

A Simple Policy for Multiple Queues with Size-Independent Service Times

Yuhang Liu^a, Zizhuo Wang^a

^a*Industrial and Systems Engineering, University of Minnesota, MN, 55455*

Abstract

We consider a service system with two Poisson arrival queues. A server chooses which queue to serve at each moment. Once a queue is served, all the customers will be served within a fixed amount of time. This model is useful in studying airport shuttling or certain online computing systems. We propose a simple yet optimal state-independent policy for this problem which is not only easy to implement, but also performs very well.

1. Introduction

Finding efficient and practical service plans for multi-queue systems has always been an important question for both researchers and practitioners. In this paper, we consider a special type of two-queue system that has the following features: 1) the customer arrivals in both queues are Poisson processes; 2) there is only one server; 3) once a queue is chosen to be served, all the customers in that queue will be served in a fixed amount of time. The decision in such a system is to decide at each time, which queue should be served and the overall objective is to minimize the total expected delays of the customers.

The above model covers a wide range of problems that may occur in practice. For example, in an airport transportation system, a shuttle bus picks up passengers from multiple locations (e.g., different hotels or rental car locations) and drops them off at the terminal. Due to the route constraints, the shuttle bus can only go to one location each time (i.e., a cyclic route is not permissible). Customers arrive at each location with a certain rate and the service provider has to decide its service schedule (the schedule could be either state-dependent or independent) to minimize the total delays of all customers. Given sufficiently large capacity, the shuttle can pick up all the passengers waiting in the location that it serves and the service time does not depend on the job size. Another example is an online computing service system, in which a server provides computational services for several types of customers. In some applications, the service time mainly depends on the setup time (software initializations and warm up, etc) and depends little on the job size. In this case, again, the decision for the server is to decide which type of customer to serve at each time period, with an overall objective of minimizing the total delays of jobs.

In this work, we first formulate this problem as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) in Section 3. Although the MDP formula is a precise description of the actual problem and the policy obtained therefore is optimal, the optimal policy has the feature of being state-dependent. However, in practice, such a feature might be undesirable due to the limited knowledge of the state of the system and the implementation constraints. To solve this problem, in Section 4, we propose a simple policy that is independent of the current state. Among the state-independent policies, we prove that the optimal one must consist of cycles of a fixed schedule, and each cycle consists of serving the slow-arriving queue once followed by serving the fast-arriving queue multiple (k) times. We then show how to choose the optimal k . We give an explicit formula for the optimal k . In particular, we show that when the discount factor across periods approaches 1, k will be approximately $\sqrt{2r} - 1$, where r is the ratio of the arrival rates between the fast-arriving queue and the slow one. This result quantifies the optimal strategy for the service providers of how often should the slow-arriving queue be served, and thus is insightful for practitioners. We implement this strategy in Section 5 and show that it performs well.

Before we proceed to the models, we review some related literature in the following.

Email addresses: liuxx839@umn.edu (Yuhang Liu), zwang@umn.edu (Zizhuo Wang)

2. Literature Review

Our work is related to the batched service systems in queueing theory. For a comprehensive review of batched service system, we refer the readers to the books by Chaudhry and Templeton [1], Cooper [2] and Gross et al. [3].

Our work is related to a vast literature in designing systems where a shuttle runs between two (or more) terminals. In those problems, a shuttle runs between two terminals and sends customers from one terminal to the other (a cyclic route is usually used when there are more than two terminals). The studies of those problems can be classified by whether the shuttle is finitely capacitated (Deb [4], Deb and Schmidt [5]) or not (Ignall and Kolesar [6], Weiss [7, 8]); whether the control can be exerted at both terminals (Deb and Schmidt [5], Deb [4], Weiss [7], Lee and Srinivasan [9]) or only can be exerted at a single terminal (Ignall and Kolesar [6], Weiss [8], Lee and Kim [10]). The cost usually consists of a fixed cost, a per passenger costs, and the waiting costs of the customers. In our work, we assume there are two queues, and the service provider can serve one of them at each time. Therefore, although the background shares some similarity, our model is quite different from this line of research.

Another research area that is related to our work is the vehicle routing problems. We refer the readers to Laporte [11] for a comprehensive review of this literature. The main difference between our work and the vehicle routing problems is that we don't design the route. Instead, we design the service schedules. And there is no capacity constraints or time windows for our service. Moreover, our load is stochastic, and our criterion is the expected waiting time.

In some sense, our model also relates to the problem of traffic controls. In those problems, there are also two (or more) queues, and one has to determine when to serve each of them. A thorough study of this problem is provided in Dunne and Potts [12] and literature thereafter. Although our work shares some similarities in terms of the state space, the model we use is quite different in that we assume all the customers can be served in a fixed amount of time, regardless of the backup, whereas in the traffic control literature, usually a departure rate is used. This difference makes our analysis and control policy quite different.

3. Model and Analysis

We consider a system of two independent queues without capacity limits. Customers arrive in each of these two queues according to Poisson processes, with rates λ_1 and λ_2 respectively. One distinguishing feature of our model is that at each time the server is idle, it could choose one of the two queues to serve. And once a queue is chosen to be served, all of its current customers will be served (and depart the system) within a deterministic time (However, the customers that arrive after the service has started will not be served during this service cycle). This model characterizes situations in which the service time is largely determined by the setup time but not how much service it needs to provide. Furthermore, we assume the service time for both queues are the same. Without loss of generality, we assume that the service time equals to 1.

We use Q_i , $i = 1, 2$ to denote the i th queue. Due to the assumption of our problem, we can consider this problem in a number of discrete time periods. The decision in our model is to decide a queue to serve at each time period. And the objective is to determine a service rule such that the expected discounted total waiting time of all the customers is minimized. To mathematically capture this objective function, we adopt a Markov Decision Process (MDP) approach. We use $s = (x, y)$ to denote the state when there are x people waiting in the first queue and y people waiting in the second queue. We use $V(x, y)$ to denote the optimal expected discounted waiting time onward (the cost function) when the state is (x, y) . The Bellman equation for this MDP problem can be written as

$$V(x, y) = \lambda + \min\{\gamma\mathbb{E}[V(Z_1, Z_2 + y)] + y, \gamma\mathbb{E}[V(Z_1 + x, Z_2)] + x.\} \quad (1)$$

where $\lambda = (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2$, Z_1 and Z_2 are independent Poisson random variables with parameter λ_1 and λ_2 respectively. In (1), the first term is the expected waiting time for the arriving customers during the current period. Note that if the arrivals are Poisson processes, given the number of arrivals in one period, the exact arrival time during this period is uniformly distributed. Therefore, the expected waiting time of the new arrivals are $\lambda_i/2$ for each queue i . The second term in (1) corresponds to the two choices available at the current period, i.e., to serve either the first queue or the second queue. When the first queue is served, the state will change to $(Z_1, Z_2 + y)$ and the expected waiting time occurred in this time period for the customers currently in the queue is y . Similarly, when the second queue is served, the state will change to $(Z_1 + x, Z_2)$ and the expected waiting time occurred in this time period for the customers currently in the queue is x . γ is the discount factor for the later periods.

The MDP defined in (1) is an infinite state problem. In order to solve it exactly, we truncate it into a finite state space problem and apply the normal procedures to solve it (e.g., value iteration). The solution method is standard and is thus omitted.

4. State-Independent Policies

In Section 3, we established an MDP model for this problem. Although the MDP problem is easily solvable, the optimal control is state-dependent, that is, at each moment, the service provider needs to know the exact queue length of each queue to make his decision. However, in practice, a state-independent policy might be desirable. There are two reasons for this. First, it might be impractical for the service provider to know exactly how many people are waiting in each queue at each moment. Consider the airport shuttle example we gave earlier, when dispatching a shuttle to one location, it is hard to know how many people are waiting in that location. Second, in real operations, it is very desirable to have a fixed service schedule. A fixed service schedule not only simplifies the service provider's task, but also relaxes the customers by informing them the next service time. In this section, we study state-independent policies. We first find the optimal state-independent policy and then show that it performs quite well in test problems.

4.1. Optimal structures of the state-independent policy

In this section, we prove the structures of the optimal state-independent policy. In the following discussion, without loss of generality, we assume $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$. We prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *The optimal state-independent policy is cyclic after a certain number of periods. In each cycle, Q_1 is served once followed by serving Q_2 $k \geq 1$ times.*

The proof of Theorem 1 follows from the following claims.

Claim 1. *The optimal state-independent policy is cyclic after a certain number of periods. In each cycle, Q_1 is served k_1 times followed by serving Q_2 k_2 times.*

Claim 2. *At least one of k_1 and k_2 must be 1.*

Claim 3. $k_1 = 1$.

Proof of Claim 1. We consider any state-independent policy π . We call π "reasonable" if it serves each queue infinite many times. It is obvious that the optimal policy must be a "reasonable" one. Now we only focus on "reasonable" policies. Consider the following piece of service schedule $\pi(l_1, l_2)$ ($l_1 \geq 0, l_2 \geq 1$): Serve Q_1 l_1 times, then serve Q_2 l_2 times, then serve Q_1 . Note that any "reasonable" policy can be decomposed into such pieces based on each occurrence of (Q_2, Q_1) in its schedule. Also note that for fixed l_1 and l_2 , the expected costs during this piece discounted back to its beginning is a constant, since at the beginning, the state of the queue is always $(Z_1, Z_2^1 + Z_2^2)$, where Z_1 is a Poisson random variable with parameter λ_1 and Z_2^i ($i = 1, 2$) are Poisson random variables with parameter λ_2 . Denote t_0 to be the first time that Q_2 is served at $t_0 - 2$ and Q_1 is served at $t_0 - 1$. Denote V to be the optimal expected cost from t_0 . Now if in the optimal policy, the first piece is $\pi(l_1, l_2)$ (as argued before, it must complete such a piece at a certain point), then we must have

$$V = V(l_1, l_2) + \gamma^{l_1+l_2+1}V$$

where $V(l_1, l_2)$ is the expected cost during this piece discounted back to its beginning. This is because the state after $l_1 + l_2 + 1$ periods after t_0 have exactly the same distribution as that at time t_0 and thus the optimal expected cost onward are the same. Noting that repeatedly using $\pi(l_1, l_2)$ will achieve V . Therefore, repeatedly using $\pi(l_1, l_2)$ is an optimal policy from time t_0 .

Finally, if we put $\pi(l_1, l_2)$ together and break it by each time we switch from Q_2 to Q_1 , we get the optimal state-independent policy must be cyclic from $t_0 - 1$ and in each cycle, Q_1 is served k_1 times followed by Q_2 served k_2 times. \square

Proof of Claim 2. We prove by contradiction. If both k_1 and k_2 are greater than 1. Then we compare the following two cycles:

1. Serve Q_1 k_1 times followed by serving Q_2 k_2 times.
2. Serve Q_1 $k_1 - 1$ times, then serve Q_2 , then serve Q_1 , then serve Q_2 $k_2 - 1$ times.

First note that both cycles cover $k_1 + k_2$ time periods so we only need to compare the expected costs within the cycle. Note that the first $k_1 - 1$ actions are the same in both cycles, therefore the expected costs are the same. Now we discuss the cost in the subsequent time periods in both cycles as follows (In the following, we ignore the waiting times incurred by the customers that arrive during the exact time period that is under consideration (i.e., the λ part) since they are the same no matter what policy is used):

- At time period k_1 , the cost for the first cycle is the waiting time of the second queue, which is the sum of arrivals in the second queue during the first $k_1 - 1$ periods (which is therefore a Poisson distribution with parameter $(k_1 - 1)\lambda_2$), and the cost for the second cycle is the waiting time of the first queue, which is simply the arrival during period $k_1 - 1$ (which is a Poisson distribution with parameter λ_1).
- At time period $k_1 + 1$, the cost for the first cycle is the waiting time of the first queue, which is a Poisson random variable with parameter λ_1 , while the cost for the second cycle is the waiting time of the second queue, which is a Poisson random variable with parameter λ_2 .
- At time after $k_1 + 1$, the expected cost for Q_2 are the same for both queues, however, the expected cost for Q_1 in the second cycle is smaller than that in the first cycle since Q_1 is last served in period $k_1 + 1$ rather than k_1 .

To summarize, the total expected costs from time period k_1 and $k_1 + 1$ is $(k_1 - 1)\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\gamma$ in the first cycle and it is $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2\gamma$ in the second cycle. Since $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$ and $\gamma < 1$, the second one is always smaller. Also the total expected costs from the period after $k_1 + 1$ is also smaller in the second cycle as discussed above. Therefore, the second cycle always has smaller cost than the first one, and thus it is not optimal to have both k_1 and k_2 to be greater than 1. \square

Proof of Claim 3. Again, we prove by contradiction. If the optimal k_1 is greater than 1, then we can compare the expected costs of the following two cycles:

1. Serve Q_1 k times followed by serve Q_2 once
2. Serve Q_1 once followed by Q_2 once, Q_1 $k - 2$ times and then Q_2 once

The expected cost in the first cycle is $\lambda_2 \sum_{i=0}^k (i+1)\gamma^i + \lambda_1\gamma^{k+1}$ and the expected cost in the second cycle is $\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\gamma + \lambda_1 \sum_{i=2}^k (i-1)\gamma^i$ (again, we ignore the γ part since they are identical in both queues). It is easy to see that when $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$ and $\gamma < 1$, the cost in the second cycle is smaller. Thus one can decompose the cycle into smaller pieces, by Claim 1, we know that $k_1 > 1$ is not optimal. \square

Now we have proved the optimal structure of a state-independent policy, that is, it should consist of cycles, each of which should serve Q_1 once followed by serving Q_2 k times. Next we study what is the optimal choice of k .

4.2. Finding optimal k

We first compute the expected discounted cost in each cycle.

Proposition 1. Consider a cycle of (Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_2) with length $k + 1$ (thus k Q_2 s). The expected discounted cost in this cycle is

$$\lambda_2 + \lambda_1 \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} i\gamma^i + \lambda \sum_{i=0}^k \gamma^i. \quad (2)$$

Proof. We simply consider the expected cost in each period and add them up. In period 1, the waiting cost consists of two parts, one is due to the waiting of the customers in Q_2 that hasn't been served. Note that the number of people in Q_2 in the beginning of period 1 must be a Poisson distribution with parameter λ_2 (because before this period, Q_2 must be just served by the cycling structure). Therefore, the expected cost is λ_2 . There is also a waiting cost for the new arrivals in period 1, which is $\lambda = \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}{2}$ as we have argued in (1). Therefore, the expected cost in period 1 is $\lambda_2 + \lambda$.

Now we consider the i th period for $i > 1$. Note that in period i , the cost is again due to two parts, one is the waiting time from Q_1 . For this part, the total number of people in Q_1 at the beginning of time period i follows a Poisson distribution with parameter $(i-1)\lambda_1$, therefore the expected cost for this part is $(i-1)\lambda_1$. There is also waiting cost due to the new arrivals during that period, which is λ . Therefore, the total expected cost during period i is $(i-1)\lambda_1 + \lambda$.

To sum them up and take into considerations the discount factor, the total expected discounted cost in this cycle is

$$\lambda_2 + \lambda_1 \sum_{i=1}^k i\gamma^i + \lambda \sum_{i=0}^k \gamma^i. \quad \square$$

Now we consider the total expected costs throughout the time horizon, if a cyclic policy with length $k + 1$ is used, each with cost C , then the total discounted cost will be $C/(1 - \gamma^{k+1})$. Therefore we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2. Assuming the initial state is (M, λ_2) where $M > \lambda_2$. Then the total expected cost of using cyclic policy (Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_2) with length $k + 1$ (thus k Q_2 s) is

$$C(k) = \frac{\lambda_2 + \lambda_1 \sum_{i=1}^k i\gamma^i + \lambda \sum_{i=0}^k \gamma^i}{1 - \gamma^{k+1}}. \quad (3)$$

Remark. The reason we involve the big M is to make sure that it is better to serve Q_1 in the first period, and the expected cost in the very first period is the same as in the first period of each cycle later. In practice, if one focuses on the long run, then the costs in the first period does not matter too much and the result still approximately holds, otherwise, a modification is needed. \square

Now our task is simply to find k to minimize $C(k)$. The following theorem shows that $C(k)$ is unimodal in k . For the convenience of notation, we denote $r = \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} > 1$ in the following discussions.

Theorem 3. There exists a unique k^* such that $C(k^* - 1) \geq C(k^*)$ and $C(k^* + 1) \geq C(k^*)$.

Proof. We compare $C(k)$ and $C(k + 1)$. Note that the λ part in $C(k)$ are the same for all k (all equal to $\frac{\lambda}{1-\gamma}$). Therefore, it suffices to compare

$$C'(k) = \frac{\lambda_2 + \lambda_1 \sum_{i=1}^k i\gamma^i}{1 - \gamma^{k+1}}$$

with $C'(k + 1)$. Further by factoring out λ_1 , we only need to compare

$$\bar{C}(k) = \frac{r + \sum_{i=1}^k i\gamma^i}{1 - \gamma^{k+1}}$$

with $\bar{C}(k + 1)$. We have $\bar{C}(k + 1) \geq \bar{C}(k)$ if and only if

$$(r + \sum_{i=1}^k i\gamma^i)(1 - \gamma^{k+2}) - (r + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} i\gamma^i)(1 - \gamma^{k+1}) \leq 0. \quad (4)$$

By expanding and regrouping terms, we get that (4) is equivalent as

$$(1 - \gamma)r - (k + 1) + (1 - \gamma) \sum_{i=1}^k i\gamma^i + (k + 1)\gamma^{k+1} \leq 0$$

i.e.,

$$r \leq (k + 1) \sum_{i=0}^k \gamma^i - \sum_{i=1}^k i\gamma^i = \sum_{i=0}^k (k + 1 - i)\gamma^i. \quad (5)$$

Note that the right hand side of (5) is increasing in k . And when $k = 0$, the right hand side is 1 which is less than r , and when k goes to infinity, the right hand also goes to infinity (since it is greater than k). Therefore, there exists a unique integer k^* such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k^*} (k^* - i)\gamma^i \leq r < \sum_{i=0}^{k^*+1} (k^* + 1 - i)\gamma^i. \quad (6)$$

Such k^* will satisfy the property stated in the theorem. \square

Remark. By Theorem 3, finding the optimal k in the state-independent policy simply becomes to find k that satisfies (6). This can be done very fast. Moreover, we can see that k only depends on γ_1 and γ_2 through $r = \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}$. When r is larger, k is also larger, and vice versa. This is consistent with our intuition that if the arrival rate of Q_2 is much larger than that of Q_1 , we should serve it more frequently.

In Figure 1, we show an example of the optimal k^* and the function $C(k)$.

The next theorem points out the relationship between the optimal k and the discount factor γ and two important limit cases.




Figure 1: Illustrations of k^* and $C(k)$

Theorem 4. *The optimal k is decreasing with the discount factor γ . Furthermore, when $\gamma \rightarrow 1$, $k \sim \sqrt{2r} - 1$ and when $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, $k \sim r$.*

Proof. The theorem follows immediately from (6).

Theorem 4 is quite instrumental. It directly links the discount factor to the optimal frequency of serving each queue. In particular, when discount factor is small, then we are more focused on the current state, and we will choose the longer queue to serve at each moment. Under the state-independent assumption, this means that if the ratio between the arrival rates is r , then the ratio of the frequency of serving the two queues should be about r (i.e., serve the slow-arrival queue only when it accumulates the same customers as the long queue). On the contrary, when the discount factor goes to 1, we have to be careful about the accumulation effect, that is, the accumulated waiting time for k period for one queue is roughly of order k^2 , and we want to serve the slow-arrival queue if k^2 is of order r . Therefore, the ratio of the frequency between serving the two queues should be about $O(\sqrt{r})$. This rule, although simple, may provide important guidance for practitioners when they decide how frequent to serve each queue.

5. Numerical experiments

In this section, we conduct our numerical experiments to verify our findings. The results are shown in Table 1.

γ	r	k^*	$C(1)$	$C(r)$	$C(k^*)$	OPT	Gap(1)	Gap(r)	Gap(k^*)
0.6	1	1	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.62	8.29%	8.29%	8.29%
0.6	3	2	10.63	10.71	10.51	9.93	6.98%	7.81%	5.82%
0.6	5	3	16.25	15.76	15.51	14.91	8.96%	5.68%	3.97%
0.6	9	4	27.50	25.15	24.95	24.51	12.20%	2.63%	1.82%
0.8	1	1	10.00	10.00	10.00	8.85	13.04%	13.04%	13.04%
0.8	3	2	20.56	21.21	20.41	18.47	11.28%	14.80%	10.49%
0.8	5	2	31.11	31.12	29.51	27.27	14.06%	14.08%	8.18%
0.8	9	4	52.22	49.07	46.20	43.93	18.86%	11.68%	5.16%
0.99	1	1	200.00	200.00	200.00	167.86	19.14%	19.14%	19.14%
0.99	3	2	399.50	424.12	399.33	342.91	16.35%	23.43%	16.30%
0.99	5	2	599.00	630.82	565.33	500.30	19.49%	25.75%	12.86%
0.99	9	3	997.99	1032.23	871.87	718.22	25.37%	29.60%	9.75%

Table 1: Numerical results of our policies

In Table 1, the first and second column show the γ and r used. The third column is the optimal k^* computed from (6). The fourth to sixth column are the expected costs when one uses a state-independent policy with serving Q_1 once followed by serving Q_2 1, r or k^* time respectively. The reason we choose $k = 1$ and $k = r$ to compare is they are the simplest choices thus might be chosen in practice. The next column OPT is the optimal expected cost in the MDP. Note that OPT provides a lower bound of the cost for all state-independent policies. The last three columns in Table 1

show the cost gap between the state-independent policies and *OPT*. For all the numbers, we use (M, λ_2) as our initial state, which conforms to Theorem 2.

In Table 1, we see that the policy k^* indeed performs much better than other choices. In particular, we see that choosing $k = 1$ and $k = r$ usually result in comparable gaps from *OPT*, while choosing k^* results in about half of the gaps. Furthermore, the gap becomes smaller when r becomes larger, since if one queue has much faster arrival than the other, in either state-independent or dependent policy, one has to serve that queue more frequently, and the discrepancies between these two policies are smaller. Also, the gap becomes larger when γ becomes larger, potentially due to that if the performance is evaluated in a long run, the ability to adjust to current state is more important.

References

- [1] M. Chaudhry, J. Templeton, *A First Course in Bulk Queues*, Wiley, New York, 1983.
- [2] R. Cooper, *Introduction to Queueing Theory*, 2nd ed, Elsevier, North-Holland, New York, 1981.
- [3] D. Gross, J. Shortle, J. Thompson, C. Harris, *Fundamentals of Queueing Theory*, 4th edition, Wiley, 2008.
- [4] R. Deb, Optimal dispatching of a finite capacity shuttle, *Management Science* 24 (1978) 1362–1372.
- [5] R. Deb, C. Schmidt, Optimal Average Cost Policies for the Two-Terminal Shuttle, *Management Science* 3 (5) (1987) 662–669.
- [6] E. Ignall, P. Kolesar, Optimal Dispatching of an Infinite-Capacity Shuttle: Control at a Single Terminal, *Operations Research* 22 (5) (1974) 1008–1024.
- [7] H. Weiss, The Computation of Optimal Control Limits for a Queue with Batch Services, *Management Science* 25 (1979) 320–328.
- [8] H. Weiss, Further results on an infinite capacity shuttle with control at a single terminal, *Operations Research* 29 (1981) 1212–1217.
- [9] H. Lee, M. Srinivasan, The shuttle dispatch problem with compound Poisson arrivals: control at two terminals, *Queueing Systems* 6 (2) (1990) 207–221.
- [10] H. Lee, S. Kim, Optimal dispatching of an infinite capacity shuttle with compound Poisson arrivals: control at a single terminal, *Computers and Operations Research* 21 (1) (1994) 67–78.
- [11] G. Laporte, The Vehicle Routing Problem: An overview of exact and approximate algorithms, *European Journal of Operations Research* 59 (1992) 345–358.
- [12] M. Dunne, R. Potts, Algorithm for Traffic Control, *Operations Research* 12 (6) (1964) 870–881.