof of Theorem 7.** We apply Proposition 3. Fix a constant  $0 < c < 1$ . The corollary implies that for  $\theta_n \equiv c\theta_0 n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_1(\theta_n, t_0) < \infty \quad (44)$$

and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} L_2(\theta_n, t_0) < \infty. \quad (45)$$

This implies that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \theta_n L_2(\theta_n, t_0) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} c\theta_0 n^{-1} L_2(\theta_n, t_0) \leq 1,$$

provided that  $c$  is sufficiently small. This means that condition (28) of Theorem 6 holds for all sufficiently large  $n$ .

Applying Theorem 6 and using  $n^{\frac{1}{2}}\theta_n = c\theta_0$  we obtain for every  $s > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}\left(w'Q^n(0)/\sqrt{n} > s\right) &\leq \frac{L_1(\theta_n, t_0)}{1 - c\theta_0/2} \exp(-\theta_n(sn^{1/2} - c_0n^{1/2})) \\ &= \frac{L_1(\theta_n, t_0)}{1 - c\theta_0/2} \exp(-c\theta_0(s - c_0)).\end{aligned}$$

From (44), there exists a sufficiently large  $n_0$  and a constant  $c_3 > 0$  such that  $L_1(\theta_n, t_0) < c_3$  for all  $n > n_0$ . Then for all  $s > c_0$  and all  $n > n_0$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi_n}\left(w'Q^n(0)/\sqrt{n} > s\right) \leq \frac{c_3}{1 - c\theta_0/2} \exp(-c\theta_0(s - c_0))$$

Setting  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  appropriately, we obtain the result. ■

**Proof of Theorem 8.** Corollary 1 implies that for every subsequence  $\hat{\pi}^{n_k}$  there exists a weakly convergent subsequence  $\hat{\pi}^{n_{k_i}}$ . Let  $\pi^*$  denote any weak limit of this subsequence. We claim that

every such limit measure  $\pi^*$  is equal to  $\pi_{\text{RBM}}$ , implying that all such weak limits are the same. It then follows that  $\hat{\pi}^n \Rightarrow \pi_{\text{RBM}}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus we are left to show that every converging sequence  $\hat{\pi}^{n_{k_i}} \Rightarrow \pi^*$  converges to  $\pi_{\text{RBM}}$ . For notational simplicity, we denote  $\hat{\pi}^{n_{k_i}}$  simply by  $\hat{\pi}^n$ .

We apply Theorem 4. Fix an arbitrary  $t > 0$ . Since  $\hat{\pi}^n$  converges weakly to  $\pi^*$  then the process  $(Q^n(nt')/\sqrt{n} : 0 \leq t' \leq t)$  conditioned on  $Q^n(0) \sim \pi^n$  converges weakly to a  $(\beta, \Gamma, I - P')$ -RBM  $(Z(t') : 0 \leq t' \leq t)$  with initial distribution given by  $\pi^*$ . In particular,  $Q^n(nt)/\sqrt{n}$  converges weakly to  $Z(t)$  with  $Z(0)$  distributed according to  $\pi^*$ . But from stationarity of  $\pi^n$ ,  $Q^n(nt)/\sqrt{n}$  is distributed as  $\hat{\pi}^n$  which by assumption converges to  $\pi^*$ . Therefore  $Z(t)$  is distributed as  $\pi^*$  and  $\pi^*$  must be the unique stationary distribution:  $\pi^* = \pi_{\text{RBM}}$ . ■

**Proof of Corollary 2.** It suffices to prove the asserted uniform integrability. Fix  $\delta > 0$ . By Theorem 7 we have that for all sufficiently large  $n$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp(n^{-1/2}\delta w'Q^n(0))] &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(n^{-1/2}w'Q^n(0) > \delta^{-1}\log x)dx \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \exp(-c_1\delta^{-1}\log x + c_2)dx \\ &< \infty, \end{aligned}$$

provided that  $c_1\delta^{-1} > 1$ . Setting  $\theta = \delta w$  we obtain the result. ■

**Proof of Theorem 9.** The proof repeats the argument used in [33]. It is first shown in [33] that when  $Q^n(0) = 0$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq t' \leq nt} D_{j,h}^n(t')/n] = 0, \quad (46)$$

for every  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . This convergence is shown by bounding the supremum by a certain linear functional of  $\sup_{0 \leq t' \leq nt} \|Q^n(t')\|/n$ . Then a random time change theorem is applied to show that the distribution of sojourn times in station  $j$  at time  $nt'$  becomes “indistinguishable” from the distribution of the sum of the workloads in every individual station  $j'$  multiplied by  $h_{j'}$ . The latter converges weakly to  $h_{j'}\mu_{j'}Z_j(t')$  by Theorem 4, and the result follows. But (46) also holds in our setting when  $Q^n(0)$  is not zero but instead  $Q^n(0)/\sqrt{n} \Rightarrow \pi_0^*$ . Indeed, by Theorem 4  $(Q^n(t')/\sqrt{n} : 0 \leq t' \leq nt)$  converges weakly to a corresponding RBM with  $Z(0) \sim \pi_0^*$ . Then  $\sup_{0 \leq t' \leq nt} \|Q^n(t')\|/\sqrt{n}$  converges weakly to  $\sup_{0 \leq t' \leq t} \|Z(t')\|$ , with initial distribution  $\pi_0^*$ . This implies that for every  $\epsilon > 0$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\sup_{0 \leq t' \leq nt} \|Q^n(t')\|/n > \epsilon) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\sup_{0 \leq t' \leq nt} \|Q^n(t')\|/\sqrt{n} > \epsilon\sqrt{n}) = 0,$$

since  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_0^*}[\sup_{0 \leq t' \leq t} \|Z(t')\|] < \infty$ . Repeating the argument in [33], (46) then holds as well and the statement in the theorem follows. ■

## A.2 Proofs of auxiliary results

**Proof of Lemma 1.** We first show that (40) implies (39) and (41). Given  $\theta_1 > 0$  select  $C$  large enough so that  $\exp(\theta_1 x) > x^2 > x$  for all  $x > C$ . Replacing  $n^{-1/2} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |X^n(t) - x_z^n(t)|$  with  $\max(C, n^{-1/2} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} \|X^n(t) - x_z^n(t)\|)$  we obtain that (39) and (41) hold provided that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(z,a,v) \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} \exp(2\theta_1 \max(C, n^{-1/2} \|X^n(t) - x_z^n(t)\|)) \middle| \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right] < \infty$$

But this bound holds if and only if (40) holds. Thus it suffices to prove (40).

The proof of (40) relies on considering tail bounds on the uniform deviations of  $X^n$  from  $x_z^n$ . We expand  $x_z^n(t)$  as  $(x_{z,1}^n(t), \dots, x_{z,J}^n(t))$ . Note that because  $X^n(0) = x_z^n(0) = Q^n(0) = z$  we have for all  $j = 1, \dots, J$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} X_j^n(t) - x_{z,j}^n(t) &= (A_j^n(t) - \alpha_j^n t) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq J} p_{ij} (S_i(B_i^n(t)) - \mu_i B_i^n(t)) - (S_j(B_j^n(t)) - \mu_j B_j^n(t)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq J} \left( R_j^i(S_i(B_i^n(t))) - p_{ij} S_i(B_i^n(t)) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that the process  $S(t)$  is independent from  $n$ .

Fix  $j, 1 \leq j \leq J$ . We then have, for all integer  $n \geq 1$  and  $(z, a, v) \in \mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} \exp(\theta n^{-1/2} |X_j^n(t) - x_{z,j}^n(t)| \geq u \middle| \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |X_j^n(t) - x_{z,j}^n(t)| \geq \theta^{-1} n^{1/2} \log u \middle| \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j^n(t) - \alpha_j^n t| \geq (\theta^{-1} n^{1/2} \log u)/3 \middle| \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |S_j(B_j^n(t)) - \mu_j B_j^n(t)| \geq (\theta^{-1} n^{1/2} \log u)/(3(J+1)) \middle| \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |R_j^i(S_i(B_i^n(t))) - p_{ij} S_i(B_i^n(t))| \geq (\theta^{-1} n^{1/2} \log u)/(3J) \middle| \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

for all  $u \geq 1$ . Since  $B_j^n(t) - B_j^n(s) \leq (t-s)$  for all  $t \geq s$ , it suffices to bound the uniform deviation of  $S_j(t)$  from  $\mu_j t$ , and  $R_j^i(S_j(t))$  from  $p_{ij} S_i(t)$  in the latter two terms on the right-hand-side above, for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, J$ . We now proceed to bound these terms using the so-called coupling probability bounds that are the main building blocks in strong approximations (cf. [9, §2.6]). Let covariance matrices  $\Gamma^0, \dots, \Gamma^{J+1}$ , be such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{ij}^0 &= \alpha_j c_{a,j}^2 \quad \text{if } i = j \text{ and } 0 \text{ otherwise} \\ \Gamma_{ij}^{J+1} &= \mu_j c_{s,j}^2 \quad \text{if } i = j \text{ and } 0 \text{ otherwise} \\ \Gamma_{ij}^k &= p_{kj}(1 - p_{kj}) \quad \text{if } i = j \text{ and } p_{ki}(1 - p_{kj}) \text{ otherwise,} \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

We now use the following lemma which provides bounds on the probability of deviation between the stochastic primitives and certain Brownian motion processes that are constructed on the same underlying probability space.

**Lemma 2.** *There exist  $J + 2$  mutually independent standard  $J$ -dimensional Brownian motions  $W^k = (W^k(t) : t \geq 0)$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, J + 1$ , such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t - (\Gamma^0)^{1/2} W_j^0(t)| \geq C_{0,j}^1 \log n + u \mid \bar{Q}(0) = (z, 0, 0)\right) &\leq C_{0,j}^2 e^{-c_{0,j} u} \\ \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |S_j(t) - \mu_j t - (\Gamma^{J+1})^{1/2} W_j^{J+1}(t)| \geq C_{J+1,j}^1 \log n + u \mid \bar{Q}(0) = (z, 0, 0)\right) &\leq C_{J+1,j}^2 e^{-c_{J+1,j} u} \\ \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |R_j^k(S_k(t)) - p_{kj} S_k(t) - (\Gamma^k)^{1/2} W_j^k(t)| \geq C_{k,j}^1 \log n + u \mid \bar{Q}(0) = (z, 0, 0)\right) &\leq C_{k,j}^2 e^{-c_{k,j} u}, \end{aligned}$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, J$  and  $k = 1, \dots, J$ , where  $C_{k,j}^1$ ,  $C_{k,j}^2$  and  $c_{k,j}$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, J + 1$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, J$  are finite positive constants independent of  $u$  and  $n$ .

Note that the first identity is given for the limiting process  $A(t)$  and not the indexed process  $A^n(t)$ . But since  $A^n(t) = A(\alpha_j^{-1} \alpha_j^n t)$ ,  $\alpha_j^n t = (\alpha_j^{-1} \alpha_j^n t) \alpha_j t$  and  $\alpha_j^n < \alpha_j$  then  $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j^n(t) - \alpha_j^n t| \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t|$ . Therefore, it suffices to obtain an appropriate bound on  $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t|$ . Note also that in the first expression above conditioning on  $\bar{Q}(0) = (z, 0, 0)$  is equivalent to conditioning on  $a_0 = 0$  since the arrival process is independent of the service time process and the queue length vector at time  $t = 0$ . Similarly, for the second expression the conditioning is equivalent to conditioning on  $v_0 = 0$ ; for the third expression conditioning on  $\bar{Q}(0) = (z, 0, 0)$  is redundant.

Using Lemma 2 we can bound the three terms on the right-hand-side of (47). Since the proof is essentially identical (with obvious modifications) in all three cases, we will provide a complete argument only for the first term on the right-hand-side of (47), i.e.,  $\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t| \geq (\theta^{-1} n^{1/2} \log u)/3 \mid \bar{Q}(0) = (z, a, v)\right)$ , omitting the other cases. Let  $\tau = (\theta^{-1} n^{1/2} \log u)/3$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t| \geq \tau \mid \bar{Q}(0) = (z, a, v)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t| \geq \tau \mid \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t| \geq \tau \mid a_j(0) \leq \tau/(2\alpha_j), \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j\right) \mathbb{P}(a_j(0) \leq \tau/(2\alpha_j) \mid \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(a_j(0) > \tau/(2\alpha_j) \mid \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t| \geq \tau \mid a_j(0) \leq \tau/(2\alpha_j), \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(a_j(0) > \tau/(2\alpha_j) \mid \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j) \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

We now bound each of the two terms appearing in the sum above, starting with the second term. Using Markov's inequality we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(a_j(0) > \tau/(2\alpha_j) | \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(\theta a_j(0)) | \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j] \exp(-\theta \tau/(2\alpha_j)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\exp(\theta a_j(0)) | \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j] u^{-(6\alpha_j)^{-1}n^{1/2}},\end{aligned}$$

using the definition of  $\tau$ . Recall that the distribution of  $a_j(0)$  conditioned on  $\hat{a}_j(0) = a_j$  is the same as the distribution of  $a_j(1) - a_j$  conditioned on  $a_j(1) > a_j$ , and from (1) we have that for  $\theta < \theta^*$ ,  $\sup_{a_j \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E}[\exp(\theta a_j(0)) | \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j] < \infty$ . When  $n > 2^2(6\alpha_j)^2$  we have  $u^{-(6\alpha_j)^{-1}n^{1/2}} < u^{-2}$  (the choice of 2 as a lower end for the interval of integration below will become clear in what follows). This implies that when  $n > 2^2(6\alpha_j)^2$  and  $\theta < \theta^*$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(z, a, v)} \int_2^\infty \mathbb{P}(a_j(0) > \tau/(2\alpha_j) | \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j) du \\ \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{a_j \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E}[\exp(\theta a_j(0)) | \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j] \int_2^\infty u^{-(6\alpha_j)^{-1}n^{1/2}} du < \infty\end{aligned}\quad (50)$$

Now we estimate the first term in (49). For every  $\tau' \leq \tau/(2\alpha_j)$ , conditioning on  $a_j(0) = \tau'$  we have  $A_j(0, t) = 1 + A_j(\tau', t)$ . Observe that the distribution of  $A_j(\tau', t)$  is the same as  $A_j(0, t - \tau')$  conditioned on having the residual interarrival time  $a_j(0) = 0$ . This follows since, by assumption, there was an arrival at time 0 (time  $\tau'$  before the shift). Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t| \geq \tau | a_j(0) = \tau', \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\tau' \leq t \leq n} |1 + A_j(t - \tau') - \alpha_j t| \geq \tau | \hat{a}_j(0) = 0\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\tau' \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t - \tau') - \alpha_j(t - \tau')| + 1 + \alpha_j \tau' \geq \tau | \hat{a}_j(0) = 0\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t| + 1 + \alpha_j \tau' \geq \tau | \hat{a}_j(0) = 0\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t| \geq (\tau/2) - 1 | \hat{a}_j(0) = 0\right),\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used the fact that  $\alpha_j \tau' \leq \tau/2$ . Since the bound above is uniform over  $\tau'$  in the range  $[0, \tau/(2\alpha_j)]$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t| \geq \tau | a_j(0) \leq \tau/2, \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j\right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t| \geq (\tau/2) - 1 | \hat{a}_j(0) = 0\right).\end{aligned}$$



Now, recall that  $\tau = (\theta^{-1}n^{1/2} \log u)/3$ , thus plugging into the above bound we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t| \geq (\theta^{-1}n^{1/2} \log u)/6 - 1 \mid \hat{a}_j(0) = 0\right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t - (\Gamma^0)^{1/2} W_j^0(t)| \geq (\theta^{-1}n^{1/2} \log u)/12 - 1\right) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{P}\left(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |(\Gamma^0)^{1/2} W_j^0(t)| \geq (\theta^{-1} \log u)/12\right) \\
& \leq n^{C_j} \exp(-(c_j/\theta)\sqrt{n} \log u + 1) + C'_j \exp(-c'_j \theta^{-2} (\log u)^2), \\
& = en^{C_j} u^{-(c_j/\theta)\sqrt{n}} + C'_j \exp(-c'_j \theta^{-2} (\log u)^2),
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

for some finite positive constants  $C_j, C'_j$  and  $c_j, c'_j$ , where the last step follows from the first displayed equation in Lemma 2 and standard tail bounds on the maximum of a Brownian motion (see, e.g., [9, Lemma 1.6.1]). For the second term in the RHS of (51) we have

$$\int_2^\infty C'_j e^{-c'_j \theta^{-2} (\log u)^2} du < \infty.$$

Let  $n_0$  be the smallest integer such that  $(c_j/\theta)\sqrt{n_0} > 1$ . Then, for the first term on the RHS of (51) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_2^\infty n^{C_j} u^{-(c_j/\theta)\sqrt{n}} du \\
& \leq \sup_{n \geq n_0} \int_2^\infty n^{C_j} u^{-(c_j/\theta)\sqrt{n}} du \\
& = \sup_{n \geq n_0} \frac{n^{C_j}}{((c_j/\theta)\sqrt{n} - 1)2^{(c_j/\theta)\sqrt{n}-1}} < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

By the finiteness of the two bounds above we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_2^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t| \geq (\theta^{-1}n^{1/2} \log u)/6 - 1 \mid a_j(0) \leq \tau/(2\alpha_j), \hat{a}_j(0) = a_j\right) du < \infty \tag{52}$$

Putting this together with (49) and (50) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(z,a,v) \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} \exp(\theta n^{-1/2} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t|) \mid \bar{Q}(0) = (z, a, v)\right] \\
& \leq 2 + \limsup_n \sup_{(z,a,v) \in \mathcal{X}} \int_2^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |A_j(t) - \alpha_j t| \geq (\theta^{-1}n^{1/2} \log u)/3 \mid \bar{Q}(0) = (z, a, v)\right) du \\
& < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Repeating these arguments for the service completion and routing processes, we obtain similar bounds for the remaining two terms on the RHS of (47). Thus, for any  $0 \leq \theta \leq \theta^*$  we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(z,a,v) \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} \exp(\theta n^{-1/2} |X_j^n(t) - x_j^n(t)|) \mid \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v)\right] < \infty.$$

Setting  $\theta_1 < \theta^*/J$  we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(z,a,v) \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} \exp(\theta n^{-1/2} \|X^n(t) - x^n(t)\|) | \bar{Q}^n(0) = (z, a, v) \right] < \infty ,$$

which concludes the proof of (40).  $\blacksquare$

**Proof of Lemma 2.** First note that the  $J$  coordinates of the renewal processes  $A(t)$  and  $S(t)$  are independent. Thus, the results of Kómlós, Major, and Tusnády [25, 26] provide the asserted coupling inequalities for the the random walks generating the renewal processes. From this one gets the corresponding coupling inequalities for the renewal processes themselves as in Csörgo, Horváth and Steinbach [8]. What remains is to prove the third coupling inequality corresponding to the routing process. Since the routing variables for any given station are dependent, we appeal to the results of Einmahl [18], and their refinements and generalizations in the more recent work of Zaitsev [40, 41], to construct a strong approximation which satisfies the sharp bounds given in the Lemma. In particular, Theorem 2 in [40] asserts that if  $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots$  is a sequence of iid  $\mathbb{R}^J$ -valued r.v.'s such that  $\mathbb{P}(\|\xi_1\| < b) = 1$  for some  $b > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}\xi_1 = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}\xi\xi' = \Gamma$ , then there exists a Brownian motion  $(W(t) : t \geq 0)$  with  $\mathbb{E}W(t) = 0$  and covariance matrix  $\Gamma$  such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left\| \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \xi_i - W(k) \right\| \geq C_1 \log n + x \right) \leq C_2 \exp(-c_1 x), \quad (53)$$

for some finite positive constants  $C_1, C_2, c_1$ . (Note that this provides a sharper bound than that obtained in [18] where the above is only established for r.v.'s whose distributions satisfy certain smoothness assumptions.) We can then use the derivations in Csörgo, Horváth and Steinbach [8] to get a similar bound for the renewal processes generated by the RW  $(\xi_n : n \geq 1)$ . Note that  $R_j^i(S_j(t))$  is a random walk stopped at the random time given by the value of the renewal process,  $S_j(\cdot)$ , at time  $t$ . Thus, we can use the results in [7] that establish coupling inequalities for stopped random walks, to combine (53) its renewal counterpart for  $S_j(\cdot)$ , and derive the asserted bound on the stopped random walk  $R_j^i(S_j(t))$ .  $\blacksquare$

## References

- [1] F. Baccelli and S. Foss, *Moments and tails in monotone-separable stochastic networks*, Annals of Applied Probability **114** (2004), no. 2, 612–650.
- [2] D. Bertsimas, D. Gamarnik, and J. Tsitsiklis, *Performance of multiclass Markovian queueing networks via piecewise linear Lyapunov functions*, Annals of Applied Probability **11** (2001), no. 4, 1384–1428.

- [3] D. Bertsimas and J. Nino-Mora, *Optimization of multiclass queueing networks with changeover times via the achievable region method: Part I, the single-station case*, Mathematics of Operations Research **24** (1999), 306–330.
- [4] ———, *Optimization of multiclass queueing networks with changeover times via the achievable region method: Part II, the multi-station case*, Mathematics of Operations Research **24** (1999), 331–361.
- [5] D. Bertsimas, I. Paschalidis, and J. Tsitsiklis, *Optimization of multiclass queueing networks: Polyhedral and nonlinear characterization of achievable performance*, Annals of Applied Probability **4** (1994), 43–75.
- [6] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. Wiley-Interscience publication, 1999.
- [7] M. Csörgo, P. Deheuvels and L. Horváth, *An approximation of stopped sums with applications in queueing theory*, Advances in Applied Probability **10** 1987, 674–690.
- [8] M. Csörgo, L. Horváth, and J. Steinbach, *Invariance principles for renewal processes*, Annals of Probability **15** 1987, 1441–1461.
- [9] M. Csörgo and P. Révész, *Strong approximations in probability and statistics*, Academic Press, New York, 1981.
- [10] H. Chen and A. Mandelbaum, *Discrete flow networks: bottleneck analysis and fluid approximations*, Mathematics of Operations Research **16** (1991), 408–446.
- [11] ———, *Stochastic discrete flow networks: diffusion approximations and bottlenecks*, Annals of Probability **19** (1991), 1463–1519.
- [12] H. Chen and D.D. Yao, *Fundamentals of queueing networks: Performance, asymptotics and optimization*, Springer Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [13] J. G. Dai, *On the positive Harris recurrence for multiclass queueing networks: A unified approach via fluid models*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **5** (1995), 49–77.
- [14] J. G. Dai and J. M. Harrison, *Reflected brownian motion in an orthant: numerical methods for steady-state analysis*, Ann. Appl. Probab **2** (1992), 65–86.
- [15] J.G. Dai and S.P. Meyn, *Stability and convergence of moments for multiclass queueing networks via fluid limit models*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control **40** (1995), 1889–1904.
- [16] D. D. Down and S. P. Meyn, *Piecewise linear test functions for stability and instability of queueing networks*, Queueing Systems **27** (1997), 205–226.

- [17] P. Dupuis and R.J. Williams, *Lyapunov functions for semimartingale reflecting Brownian motions*, Annals of Probability **22** (1994), 680–702.
- [18] U. Einmahl, *Extension of results of Komlós, Major and Tusnády to the multivariate case*, J. of Multivariate Anal. **28** (1989), 20–68.
- [19] J. M. Harrison and M. I. Reiman, *Reflected Brownian motion on an orthant*, Annals of Probability **9** (1981), 302–308.
- [20] J. M. Harrison and R. J. Williams, *Brownian models of open queueing networks with homogeneous customer populations*, Stochastics **22** (1987), 77–115.
- [21] J. M. Harrison and R. J. Williams, *Multidimensional reflected Brownian motions having exponential stationary distribution*, Annals of Probability **15** (1987), 115–137.
- [22] L. Horváth, *Strong approximations of open queueing networks*, Math. Oper. Res. **17** (1992), 487–508.
- [23] D. P. Johnson, *Diffusion approximations for optimal filtering of jump processes and for queueing networks*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1983.
- [24] H. Kaspi and A. Mandelbaum, *Regenerative closed queueing networks*, Stochastics and stochastic reports **39** (1992), 239–258.
- [25] J. Kómlós, P. Major, and G. Tusnády, *An approximation of partial sums of independent random variables and the sample d.f. i*, Z. Wahr. und Verw. Gebiete **32** (1975), 111–131.
- [26] J. Kómlós, P. Major, and G. Tusnády, *An approximation of partial sums of independent random variables and the sample d.f. ii*, Z. Wahr. und Verw. Gebiete **34** (1976), 33–58.
- [27] H. Jin, J. Ou, and P. R. Kumar, *The throughput of irreducible closed Markovian queueing networks: functional bounds, asymptotic loss, efficiency, and the Harrison-Wein conjectures.*, Mathematics of Operations Research **22** (1997), 886–920.
- [28] J. F. C. Kingman, *The single server queue in heavy traffic*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **57** (1961), 902–904.
- [29] J. F. C. Kingman, *On queues in heavy traffic*, J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B **24** (1962), 383–392.
- [30] S. Kumar and P. R. Kumar, *Performance bounds for queueing networks and scheduling policies*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control **8** (1994), 1600–1611.

- [31] P. R. Kumar and S. P. Meyn, *Stability of queueing networks and scheduling policies*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control **40** (1995), 251–261.
- [32] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie, *Markov chains and stochastic stability*, Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [33] M. I. Reiman, *Open queueing networks in heavy traffic*, Mathematics of Operations Research **9** (1984), 441–458.
- [34] W. Szczotka, *Exponential approximation of waiting time and queue size for queues in heavy traffic*, Advances in Applied Probability **22** (1990), 230–240.
- [35] K. Sigman, *The stability of open queueing networks*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications **35** (1990), 11–25.
- [36] X. Shen, H. Chen, J.G. Dai and W. Dai, *The finite element method for computing the stationary distribution of an SRBM in a hypercube with applications to finite buffer queueing networks*, Queueing Systems, **42** (2002), 33–62.
- [37] A. Stolyar, *On the stability of multiclass queueing networks: A relaxed sufficient condition via limiting fluid processe*, Markov Processes and Related Fields (1995), 491–512.
- [38] R. J. Williams, *Semimartingale reflecting brownian motions in the orthant*, Stochastic Networks, IMA Volumes in Mathematics and Its Applications, Volume 71, eds. F. P. Kelly and R. J. Williams. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995, pp. 125–137.
- [39] W. Whitt, *Stochastic Process Limits*, Springer Verlag, NY, 2002.
- [40] A.Y. Zaitsev, *Multidimensional version of a result of sakhanenko in the invariance principle for vectors with finite exponential moments. i*, Theory Probab. Appl. **45** (2000), 624–641.
- [41] A.Y. Zaitsev, *Multidimensional version of a result of sakhanenko in the invariance principle for vectors with finite exponential moments. ii*, Theory Probab. Appl. **46** (2001), 490–514.