

The BRAVO effect and other problems
involving ‘biological’ models

D. J. DALEY

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics
The University of Melbourne*

[ALSO: The Australian National University, Canberra]

Conference in Honour of Søren Asmussen

New Frontiers in Applied Probability

Sandbjerg, 1–5 August 2011

SA–DD: Two-sex Galton–Watson branching proc. (ZW, 1968)

[DD proved ‘obvious’ sufficient condition for a.s. extinction using complex variable technique; SA gave martingale proof]

Visit to Australia c.1980 or 1983 ? (Pat Moran’s office, view of lake).

etc.

Overlapping visits in Santa Barbara 1988

Oberwolfach meetings . . .

Mittag-Leffler meeting c.2004

AP Editor-in-Chief

Host on briefer visits: Goteborg ’91, Aalborg ’94, Aarhus ’05
([pipe] organ)

New Frontiers in AP

1. A digression (?)

Epidemics and Rumours in Complex Systems

Moez Draief and Laurent Massoulié (Cambridge UP, 2010)

Basically about Graph Theory applicable to spreading processes in models for epidemics, rumours (information spread)

Two parts: network unstructured or structured

Counting problems

Math'l techniques giving 'solutions' (martingales, Chernoff bounds [ex Tchebychef inequality])

Connection between microscopic (stochastic) models and macroscopic (deterministic) models

(d.e. methods for latter — Kurtz' theorem)

Graph-theoretic ideas: to what extent are they applicable to (locally finite) infinite stochastic models (on \mathbb{R}^d) ??

[Population processes that remain locally finite ??]

(percolation in germ–grain models — Gunter Last . . .)

Yoni Nazarathy and Gideon Weiss (QUESTA 2008)

BRAVO effect:

Balancing **R**educes **A**symptotic **V**ariance of **O**utputs

$$\text{var } N_{\text{dep}}(0, t]$$

M/M/1/K, Buffer of size K , Stationary

Arrivals are Poisson at rate λ ,

Service times i.i.d. exponential at rate μ ,

With $\rho = \lambda/\mu$ and $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\text{var } N(0, t] \sim \begin{cases} \rho t & \text{if } \rho < 1, \\ t & \text{if } \rho > 1, \\ \frac{2}{3} t & \text{if } \rho \approx 1, \end{cases}$$

because output $\approx \begin{cases} \text{input} & \text{if } \rho < 1, \\ \text{max service rate} & \text{if } \rho > 1. \end{cases}$

[NW08] figures

What happens when $\rho \approx 1$?

What happens in many-server system ?

What if reneging or abandonment in place of buffer ?

(joint work with Yoni Nazarathy)

For a stationary orderly point process N ,

$$\text{var } N(0, t] = \int_0^t (2[U(u) - mu] - 1) m \, du,$$

where $U(u) = \mathbb{E}[N[0, u] \mid N(\{0\}) > 0]$ and $m = \mathbb{E}(N(0, 1])$.

For a renewal process, U is renewal function, and if generic lifetime X has finite second moment, then

$$\text{var } N(0, t] \sim \frac{\mathbb{E}(X^2)}{[\mathbb{E}(X)]^2} \frac{t}{\mathbb{E}(X)}$$

If further $\mathbb{E}(X^3) < \infty$, then exact linear asymptotics hold i.e.

$$\text{var } N(0, t] = At + B + o(1)$$

for finite constants A and B ; renewal-theoretic arguments suffice.

Both these properties hold for Markov renewal processes with finite second or third moments.

Queueing O/P in general not Markov renewal, let alone renewal . . .

Output = Arrivals – lost customers

CONSERVATION arguments.

e.g. k -server system and K waiting places:

$Q(t)$ = stationary number of customers in system.

$$Q(0) + N_{\text{adm}}(0, t] = N_{\text{dep}}(0, t] + Q(t)$$

$$|N_{\text{adm}}(0, t] - N_{\text{dep}}(0, t]| \leq k + K$$

$$\text{var} \left(\frac{N_{\text{dep}}(0, t]}{\sqrt{t}} - \frac{N_{\text{adm}}(0, t]}{\sqrt{t}} \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad (t \rightarrow \infty)$$

Theorem. *In a stationary $G/G/k/K$ queueing system for which $\text{var } N_{\text{arr}}(0, 1) < \infty$, the limits as $t \rightarrow \infty$ of*

$$\frac{\text{var } N_{\text{dep}}(0, t]}{t} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\text{var } N_{\text{adm}}(0, t]}{t}$$

either both exist finite and are equal, or both are infinite.

(Sufficient condition for crude asymptotic linearity.)

Turn to *detailed* conservation equations for point processes (sample path realizations — cf. Bremaud (1981)).

[NW08] is about M/M/1/K (and M/M/k/(K - k)). N_{dep} is NOT renewal for $K \geq 2$ but the refined limit behaviour holds for M/M/k/K because $Q(t)$ is finite state space continuous time Markov chain and asymptotics for geometrically ergodic chains apply.

A ‘quick’ route to expressions for the moment behaviour of N_{dep} comes from point process expressions, using N_{arr} and N_{serv} to describe counting functions of arrival point processes and *potential* service departure epochs:

Use $I_j(t)$ to denote an indicator function for $\{Q(t) = j\}$: then in M/M/1/K,

$$N_{\text{lost}}(0, t] := \int_{(0, t]} I_{1+K}(u-) N_{\text{arr}}(du),$$

hence

$$N_{\text{adm}}(0, t] = \int_{(0, t]} (1 - I_{1+K}(u-)) N_{\text{arr}}(du).$$

Similarly

$$N_{\text{dep}}(0, t] := \int_{(0, t]} (1 - I_0(u-)) N_{\text{serv}}(du).$$

Taking expectations appropriately, e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(N_{\text{adm}}(0, t])^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{(0, t] \times (0, t]} [1 - I_{1+K}(u-)][1 - I_{1+K}(v-)] N_{\text{arr}}(du) N_{\text{arr}}(dv)\right] \end{aligned}$$

This leads ultimately to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var } N_{\text{adm}}(0, t] - \mathbf{E}(N_{\text{adm}}(0, t]) \\ = 2\lambda\mu\pi_0 \int_0^t [(t-u)(p_{0,1+K}(u) - \pi_{1+K})] du. \end{aligned}$$

The coarse asymptotics follow by extracting a factor t and then standard convergence property of the integral.

To extract the fine asymptotics, write integral as

$$t \int_0^\infty [p_{0,1+K}(u) - \pi_{1+K}] du - \int_0^\infty u[p_{0,1+K}(u) - \pi_{1+K}] du + o(1)$$

where the $o(1)$ term takes account of the discrepancy between the finite and infinite integration, and the other terms have finite limits because of geometric ergodicity and monotonicity of the transition probability functions.

This technique for studying O/P works for M/M/k/K

What are implications for graph $Q(t)$ v. t ?

(ditto) BRAVO effect ?

(ditto) both of the above for M/M/k/rneg

A PROBLEM

The departure process N_{dep} of these M/M/k/K systems is certainly not renewal, though it is irreducible Markov renewal. As a point process, there is embedded in it a sequence of regenerative epochs:

What can be said about limit properties of a point process containing an embedded regenerative structure?

(think of variance behaviour (!))

For a stationary renewal process, the fine detailed asymptotics hold as soon as the lifetime distribution has a third moment. Do these carry over to a stationary point process that contains an embedded regenerative structure ?

Refer to integral for variance:

$$\text{var } N(0, t] = mt + 2 \int_0^t [U(u) - mu] du$$

Depends of rate of convergence of $U(u) - mu$ to its limit (if it exists) (for renewal process, limit = $E(X^2)/2[(E(X))^2]$; renewal theorem does not yield full detail of convergence rate, though finite third moment does yield finiteness on

$$U(u) - mu - \frac{1}{2}(\text{approx'n to 2nd moment}).$$

OUTPUT OF M/M/k/K

Recall: $\{\pi_i\}$ is stationary queue-size distribution,

$$\pi_i = \Pr\{Q(t) = i\} \quad (\text{all } t)$$

$$\lambda\pi_{i-1} = \min(i, k)\mu \quad (i = 1, \dots, k, \dots, k+K),$$

$\sum_{i=0}^{k+K} \pi_i = 1$. For BRAVO effect, want arrival and service rates around ‘balance’, i.e. $\mu = k\lambda$. Recurrence relations give

$$\pi_i = \begin{cases} \frac{(k\lambda/\mu)^i}{i!} \pi_0 = \frac{(k\rho)^i}{i!} \pi_0 & \text{for } i \leq k, \\ (\lambda/\mu)^{i-k} \pi_k = \rho^{k-i} \pi_k & \text{for } i \geq k, \end{cases}$$

First investigate case $\rho = 1$:

Cases $i \leq k$ give $\sum_{i=0}^k \pi_i \approx \frac{1}{2}e^k \pi_0 \approx \frac{1}{2}\pi_k \sqrt{2\pi k}$ for k not small.

Cases $i > k$ give $\sum_{i=k+1}^{k+K} \pi_i = K\pi_k$.

Special case: $\frac{\pi_k}{\pi_0} = \frac{k^k}{k!} \approx \frac{k^k}{\sqrt{2\pi k} k^k e^{-k}} = \frac{e^k}{\sqrt{2\pi k}}$.

Hence, $\pi_k \left(K + \sqrt{\pi k/2} \right) \approx 1$.

Want to evaluate crude linear asymptote (this exists, and fine linear asymptotic relation also, because the stationary MC $\{Q(t)\}$ has finite state space and is irreducible, hence it is geometrically ergodic).

Introduce the family of indicator random variables $J_{Q(t-)}$ which, conditional on $Q(t-)$, are mutually independent for distinct time variables t and independent of $N_{\text{serv}}(du)$ in $u \geq t$, for which

$$J_{Q(t-)} | \{Q(t-) = i\} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{with probability } \min(i, k)/k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $N_{\text{dep}}(dt) = J_{Q(t-)} N_{\text{serv}}(dt)$, equivalently

$$N_{\text{dep}}(0, t] = \int_{(0, t]} N_{\text{dep}}(du) = \int_{(0, t]} J_{Q(u-)} N_{\text{serv}}(du).$$

This leads ultimately to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{var } N_{\text{dep}}(0, t] - \mathbb{E}(N_{\text{dep}}(0, t]) \\
&= \frac{2\mu^2}{k^2} \sum_{i=1}^{k+K} \sum_{j=1}^{k+K} \min(i, k) \min(j, k) \int_0^t (t-u) \pi_i [p_{i-1, j}(u) - \pi_j] du, \\
&= \frac{2\mu\lambda}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k+K} \min(j, k) \int_0^t (t-u) \pi_{k+K} [\pi_j - p_{k+K, j}(u)] du,
\end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} [\text{var } N_{\text{dep}}(0, t] - \mathbb{E}(N_{\text{dep}}(0, t])] / \lambda t \\
&= \frac{2\mu}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k+K} \min(j, k) \int_0^\infty \pi_{k+K} [\pi_j - p_{k+K, j}(u)] du,
\end{aligned}$$

and exploiting reversibility, this equals

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{2\mu}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k+K} \min(j, k) \pi_j \int_0^\infty [\pi_{k+K} - p_{j, k+K}(u)] du \\
&= 2\lambda \sum_{j=1}^{k+K} \pi_{j-1} \int_0^\infty [\pi_{k+K} - p_{j, k+K}(u)] du.
\end{aligned}$$

[Now convert this to sums of moments of first-passage times etc.]

What changes for $\rho \neq 1$?

Use $\rho = 1 - \frac{\beta}{K}$, and $K = \alpha\sqrt{k}$

(so both $k, K \rightarrow \infty$ but ‘controlled’ relative rate).

Use

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{var } N_{\text{dep}}(0, t]}{\mathbb{E}(N(0_{\text{dep}}(0, t]))} = 1 - 2 \sum_{i=0}^{k+K} \pi_i v_i (1 - v_i)$$

where (birth-and-death process) $v_i = \pi_{k+K} P_i / \pi_i$ and $P_i = \sum_{j=0}^i \pi_j$.

$\text{var } N_{\text{dep}}(0, t]$ falls short of asymptotic rate for Poisson process

$$x(1 - x) \leq \frac{1}{4} \quad (\text{all real } x)$$

[BUT: expression is for finite state-space birth–death proc.]

Return to [NW08] figure:

It is *variance* function that is asymptotically discontinuous .
. . there is change in mechanism producing the O/P process
at $\rho = 1$: why should second-order (variability) effect remain
continuous like first-order (mean) effect?

Why should volatility near change point be ‘continuous’ ?

Draief and Massoulié emphasize the criticality theorem for
branching processes as simplest change-point phenomenon with
small change in reproduction rate produces catastrophic change
in ultimate population.

Does BRAVO effect change output from more complex queue-
ing systems as system nears criticality (‘heavy traffic’) ?