

---

Faculty of Mathematical Sciences



University of Twente  
The Netherlands

---

---

P.O. Box 217  
7500 AE Enschede  
The Netherlands

Phone: +31-53-4893400

Fax: +31-53-4893114

Email: [memo@math.utwente.nl](mailto:memo@math.utwente.nl)

[www.math.utwente.nl/publications](http://www.math.utwente.nl/publications)

---

MEMORANDUM No. 1643

Proofs for some conjectures  
of Rajaratnam and Takawira

E.A. VAN DOORN AND A.T.T. KIEU

SEPTEMBER, 2002

ISSN 0169-2690

# Proofs for some conjectures of Rajaratnam and Takawira

Erik A. van Doorn and An T.T. Kieu

Faculty of Mathematical Sciences  
University of Twente  
P.O. Box 217, 7500 AE Enschede, The Netherlands  
E-mail: {e.a.vandoorn,a.t.t.kieu}@math.utwente.nl

September 4, 2002

**Abstract.** The purpose of this note is to supplement a recent paper by Rajaratnam and Takawira (*IEEE Trans. Vehicular Technol.* **49** (2000) 817-834), which deals with a model for the performance analysis of cellular mobile networks. We show that the key performance quantity may be obtained by evaluating an explicit formula rather than by solving a set of equations. This result enables us to verify some conjectures formulated by Rajaratnam and Takawira on the basis of numerical experiments. We also show uniqueness of the solution to a system of nonlinear equations, required in the performance analysis, as conjectured by Rajaratnam and Takawira.

*Keywords and phrases:* carried traffic, cellular mobile network, handoff traffic, output traffic, output process, peakedness factor, smooth traffic, tandem system

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification:* 90B22, 60K25, 68M20

# 1 Introduction

In a series of papers ([9]–[13]) Rajaratnam and Takawira have proposed a method for analysing the performance of cellular mobile networks. At the heart of their method, more specifically at the heart of their cell traffic model, lies the simple tandem service system depicted in Figure 1. It consists of a first cell containing  $N$  servers and a second cell with infinitely many servers. Customers (calls) arrive at the first cell according to a Poisson process with intensity  $\lambda$ . If upon arrival of a call at least one of the servers in the first cell is free, the call seizes an arbitrary free server and keeps it occupied during the call's service time; if all servers in the first cell are busy the call is lost. After being served in the first cell a call leaves the system with probability  $1 - p$  and is transferred with probability  $p$  to the second cell, where it is served for a second time. Service times are mutually independent random variables and also independent of the arrival process; the service times in cell  $i$  are identically distributed with mean  $\mu_i^{-1}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .




Figure 1: A tandem service system

The stream of calls entering the second cell models the *handoff traffic* from a cell in a cellular network, and is characterized by the mean  $M_h(p)$  and variance  $V_h(p)$  of the stationary number of occupied servers in the second cell. (It will be convenient to explicitly indicate dependence on  $p$ .) The question is how these quantities depend on the parameters of the model, and, more concretely, whether explicit expressions for  $M_h(p)$  and  $V_h(p)$  can be given, perhaps in specific settings. Rajaratnam and Takawira have obtained partial solutions to these problems. Also, they have formulated a number of conjectures on the basis of numerical experiments. We will now briefly describe their findings and the supplementary results we intend to establish in this paper.

For future reference we note that the mean  $M_c \equiv M_c(N, a)$  and variance

$V_c \equiv V_c(N, a)$  of the stationary number of occupied servers in the first cell (known as the mean and variance of the *carried traffic*) are given by

$$M_c = a(1 - B) \quad (1)$$

and

$$V_c = M_c - (a - M_c)(N - M_c), \quad (2)$$

where  $a \equiv \lambda/\mu_1$  and  $B \equiv B(N, a)$  denotes the Erlang loss function

$$B(N, a) \equiv \frac{a^N/N!}{1 + a + a^2/2! + \dots + a^N/N!} \quad (3)$$

(see, for example, [3]).

It is shown in [12] and [13] that

$$M_h(p) = pM_h(1) \quad (4)$$

and

$$\frac{V_h(p)}{M_h(p)} = 1 - p \left( 1 - \frac{V_h(1)}{M_h(1)} \right), \quad (5)$$

so that the problem of calculating  $M_h(p)$  and  $V_h(p)$  reduces to that of finding  $M_{out} \equiv M_h(1)$  and  $V_{out} \equiv V_h(1)$ , the index *out* being mnemonic for *output traffic*. Evidently, by Little's formula,

$$M_{out} = \lambda(1 - B)/\mu_2 = (\mu_1/\mu_2)M_c, \quad (6)$$

but a relation between  $V_{out}$  and  $V_c$  has been established only in the case that the service times in each cell are deterministic and equal, namely  $V_{out} = V_c$  (see [11]).

Assuming that the service times are exponentially distributed, Rajaratnam and Takawira [12] show that  $V_{out}$  may be obtained by solving a set of  $N + 1$  simultaneous equations. On the basis of numerical experiments they subsequently conjecture that the *peakedness (factor)*  $Z_{out} \equiv V_{out}/M_{out}$  of the output traffic satisfies

$$Z_{out} < 1 \quad (7)$$

and

$$Z_{out} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } a \downarrow 0 \quad \text{or } a \rightarrow \infty. \quad (8)$$

In Section 2 we shall obtain an explicit expression for  $V_{out}$ , which will enable us in Section 3 to prove the conjectured properties of  $Z_{out}$ . It then follows immediately from (5) that the peakedness factor  $Z_h(p) \equiv V_h(p)/M_h(p)$  of the handoff traffic has similar properties.

As part of their (approximative) performance analysis Rajaratnam and Takawira require a solution  $(a, N)$  to the system of equations  $m = M_c(N, a)$  and  $v = V_c(N, a)$ . Evidently, such a solution will not exist in general if one requires  $N$  to be an integer. However, it is conceptually and computationally easy to continue the Erlang loss function  $B(N, a)$  to nonintegral values of the first argument by letting

$$B(x, a) \equiv \left\{ a \int_0^\infty e^{-at} (1+t)^x dt \right\}^{-1}, \quad x \geq 0 \quad (9)$$

(see, for example, [4] or [5]). With this interpretation of the Erlang loss function Rajaratnam and Takawira [12] conjecture that there is a unique solution  $(a, x)$  to the system of equations

$$m = a - aB(x, a) \quad (10)$$

$$v = m - (a - m)(x - m) \quad (11)$$

for given values of  $m$  and  $v$  such that  $0 < v < m$ . In Section 4 we will verify this conjecture. (A similar problem involving *overflow traffic* was solved in [5].)

We conclude this introduction with the observation that the proof of (5) in [12] does not depend on the particular type of traffic involved. That is, the effect on peakedness of *thinning* an arbitrary traffic stream by accepting each call with probability  $p$  is expressed by

$$Z(p) = 1 - p(1 - Z), \quad (12)$$

where  $Z$  and  $Z(p)$  denote the peakedness factors of the original and the thinned stream, respectively. This relation was observed earlier in the context of exponential service times in [2].

## 2 Variance of the output traffic

Since service times are assumed to be exponentially distributed, the number of calls in the first cell is a birth-death process, and hence reversible (see,

for example, Kelly [7]). It follows that in equilibrium the output process of the first cell is stochastically identical to the input process, that is, the arrival process of served calls. (The input process together with the *overflow process* – the arrival process of lost calls – constitute the arrival process to the first cell). Calculating the variance  $V_{out}$  of the output traffic is therefore equivalent to computing the variance  $V_{fc}$  of the *freed carried traffic*, that is, the variance of the stationary number of occupied servers when a copy of the input process to the first cell is offered to a hypothetical infinite-size cell in which each call is served during an exponentially distributed service time (of mean  $\mu_2$ ) which is independent of its service time in the first cell.

Freed carried traffic has recently been studied in the more general setting of renewal arrival processes by Brandt and Brandt [1]. Specifying their results for the setting at hand, these authors present in [1, (3.9)] an explicit formula for  $V_{fc}$  which, in our notation, reads as

$$V_{fc} = M_{fc} \left\{ 1 - \frac{B}{2(1-B)} \left( N + aB - M_c - \frac{a}{N+1-M_c} \right) \right\}. \quad (13)$$

Here, as before,  $a = \lambda/\mu_1$ ,  $B \equiv B(N, a)$  is the Erlang loss function (3), and  $M_c$  is the mean of the carried traffic given in (1). In addition,  $M_{fc}$  is the mean of the freed carried traffic (the mean number of occupied servers in the hypothetical cell). Clearly, by Little's law,  $M_{fc} = \lambda(1-B)/\mu_2$ , so that  $M_{fc} = M_{out}$  in view of (6). Since  $V_{out} = V_{fc}$ , the solution to our problem of determining  $V_{out}$  can now be given as follows.

**Theorem 1** *The variance  $V_{out}$  of the output traffic can be represented as*

$$V_{out} = M_{out} \left\{ 1 - \frac{B}{2(1-B)} \left( Y + aB - \frac{a}{Y+1} \right) \right\}, \quad (14)$$

where  $Y \equiv N - M_c$ .

We note that  $Y$  can be interpreted as the mean number of free servers in the first cell, so that  $Y > 0$ .

For some specific parameter values we have compared the results of evaluating (14) with the results Rajaratnam and Takawira [12, Figure 7] obtained by solving a system of linear equations, and found complete agreement.

### 3 Proofs of the peakedness conjectures

Theorem 1 tells us that the peakedness factor  $Z_{out} \equiv V_{out}/M_{out}$  of the output traffic is given by

$$Z_{out} = 1 - \frac{B}{2(1-B)} \left( Y + aB - \frac{a}{Y+1} \right). \quad (15)$$

We can now prove the following theorem, verifying conjecture (8).

**Theorem 2** *Let  $N$  be a fixed positive integer, then  $Z_{out} \rightarrow 1$  as  $a \downarrow 0$  or  $a \rightarrow \infty$ .*

**Proof.** It is obvious that if  $a \downarrow 0$  then also  $B \equiv B(N, a) \rightarrow 0$ , while  $Y \equiv N - M_c = N - a(1-B) \rightarrow N$ . Hence the first part follows immediately from (15).

To prove the second part we note from (3) that, as  $a \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{B} = 1 + \frac{N}{a} + \frac{N(N-1)}{a^2} + \frac{N(N-1)(N-2)}{a^3} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{a^4}\right). \quad (16)$$

As a consequence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Y}{B} + a &= \frac{N-a}{B} + 2a = a + \frac{N}{a} + \frac{2N(N-1)}{a^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{a^3}\right), \\ \frac{Y+1}{B} &= \frac{N-a+1}{B} + a = 1 + \frac{2N}{a} + \frac{3N(N-1)}{a^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{a^3}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left(\frac{a}{B}\right)^2 = a^2 + 2aN + 3N^2 - 2N + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{a}\right),$$

so that

$$a \left( \frac{Y}{B} + a \right) \left( \frac{Y+1}{B} \right) - \left( \frac{a}{B} \right)^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{a}\right). \quad (17)$$

Evidently, if  $a \rightarrow \infty$  then  $B \rightarrow 1$  and  $Y \rightarrow 0$ , while, in view of (16),  $a(1-B)/B \rightarrow N$ . Since we can rewrite (15) as

$$Z_{out} = 1 - \frac{B^2}{2(Y+1)a(1-B)} \left( a \left( \frac{Y}{B} + a \right) \left( \frac{Y+1}{B} \right) - \left( \frac{a}{B} \right)^2 \right),$$

these facts together with (17) imply that  $Z_{out} \rightarrow 1$  as  $a \rightarrow \infty$ , as required.  $\square$

It requires more effort to prove the next theorem, which verifies conjecture (7).

**Theorem 3** *For any positive integer  $N$  and real  $a > 0$  we have  $Z_{out} < 1$ .*

**Proof.** We define

$$H \equiv \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{a^i}{i!}$$

(so that  $HB = a^N/N!$ ), and let

$$C \equiv H^2\{(Y + aB)(Y + 1) - a\}. \quad (18)$$

Substitution of  $Y = N - a(1 - B)$  shows us that

$$C = H^2\{2a^2B^2 - (3a^2 - a(3N + 2))B + a^2 - 2a(N + 1) + N(N + 1)\}. \quad (19)$$

Clearly,  $C$  is a polynomial in  $a$  of maximum degree  $2N + 2$ , so that we can write

$$C \equiv C(a) = \sum_{i=0}^{2N+2} c_i a^i. \quad (20)$$

We see from (15) and (18) that

$$Z_{out} < 1 \iff (Y + aB)(Y + 1) > a \iff C > 0, \quad (21)$$

and we will prove that  $C > 0$  by showing that each coefficient  $c_i$  in (20) is nonnegative, while  $c_0 > 0$ .

We first note from (19) that  $c_0 = N(N + 1) > 0$ , as required. Let us next assume that  $0 < i \leq N$ . It then follows from (19) that

$$\begin{aligned} c_i &= \sum_{k+l=i-2} \frac{1}{k! l!} - \sum_{k+l=i-1} \frac{2(N+1)}{k! l!} + \sum_{k+l=i} \frac{N(N+1)}{k! l!} \\ &\geq \sum_{k=0}^i \frac{N(N+1)}{k!(i-k)!} - \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \frac{2(N+1)}{k!(i-k-1)!} \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k=0}^i \frac{(N+1)(N-2i+2k)}{k!(i-k)!} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^i \frac{(N+1)(N-i)}{k!(i-k)!} - \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \frac{N+1}{k!(i-k-1)!} + \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{N+1}{(k-1)!(i-k)!} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^i \frac{(N+1)(N-i)}{k!(i-k)!} \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The following step is to observe from (19) that

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{N+1} &= \frac{3N+2}{N!} + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{k!(N-k-1)!} - \sum_{k=0}^N \frac{2(N+1)}{k!(N-k)!} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{N(N+1)}{k!(N-k+1)!} \\
&= \frac{N}{N!} + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left( \frac{1}{k!(N-k-1)!} - \frac{2(N+1)}{k!(N-k)!} + \frac{N(N+1)}{(k+1)!(N-k)!} \right) \\
&= \frac{N}{N!} + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{N(N-k) - (k+1)(k+2)}{(k+1)!(N-k)!} \\
&= \frac{N}{N!} + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{N}{k!(N-k)!} - \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{k+2}{k!(N-k)!} \\
&= \frac{N}{N!} + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{N}{k!(N-k)!} - \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{N-k+2}{k!(N-k)!} \\
&= \sum_{k=2}^N \frac{k-2}{k!(N-k)!} \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We subsequently obtain from (19) by straightforward calculations that

$$c_{2N+2} = c_{2N+1} = c_{2N} = 0,$$

so it remains to check whether  $c_i \geq 0$  for  $N+1 < i < 2N$ . To this end we first derive a representation for  $c_{N+j}$ ,  $1 < j \leq N$ . Namely, from (19) we have

$$c_{N+j} - \frac{N-j+1}{N!(j-1)!} = -\frac{3}{N!(j-2)!} + \frac{3N+2}{N!(j-1)!}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{k=j-2}^N \frac{1}{k!(N+j-k-2)!} - \sum_{k=j-1}^N \frac{2(N+1)}{k!(N+j-k-1)!} \\
& + \sum_{k=j}^N \frac{N(N+1)}{k!(N+j-k)!} - \frac{N-j+1}{N!(j-1)!} \\
= & \sum_{k=j-1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{k!(N+j-k-2)!} - \sum_{k=j-1}^{N-1} \frac{2(N+1)}{k!(N+j-k-1)!} \\
& + \sum_{k=j-1}^{N-1} \frac{N(N+1)}{(k+1)!(N+j-k-1)!} \\
= & \sum_{k=j-1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{k!(N+j-k-2)!} - \sum_{k=j-1}^{N-1} \frac{N+1}{k!(N+j-k-1)!} \\
& + \sum_{k=j-1}^{N-1} \frac{(N+1)(N+j-k-1)}{(k+1)!(N+j-k-1)!} - \sum_{k=j-1}^{N-1} \frac{j(N+1)}{(k+1)!(N+j-k-1)!} \\
= & \sum_{k=j-1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{k!(N+j-k-2)!} - \sum_{k=j-1}^{N-1} \frac{j(N+1)}{(k+1)!(N+j-k-1)!} \\
= & \sum_{k=j-1}^{N-1} \frac{(k-j+1)(N-k-1)-j}{(k+1)!(N+j-k-1)!},
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$c_{N+j} = \frac{N-j+1}{N!(j-1)!} + \sum_{l=0}^{N-j} \frac{l(N-j-l)-j}{(j+l)!(N-l)!}, \quad 1 < j \leq N.$$

Using this result twice we obtain for  $2 < j \leq N$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{N+j-1} & = \frac{N-j+2}{N!(j-2)!} + \sum_{l=0}^{N-j+1} \frac{l(N-j-l+1)-j+1}{(j+l-1)!(N-l)!} \\
& = \frac{N-j+1}{N!(j-2)!} + \sum_{l=0}^{N-j} \frac{l(N-j-l+1)-j+1}{(j+l-1)!(N-l)!} \\
& = (j-1) \left( c_{N+j} - \sum_{l=0}^{N-j} \frac{l(N-j-l)-j}{(j+l)!(N-l)!} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{l=0}^{N-j} \frac{l(N-j-l+1) - j + 1}{(j+l-1)!(N-l)!} \\
& = (j-1)c_{N+j} + \sum_{l=0}^{N-j} \frac{l(l+1)(N-j-l+1)}{(j+l-1)!(N-l)!} \geq (j-1)c_{N+j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $c_{2N} = 0$ , it now follows by induction that we have  $c_i \geq 0$  for  $i = 2N, 2N-1, \dots, N+2$ . Thus we have shown that all coefficients in (20) are nonnegative while  $c_0 > 0$ . As a result we have  $C > 0$  and hence, by (21),  $Z_{out} < 1$ .  $\square$

We conclude this section with two remarks. First, the validity of Theorem 3 was claimed earlier by Kirstein [8, (4.11)], but, as explained in a Correction to [8], his proof is in error. Secondly, recalling that the peakedness factor  $Z_{ov}$  of the overflow traffic satisfies

$$Z_{ov} = 1 - aB + \frac{a}{Y+1}$$

(see, for example, [3]), we note that (21) yields the interesting upper bound

$$Z_{ov} < 1 + Y, \tag{22}$$

supplementing the well-known lower bound  $Z_{ov} > 1$  (see, for example, [5]).

## 4 Uniqueness of a solution

As announced we will prove in this section the following theorem.

**Theorem 4** *For given values of  $m$  and  $v$  such that  $0 < v < m$ , the system of equations (10) and (11) has a unique solution  $(a, x)$  such that  $a > m$  and  $x > 0$ .*

**Proof.** Writing  $\alpha \equiv (a - m)^{-1}$  and solving (11) for  $x$  we find

$$x = m + (m - v)\alpha.$$

Hence, letting

$$f(x, a) \equiv \{aB(x, a)\}^{-1} = \int_0^\infty e^{-at}(1+t)^x dt,$$

we can reformulate our problem as that of establishing that there is a unique positive solution to the single equation

$$g(\alpha) = \alpha,$$

where

$$g(\alpha) \equiv f(m + (m - v)\alpha, m + \alpha^{-1}).$$

It is straightforward to verify that under our assumption  $0 < v < m$  we have  $g'(\alpha) < 0$  for  $\alpha > 0$ . Since  $g(\alpha) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\alpha \downarrow 0$  and  $g(\alpha) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ , the required result follows immediately.  $\square$

We finally note that uniqueness of the solution was claimed already by Katz in [6], but no proof was given. We must add that Katz uses a logarithmic interpolation formula rather than (9) to compute the Erlang loss function for a nonintegral number of servers.

**Acknowledgement.** We thank Bart Sanders of Vodafone Research in Maastricht, The Netherlands for pointing our attention to the conjectures of Rajaratnam and Takawira, and we are grateful to Andreas Brandt of the Humboldt University in Berlin for informing us about his joint work with M. Brandt [1] prior to publication.

## References

- [1] A. Brandt and M. Brandt, On the moments of the overflow and freed carried traffic for the  $GI/M/C/0$  system. *Methodol. Comput. Appl. Probab.*, to appear.
- [2] E.A. van Doorn, Some aspects of the peakedness concept in teletraffic theory. *Elektron. Informationsverarb. Kybernet.* **22** (1986) 93-104.
- [3] A. Girard, *Routing and Dimensioning in Circuit-Switched Networks*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1990.
- [4] D.L. Jagerman, Some properties of the Erlang loss function. *Bell System Tech. J.* **53** (1974) 525-551.

- [5] A.A. Jagers and E.A. van Doorn, On the continued Erlang loss function. *Oper. Res. Lett.* **5** (1986) 43-46.
- [6] S. Katz, Statistical performance analysis of a switched communications network. *Proc. 5th International Teletraffic Congress*, 1967, pp. 566-575.
- [7] F.P. Kelly, *Reversibility and Stochastic Networks*. Wiley, Chichester, 1979.
- [8] B.M. Kirstein, Some inequalities for queues with applications to tandem and overflow systems. *Elektron. Informationsverarb. Kybernet.* **14** (1978) 445-462. Correction. **15** (1979) 336.
- [9] M. Rajaratnam and F. Takawira, Hand-off traffic modelling in cellular networks. In *Proc. IEEE Globecom '97*, Phoenix, AZ, 1997, pp. 131-137.
- [10] M. Rajaratnam and F. Takawira, The two moment performance analysis of cellular mobile networks with and without channel reservation. In *Proc. IEEE ICUPC '98*, Florence, 1998, p. 1157.
- [11] M. Rajaratnam and F. Takawira, Performance analysis of highway cellular networks using generalised arrival and generalised service time distributions. In *Teletraffic Engineering in a Competitive World* (Proc. 16th International Teletraffic Congress), P. Key and D. Smith eds., Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1999, pp. 11-22.
- [12] M. Rajaratnam and F. Takawira, Nonclassical traffic modeling and performance analysis of cellular mobile networks with and without channel reservation. *IEEE Trans. Vehicular Technol.* **49** (2000) 817-834.
- [13] M. Rajaratnam and F. Takawira, Handoff traffic characterization in cellular networks under nonclassical arrivals and service time distributions. *IEEE Trans. Vehicular Technol.* **50** (2001) 954-970.