

A LARGE CLOSED QUEUEING NETWORK IN MARKOV ENVIRONMENT AND ITS APPLICATION

VYACHESLAV M. ABRAMOV

ABSTRACT. A paper studies a closed queueing network containing a server station and k client stations. The server station is an infinite server queueing system, and client stations are single server queueing systems with autonomous service, i.e. every client station serves customers (units) only at random instants generated by strictly stationary and ergodic sequence of random variables. The total number of units in the network is N . The expected times between departures in client stations are $(N\mu_j)^{-1}$. After service completion in the server station a unit is transmitted to the j th client station with probability p_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, k$), and being processed in the j th client station the unit returns to server station. The network is assumed to be in Markov environment. The Markov environment is defined by initial state, and phase space of dimension d . Then the routing matrix p_j as well as transmission rates (which are expressed via parameters of the network) depend on the Markov state of the environment. The paper studies the queue-length processes in client stations of this network, and is aimed to analysis of performance measures associated with this network. The questions risen in this paper have immediate relation to quality control of complex telecommunication networks.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider a closed queueing network containing a server station and k client stations. The server station is an infinite server queueing system with identical servers. Client stations are single server queueing systems with autonomous service mechanism, where customers (units) are served only at random instants generated by strictly stationary and ergodic sequence of random variables.

Queueing systems with autonomous service mechanism, were introduced and originally studied by Borovkov [7], [8]. The definition of these systems is clearly understandable and was recalled in many papers related to this subject (e.g. [3], [5]). Therefore we do not recall it here again. We only note, that analysis of queueing systems or networks with autonomous service mechanism is much easier than that analysis of “usual” systems with generally distributed service times. By *usual* queueing systems we mean such systems with the following feature: *a unit arriving to an empty system is served immediately; otherwise if upon arrival a system is busy, then it waits in queue for a service.* The typical assumption in a majority of papers on usual queueing systems is that interarrival and service times are independent and identically distributed random variables, and the typical method of their analysis is based on analytic techniques of mathematical analysis and probability theory. In contrast, queueing systems and networks with autonomous service mechanism,

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60K25, 60K30, 60H30, 60H35.

Key words and phrases. Closed queueing network; Markov Modulated Poisson Process; Martingales and Semimartingales; Skorokhod reflection principle.

because of their simple construction, are studied under more general settings of dependent inter-arrival and inter-departure times, and their analysis is based on the methods of stochastic calculus and the theory of martingales. The corresponding results for Markovian queueing systems and networks follow as a particular case. For different applications of queueing systems (networks) with autonomous service mechanism see e.g. [1], [3], [4] and [5].

The model of the network which is considered in this paper is very close to the model considered in [11] and [1] (see also [3] for a more general construction of network with two types of node and multiple customer classes). Therefore, the description of the present model is very close to description of the model of [1]. So, we repeat some previous description and assumptions.

The departure instants in the j th client station ($j = 1, 2, \dots, k$) are denoted $\xi_{j,N,1}, \xi_{j,N,1} + \xi_{j,N,2}, \xi_{j,N,1} + \xi_{j,N,2} + \xi_{j,N,3}, \dots$, and

- each sequence $\{\xi_{j,N,1}, \xi_{j,N,2}, \dots\}$ forms a strictly stationary and ergodic sequence of random variables.

The total number of units in the network is N . It was assumed in [1] that the service time of each unit in the server is exponentially distributed random variable with a *given* parameter λ .

In the present paper the assumption is different. Under the assumption that environment is Markovian the parameter λ is not longer a *constant value*. It is a random variable (depending on an environment state). The same note has relation to the routing probability matrix. It was assumed in [1] that after a service completion at the server station, a unit was transmitted to the client station j with probability p_j , $p_j \geq 0$, and $\sum_{j=1}^k p_j = 1$. These assumptions are not longer valid in the case of the system considered in this paper. The routing probabilities will be assumed to be random (depending on an environment state) as well.

Let us describe a Markov environment. We assume that the network is complete in the following sense. There are exactly k links between the server and k client stations. There is also a Markov chain with finite or countable infinite states space. Denoting these states $\mathcal{E}_i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, assume that

- for any $j=1, 2, \dots, k$ there exist $i_j \geq 1$, such that $p_j(\mathcal{E}_{i_j}) > 0$.

This assumption is not technical and not explicitly used in our proofs. Nevertheless, it must be mentioned, because otherwise a station j becomes isolated and not representative.

In the above assumption by $p_j(\mathcal{E}_i)$ we mean the value of probability p_j when the network is in state $\mathcal{E}_i$. It is assumed additionally that for any $i = 1, 2, \dots$, the sum of probabilities $\sum_{j=1}^k p_j(\mathcal{E}_i) = 1$. The notation with similar meaning is used for parameter λ . Namely, $\lambda(\mathcal{E}_i)$ is assumed to be strictly positive for any state $\mathcal{E}_i$, however $\lambda_j(\mathcal{E}_i) = \lambda(\mathcal{E}_i)p_j(\mathcal{E}_i)$ can be equal to 0 (because $p_j(\mathcal{E}_i)$ need not be strictly positive in general).

The results of [1] are associated with the asymptotic analysis of a network with a bottleneck station as N increases indefinitely. One of the main results of [1] was then developed in [3] for networks containing two types of node and multiple customer classes in the case, where one of client stations was bottleneck. So, the results obtained in [1], [2], [3] as well as the results of preceding them paper [11] all can be considered as theoretical contribution to the theory of client/server computer networks with bottleneck.

The aim of the present paper is another. We follow towards performance analysis, and are aimed to use the known theoretical results of [11] and [1]. However, the known theoretical results obtained in these papers are scanty for their immediate application for real telecommunication systems the parameters of which can change in time. Therefore, for the purpose of performance analysis we need in substantial development of the earlier results related to this model.

1. First, we must study a standard client/server network (without random environment) under *arbitrary* initial queue lengths in client stations and *arbitrary* number of bottleneck client stations amongst the given k stations. The asymptotic behavior of queue-lengths in client stations as $N \rightarrow \infty$ in this general case is much more difficult than that was considered earlier in [11], [1], [2] and [3] under the assumption that at the initial time moment all units are in the server station. Moreover, the last mentioned case is the simplest particular case (in the sense of the behavior of queues) of that arbitrary initial queue lengths in client stations. The relevant case studies are necessary because the behavior of queues in random (Markov) environment is very complicated, and therefore the study of this behavior must be a consequence of the investigation of all typical situations arising in standard client/server networks (without random environment) when units are initially distributed between the server station and in client stations in proportions. As state of Markov environment is changed, then a non-bottleneck client station can become bottleneck and vice versa, so the number of bottleneck and non-bottleneck stations can vary any time. Therefore, our initial study of standard client/server networks without random environment must include the cases of arbitrary number of bottleneck client stations amongst those k stations as well.

2. The second step is a study a client/server network in Markov environment. A Markov environment will be described in Mathematical terms later. However, roughly speaking, the network in Markov environment can be explained as follows. There are states of Markov chain (the number of which is finite or countable infinite), and $0 < \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < \dots$ are time instants when the states are changed according to the transition probability matrix. A random time between σ_i and σ_{i+1} is assumed to be exponentially distributed, and during that random time between σ_i and σ_{i+1} the network's behavior is the following. At time σ_i the network is characterized by (initial) queue-lengths $Q_j(\sigma_i)$ in client stations $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ as well as by such parameters as rates $\lambda(\mathcal{E}(\sigma_i))$ and transition probabilities $p_j(\mathcal{E}(\sigma_i))$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, k$), where the state $\mathcal{E}(\sigma_i)$ corresponds to the state of a Markov chain in time σ_i . Then rates and transition probabilities are changed in time σ_{i+1} , while the (initial) queue-lengths $Q_j(\sigma_{i+1})$ in time σ_{i+1} corresponding to the client stations $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ are stochastically determined by those queue-lengths $Q_j(\sigma_i)$ and by the above parameters $\lambda(\mathcal{E}(\sigma_i))$ and $p_j(\mathcal{E}(\sigma_i))$. Thus, the asymptotic behavior of the queue-length processes in client stations as $N \rightarrow \infty$ is stochastically determined from the change of a Markov environment.

Therefore, summarizing the above two paragraphs, one concludes that in order to study asymptotic behavior of the queues in client stations of the network in random environment, first we must study all possible cases of a network without random environment but with arbitrary initial queue-lengths in client stations and under the general assumption that a part of client stations is bottleneck, and the rest is non-bottleneck. (The concept of bottleneck is formalized later in this section.) Only then one can investigate the network in Markov environment, the

asymptotic behavior of queue-lengths in client stations of which can be stochastically characterized from that behavior of the “deterministic” analogues (without a Markov environment). By “deterministic” analogue of a standard client/server network we mean the *fluid* limit model of this network as N increases indefinitely. In other words, for large N , the normalized queue-lengths in client stations $\frac{Q_{i,N}(t)}{N}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$, are fluid approximations for the real dynamics of queue-length processes in the case when queue-lengths are large.

Analysis of queueing networks in Markov environment considered in this paper is important from both theoretical and practical points of view. If the network operates for a given fixed time interval $(0, T)$, then its performance characteristic (for example, payment for the increasing a given level of queue in a given client station) depends on the initial condition of a Markov environment. For one initial condition, the measure of time that the queue-length in a client station of the network is greater than a given fixed level is x , and we must pay, say Cx . For other initial condition, this measure of time is y and the corresponding payment is Cy . On the other hand, the cost for initialization the first initial condition related to the above client station of the network is X , and that cost for initialization the second initial condition is Y . So, the total expenses in the first case are $X + Cx$, and in the second case $Y + Cy$. If $X + Cx < Y + Cy$, then the first *strategy* is more profitable than the second one. In practical context, the first strategy can mean *the first type repair* of a failing client station of the system, and the second strategy *the second type repair* of that failing station correspondingly. For example, the first type repair can contain an additional prophylactical service and therefore be more expensive that the second type repair (i.e. $X > Y$).

Concluding the above, one can also say about an *optimal policy*, where the problem is to find an initial state of a Markov chain such that the total expenses during $(0, T)$ will be equal to $X^{opt} + Cx^{opt}$ and not greater than total expenses under any other policy. Clearly, that an optimal policy is not necessarily unique. There can be a subset of initial conditions under which we have the same optimal value of total expenses.

The Mathematical formalization for the concept of a (homogeneous) Markov environment, which is used in this paper, is as follows. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \dots\}$ be a phase space. Let $Z(t)$ be a homogeneous Markov process with transition probabilities $z_{l,m}\Delta t + o(\Delta t)$ from the state $\mathcal{E}_l$ to the state $\mathcal{E}_m$ ($l \neq m$) during a small time interval $(t, t + \Delta t)$, and there is probability $1 - \sum_{m \neq l} z_{l,m}\Delta t + o(\Delta t)$ to stay in the same state $\mathcal{E}_l$ during the same time interval $(t, t + \Delta t)$. The initial state of this Markov process will be denoted $\mathcal{E}(0)$. In the context of this paper the above Markov process will be called Markov environment. (In many papers on queueing theory, telecommunication systems, inference of stochastic processes, statistics and other areas such type of process is often called a Markov Modulated Poisson Process.)

The above Markov process $Z(t)$ is assumed to be given on the special probability space $\{\Omega_Z, \mathcal{F}_Z, \mathbb{P}_Z\}$, which in turn is contained in the common filtered probability space $\{\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{P}\}$.

$\mathcal{E}(t)$ will denote a state of a Markov environment in time t . For example, the equality $\mathcal{E}(4) = \mathcal{E}_5$ means that in time $t = 4$ the associated Markov chain is in state $\mathcal{E}_5$. We also use the following notation: $\lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(t)) = \lambda(\mathcal{E}(t))p_j(\mathcal{E}(t))$. In the sequel we will also write $\lambda(t)$ and $p_j(t)$ and correspondingly, $\lambda_j(t)$. However there

is a difference in the definition of $\lambda(t)$ and $\lambda(\mathcal{E}(t))$ as well as $\lambda_j(t)$ and $\lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(t))$, so $\lambda(\mathcal{E}(t)) \neq \lambda(t)$ and $\lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(t)) \neq \lambda_j(t)$ in general. This difference will be explained later in this section. $\lambda_j(t)$ is a random parameter, i.e. $\lambda_j(t) = \lambda_j(t, \omega_Z)$, where $\omega_Z \in \Omega_Z$. In the sequel this dependence upon ω_Z will be always implied, but shown explicitly only in the cases where it is necessary.

If at the initial time moment $t = 0$ all units are in the server station, then the input rate to the j th client station is $\lambda_j(0)N$. ($\lambda_j(0)$ is the individual rate of each unit arriving to the client station j , and therefore the rate between arrivals is $\lambda_j(0)N$.) The time parameter 0 in parentheses is associated with the state of Markov environment in time 0. Specifically, if at the initial time moment $t = 0$ all units are in the server station, then $\lambda_j(0) = \lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(0))$. If the network is considered without Markov environment, then that initial arrival rate is $\lambda_j N$ which is associated with the individual rate λ_j of each unit of the server.

The departure (service) rate of the j th client station is assumed to be independent of Markov environment as well as independent of input rates $\lambda_j(t)$. Specifically,

- it is assumed that the expectation of service (inter-departure) time in the j th client station is $\mathbb{E}\xi_{j,N,1} = \frac{1}{\mu_j N}$.

Therefore, if at the initial time moment $t = 0$ all units are in the server, then the load parameter of the j th client station is $\rho_j(0) = \frac{\lambda_j(0)}{\mu_j}$, and in the case where there is no Markov environment, $\rho_j(0) = \rho_j = \frac{\lambda_j}{\mu_j}$.

If at the initial time moment there are αN units in the server, $\alpha < 1$, then for arrival process to any client station j of a standard network (without random environment) we also use the notation $\lambda_j(0)$. However, the meaning of $\lambda_j(0)$ is not longer the individual rate of each unit at time $t = 0$ arriving to the station j . More specifically, $\lambda_j(0) = \lambda_j \alpha$, where λ_j is the individual rate of each unit at time $t = 0$ arriving to the station j . The meaning of $\lambda_j(t)$ is similar. The only difference that it is said about arbitrary time t . For example, if there are $\alpha(t)N$ units in the server in time t , $\alpha(t) < 1$, then $\lambda_j(t) = \lambda_j \alpha(t)$.

In the case of network with Markov environment, the meaning of the notation $\lambda_j(t)$ is the same as well. If there are $N\alpha(t)$ units in the server in time t , $\alpha(t) < 1$, and the rate of arrival of a unit from the server to the client station j is $\lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(t))$, then $\lambda_j(t) = \lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(t))\alpha(t)$. Then the load of the j th client station in time t is $\rho_j(t) = \frac{\lambda_j(t)}{\mu_j}$.

Now introduce necessary definitions. The first two definitions are related to both standard client/server networks and client/server networks in Markov environment.

Definition 1.1. The client station j is called *locally non-bottleneck* in time t if $\rho_j(t) < 1$. Otherwise, the j th client station is called *locally bottleneck* in time t . A client station locally (non-) bottleneck in time 0 will be also called *initially (non-) bottleneck*.

Definition 1.2. The client station j is called *non-bottleneck* in time interval $[t_1, t_2]$ if it is locally non-bottleneck in all points of this interval. Otherwise, if there is a point $t^* \in [t_1, t_2]$ such that $\rho_j(t^*) \geq 1$, then the client station is called *bottleneck* in time interval $[t_1, t_2]$. A client station is called *(non-) bottleneck* if it is (non-) bottleneck for all t .

The special definition for standard client/server networks (without Markov environment) is as follows.

Definition 1.3. A client station is called *absolutely non-bottleneck* if it is a non-bottleneck station in the case where all units are in the server. Otherwise, a client station is called *absolutely bottleneck*.

Clearly, that absolutely non-bottleneck client station j is a non-bottleneck client station, because then for all t we have $\lambda_j(t) < \mu_j$. In the next section we prove that absolutely bottleneck client station is a bottleneck client station as well. That is, if a client station is currently locally bottleneck station, then it never can become a locally non-bottleneck. This means that the client station is bottleneck.

Definition 1.3 can be extended to network stations in Markov environment for an arbitrary time t . Specifically, we have the following definition.

Definition 1.4. The client station j of a network in random environment is called absolutely non-bottleneck in time t if it belongs to state $\mathcal{E}_i$ at time t , i.e. $\mathcal{E}(t) = \mathcal{E}_i$, and $\lambda_j(\mathcal{E}_i) < \mu_j$. Otherwise, this client station is called absolutely bottleneck in time t .

The last notion enables us to judge on the behavior of client stations in random intervals $[\sigma_i, \sigma_{i+1})$, where the network is in given state $\mathcal{E}_i$. Recall that σ_i is a time instant when the state of Markov environment is changed. So, during the random interval $[\sigma_i, \sigma_{i+1})$ the network is in fixed state of the Markov environment.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we study all possible situations associated with behavior of queue-length processes in client stations under arbitrary initial queue-lengths in client stations and arbitrary number of (absolutely) bottleneck client stations amongst given k ones in standard client/server networks. In Section 3 we extend the results of [1] to the case of client/server networks in Markov environment. Specifically, the main result is representation (3.14). We also extend Theorem 2.4 established in Section 2 for standard client/server networks. In Section 4 we discuss possible ways of application of the main results and describe a class of conditions, under which we can solve many realistic problems numerically. We also provide a numerical study for a concrete network in a given Markov environment. Concluding remarks are in Section 5.

2. BOTTLENECK ANALYSIS OF A STANDARD CLIENT/SERVER NETWORK

In this section we discuss a behavior of the queue-length processes in a large closed client/server network in traditional formulation (without Markov environment). An example of a client/server network with 4 client stations is presented in Figure 1.

The bottleneck analysis of the Markovian client/server model has been originally studied in [11]. These results were then extended for the case of autonomous service mechanism in client stations in [1]. However, the results obtained in both these papers are related to a single special case. The results obtained in these papers are not enough for the purpose of our performance analysis, and we will study all possible cases including the behavior of the system under different initial lengths of queues in client stations and several absolutely bottleneck and absolutely non-bottleneck client stations.

In [11] and [1] there only has been considered the case where in the initial time moment $t = 0$ all units are in the server station (i.e. all client stations are empty) and only one (the k th) client station is a bottleneck station. (In this particular




FIGURE 1. An example of client/server network topology

case the notions of (non-)bottleneck and absolutely (non-)bottleneck client station coincide.) Specifically, there has been proved the following result in [1].

Proposition 2.1. *Let $S_{j,N}^*(t) = \inf\{s > 0 : S_{j,N}(s) = S_{j,N}(t)\}$, and $Q_{j,N}(t)$ denotes the queue-length in the j th client station in time t . Under the assumption that the k th client section is bottleneck, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ and for any $t > 0$ we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{Q_{j,N}[S_{j,N}^*(t)] = 0\} &= 1 - \rho_j(t), \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \rho_j(s) \mathbb{P}\{Q_{j,N}(s) = l\} ds &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \mathbb{P}\{Q_{j,N}[S_{j,N}^*(s)] = l + 1\} ds, \\ l &= 0, 1, \dots, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(2.1) \quad \rho_j(t) = \rho_j(0)[1 - q(t)],$$

$$(2.2) \quad q(t) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\rho_k(0)}\right) (1 - e^{-\rho_k(0)\mu_k t}).$$

The meaning of $1 - q(t)$ in (2.1) is the limiting fraction of units remaining at server station in time t as $N \rightarrow \infty$. For example, in the case where $\rho_k(0) = 1$ this fraction remains the same in any time t as initially, that is, as N large, the number of units in server station remains asymptotically equivalent to N . However, if $\rho_k(0) > 1$, then the number of units in server station in time t is asymptotically equivalent to $N[1 - q(t)]$. Then, the number of units remaining at bottleneck station in time t is asymptotically equivalent to $Nq(t)$.

Now we consider different cases of a client/server network with bottlenecks. These cases will be considered in order of increasing complexity. The most of mathematical proofs will be possibly shorten but accompanied by corresponding systems of differential equations and their solutions. The detailed proof are similar to the proof of Proposition 2.1 given in [1] (see also [11]). See also next Section 3, where there is the proof of the more general representation related to queue-lengths processes of the network in Markov environment.

Assuming that the initial condition of the network is the same as in Proposition 2.1 (i.e. at the initial time $t = 0$ all units are at the server station), let us consider the case that the client stations $1, 2, \dots, k_0$ are non-bottleneck, while the rest client stations $k_0 + 1, \dots, k$ are bottleneck. We have the following statement.

Proposition 2.2. *Under the assumption that the client sections $k_0 + 1, \dots, k$ are bottleneck, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, k_0$ and for any $t > 0$ we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{Q_{j,N}[S_{j,N}^*(t)] = 0\} &= 1 - \rho_j(t), \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \rho_j(s) \mathbb{P}\{Q_{j,N}(s) = l\} ds &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \mathbb{P}\{Q_{j,N}[S_{j,N}^*(s)] = l + 1\} ds, \\ l &= 0, 1, \dots, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(2.3) \quad \rho_j(t) = \rho_j(0)[1 - q(t)],$$

$$(2.4) \quad q(t) = \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{v=k_0+1}^k \mu_v}{\sum_{v=k_0+1}^k \lambda_v}\right) \left(1 - \exp\left[-t \sum_{v=k_0+1}^k \lambda_v\right]\right).$$

It is readily seen that the main difference between Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.2 is only in expression for $q(t)$. The difference between expressions (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3), (2.4) can be easily explained. Considering all bottleneck client stations as a separate subsystem, one can notice that the arrival rate to this subsystem is $\sum_{v=k_0+1}^k \lambda_v$, and the service rate (the sum of reciprocals of the expected inter-departure times) is $\sum_{v=k_0+1}^k \mu_v$. This subsystem can be thought as a bottleneck station with the load

$$\frac{\sum_{v=k_0+1}^k \lambda_v}{\sum_{v=k_0+1}^k \mu_v}.$$

Therefore Proposition 2.2 is an elementary extension of Proposition 2.1. Notice, that the the number of units remaining at the bottleneck station v , $v = k_0+1, \dots, k$ in time t is asymptotically equal to

$$(2.5) \quad Nq_v(t) = N \left([\lambda_v - \mu_v]t - \lambda_v \int_0^t q(s) ds \right).$$

Let us in short recall the main elements of the known proof for the representation $q(t)$ given by (2.2), and consequently explain the proof of (2.5). We use the notation similar to that of the earlier papers [1] and [11]. The difference between arrival and departure processes in the j th client station is denoted $X_{j,N}(t) = A_{j,N}(t) - S_{j,N}(t)$ and its normalization $x_{j,N}(t) = \frac{X_{j,N}(t)}{N}$. Let $x_j(t)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ denote the limit in probability of $x_{j,N}(t)$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$. The queue-length in the j th client station in time t is denoted $Q_{j,N}(t)$, its normalization is denoted $q_{j,N}(t) = \frac{Q_{j,N}(t)}{N}$, and the limit of $q_{j,N}(t)$ in probability, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, is denoted $q_j(t)$.

Next, $\Phi_t(x_j) = x_j(t) - \inf_{s \leq t} x_j(s)$. For any càdlàg function X , the functional $\Phi_t(X)$ was introduced in [11] as a solution of the Skorokhod problem on normal reflection at zero, and $\Phi_t(x_j)$ is described a dynamic of normalized queue-length of the queue-length process in the j th client station under the “usual” initial conditions given in Propositions 2.1 and 2.2. Under these “usual” conditions, the functions $x_j(t)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ satisfy the system of equations:

$$(2.6) \quad x_j(t) = \int_0^t \left\{ \lambda_j \left[1 - \sum_{l=1}^k \Phi_s(x_l) \right] - \mu_j \right\} ds, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, k.$$

Note, that the normalized functions $x_j(t)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ are usual (non-random) continuous functions, and (2.6) is a usual system of linear differential equations.

The statement of Proposition 2.1 is based on the solution of the system of these equation. (It is proved in [11] that there is a unique solution of (2.6).) More specifically, in the case where the node k is bottleneck, $\inf_{s \leq t} x_k(s) = x_k(0) = 0$, and we therefore have $\Phi_s(x_k) = x_k(s)$. The solution of (2.6) is $x_j(t) = 0$ for the non-bottleneck stations $j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, and $x_k(t) = q(t)$ for the bottleneck station, where $q(t)$ is given by (2.2). In the case of several bottleneck nodes we write the similar equation for the dynamic of cumulated queue in all bottleneck stations. Specifically,

$$\sum_{v=k_0+1}^k x_v(t) = \int_0^t \left\{ \sum_{v=k_0+1}^k \lambda_v \left[1 - \sum_{l=k_0+1}^k x_l(s) \right] - \sum_{v=k_0+1}^k \mu_v \right\} ds,$$

gives the solution (2.4) for $q(t)$ in the similar statement of Proposition 2.2. Then, the solution of system (2.6) for bottleneck client stations $k_0 + 1, \dots, k$ is given by

$$x_v(t) = q_v(t) = (\lambda_v - \mu_v)t - \lambda_v \int_0^t q(s)ds,$$

where $q(t)$ is defined by (2.4), and the queue-lengths in the bottleneck stations are asymptotically evaluated by (2.5).

Now, we discuss the behavior of network, in which the client stations are not initially empty. The analysis of cases related to initially not empty queues is much more difficult. Therefore, we start from the simplest case of the network containing only one client station, i.e. $k = 1$. Let $\beta_1 \leq 1$ be a positive real number, and assume that the initial number of units in this client station is asymptotically equivalent to $N\beta_1$. Consider the following two cases as (i) the client station is initially bottleneck, i.e. $\lambda_1(0) \geq \mu_1$, and (ii) the client station is initially non-bottleneck, i.e. $\lambda_1(0) < \mu_1$.

Case (i) is relatively simple. It is a simple extension of the cases considered above. Specifically, we have the following system of equations:

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} x_1(t) &= \beta_1 + (1 - \beta_1)z_1(t), \\ z_1(t) &= \int_0^t \{\lambda_1(0)[1 - z_1(s)] - \mu_1\} ds. \end{aligned}$$

From (2.7) we have the following solution:

$$(2.8) \quad x_1(t) = \beta_1 + (1 - \beta_1) \left(\frac{\lambda_1(0) - \mu_1}{\lambda_1(0)} \right) (1 - e^{-\lambda_1(0)t}).$$

The normalized queue-length $q_1(t)$ in this client station is $q_1(t) = x_1(t)$.

Case (i) can be easily extended to a more general case of k initially bottleneck client stations. Let β_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ denote nonnegative real numbers, and $\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \dots + \beta_k \leq 1$. Assume then that the initial number of units in the j th client station is asymptotically equivalent to $N\beta_j$. Let $q(t)$ denote the cumulated normalized queue-length in all client stations.

Proposition 2.3. *Assume that all client stations are initially bottleneck, and the initial queue-lengths in client stations are asymptotically equivalent to $N\beta_1, N\beta_2, \dots, N\beta_k$ correspondingly ($\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \dots + \beta_k \leq 1$), as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Then,*

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} q(t) &= \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j + \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j \right) r(t), \\ r(t) &= \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_j(0) - \mu_j)}{\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(0)} \right) \left(1 - \exp \left[-t \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(0) \right] \right), \end{aligned}$$

and the normalized queue-length in the j th client station is defined as

$$(2.10) \quad q_j(t) = \beta_j + \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j \right) \left([\lambda_j(0) - \mu_j]t - \lambda_j(0) \int_0^t r(s)ds \right).$$

Let us now discuss case (ii). This case is also described by system of equations (2.7), and the dynamic of the process $x_1(t)$ is therefore similar to the case considered above. However, this case is more delicate. The client station is initially non-bottleneck, i.e. $\lambda_1(0) < \mu_1$, and the function $x_1(t)$ is therefore decreasing in

the right side of 0. According to the convention, the initial value of queue is asymptotically equivalent to $\beta_1 N$, and therefore $\lambda_1(0) = (1 - \beta_1)\lambda_1^*$. Then the meaning of λ_1^* is a maximally possible rate of units arriving from the server station to client station, when all units are in the server station and the client station is empty. Then the client station is absolutely non-bottleneck if $\lambda_1^* < \mu_1$, and it is absolutely bottleneck if $\lambda_1^* \geq \mu_1$.

Consider first the case of an absolutely bottleneck station, i.e. $\lambda_1^* \geq \mu_1$. In this case, from the solution given by (2.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} q_1(t) &= \beta_1 + (1 - \beta_1) \frac{\lambda_1(0) - \mu_1}{\lambda_1(0)} \\
 (2.11) \qquad &= \frac{\lambda_1(0) - \mu_1(1 - \beta_1)}{\lambda_1(0)} \\
 &= \frac{\lambda_1^* - \mu_1}{\lambda_1^*}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The meaning of the last result is the following. Let $N\overline{\beta_1}$ be an asymptotical value of the queue-length at the client station, at which this queue station (at the first time) becomes a locally bottleneck station. Then, according to (2.11) the normalized queue-length in the client station approaches to this level $\overline{\beta_1} = \frac{\lambda_1^* - \mu_1}{\lambda_1^*}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Notice, that the same level for normalized queue-length is achieved for an initially bottleneck station in case (i). The result of (2.11) is also supported by results (2.1) and (2.2) of Proposition 2.1. Thus, for a bottleneck station, the same level is asymptotically achieved independently of an initial queue-length. For this reason for any absolutely bottleneck station in which $\lambda_1^* > \mu_1$ we do not distinguish between two cases $\lambda_j(0) < \mu_j$ and $\lambda_j(0) \geq \mu_j$, and absolutely bottleneck client station is always a bottleneck station.

Consider now the case of an absolutely non-bottleneck client station (and therefore non-bottleneck client station) where $\lambda_1^* < \mu_1$. Then, according to the same calculation as in (2.11) we have

$$(2.12) \qquad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_1(t) = \frac{\lambda_1^* - \mu_1}{\lambda_1^*} < 0.$$

Therefore, there exists the time instant τ_1 at which the normalized queue-length becomes at the first time empty. For this time instant we have the equation

$$(2.13) \qquad \tau_1 = -\frac{1}{\lambda_1(0)} \log \left(1 + \frac{\beta_1 \lambda_1(0)}{(1 - \beta_1)(\lambda_1(0) - \mu_1)} \right).$$

Let us extend the result of case (ii) for a network with k initially non-bottleneck client stations, all satisfying the condition $\lambda_j(0) < \mu_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$. It is assumed that the initial number of units in the j th client station is asymptotically equivalent to $N\beta_j$ ($\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \dots + \beta_k \leq 1$) as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Assume also that the first k_0 client stations are (absolutely) non-bottleneck, i.e. $\lambda_j^* = \lambda_j(0)(1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2 - \dots - \beta_k) < \mu_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k_0$, while the rest $k - k_0$ client stations are (absolutely) bottleneck, i.e. $\lambda_v^* = \lambda_v(0)(1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2 - \dots - \beta_k) \geq \mu_v$, $v = k_0 + 1, k_0 + 2, \dots, k$.

Similarly to (2.7) we have the following system of equations

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} x(t) &= \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j + \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j\right) z(t), \\ z(t) &= \int_0^t \left\{ (1 - z(s)) \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(0) - \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j \right\} ds, \end{aligned}$$

and for $z(t)$ we have the solution

$$(2.15) \quad z(t) = \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_j(0) - \mu_j)}{\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(0)} \right) \left(1 - \exp \left[-t \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(0) \right] \right).$$

Then for $x_j(t)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ we have the following solutions:

$$(2.16) \quad x_j(t) = \beta_j + \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^k \beta_j\right) \left((\lambda_j(0) - \mu_j)t - \lambda_j(0) \int_0^t z(s) ds \right).$$

(Recall that $x_j(t) = \mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A_{j,N}(t) - S_{j,N}(t)}{N}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$.)

However, since the first k_0 client stations are non-bottleneck, then the equality $q_j(t) = x_j(t)$ for the normalized queue-lengths in client stations is valid only for the values t from the interval $0 \leq t \leq \tau_1$, where the value τ_1 can be found from (2.16) as

$$(2.17) \quad \tau_1 = \min_{1 \leq j \leq k_0} \inf \{t : x_j(t) \leq 0\}.$$

Let $j_0 = \arg \min_{1 \leq j \leq k_0} \inf \{t : x_j(t) \leq 0\}$. Then the normalized queue-length process $q_{j_0}(t)$ is as follows. For $0 \leq t \leq \tau_1$, $q_{j_0}(t) = x_{j_0}(t)$, and for $t \geq \tau_1$ it satisfies the equation

$$(2.18) \quad x_{j_0}(t) = \int_0^{t-\tau_1} \left[\lambda(\tau_1) \left(1 - \sum_{j \neq j_0} x_j(s) - \Phi_s(x_{j_0}) \right) - \mu_{j_0} \right] ds,$$

where $\Phi_s(x_{j_0}) = x_{j_0}(s) - \inf_{0 \leq u \leq s} x_{j_0}(u)$.

Together with (2.18) for all remaining $j = 1, 2, \dots, j_0-1, j_0+1, \dots, k$ and $t \geq \tau_1$ we have:

$$(2.19) \quad \begin{aligned} x(t) &= \sum_{j \neq j_0} x_j(\tau_1) + \left(1 - \sum_{j \neq j_0} x_j(\tau_1)\right) z(t), \\ z(t) &= \int_0^{t-\tau_1} \left\{ (1 - z(s)) \sum_{j \neq j_0} \lambda_j(\tau_1) - \sum_{j \neq j_0} \mu_j \right\} ds, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly to (2.15) for $z(t)$ we have the solution

$$(2.20) \quad z(t) = \left(\frac{\sum_{j \neq j_0} (\lambda_j(\tau_1) - \mu_j)}{\sum_{j \neq j_0} \lambda_j(\tau_1)} \right) \left(1 - \exp \left[-(t - \tau_1) \sum_{j \neq j_0} \lambda_j(\tau_1) \right] \right).$$

Therefore for $j = 1, 2, \dots, j_0 - 1, j_0 + 1, \dots, k$ and $t \geq \tau_1$ we obtain

$$(2.21) \quad \begin{aligned} x_j(t) = & x_j(\tau_1) + \left(1 - \sum_{j \neq j_0} x_j(\tau_1)\right) \times \\ & \times \left((\lambda_j(\tau_1) - \mu_j)(t - \tau_1) - \lambda_j(\tau_1) \int_0^{t-\tau_1} z(s) ds\right), \end{aligned}$$

and since $x_{j_0}(t)$ is nonnegative, for $j = j_0$ and $t \geq \tau_1$ we obtain

$$(2.22) \quad x_{j_0}(t) = 0.$$

However, again since the client stations $j = 1, 2, \dots, j_0 - 1, j_0 + 1, \dots, k_0$ all are non-bottleneck stations, then the equality $q_j(t) = x_j(t)$ for the normalized queue-length processes is valid for all $t \leq \tau_2$, where τ_2 is defined as

$$(2.23) \quad \tau_2 = \min_{1 \leq j \neq j_0 \leq k_0} \inf\{t : x_j(t) \leq 0\}.$$

Setting now $j_1 = \arg \min_{1 \leq j \neq j_0 \leq k_0} \inf\{t : x_j(t) \leq 0\}$ one can continue this procedure to find $\tau_3, \dots, \tau_{k_0}$ and then to know the behaviour of the queue-length processes in all (non-bottleneck and absolutely bottleneck) client stations for all t .

The considered extension of case (ii) is in fact a general case in which amongst k client stations there are k_0 non-bottleneck client stations, and the rest $k - k_0$ stations are absolutely bottleneck (i.e. part of them can be initially non-bottleneck), and all k client stations are with arbitrary initial queue-lengths.

The result can be resumed as follows.

Theorem 2.4. *Assume that there are k client stations, where k_0 client stations (non necessarily the first ones) are absolutely non-bottleneck, and the initial normalized queue-length in all these k client stations are β_j in limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ correspondingly ($j = 1, 2, \dots, k$). Then there are time instants $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots \leq \tau_{k_0}$ which are defined recurrently as follows. Consider the system*

$$(2.24) \quad \begin{aligned} x_j(t) = & x_j(0) + \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^k x_j(0)\right) \left((\lambda_j(0) - \mu_j)t - \lambda_j(0) \int_0^t z(s) ds\right), \\ & j = 1, 2, \dots, k, \end{aligned}$$

where $x_j(0) = \beta_j$, and

$$(2.25) \quad z(t) = \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_j(0) - \mu_j)}{\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(0)}\right) \left(1 - \exp\left[-t \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(0)\right]\right).$$

Then,

$$\tau_1 = \min_{1 \leq j \leq k} \inf\{t : x_j(t) \leq 0\},$$

and the argument t in (2.24) and (2.25) belongs to the interval $[0, \tau_1]$. In this case $q_j(t) = x_j(t)$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Let $j_0 = \arg \min_{1 \leq j \leq k} \inf\{t : x_j(t) \leq 0\}$. Then

$q_{j_0}(t)=0$ for all $t \geq \tau_1$. Next, consider the system

$$(2.26) \quad \begin{aligned} x_j(t) = & x_j(\tau_1) + \left(1 - \sum_{j \neq j_0} x_j(\tau_1)\right) \times \\ & \times \left((\lambda_j(\tau_1) - \mu_j)(t - \tau_1) - \lambda_j(\tau_1) \int_0^{t-\tau_1} z(s) ds \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(2.27) \quad z(t) = \left(\frac{\sum_{j \neq j_0} (\lambda_j(\tau_1) - \mu_j)}{\sum_{j \neq j_0} \lambda_j(\tau_1)} \right) \left(1 - \exp \left[-t \sum_{j \neq j_0} \lambda_j(\tau_1) \right] \right).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_2 = & \min_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq k \\ j \neq j_0}} \inf \{t \geq \tau_1 : x_j(t) \leq 0\}, \\ j_1 = & \arg \min_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq k \\ j \neq j_0}} \inf \{t \geq \tau_1 : x_j(t) \leq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and the argument t in (2.26) and (2.27) belongs to the interval $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$, and subscript j in these equations is $j = 1, 2, \dots, j_0 - 1, j_0 + 1, \dots, k$. In this case $q_j(t) = x_j(t)$, and $q_{j_1}(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq \tau_2$.

Consequently, τ_l , $2 \leq l \leq k_0$ is defined from the system

$$(2.28) \quad \begin{aligned} x_j(t) = & x_j(\tau_{l-1}) + \left(1 - \sum_{j \neq j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{l-2}} x_j(\tau_{l-1})\right) \times \\ & \times \left((\lambda_j(\tau_{l-1}) - \mu_j)(t - \tau_{l-1}) - \lambda_j(\tau_{l-1}) \int_0^{t-\tau_{l-1}} z(s) ds \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(2.29) \quad \begin{aligned} z(t) = & \left(\frac{\sum_{j \neq j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{l-2}} (\lambda_j(\tau_{l-1}) - \mu_j)}{\sum_{j \neq j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{l-2}} \lambda_j(\tau_{l-1})} \right) \times \\ & \times \left(1 - \exp \left[-t \sum_{j \neq j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{l-2}} \lambda_j(\tau_{l-1}) \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_l = & \min_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq k \\ j \neq j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{l-2}}} \inf \{t \geq \tau_{l-1} : x_j(t) \leq 0\}, \\ j_{l-1} = & \arg \min_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq k \\ j \neq j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{l-2}}} \inf \{t \geq \tau_{l-1} : x_j(t) \leq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and the argument t in (2.28) and (2.29) belongs to the interval $[\tau_{l-1}, \tau_l]$, and subscript j in these equations takes the values from 1 to k but $j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{l-2}$. In this case $q_j(t) = x_j(t)$, and $q_{j_{l-1}}(t)=0$ for all $t \geq \tau_l$.

3. QUEUE-LENGTH PROCESSES IN THE CLIENT STATIONS OF NETWORKS WITH MARKOV ENVIRONMENT

Consider the client station j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, k$). Let $Q_{j,N}(t)$ denote a queue-length there in time t . Assume that at the initial time instant $t = 0$, according to convention $Q_{j,N}(0) = 0$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$, i.e. all units are initially in the server. This is the simplest case, and we start its study. For $t > 0$,

$$(3.1) \quad Q_{j,N}(t) = A_{j,N}(t) - D_{j,N}(t),$$

where $A_{j,N}(t)$ is the arrival process to client station j , and $D_{j,N}(t)$ is the departure process from that client station j . The equation for departure process is the following. Let

$$S_{j,N}(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{I}\{\xi_{j,N,l} \leq t\}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, k$$

be a point process associated with consecutive departures from the j th client station. Then,

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} D_{j,N}(t) &= \int_0^t \mathbb{I}\{Q_{j,N}(s-) > 0\} dS_{j,N}(s) \\ &= S_{j,N}(t) - \int_0^t \mathbb{I}\{Q_{j,N}(s-) = 0\} dS_{j,N}(s), \\ &\quad j = 1, 2, \dots, k \end{aligned}$$

The definition of the departure process given by (3.2) is as in [1]. However, the construction of arrival process is more difficult.

Let $A_{j,N}(t) = A_{j,N}(\mathcal{E}(t))$ denote arrival process to client station j . Then,

$$(3.3) \quad A_{j,N}(t) = \int_0^t \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{I}\left\{N - \sum_{l=1}^k Q_{l,N}(s-) \geq i\right\} d\pi_{j,i}(s, \omega_Z).$$

The processes $\{\pi_{j,i}(s, \omega_Z)\}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, appearing in relation (3.3) are a collection of conditionally independent Poisson processes with parameters depending on ω_Z . This means that for given ω_Z we have a set of independent realizations of Poisson processes with parameters $\lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(s))$ (depending on the state of Markov environment in time s).

This is just the main difference between the consideration in [1] and that in the present paper. In [1] there was a family of independent standard Poisson processes (with a fixed rate λ_j). (3.3) can be then rewritten as follows. Let $0 = \sigma_0 < \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < \dots$ be a sequence of time instants of Markov environment where the associated Markov chain changes the state. Then

$$(3.4) \quad A_{j,N}(t) = \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \int_{t \wedge \sigma_{v-1}}^{t \wedge \sigma_v} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{I}\left\{N - \sum_{l=1}^k Q_{l,N}(s-) \geq i\right\} d\pi_{j,i,v}(s),$$

where $\pi_{j,i,v}(s)$ is an associated sequence of conditionally independent Poisson process with parameter depending on the state of the Markov environment $\mathcal{E}(\sigma_{v-1})$. (Here in (3.4) and later we use the standard notation for a minimum of two numbers: $a \wedge b \equiv \min(a, b)$.)

Relations (3.1) and (3.2) enable us to write the following representation for the queue-length process $Q_{j,N}(t)$:

$$(3.5) \quad Q_{j,N}(t) = A_{j,N}(t) - S_{j,N}(t) + \int_0^t \mathbb{I}\{Q_{j,N}(s-) = 0\} dS_{j,N}(s).$$

This implies that $Q_{j,N}(t)$ is the normal reflection of the process

$$(3.6) \quad X_{j,N}(t) = A_{j,N}(t) - S_{j,N}(t), \quad X_{j,N}(0) = 0$$

at zero. More accurately, $Q_{j,N}(t)$ is a nonnegative solution of the Skorokhod problem (see [14] as well as [6], [13], [15] and others) on the normal reflection of the process $X_{j,N}(t)$ at zero (for the detailed arguments see [11]). Recall that according to the Skorokhod problem,

$$(3.7) \quad \int_0^t \mathbb{I}\{Q_{j,N}(s-) = 0\} dS_{j,N}(s) = -\inf_{s \leq t} X_{j,N}(s),$$

and $Q_{j,N}(t)$ has the representation

$$(3.8) \quad Q_{j,N}(t) = X_{j,N}(t) - \inf_{s \leq t} X_{j,N}(s).$$

In the sequel it is convenient to use the notation: $\Phi_t(X) = X(t) - \inf_{s \leq t} X(s)$ for any càdlàg function $X(t)$ satisfying $X(0) = 0$. According to this notation, (3.8) can be rewritten $Q_{j,N}(t) = \Phi_t(X_{j,N})$.

Next, we take into account that the process $A_{j,N}(t)$ is a semimartingale adapted with respect to filtration $\mathcal{F}_t$. Let $\hat{A}_{j,N}(t)$ denote the compensator of $A_{j,N}(t)$ and $M_{A_{j,N}}(t)$ denote the square integrable martingale of $A_{j,N}(t)$ in the Doob-Meyer semimartingale decomposition: $A_{j,N}(t) = \hat{A}_{j,N}(t) + M_{A_{j,N}}(t)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Then, the process $X_{j,N}(t)$ given by (3.6) can be represented

$$(3.9) \quad X_{j,N}(t) = \hat{A}_{j,N}(t) - S_{j,N}(t) + M_{A_{j,N}}(t),$$

where

$$(3.10) \quad \hat{A}_{j,N}(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \int_{\sigma_{l-1} \wedge t}^{\sigma_l \wedge t} \lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(\sigma_{l-1})) \left\{ N - \sum_{i=1}^k Q_{i,N}(s) \right\} ds.$$

The details for last formula (3.10) can be obtained from [9] or [12], Theorem 1.6.1.

Let us now study asymptotic properties of the normalized queue-lengths $q_{j,N}(t) = \frac{Q_{j,N}(t)}{N}$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. For normalized processes we will use small Latin letters. For example, $x_{j,N}(t) = \frac{X_{j,N}(t)}{N}$, $\hat{a}_{j,N}(t) = \frac{\hat{A}_{j,N}(t)}{N}$, and so on.

Then, from (3.9) we have

$$(3.11) \quad x_{j,N}(t) = \hat{a}_{j,N}(t) - s_{j,N}(t) + m_{A_{j,N}}(t), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, k.$$

Let us derive a relation for $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} x_{j,N}(t)$. ($\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim$ denotes the limit in probability.)

From Lenglart-Rebolledo inequality (e.g. Liptser and Shirayev [12]), we have:

$$(3.12) \quad \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |m_{A_{j,N}}(s)| > \delta \right\} = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |A_{j,N}(s) - \hat{A}_{j,N}(s)| > \delta N \right\} \\ \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\delta^2} + \mathbb{P}\{\hat{A}_{j,N}(t) > \epsilon N^2\},$$

where $\epsilon = \epsilon(N)$ vanishes such that $\epsilon N \rightarrow \infty$ nevertheless. Then, by virtue of (3.10), the term $\mathbb{P}\{\widehat{A}_{j,N}(t) > \epsilon N^2\} = \mathbb{P}\{\widehat{a}_{j,N}(t) > \epsilon N\}$ vanishes as well, and for any small $\delta > 0$ the fraction $\frac{\epsilon}{\delta^2}$ vanishes. Therefore,

$$(3.13) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} m_{A_{j,N}}(t) = 0$$

for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and $t \geq 0$.

Next, according to the assumption above, $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} s_{j,N}(t) = \mu_j t$.

Therefore,

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} x_j(t) &= \mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} x_{j,N}(t) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{a}_{j,N}(t) - \mu_j t \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \int_{\sigma_{l-1} \wedge t}^{\sigma_l \wedge t} \left[\lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(\sigma_{l-1})) \left\{ N - \sum_{i=1}^k \Phi_s(x_j) \right\} - \mu_j \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Representation (3.14) is an extension of the similar result of [1] for queue-length processes in client stations of standard client/server networks.

The statement of Theorem 2.4 can be easily adapted to client/server networks in Markov environment. Specifically, in this case we speak on the behavior of network in random intervals $[\sigma_{l-1} \wedge t, \sigma_l \wedge t)$.

For example, in the case of a random interval $[0, \sigma_1 \wedge t)$ we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that amongst k client stations, there are k_0 absolutely non-bottleneck in time 0, and the rest $k - k_0$ client stations are absolutely bottleneck in time 0. Assume that the initial normalized queue-lengths in all these k client stations are β_j in limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ correspondingly ($j = 1, 2, \dots, k$). Then there are time instants $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots \leq \tau_{k_0}$ which are defined recurrently by the scheme of Theorem 2.4. We only take into account the values τ_i satisfying inequality $\tau_i \leq \sigma_1 \wedge t$, i.e. set $\ell = \ell(\sigma_1) = \max\{i : \tau_i \leq \sigma_1 \wedge t\}$. Then, only the instants $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots \leq \tau_\ell$ are taken into account in this theorem. The main relation (2.24) of Theorem 2.4 now looks*

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} x_j(\sigma_1 \wedge t) &= x_j(0) + \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^k x_j(0) \right) \times \\ &\times \left((\lambda_j(0) - \mu_j)(\sigma_1 \wedge t) - \lambda_j(0) \int_0^{\sigma_1 \wedge t} z(s) ds \right), \\ &j = 1, 2, \dots, k, \end{aligned}$$

where $x_j(0) = \beta_j$, and

$$(3.16) \quad z(t) = \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_j(0) - \mu_j)}{\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(0)} \right) \left(1 - \exp \left[-t \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(0) \right] \right).$$

The other relations of this theorem are defined similarly to the corresponding relations of Theorem 2.4 where only argument t is replaced by $\sigma_1 \wedge t$ in the corresponding

places. Specifically, (2.26) now looks

$$x_j(\sigma_1 \wedge t) = x_j(\tau_1) + \left(1 - \sum_{j \neq j_0} x_j(\tau_1)\right) \times \\ \times \left((\lambda_j(\tau_1) - \mu_j)((\sigma_1 \wedge t) - \tau_1) - \lambda_j(\tau_1) \int_0^{(\sigma_1 \wedge t) - \tau_1} z(s) ds \right),$$

where $z(t)$ is defined by (2.27), and (2.28) now looks

$$(3.17) \quad x_j(\sigma_1 \wedge t) = x_j(\tau_{l-1}) + \left(1 - \sum_{j \neq j_0, j_1, \dots, j_{l-2}} x_j(\tau_{l-1})\right) \times \\ \times \left((\lambda_j(\tau_{l-1}) - \mu_j)((\sigma_1 \wedge t) - \tau_{l-1}) - \lambda_j(\tau_{l-1}) \int_0^{(\sigma_1 \wedge t) - \tau_{l-1}} z(s) ds \right),$$

where $z(t)$ is defined by (2.29), and $l = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$.

4. FURTHER DISCUSSIONS AND NUMERICAL STUDY

Theorem 3.1 looks very complicated, and its further analysis is very difficult to make a conclusion on the behavior of queue-length processes. For example, it seems very difficult to obtain any numerical characteristics of normalized queue-length processes analytically, $\mathbb{E}x_j(\sigma_1 \wedge t)$ for example. Therefore, the numerical work should be based on simulation of Markov environment in order to obtain required performance characteristics of the process.

For the purpose of performance analysis we also should restrict the class of networks and processes describing the behavior of queue-length processes in client stations. This restriction is related to application of the results rather than development of the theory. Comparing two different strategies mentioned in the introduction for fixed interval $(0, T)$, then a better strategy can be found with the aid of Theorem 3.1, and the aforementioned problem can be solved. However, under these general settings we cannot answer to other significant questions. One of them is *How behave this criteria when the considered time interval is changed?* For example, we have two strategies corresponding two different initial conditions of Markov environment, and suppose we concluded that the first strategy is more profitable than the second one for specific time interval $(0, T)$. *Is this conclusion remains correct (or becomes not correct) for another time interval $(0, T^*)$?* Another typical question is as follows. Again, we have two strategies corresponding two different initial conditions of Markov environment. Suppose we established that for an interval $(0, T)$ the both strategies are equivalent. Let T^* be a new time instant, and $T^* > T$. *What strategy is now more profitable in the new time interval $(0, T^*)$, the first or second?* The same question is under the opposite inequality $T^* < T$.

These questions can be answered in the case when the class of processes studied numerically has a monotone stricture and is described by the properties listed below. Then in certain cases the behavior of queue-length processes in client stations and consequently a conclusion about better strategy for other time intervals can be established as well.

The aforementioned properties are as follows.

- (1) For any two positive integers $l \leq m$ assume that $z_{l,m} \geq z_{m,l}$.

Recall that $z_{l,m}\Delta t + o(\Delta t)$ are the transition probabilities from the state $\mathcal{E}_l$ to the state $\mathcal{E}_m$ of a homogeneous Markov process for a small time interval $(t, t + \Delta t)$.

(2) $\lambda_j(\mathcal{E}_l) \leq \lambda_j(\mathcal{E}_m)$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$, and $l \leq m$.

Property (1) means that the Markov process $Z(t)$ is an increasing process in the following sense: for two time moments σ_{l-1} and σ_l we have $Z(\sigma_{l-1}) \leq_{st} Z(\sigma_l)$, which means that the state of a Markov process in time σ_{l-1} is not greater (in stochastic sense) than that state in time σ_l for any integer positive l . The above property remains correct for any $t_1 \leq t_2$, i.e. $Z(t_1) \leq_{st} Z(t_2)$.

Property (1) also means that for two Markov properties $Z_1(t)$ and $Z_2(t)$ having the same transition probabilities, but different initial conditions satisfying $Z_1(0) \leq_{st} Z_2(0)$, we also have $Z_1(t) \leq_{st} Z_2(t)$, $t \geq 0$. (For details of the proof of these properties see e.g. Kalmykov [10].)

Consequently, from property (2) we have $\lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(\sigma_{l-1})) \leq_{st} \lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(\sigma_l))$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and any integer positive l . Moreover, for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and any $t_1 \leq t_2$ we have $\lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(t_1)) \leq_{st} \lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(t_2))$.

Thus the rates $\lambda_j(\mathcal{E}(t))$ are increasing in time. As a result, the queue-length processes in client stations increase sharper than in the case of fixed λ_j , and more extended problems mentioned in this section seem can be solved as well. We however do not provide their solutions in the present paper.

Let us now provide numerical investigation for concrete client server networks in a given Markov environment, satisfying the above two properties.

4.1. Example. In this example we do not intend to challenge a problem comparing two different strategies or finding an optimal strategy. We only show (step-by-step) how to study the behavior of queue-lengths in client stations numerically. However, the detailed explanations of the given example can help to solve some of the aforementioned problems.

We consider the simplest case of Markov transition matrix of the order 4

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

associated with the continuous Markov process $Z(t)$. In this matrix $P_{l,l+1} = 1$, $l = 1, 2, 3$, and $P_{4,4} = 1$. This means that if the initial state of the process is $\mathcal{E}(0) = \mathcal{E}_1$, then the next state is $\mathcal{E}(\sigma_1) = \mathcal{E}_2$. Consequently, $\mathcal{E}(\sigma_2) = \mathcal{E}_3$, and $\mathcal{E}(\sigma_3) = \mathcal{E}_4$. Then $\mathcal{E}(\sigma_l) = \mathcal{E}_4$ for all $l \geq 3$. Assume also that $z_{l,l+1} = 1$, $l = 1, 2, 3$, so that $\mathbb{E}(\sigma_l - \sigma_{l-1}) = 1$, $l = 1, 2, 3$.

For simplicity, the network contains only 2 client stations. Assume that $\lambda_1(\mathcal{E}_1) = 1$, $\lambda_1(\mathcal{E}_2) = 2$, and for $l = 3, 4$, $\lambda_1(\mathcal{E}_l) = 3$. We also assume that $\lambda_1(\mathcal{E}_l) = \lambda_2(\mathcal{E}_l)$ for $l = 1, 2, 3, 4$. The values $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 2$. Next, $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0.1$, i.e. at the initial time moment each client station contains 10% of all units in the queue.

We set $T = 3$, and study behavior of queue-length processes in client station in the time interval $(0, 3)$. By simulation we obtained the following exponentially distributed random variables: 0.5488, 1.0892 and 1.8734. The sum of these 3 random variables is greater than 3, so this quantity of exponentially distributed random variables is enough for our experiment.

Note, that $\lambda_1(0) = \lambda_2(0) = 0.8$. There three time intervals: $[0, 0.5488)$, $[0.5488, 1.6380)$, $[1.6380, 3)$.

For the time interval $[0, 0.5488)$ the two client stations are absolutely non-bottleneck because $\frac{\lambda_j(\varepsilon_1)}{\mu_j}=0.5$, and we have the following equations:

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} x_1(t) &= x_2(t) = 0.1 - 0.96t - 0.8 \int_0^t z(s)ds, \\ z(t) &= -1.5 (1 - e^{-1.6t}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from (4.1) we obtain:

$$(4.2) \quad x_1(t) = x_2(t) = -0.65 + 0.24t + 0.75e^{-1.6t}.$$

Substituting 0.5488 for t in (4.2) one can see that

$$x_1(0.5488) = x_2(0.5488) \approx -0.2066.$$

The endpoints are negative, therefore we are to find such the values τ_1 and τ_2 such that $x_1(\tau_1)=0$ and $x_2(\tau_2)=0$. In our case $\tau_1 = \tau_2 \approx 0.117$. This means that $q_1(t) = q_2(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0.117$ of the given interval $[0, 0.5488)$. Therefore, in the endpoint of this interval $q_1(0.5488) = q_2(0.5488) = 0$.

Consider now the time interval $[0.5488, 1.6380)$. In point 0.5488 we now set $x_1(0.5488) = x_2(0.5488)=0$. Therefore, $\lambda_1(0.5488) = \lambda_2(0.5488)=2$, and the both client stations are bottleneck in $[0.5488, 1.6380)$. Since $\frac{\lambda_j(0.5488)}{\mu_j}=1$, $j = 1, 2$, then $x_1(t)$ and $x_2(t)$ are equal to zero in this interval, and $q_1(t) = q_2(t) = 0$ in this interval as well.

We arrive at the last time interval $[1.6380, 3)$. Similarly to the above, we have $x_1(1.6380) = x_2(1.6380)=0$, and $\lambda_1(1.6380) = \lambda_2(1.6380)=3$, and the both client stations are bottleneck in $[1.6380, 3)$. However, in the both client stations we have $\frac{\lambda_j(1.6380)}{\mu_j}=1.5$, $j = 1, 2$. Therefore, after a little algebra we have the following equations:

$$q_j(t) = \frac{1}{6} \left(1 - e^{-6(t-1.6380)} \right), \quad j = 1, 2,$$

for all t from the interval $[1.6380, 3)$.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the present paper we introduced a class of client/server networks in order to study performance measures of real client/server networks. Our analysis was based on the results of earlier papers related to closed queueing networks with bottleneck. However, for purpose of real applications, we developed the earlier results and provided complete analysis of standard bottleneck client/server networks. We then extended our results for client/server networks in Markov environment. We discussed new problems and ways for their solution. Numerical study given in this paper will help to clearly understand solution for many related problems.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The present research was supported by Australian Research Council grant No. DP0771338.

REFERENCES

- [1] ABRAMOV, V.M. (2000). A large closed queueing network with autonomous service and bottleneck. *Queueing Systems*, 35, 23-54.
- [2] ABRAMOV, V.M. (2001). Some results for large closed queueing networks with and without bottleneck: Up- and down-crossings approach. *Queueing Systems*, 38, 149-184.
- [3] ABRAMOV, V.M. (2004). A large closed queueing network containing two types of node and multiple customers classes: One bottleneck station. *Queueing Systems*, 48, 45-73.
- [4] ABRAMOV, V.M. (2005). The stability of join-the-shortest-queue models with general input and output processes. arXiv: math/PR 0505040.
- [5] ABRAMOV, V.M. (2006). The effective bandwidth problem revisited. arXiv: math/PR 0604182.
- [6] ANULOVA, S.V. AND LIPTSER, R. SH. (1990). Diffusion approximation for processes with normal reflection. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 35, 413-423.
- [7] BOROVKOV, A.A. (1976). *Stochastic Processes in Queueing Theory*. Springer, Berlin.
- [8] BOROVKOV, A.A. (1984). *Asymptotic Methods in Queueing Theory*. John Wiley, New York.
- [9] DELLACHERIE, C. (1972). *Capacités et Processus Stochastiques*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [10] KALMYKOV, G.I. (1962). On the partial ordering of one-dimensional Markov processes. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 7, 456-459.
- [11] KOGAN, YA. AND LIPTSER, R.SH. (1993). Limit non-stationary behavior of large closed queueing networks with bottlenecks. *Queueing Systems*, 14, 33-55.
- [12] LIPTSER, R.SH. AND SHIRYAYEV, A.N. (1989). *Theory of Martingales*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- [13] RAMANAN, K. (2006). Reflected diffusions defined via extended Skorokhod map. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 11, 934-992.
- [14] SKOROKHOD, A.V. (1961). Stochastic equations for diffusion processes in a bounded region. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 6, 264-274.
- [15] TANAKA, H. (1979). Stochastic differential equations with reflected boundary conditions in convex regions. *Hiroshima Mathematical Journal*, 9, 163-177.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, MONASH UNIVERSITY, BUILDING 28M, WELLINGTON RD,
CLAYTON, VIC 3800, AUSTRALIA

E-mail address: vyacheslav.abramov@sci.monash.edu.au