

# Tail Optimality and Performance Analysis of the Nudge-M Scheduling Algorithm

NILS CHARLET AND BENNY VAN HOUDT, Dept. Computer Science, University of Antwerp, Belgium

Recently it was shown that the response time of First-Come-First-Served (FCFS) scheduling can be stochastically and asymptotically improved upon by the *Nudge* scheduling algorithm in case of light-tailed job size distributions. Such improvements are feasible even when the jobs are partitioned into two types and the scheduler only has information about the type of incoming jobs (but not their size).

In this paper we introduce Nudge- $M$  scheduling, where basically any incoming type-1 job is allowed to pass any type-2 job that is still waiting in the queue given that it arrived as one of the last  $M$  jobs. We prove that Nudge- $M$  has an asymptotically optimal response time within a large family of Nudge scheduling algorithms when job sizes are light-tailed. Simple explicit results for the asymptotic tail improvement ratio (ATIR) of Nudge- $M$  over FCFS are derived as well as explicit results for the optimal parameter  $M$ . An expression for the ATIR that only depends on the type-1 and type-2 mean job sizes and the fraction of type-1 jobs is presented in the heavy traffic setting.

The paper further presents a numerical method to compute the response time distribution and mean response time of Nudge- $M$  scheduling provided that the job size distribution of both job types follows a phase-type distribution (by making use of the framework of Markov modulated fluid queues with jumps).

## 1 INTRODUCTION

First-Come-First-Served (FCFS) scheduling, where jobs are served in their order of arrival, can be regarded as the most basic scheduling discipline that is used in many systems. It is generally considered to be fair and is in fact known to be weakly tail optimal for class-I job size distributions [3]. A class-I job size distribution  $X$  is a light-tailed distribution for which some mild technical conditions hold such that the response time in an M/G/1 queue, where  $X$  represents the service time, has exponential decay [1]. These distributions include all phase-type distributions [11] as well as any distribution with finite support. Recall that a distribution is light-tailed if there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $E[e^{-\epsilon X}]$  is finite. Thus for any class-I job size distribution  $X$ , we have

$$P[R_{FCFS} > t] \sim c_Z e^{-\theta_Z t},$$

where  $R_{FCFS}$  is the job response time in an M/G/1 queue with job size distribution  $X$  under the FCFS scheduling discipline [1, Section 5]. The fact that FCFS is weakly tail optimal means that FCFS has the highest possible decay rate  $\theta_Z$  of all scheduling disciplines. In fact this decay rate is equal to the decay rate of the workload in the queue (which is the same for any work conserving scheduling discipline).

In a recent paper [7] it was shown that the *prefactor*  $c_Z$  is however not minimal among all scheduling disciplines (meaning FCFS is not strongly tail optimal) and a lower prefactor can be achieved by the so-called *Nudge* scheduling algorithm. The Nudge algorithm in [7] was such that the scheduler needed to know whether the size of an incoming job exceeds certain thresholds. It was subsequently shown in [16] that similar results can be obtained in a much more relaxed setting where jobs are partitioned into two types and the scheduler only needs to know the type of incoming jobs. This was done by introducing the Nudge- $K$  scheduling algorithm. Nudge- $K$  operates as follows: when a type-1 job arrives at time  $t$  and the previous  $k \leq K$  arrivals were type-2, then the incoming type-1 job is served before any of these  $k$  type-2 jobs that are still waiting in the

queue at time  $t$ . Note that under Nudge- $K$  a type-1 job can pass up to  $K$  type-2 jobs, but a type-2 job can be passed at most once.

Let  $R_{Nudge-K}$  be the response time in an M/G/1 queue using the Nudge- $K$  scheduling algorithm and denote the Laplace transform of the job size distribution, the type-1 job size distribution and the type-2 job size distribution as  $\tilde{S}(s)$ ,  $\tilde{S}_1(s)$  and  $\tilde{S}_2(s)$ , respectively. It was shown in [16] that

$$P[R_{Nudge-K} > t] \sim c_K e^{-\theta_Z t},$$

for some prefactor  $c_K$  and this prefactor is minimized over  $K \geq 0$  by setting  $K = \max(0, K_{opt})$  with

$$K_{opt} = \left\lfloor \log \left( \frac{\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)(\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z) - 1)}{\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)(\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) - 1)} \right) \right\rfloor / \log(\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)). \quad (1)$$

When  $K_{opt} \leq 0$ , then  $c_Z < c_K$  for any  $K > 0$ , while otherwise  $c_Z > c_K$  for  $K = K_{opt}$ .

The objective of this paper is to study how small the prefactor can be made by a Nudge-like scheduling algorithm that only uses job arrival types to make scheduling decisions. For this purpose we introduce the Nudge- $M$  scheduling algorithm. When a type-1 job arrives at time  $t$  under Nudge- $M$ , it passes any type-2 job still waiting in the queue provided that this type-2 job was among the last  $M$  arrivals (before time  $t$ ). Rather surprisingly, we show that for the response time  $R_{Nudge-M}$  of Nudge- $M$  for any class-I job size distribution:

$$P[R_{Nudge-M} > t] \sim c_M e^{-\theta_Z t},$$

and minimizing  $c_M$  is done by setting  $M = \max(0, M_{opt})$  with  $M_{opt} = K_{opt}$ . This means that Nudge- $M$  has a lower prefactor  $c_M$  than FCFS if and only if Nudge- $K$  has a lower prefactor  $c_K$ . Further the optimal parameter value of  $M$  and  $K$  coincide and we therefore use  $M_{opt}$  and  $K_{opt}$  interchangeably.

More importantly we also introduce a large family  $\mathcal{F}$  of Nudge-like scheduling policies (see Section 2) and show that Nudge- $M$  with  $M = M_{opt}$  minimizes the prefactor among all the scheduling algorithms in this family  $\mathcal{F}$ , meaning Nudge- $M$  with  $M = M_{opt}$  is strongly tail optimal within  $\mathcal{F}$ . Our results in the paper are presented using the asymptotic tail improvement ratio (ATIR) between two scheduling algorithms  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  (as in [7] and [16]) which is defined by

$$ATIR = 1 - c_{A_1}/c_{A_2},$$

where  $c_{A_i}$  is the prefactor of scheduling algorithm  $A_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . In our case  $A_2$  will be FCFS and  $A_1$  is a Nudge scheduling algorithm belonging to  $\mathcal{F}$ . Notice that minimizing the prefactor corresponds to maximizing the ATIR of  $A_1$  with  $A_2 = FCFS$ .

The Nudge- $M$  scheduling algorithm only uses the type of arriving jobs and the order in which they arrive. One may wonder to what extent it can be further improved if more information is used, such as the exact arrival times. In a closely related paper [18] that was written concurrently to this paper, the authors introduce the  $\gamma$ -Boost scheduling algorithm. This algorithm minimizes the prefactor for class-I job size distributions in an M/G/1 queue among all scheduling policies in case the job size  $s$  of each individual job as well as the arrival time of each job is known. The idea is to boost the arrival time of a size  $s$  job by  $b(s) = \log(1/(1 - e^{-\theta_Z s}))/\theta_Z$ , thus a size  $s_2$  job that arrives at time  $t_2$  is served before a size  $s_1$  job that arrived at time  $t_1 < t_2$  if  $t_2 - b(s_2) < t_1 - b(s_1)$  provided that the size  $s_1$  job is still waiting in the queue at time  $t_2$ . Moreover the authors also propose a  $\gamma$ -Boost algorithm in case the jobs are partitioned into several types and the scheduler only has information about the job types and arrival time, but not the individual sizes. In this setting the boost of a job depends on its type only. The authors of [18] prove that  $\gamma$ -Boost achieves a lower prefactor than the Nudge- $M$  algorithm by exploiting the additional arrival time information. In this paper we prove that the prefactor of  $\gamma$ -Boost and Nudge- $M$  coincide in the heavy traffic limit.

This indicates that the gain offered by the additional arrival time information vanishes as the load tends to one.

The main contributions of the paper are the following:

- (1) We introduce the Nudge- $M$  scheduling algorithm and derive simple explicit results for the ATIR of Nudge- $M$  as well as for the parameter  $M$  that maximizes the ATIR of Nudge- $M$ . These explicit results are expressed in terms of the Laplace transforms  $\tilde{S}(s)$ ,  $\tilde{S}_1(s)$  and  $\tilde{S}_2(s)$  evaluated in  $s = -\theta_Z$ .
- (2) We present explicit results for the ATIR of Nudge- $M$ , with  $M$  optimized, in heavy traffic (as  $\lambda$  tends to one) that depend only on  $p$ ,  $E[X_1]$ ,  $E[X_2]$  and show that the ATIR coincides with that of the  $\gamma$ -Boost algorithm in [18] in the limit.
- (3) We prove that Nudge- $M$ , with  $M$  optimized, maximizes the ATIR in a large family of Nudge scheduling algorithms  $\mathcal{F}$ .
- (4) We present a numerical method to compute the mean response time of Nudge- $M$  as well as the type-1 and type-2 job response time distribution. Numerical results show that Nudge- $M$  also yields significant gains for the mean response time.

The first three contributions are established for any class-I job size distribution. The final contribution is made under the assumption that job sizes follow a phase-type distribution. This numerical method is very different from the methods used in [7] and [16], because it is no longer possible to create a simple link between the Nudge- $M$  queue and the FCFS queue. This forced us to use a radically different approach.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the model as well as the family of scheduling algorithms under consideration. Explicit results for the ATIR and optimal  $M$  for Nudge- $M$  are derived in Section 3, where the heavy traffic setting is studied in subsection 3.1. The optimality of Nudge- $M$  in  $\mathcal{F}$  with respect to the ATIR is established in Section 4. In Sections 5 and 6 the distribution of the number of times that a type-2 job is passed and the mean response time of Nudge- $M$  are analyzed, respectively. A numerical method to compute the response time distribution of a type-2 job under Nudge- $M$  is developed in Section 7, while the same is done for a type-1 job in Section 8. Finally conclusions are drawn and future work is discussed in Section 9.

## 2 MODEL AND ALGORITHMS

We consider a queuing system with two types of jobs. Arriving jobs are either type-1 with probability  $p$  or type-2 with probability  $1 - p$ , and consecutive types are independent. Jobs arrive following a Poisson process with parameter  $\lambda$ . Denote  $\tilde{S}_i(s)$  as the Laplace transform of a type- $i$  job size, for  $i = 1, 2$  and let  $\tilde{S}(s) = p\tilde{S}_1(s) + (1 - p)\tilde{S}_2(s)$  be the Laplace transform of a random job size. Let  $E[X_i]$  be the mean job size of a type- $i$  job, for  $i = 1, 2$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $pE[X_1] + (1 - p)E[X_2] = 1$  so that the load of the system is  $\lambda$ . In Sections 3 and 4 we demand that the job size distribution is a class-I distribution. Denote  $\theta_i$  as the decay rate of the type- $i$  job size distribution, for  $i = 1, 2$ . From Section 5 onwards we make a slightly stronger assumption by assuming that the service time of a type- $i$  job follows a phase-type distribution  $X_i \sim PH(\alpha_i, S_i)$  with  $n_i$  phases. Define  $\alpha = (p\alpha_1, (1 - p)\alpha_2)$ ,

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & 0 \\ 0 & S_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

$s_i^* = (-S_i)\mathbf{1}$ , and  $s^* = (-S)\mathbf{1}$  for further use. A random job's service time follows a phase-type distribution with parameters  $(\alpha, S)$ :  $X = pX_1 + (1 - p)X_2$  and  $E[X] = \alpha(-S)^{-1}\mathbf{1} = 1$ . We assume that  $\alpha\mathbf{1} = 1$ , meaning all jobs have a nonzero size. In this case we have  $\tilde{S}_i(s) = \alpha_i(sI - S_i)^{-1}s_i^*$  and  $\tilde{S}(s) = \alpha(sI - S)^{-1}s^*$ . It is well known that any general positive-valued distribution can be approximated

arbitrary close with a PH distribution [11]. Further, various fitting algorithms and tools are available online for phase-type distributions (e.g., [6, 10, 12]). Whenever we use a hyperexponential (HE) distribution for the type- $i$  jobs (with 2 phases) we match the mean  $E[X_i] = q/\mu_1 + (1 - q)/\mu_2$ , the squared coefficient of variation (SCV) and the parameter  $f = (q/\mu_1)/E[X_i]$ , when the HE distribution is characterized by  $q, \mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ .

We consider the following family  $\mathcal{F}_M$  of Nudge policies. Let  $t$  be the function that counts in number of twos in a string of any length consisting of ones and twos, e.g.,  $t(12122) = 3$ . A Nudge scheduling algorithm belonging to  $\mathcal{F}_M$  is characterized by a function  $n$  from  $\{1, 2\}^M$  to  $\{0, \dots, M\}$  that obeys the following two conditions:

$$(C1) \quad n(s) \leq t(s),$$

$$(C2) \quad n(s_0 s_1 \dots s_{M-1}) \leq n(s) + 1(s_0 = 2)$$

for all  $s = s_1 \dots s_M \in \{1, 2\}^M$ , where  $1(A) = 1$  if  $A$  is true and  $1(A) = 0$  otherwise. The interpretation of this function is as follows. Whenever a type-1 job arrives it looks at the types of the last  $M$  arrivals. Assume these  $M$  types are characterized by the string  $s$ , then the type-1 job passes the  $n(s)$  most recent type-2 arrivals if they are still waiting in the queue. For instance, if  $n(s) = 3$ , but there are only two type-2 jobs waiting in the queue, then the type-1 job passes only these two type-2 jobs. Note that the condition (C2) on  $n(s)$  guarantees that if a type-1 job may pass a type-2 job, all intermediate arrivals of type-1 may also pass this type-2 job. We clearly have that  $\mathcal{F}_M \subset \mathcal{F}_{M+1}$ , for any  $M$ , as for any  $n(s)$  in  $\mathcal{F}_M$ , we can define  $n'(s)$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{M+1}$  such that  $n'(s_1 \dots s_{M+1}) = n'(s_1 \dots s_M 2) = n(s_1 \dots s_M)$ . The family  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined as  $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{M \geq 0} \mathcal{F}_M$  and contains a large variety of scheduling policies that use the last  $M$  job arrival types for some  $M$  to make scheduling decisions.

Examples of Nudge policies that are part of the family  $\mathcal{F}$  are the following:

- (1) **Nudge- $M$**   $\in \mathcal{F}_M$ : Under this scheduling algorithm a type-1 job passes any type-2 job still waiting in the queue that arrived among the last  $M$  arrivals. It is defined by letting  $n(s) = t(s)$  for all strings  $s$ . Under this scheduling algorithm a type-1 job can pass at most  $M$  type-2 jobs and a type-2 job is passed at most  $M$  times.
- (2) **Nudge- $K$**   $\in \mathcal{F}_K$ : Under this scheduling algorithm, studied in [16], a type-1 job passes at most  $K$  type-2 jobs and a type-2 job is passed at most once. It is defined by setting  $n(s)$  as the number of leading twos in  $s$  before encountering a one in  $s$ , for example  $n(22212) = 3$ . This clearly satisfies (C1), and (C2) is also satisfied as  $n(s_0 s_1 \dots s_{K-1}) = n(s) + 1$  if  $s_0 = 2$  (except if  $n(s_0 s_1 \dots s_{K-1}) = n(s) = K$ ), or  $n(s_0 s_1 \dots s_{M-1}) = 0 \leq n(s)$  if  $s_0 = 1$ .
- (3) **Nudge- $L$**   $\in \mathcal{F}_L$ : Under this scheduling algorithm a type-1 job can pass at most one type-2 job and a type-2 job is passed at most  $L$  times. As such the scheduling algorithm can be regarded at the *dual* of the Nudge- $K$  scheduling algorithm. In this case  $n(s) = \min(t(s), 1)$ .
- (4) **Nudge- $K, M$**   $\in \mathcal{F}_M$ : This scheduling algorithm is the same as Nudge- $M$ , but we limit the number of type-2 jobs that a type-1 job can pass to  $K \leq M$ . It is defined by the function  $n(s) = \min(t(s), K)$ . If  $K = M$ , the scheduling algorithm coincides with Nudge- $M$  and setting  $K = 1$  yields Nudge- $L$ .
- (5) **Nudge- $M, L$**   $\in \mathcal{F}_M$ : This scheduling algorithm is the same as Nudge- $M$ , but we limit the number of times a type-2 jobs can be passed to  $L \leq M$ . It is defined by the function  $n(s)$  where  $n(s)$  counts the number of twos before encountering the  $L$ -th one in  $s$ . If  $L = M$ , the scheduling algorithm coincides with Nudge- $M$ , while for  $L = 1$  it coincides with Nudge- $K$ .
- (6) **Nudge- $K, L$**   $\in \mathcal{F}_{K+L-1}$ . Under this scheduling algorithm a type-1 job can pass up to  $K$  type-2 jobs, while a type-2 job is passed at most  $L$  times. It can be regarded as a combination of Nudge- $K, M$  and Nudge- $M, L$ . For this scheduling algorithm,  $n(s)$  is defined as follows: count from left to right the number of ones and twos in  $s$ , stopping either when  $K$  twos have been counted or when  $L$  ones have been counted.  $n(s)$  is then the number of twos counted,

which corresponds to at most  $K$  type-2 jobs that have been swapped fewer than  $L$  times. As an example, with  $K = 3$  and  $L = 2$  we have  $n(\underline{2112}) = 1$ ,  $n(\underline{2222}) = 3$ , and  $n(\underline{1122}) = 0$ , where the underlined type is the last one that is counted. Clearly (C1) holds, and (C2) is also satisfied as explained next. If  $s_0 = 1$ , then an extra type-1 job is counted before continuing as in  $s$ . This means the counting is either stopped at the same time in  $s$  if  $K$  twos were seen, or sooner than in  $s$  if  $L$  ones were seen,  $L - 1$  of which are in  $s$ . If  $s_0 = 2$ , an extra type-2 job is counted before continuing as in  $s$ . Either the counting stops when seeing  $K$  twos,  $K - 1$  of which were also counted in  $s$ , or the counting stops when counting  $L$  ones and  $i < K$  twos, which is an extra two compared to the result  $n(s)$  of  $s$ .

In the next two sections we present results on the ATIR. We will often make use of the final value theorem and the properties of the Laplace transform in the following manner. Assume  $Y = Y_1 + Y_2$  with  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  independent, where both  $Y$  and  $Y_1$  decay exponentially at rate  $\theta_Z$ , meaning  $P[Y > t] \sim c_Y e^{-\theta_Z t}$  and  $P[Y_1 > t] \sim c_{Y_1} e^{-\theta_Z t}$  for some  $c_Y$  and  $c_{Y_1}$ . Then,

$$c_Y = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\theta_Z t} P[Y > t] = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\theta_Z} s \tilde{Y}(s - \theta_Z) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\theta_Z} s \tilde{Y}_1(s - \theta_Z) \tilde{Y}_2(s - \theta_Z) = c_{Y_1} \tilde{Y}_2(-\theta_Z).$$

### 3 THE ASYMPTOTIC TAIL IMPROVEMENT RATIO OF NUDGE-M

As any job can either pass up to  $M$  jobs or be passed by up to  $M$  jobs under Nudge- $M$ , it is not hard to prove that both the type-1 and type-2 response time distribution also decay exponentially with rate  $\theta_Z$  for any class- $I$  job size distribution  $X$ . In this section we start by deriving expressions for the prefactors of  $c_{W^{(i)}}(M)$  of the waiting time  $W_M^{(i)}$  of a type- $i$  job under Nudge- $M$  scheduling for  $i = 1, 2$ .

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $c_{W^{(1)}}(M) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\theta_Z t} P[W_M^{(1)} > t]$ , then*

$$c_{W^{(1)}}(M) = c_Z (w_1 + w)^M, \quad (2)$$

with  $w_1 = p \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) / \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)$  and  $w = (1 - p) / \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)$ , which decreases in  $M$  as  $w_1 + w < 1$ .

**PROOF.** The proof makes use of the coupled FCFS queue. This queue is identical to our Nudge- $M$  queue, except that jobs are served in FCFS order. In other words the arrival times are the same in both queues and the arriving jobs have exactly the same type and size in both systems.

Let  $\tilde{Z}(s)$  be the Laplace transform of the workload of the coupled FCFS queue (which is identical to the workload in the Nudge- $M$  queue). Note that this is also the FCFS workload seen by a type-1 arrival due to the PASTA property. Let  $p_+$  be the probability that an arriving type-1 job sees at least  $M$  jobs waiting in the FCFS queue. Let  $Z_+$  (and  $\tilde{Z}_+(s)$ ) be the FCFS workload (and its transform) seen by an arriving type-1 job when there are at least  $M$  waiting jobs in the FCFS queue. If there are less than  $M$  jobs waiting in the FCFS queue, we denote the workload and its Laplace transform as  $Z_-$  and  $\tilde{Z}_-(s)$ , respectively. Hence,

$$P[Z > t] = p_+ P[Z_+ > t] + (1 - p_+) P[Z_- > t].$$

and

$$\tilde{Z}(s) = p_+ \tilde{Z}_+(s) + (1 - p_+) \tilde{Z}_-(s).$$

The workload in the event that fewer than  $M$  jobs are waiting in the FCFS queue decays as  $\min(\theta_1, \theta_2)$  as it is the superposition of at most  $M$  jobs. This implies that

$$c_Z = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\theta_Z t} P[Z > t] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\theta_Z t} p_+ P[Z_+ > t],$$

as  $\theta_Z < \min(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ . We further note that  $\tilde{Z}_+(s)$  can be written as

$$\tilde{Z}_+(s) = \tilde{Z}_+^{(r)}(s) \tilde{S}(s)^M,$$

where  $\tilde{Z}_+^{(r)}(s)$  is the Laplace transform of the workload seen by a type 1 job that encounters at least  $M$  jobs in the coupled FCFS queue, except for the work belonging to the last  $M$  waiting jobs (in the FCFS queue). Let  $W_M^{(1)}$  (and  $\tilde{W}_M^{(1)}(s)$ ) be the waiting time (and its transform) of a type 1 job in the Nudge- $M$  queue. Similarly we use the notations  $W_{M+}^{(1)}$ ,  $W_{M-}^{(1)}$ ,  $\tilde{W}_{M+}^{(1)}(s)$  and  $\tilde{W}_{M-}^{(1)}(s)$  for the waiting times in the Nudge- $M$  queue of a type 1 job depending on whether this job encounters at least  $M$  jobs in the coupled FCFS queue. Hence,

$$P[W_M^{(1)} > t] = p_+ P[W_{M+}^{(1)} > t] + (1 - p_+) P[W_{M-}^{(1)} > t].$$

and

$$\tilde{W}_M^{(1)}(s) = p_+ \tilde{W}_{M+}^{(1)}(s) + (1 - p_+) \tilde{W}_{M-}^{(1)}(s).$$

Clearly  $W_{M-}^{(1)}$  also decays as  $\min(\theta_1, \theta_2)$  and we therefore have

$$c_{W^{(1)}}(M) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\theta_Z t} P[W_M^{(1)} > t] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\theta_Z t} p_+ P[W_{M+}^{(1)} > t].$$

The key observation now is that when a type-1 job arrives and there are at least  $M$  jobs in the coupled FCFS queue, then we can determine the waiting time of that type-1 job by looking at the types of the last  $M$  jobs in the coupled FCFS queue. All the type-2 jobs among these  $M$  jobs are swapped with the arriving type-1 job, because any type-2 job waiting in the coupled FCFS queue is also waiting in the Nudge- $M$  queue. In other words, the waiting time of the type 1 job can be expressed as  $Z_+^{(r)}$ , which is the workload without these  $M$  last jobs, plus the work associated to all the type 1 jobs among the last  $M$  jobs in the coupled FCFS queue. Hence, with probability  $\binom{M}{k} (1-p)^k p^{M-k}$  we need to add the work of  $M-k$  type-1 jobs, which yields (using the final value theorem)

$$\begin{aligned} c_{W^{(1)}}(M) &= \frac{c_Z}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^M} \sum_{k=0}^M \binom{M}{k} (1-p)^k p^{M-k} \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{M-k} \\ &= c_Z \sum_{k=0}^M \binom{M}{k} \left( \frac{(1-p)}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)} \right)^k \left( \frac{p \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)} \right)^{M-k} \\ &= c_Z (w_1 + w)^M. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

To see that  $w + w_1 < 1$ , note that  $\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)$ ,  $\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)$ ,  $\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z) > 1$  holds as  $\theta_Z > 0$ . Combining this with  $p \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) + (1-p) \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z) = \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)$  implies that  $w$ ,  $w_1$ , and  $w + w_1$  are in  $(0, 1)$ .  $\square$

**THEOREM 2.** Let  $c_{W^{(2)}}(M) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\theta_Z t} P[W_M^{(2)} > t]$ , then

$$c_{W^{(2)}}(M) = c_Z (w_1 + w)^M \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^M, \quad (4)$$

with  $w_1 = p \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) / \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)$  and  $w = (1-p) / \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)$ , which increases in  $M$  as  $(w_1 + w) \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z) = (1-p) + p \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) > 1$ .

**PROOF.** When determining the prefactor  $c_{W^{(2)}}(M)$  of the waiting time of a type-2 job, we may assume that the next  $M$  arrivals occur while the tagged type-2 job is still waiting. This can be seen as follows. Pick any  $s > 0$ . We can distinguish between type-2 jobs that see  $w > s$  work upon arrival and type-2 jobs that see  $w \leq s$  work. For the latter jobs their waiting time decays as  $\min(\theta_1, \theta_2) > \theta_Z$ . Therefore,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\theta_Z t} P[W_M^{(2)} > t | Z_2 \leq s] = 0,$$

where  $Z_2$  is the workload seen by a type-2 arrival. Further, for any  $\epsilon > 0$  we can pick  $s$  such that the probability of having  $M$  or more arrivals in  $(0, s)$  is at least  $1 - \epsilon$ . Hence, we may assume when computing  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\theta_Z t} P[W_M^{(2)} > t]$  that at least  $M$  arrivals occur while the type-2 job is waiting.

With probability  $\binom{M}{k} (1-p)^{M-k} p^k$  there are  $k$  type-1 jobs among the next  $M$  arrivals and these  $k$  jobs pass the type-2 job. The waiting time of the type-2 job therefore equals the FCFS workload plus the work associated with  $k$  type-1 jobs. Hence, by the final value theorem we find

$$c_{W^{(2)}}(M) = c_Z \sum_{k=0}^M \binom{M}{k} (1-p)^{M-k} p^k \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^k = c_Z (w_1 + w)^M \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^M. \quad (5)$$

□

The next theorem given an explicit expression for the ATIR of Nudge- $M$  over FCFS, denoted as  $ATIR_M(M)$ .

**THEOREM 3.** *For Nudge- $M$  we have*

$$ATIR_M(M) = 1 - w_1 (w_1 + w)^M - (1 - w_1) (w_1 + w)^M \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^M, \quad (6)$$

with  $w_1 = p \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) / \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)$  and  $w = (1-p) / \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)$ . Further,  $ATIR_M(M)$  is concave and achieves a unique maximum in  $M_{opt} = K_{opt}$  defined by (1).

**PROOF.** Given the expressions for  $c_{W^{(1)}}(M)$  and  $c_{W^{(2)}}(M)$  we have

$$ATIR_M(M) = 1 - p \frac{c_{W^{(1)}}(M) \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)}{c_Z \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)} - (1-p) \frac{c_{W^{(2)}}(M) \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)}{c_Z \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)} \quad (7)$$

$$= 1 - w_1 (w_1 + w)^M - (1 - w_1) (w_1 + w)^M \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^M \quad (8)$$

This implies that the derivative with respect to  $M$  is given by

$$(w_1 + w_1)^M \left( \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^M (w_1 - 1) \log((w_1 + w) \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)) - w_1 \log(w_1 + w) \right).$$

and equals zero when

$$\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^M = \frac{-w_1 \log(w_1 + w)}{(1 - w_1) \log((w_1 + w) \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z))}.$$

The second derivative of  $ATIR_M(M)$  with respect to  $M$  can be written as

$$(w_1 + w)^M \left( \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^M (w_1 - 1) \log((w_1 + w) \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z))^2 - w_1 \log(w_1 + w)^2 \right),$$

which is negative as  $0 < w_1 < 1$ , proving that  $ATIR_M(M)$  is concave in  $M$ . This proves that the  $ATIR_M(M)$  has a unique maximum.

Define  $\Delta ATIR_M(M) = ATIR_M(M+1) - ATIR_M(M)$ , then we have

$$\Delta ATIR_M(M) = (w_1 + w)^M \left( w_1 w (\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z) - 1) - (1 - w_1) \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^M p (\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) - 1) \right). \quad (9)$$

The maximum of  $ATIR_M(M)$  is located in the ceil of the value of  $M$  for which  $\Delta ATIR_M(M) = 0$ . Rewriting this equality yields (1). □

It is easy to see that  $M_{opt} < 0$  whenever  $\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) > \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)$ . In such case one can reverse the role of the type-1 and type-2 jobs. The optimal  $M$  for this reversed system is simply given by  $-(M_{opt} + 1)$ .

In the next section we prove that Nudge- $M$  with  $M = M_{opt}$  maximizes the ATIR in  $\mathcal{F}$ . To illustrate that the gains over Nudge- $K$ , studied in [16], are often substantial we look at the ATIR of Nudge- $M$  over Nudge- $K$  in Figure 1a with  $K = M = K_{opt}$  when both job sizes are exponential. The ATIR of




Fig. 1. The asymptotic tail improvement ratio of Nudge-M over Nudge-K (left) and  $\gamma$ -Boost over Nudge-M (right) with optimized parameters for  $p = 0.9$  with exponential type-1 and type-2 jobs. Nudge-M yields a much higher ATIR than Nudge-K, especially for high loads  $\lambda$ .  $\gamma$ -Boost improves Nudge-M by exploiting arrival time information, but the gains vanish as the load tends to one. The flat white area in the first plot corresponds to an ATIR of zero which occurs when  $M_{opt} \leq 1$ .

Nudge-M is clearly much higher, especially under high loads  $\lambda$ . We further note that even higher ATIR values can often be achieved for Nudge-M, for instance by making the type-2 job sizes more variable. Figure 1b shows the ATIR of  $\gamma$ -Boost over Nudge-M. While  $\gamma$ -Boost further improves the ATIR over Nudge-M, the gains are less pronounced compared to the gains of Nudge-M over Nudge-K (especially at high loads). Further, in Corollary 1 we show that the ATIR over FCFS of Nudge-M and of  $\gamma$ -Boost converge to the same quantity when  $\lambda$  tends to one.

### 3.1 Heavy Traffic Regime

In this subsection we study the ATIR for  $\lambda$  tending to one and present simple explicit results.

**THEOREM 4.** *For Nudge-M with  $E[X_2] \geq E[X_1]$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} ATIR_M(M_{opt}) &= 1 - p \left( \frac{E[X_1]}{E[X_2]} \right)^{(1-p)E[X_2]} - (1-p) \left( \frac{E[X_2]}{E[X_1]} \right)^{pE[X_1]}, \\ &= 1 - \left( \frac{1}{E[X_1]} \right)^{pE[X_1]} \left( \frac{1}{E[X_2]} \right)^{(1-p)E[X_2]} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where

$$M_{opt} \approx \left\lceil \frac{\log(E[X_2]/E[X_1])}{\log(1 + \theta_Z)} \right\rceil \approx \left\lceil \frac{\log(E[X_2]/E[X_1])E[X^2]}{2(1 - \lambda)} \right\rceil \quad (11)$$

for  $\lambda$  close to one. Moreover, this limit is increasing in  $E[X_2]/E[X_1]$  on  $(1, \infty)$ , equals 0 in 1 and

$$\lim_{E[X_2]/E[X_1] \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} ATIR_M(M_{opt}) = p. \quad (12)$$

**PROOF.** The expression for  $M_{opt}$  for  $\lambda$  close to one is immediate from [16, Theorem 11] (and its proof) as  $M_{opt} = K_{opt}$ . To compute the limit of the  $ATIR_M(M_{opt})$  we make use of the fact that  $\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z) = 1 + \theta_Z + o(\theta_Z^2)$  and similarly that  $\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) = 1 + E[X_1]\theta_Z + o(\theta_Z^2)$ . Note that  $\theta_Z$  tends to zero as  $\lambda$  tends to one.



We first look at the limit of  $\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{M_{opt}}$  as  $\lambda$  tends to one:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{M_{opt}} &= \lim_{\theta_Z \rightarrow 0^+} (1 + \theta_Z)^{\frac{\log(E[X_2]/E[X_1])}{\log(1+\theta_Z)}} \\ &= e^{\log(E[X_2]/E[X_1])} = E[X_2]/E[X_1], \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

as  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} (1 + ax)^{b/\log(1+x)} = e^{ab}$ , which we apply with  $a = 1$  and  $b = \log(E[X_2]/E[X_1])$ . Next consider the limit of  $(w + w_1)^{M_{opt}}$  as  $\lambda$  tends to one. First note that  $w_1 \approx p(1 + E[X_1]\theta_Z)/(1 + \theta_Z)$  and  $w \approx (1 - p)/(1 + \theta_Z)$ , meaning  $w_1 + w \approx (1 + pE[X_1]\theta_Z)/(1 + \theta_Z)$ . This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} (w_1 + w)^{M_{opt}} &= \lim_{\theta_Z \rightarrow 0^+} \left( \frac{(1 + pE[X_1]\theta_Z)}{(1 + \theta_Z)} \right)^{\frac{\log(E[X_2]/E[X_1])}{\log(1+\theta_Z)}} \\ &= e^{pE[X_1] \log(E[X_2]/E[X_1])} E[X_1]/E[X_2] \\ &= (E[X_1]/E[X_2])^{1-pE[X_1]}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where we applied  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} (1 + ax)^{b/\log(1+x)} = e^{ab}$  twice. The result now follows by noting that  $pE[X_1] + (1 - p)E[X_2] = 1$  and

$$ATIR_M(M_{opt}) = 1 - w_1(w_1 + w)^{M_{opt}} - (1 - w_1)(w_1 + w)^{M_{opt}} \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{M_{opt}},$$

where  $w_1$  tends to  $p$  as  $\lambda$  goes to one.

To compute the limit as  $E[X_2]/E[X_1]$  tends to infinity, denote  $E[X_2]/E[X_1]$  as  $x$ . As  $1 = pE[X_1] + (1 - p)E[X_2]$ , we can express both  $E[X_1]$  and  $E[X_2]$  in terms of  $x$ , leading to

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} ATIR_M(M_{opt}) = 1 - px^{\frac{-(1-p)}{(1-p)x+p}} - (1-p)x^{\frac{p}{(1-p)x+p}}.$$

The derivative of this function in  $x$  factorizes as

$$\frac{d}{dx} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} ATIR_M(M_{opt}) = \frac{p(1-p)}{(1-p)x+p} \log(x) x^{\frac{-(1-p)x}{(1-p)x+p}},$$

which is positive for  $x > 1$ . Further,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} ATIR_M(M_{opt}) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} 1 - px^{\frac{-(1-p)}{(1-p)x+p}} - (1-p)x^{\frac{p}{(1-p)x+p}} = p,$$

as the second term tends to zero and the last to  $1 - p$ .  $\square$

**COROLLARY 1.** *Let  $ATIR_Y$  denote the ATIR of  $\gamma$ -Boost, then*

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} ATIR_M(M_{opt}) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} ATIR_Y,$$

*meaning the ATIR of  $\gamma$ -Boost and Nudge-M coincide in the heavy traffic limit.*

**PROOF.** By simplifying the expression for the tail constant  $C_{Boost}$  in [18] in the setting of two job types one finds:

$$ATIR_Y = 1 - \frac{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z) - 1}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)} \left( \frac{\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)}{\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) - 1} \right)^{\frac{\lambda p(\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) - 1)}{\theta_Z}} \left( \frac{\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)}{\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z) - 1} \right)^{\frac{\lambda(1-p)(\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z) - 1)}{\theta_Z}}. \quad (15)$$

When  $\lambda$  tends to one,  $\theta_Z$  goes to zero, while  $\tilde{S}_i(-\theta_Z)$  and  $\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)$  converge to one. For  $\lambda$  close to one,  $\tilde{S}_i(-\theta_Z)$  can be approximated by  $1 + \theta_Z E[X_i]$  as  $\tilde{S}_i(-\theta_Z) = 1 + \theta_Z E[X_i] + o(\theta_Z)$  due to the




Fig. 2. The asymptotic tail improvement ratio of Nudge- $M$  over FCFS with  $M = M_{opt}$  and  $M = M_{heavy}$  for  $p = 2/3$  and  $E[X_1]/E[X_2] = 4$ . Setting  $M = M_{heavy}$  yields most of the gains even when  $\lambda$  is not very close to one.

Taylor series expansion of  $\tilde{S}_i(-\theta_Z)$ . In the same manner  $\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)$  approaches  $1 + \theta_Z$  for  $\lambda$  close to one. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} ATIR_Y &= 1 - \lim_{\theta_Z \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\theta_Z}{1 + \theta_Z} \left( \frac{1 + \theta_Z E[X_1]}{\theta_Z E[X_1]} \right)^{pE[X_1]} \left( \frac{1 + \theta_Z E[X_2]}{\theta_Z E[X_2]} \right)^{(1-p)E[X_2]} \\ &= 1 - \lim_{\theta_Z \rightarrow 0^+} \left( \frac{1 + \theta_Z E[X_1]}{E[X_1]} \right)^{pE[X_1]} \left( \frac{1 + \theta_Z E[X_2]}{E[X_2]} \right)^{(1-p)E[X_2]}, \end{aligned}$$

which equals (10). □

Theorem 4 has two more important consequences:

- (1) It shows that the heavy traffic limit of the  $ATIR_M(M_{opt})$  is insensitive to the shape of the job size distributions  $X_1, X_2$  and  $X$ .
- (2) It further shows that for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists an  $X, X_1$  and  $X_2$  such that for  $\lambda$  sufficiently close to one we have  $c_M/c_Z \leq \epsilon$ , that is,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\theta_Z t} P[W_M > t] \leq \epsilon c_Z.$$

To see this, one can set  $p = 1 - \epsilon/2$  and use the optimal  $M$  such that

$$\lim_{E[X_2]/E[X_1] \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} \left( 1 - \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\theta_Z t} P[W_M > t]/c_Z \right) = 1 - \epsilon/2.$$

We further note that the optimal  $M$  for the heavy traffic regime given by (11), which we denote as  $M_{heavy}$ , is expressed in terms of  $\lambda, E[X_1], E[X_2]$  and  $E[X^2]$  only and may therefore be easier to estimate in practice than (1). We therefore also compare the ATIR of Nudge- $M$  with  $M = M_{opt}$  and  $M = M_{heavy}$  in Figure 2. The figure illustrates that using  $M_{heavy}$  is also effective when the load is high, but not necessarily very close to one.

#### 4 OPTIMALITY OF NUDGE-M WITHIN A FAMILY OF NUDGE POLICIES

We first present an expression for  $c_{W^{(1)}}$  and  $c_{W^{(2)}}$  of any scheduling algorithm in  $\mathcal{F}_M$ .

**THEOREM 5.** *Consider a scheduling algorithm belonging to  $\mathcal{F}_M$  characterized by the function  $n$ , then the prefactor of the type-1 and type-2 waiting time can be expressed as:*

$$c_{W^{(1)}} = \frac{c_Z}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^M} \sum_{s \in \{1,2\}^M} (1-p)^{t(s)} p^{M-t(s)} \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{M-t(s)} \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)^{t(s)-n(s)}. \quad (16)$$

and

$$c_{W^{(2)}} = \frac{c_Z}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{M-1}} \sum_{\substack{s \in \{1,2\}^{2M} \\ s_{M+1}=2}} \frac{(1-p)^{t(s)} p^{2M-t(s)}}{(1-p)} \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{M-1-t(s_{M+2}\dots s_{2M})} \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)^{t(s_{M+2}\dots s_{2M})} \\ \cdot \prod_{k=1}^M \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{1(s_k=1 \wedge n(s_{k+1}\dots s_{k+M}) > t(s_{k+1}\dots s_M))}. \quad (17)$$

**PROOF.** By repeating the arguments in the proof of Theorem 1, we may assume that a type-2 job that arrived among the last  $M$  arrivals seen by a tagged type-1 arrival is still present in the queue when studying the prefactor  $c_{W^{(1)}}$ . A tagged type-1 job sees the string  $s$  as the string of the last  $M$  arrivals with probability  $(1-p)^{t(s)} p^{M-t(s)}$ . In this case the type-1 job passes  $n(s)$  type-2 jobs, such that its waiting time equals the FCFS workload minus the work of the last  $M$  arrivals plus the work of  $M-t(s)$  type-1 jobs plus the work of  $t(s)-n(s)$  type-2 jobs. Summing over  $s \in \{1,2\}^M$  yields

$$c_{W^{(1)}} = \frac{c_Z}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^M} \sum_{s \in \{1,2\}^M} (1-p)^{t(s)} p^{M-t(s)} \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{M-t(s)} \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)^{t(s)-n(s)},$$

where  $c_Z/\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^M$  covers the work without the last  $M$  arrivals, the factor  $\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{M-t(s)}$  adds the work of the type-1 jobs in the last  $M$  arrivals and  $\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)^{t(s)-n(s)}$  the work of the type-2 jobs in the last  $M$  arrivals that are not passed.

As in the proof of Theorem 3 we may assume that the next  $M$  arrivals occur while a tagged type-2 job is still waiting when considering  $c_{W^{(2)}}$ . The expression for  $c_{W^{(2)}}$  is somewhat more involved to determine as a tagged type-2 job can be passed by multiple type-1 jobs that do not necessarily see the same string  $s$ , but do see overlapping strings. We therefore look at a sequence of  $2M$  arrivals where the tagged type-2 job is the  $M+1$ -th oldest of the  $2M$  arrivals. Further, as the arrivals in position  $M+2$  to  $2M$  in  $s$  already occurred when the tagged type-2 job arrives, we need to condition the FCFS workload on the types  $s_{M+2}\dots s_{2M}$  of the last  $M-1$  arrivals before the tagged type-2 job. Note that the type-1 jobs that may pass the tagged type-2 job are among the most recent  $M$  arrivals (with types  $s_1\dots s_M$ ). A type-1 job in position  $k \leq M$  passes the tagged type-2 job in position  $M+1$  if  $n(s_{k+1}\dots s_{k+M}) > t(s_{k+1}\dots s_M)$ , yielding:

$$c_{W^{(2)}} = c_Z \sum_{\substack{s \in \{1,2\}^{2M} \\ s_{M+1}=2}} \frac{(1-p)^{t(s)} p^{2M-t(s)} \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{M-1-t(s_{M+2}\dots s_{2M})} \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)^{t(s_{M+2}\dots s_{2M})}}{(1-p) \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{M-1}} \\ \cdot \prod_{k=1}^M \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{1(s_k=1 \wedge n(s_{k+1}\dots s_{k+M}) > t(s_{k+1}\dots s_M))},$$

where the second fraction in the sum is due to the conditioning on the FCFS workload.  $\square$

**THEOREM 6.** *Let  $s \in \{1, 2\}^M$  selected at random, if we increase  $n(s)$  by one such that the conditions (C1) and (C2) on the function  $n$  remain valid, then this leads to an improved ATIR if and only if the position of the  $n(s) + 1$ -st two in  $s$  is in the first  $M_{opt}$  positions.*

**PROOF.** If  $n(s)$  is increased by one such that the conditions (C1) and (C2) on  $n$  remain valid, one finds that  $c_{W^{(1)}}$  changes by

$$\Delta c_{W^{(1)}} = \frac{c_Z}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^M} (1-p)^{t(s)} p^{M-t(s)} \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{M-t(s)} \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)^{t(s)-(n(s)+1)} (1 - \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)),$$

as when a type-1 jobs sees the string  $s$  upon arrival it now passes  $n(s) + 1$  type-2 jobs as opposed to  $n(s)$ , which results in the correction of a single term in  $c_{W^{(1)}}$ .

We now focus on the change to  $c_{W^{(2)}}$ . By increasing  $n(s)$  by one, the power of  $\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)$  needs to be increased by one for some of the length  $2M$  strings. The strings  $s' = s'_1 \dots s'_{2M}$  that require a change are such that

- $s = s'_{k+1} \dots s'_{k+M}$  for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ ,
- the tagged type-2 job is in position  $M + 1$  and a type-1 job is in position  $k$ , that is,  $s'_k = 1$ ,
- the tagged type-2 job is the  $n(s) + 1$ -st type-2 job in the string  $s$ .

Notice that in such case the type-1 job that is in position  $k$  of  $s'$  did not pass the tagged type-2 job in position  $M + 1$  of  $s'$  before increasing  $n(s)$  by one, but it does pass this tagged job due to the increase of  $n(s)$  as the tagged job is the  $n(s) + 1$ -st type-2 job in the string  $s$  seen upon arrival by the type-1 job in position  $k$  of  $s'$ . The value of  $k$  is fully determined by noting that if the  $n(s) + 1$ -st two is in position  $k' \geq n(s) + 1$  of  $s$ , then  $k = M + 1 - k'$ . There can clearly be several strings  $s'$  of length  $2M$  for which the above listed 3 requirements hold. The change to  $c_{W^{(2)}}$  will be  $(\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) - 1) > 0$  times the sum of all the terms associated to these strings  $s'$ . For these strings  $s'$  the entries in position  $k$  to  $k + M$  contribute a factor equal to

$$p \frac{(1-p)^{t(s)} p^{M-t(s)}}{1-p} \frac{\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{M-k-n(s)} \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{M-k'-(t(s)-(n(s)+1))} \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)^{t(s)-(n(s)+1)}}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{M-k'}} = p \frac{(1-p)^{t(s)} p^{M-t(s)} \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{M-t(s)} \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)^{t(s)-(n(s)+1)}}{1-p \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{M-k'}} \quad (18)$$

as there are  $M - k - n(s)$  type-1 jobs in  $s'_{k+1} \dots s'_M$  which all pass the type-2 job in position  $M + 1$  of  $s'$  as increasing  $n(s)$  would otherwise violate condition (C2). The second fraction takes care of the conditioning on the types of the jobs after the tagged type-2 job up to position  $k + M$ . There are  $M - k'$  such jobs and  $t(s) - (n(s) + 1)$  of them are type-2. We divide by  $(1 - p)$  as we condition on having a type-2 job in position  $M + 1$ . The entries in position  $k + M + 1$  to  $2M$  in  $s'$  can be of any type and do not affect the value of (18). A type-1 job contributes a factor  $p\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)/\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)$  and a type-2 job a factor  $(1-p)\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)/\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)$ . They can therefore be safely ignored as  $p\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) + (1-p)\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z) = \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)$ , meaning  $(p\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) + (1-p)\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z))^{M-k}/\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{M-k} = 1$ .

Finally, if we look at the factor contributed by one of the first  $k - 1$  entries in  $s'$ , we note that any type-1 job among the first  $k - 1$  cannot pass the tagged type-2 job in position  $M + 1$  as the type-1 job in position  $k$  could not pass the tagged job either (before increasing  $n(s)$  by one) and condition (C2) holds on  $n$ . This means that the jobs in the first  $k - 1$  positions either contribute a factor  $1 - p$  or  $p$ . Further (18) does not depend on  $s'_1$  to  $s'_{k-1}$ . Summing over the different possibilities for the types of these  $k - 1$  jobs simply yields a factor 1 as  $((1 - p) + p)^{k-1} = 1$ . Combining the above yields the following expression for  $\Delta c_{W^{(2)}}$ :

$$\Delta c_{W^{(2)}} = c_Z p \frac{(1-p)^{t(s)} p^{M-t(s)} \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{M-t(s)} \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)^{t(s)-(n(s)+1)}}{1-p \tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{M-k'}} (\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) - 1),$$

The ATIR improves when increasing  $n(s)$  by one if and only if

$$p\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)\Delta c_{W^{(1)}} + (1-p)\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)\Delta c_{W^{(2)}} < 0.$$

Using the expression for  $\Delta c_{W^{(1)}}$  and  $\Delta c_{W^{(2)}}$ , we have

$$\frac{c_Z}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{M-k'}}(1-p)^{t(s)}p^{M-t(s)}p\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{M-t(s)}\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)^{t(s)-(n(s)+1)} \\ \left( \frac{1}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{k'}}\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)(1-\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)) + \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)(\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)-1) \right) < 0, \quad (19)$$

which can be restated as the ATIR improves if and only if

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{k'}} \frac{\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)(\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)-1)}{\tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)(\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)-1)} > 1, \quad (20)$$

where  $k'$  is the position where the  $n(s) + 1$ -st two appears in  $s$ . By definition of  $M_{opt}$  the above condition holds if and only if  $k' \leq M_{opt}$ .  $\square$

**THEOREM 7.** *The Nudge-M scheduling algorithm with  $M = M_{opt} \geq 0$  has the highest ATIR in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Further, Nudge-M maximizes the ATIR in  $\mathcal{F}_M$  for  $M \leq M_{opt}$ .*

**PROOF.** We first prove the optimality of Nudge-M in  $\mathcal{F}_M$  for  $M \leq M_{opt}$ . This follows from the fact that any scheduling algorithm in  $\mathcal{F}_M$  can be transformed into Nudge-M by a sequence of operations that increase  $n(s)$  by one for some string  $s$  without violating the conditions (C1) and (C2) on the function  $n$ . More specifically, we repeatedly pick  $s$  such that the following three conditions hold (until  $n(s) = t(s)$  for all  $s$ ):

- $n(s) < t(s)$ ,
- $n(s)$  is minimal among all strings  $s$  with  $n(s) < t(s)$ ,
- the position  $k'$  that holds the  $n(s) + 1$ -st two is minimal among all strings satisfying the previous two conditions.

Condition (C1) is clearly preserved during this procedure. To see that condition (C2) remains true, pick  $s$  such that the above three conditions hold and define  $\bar{n}(s') = n(s')$  for all  $s' \neq s$  and let  $\bar{n}(s) = n(s) + 1$ . To show that  $\bar{n}$  satisfies (C2), given that  $n$  satisfied (C2), we must check two cases: the case where  $s$  appears on the left in (C2) and the case where  $s$  appears on the right. First, assume  $s = s_0 \dots s_{M-1}$  and we need to check (C2) for  $\bar{n}$ . This means

$$\bar{n}(s) = n(s) + 1 \leq \bar{n}(s_1 \dots s_{M-1} s_M) + 1 (s_0 = 2),$$

must hold. As  $n(s)$  was minimal, the only problem that can occur is when  $\bar{n}(s_1 \dots s_{M-1} s_M) = n(s_1 \dots s_{M-1} s_M) = n(s)$  and  $s_0 = 1$ . However, in such case  $s_1 \dots s_M$  would have been selected instead of  $s = s_0 \dots s_{M-1}$  as it has the same  $n$  value, but its  $n(s) + 1$ -st two appears in position  $k' - 1$ . The second case we must verify is whether

$$\bar{n}(s_0 \dots s_{M-1}) \leq \bar{n}(s) + 1 (s_0 = 2),$$

holds where  $s = s_1 \dots s_M$ . The left hand side equals  $n(s_0 \dots s_{M-1})$  and the right  $n(s) + 1 + 1 (s_0 = 2)$ , so this clearly holds as (C2) was valid for  $n$ . As  $k' \leq M_{opt}$ , this change to  $n(s)$  increases the ATIR due to Theorem 6.

We can then prove that Nudge-M with parameter  $M_{opt}$  is optimal in  $\mathcal{F}_M$  with  $M > M_{opt}$  using a similar transformation. Any scheduling algorithm in  $\mathcal{F}_M$  with  $M > M_{opt}$  can be transformed into Nudge-M with  $M = M_{opt}$  by a sequence of operations where  $n(s)$  is either incremented or decremented and where each operation improves the ATIR. We first repeat the previous part of the proof to increase  $n(s)$  for some strings  $s$  such that all twos in positions  $k' \leq M_{opt}$  can be

passed by an arriving type-1 job. This improves the ATIR and preserves conditions (C1) and (C2) as shown above. Secondly,  $n(s)$  needs to be decreased for some strings  $s$  to make sure no twos beyond position  $M_{opt}$  can be passed by an arriving type-1 job. This can be done by repeatedly picking  $s = s_1 \dots s_M$  such that the following three conditions hold (until no more strings satisfy them, i.e.  $n(s) = t(s_1 \dots s_{M_{opt}})$  for all  $s$ ):

- $n(s) > t(s_1 \dots s_{M_{opt}})$ , as this implies a type-2 job beyond position  $M_{opt}$  can be passed,
- $n(s)$  is maximal among all strings  $s$  with  $n(s) > t(s_1 \dots s_{M_{opt}})$ ,
- the position  $k'$  that holds the  $n(s)$ -st two is maximal among all strings satisfying the previous two conditions.

As  $n(s)$  stays the same for some  $s$  while decreasing for other strings, condition (C1) clearly stays preserved. To see that condition (C2) also remains true, pick a string  $s$  satisfying the previous three conditions and define  $\bar{n}(s') = n(s')$  for all  $s' \neq s$  and  $\bar{n}(s) = n(s) - 1$ . We can again show that  $\bar{n}$  satisfies (C2) given that  $n$  did by checking the two cases where  $s$  either appears in the left-hand side of (C2), or in the right-hand side. For the first case, assume  $s = s_0 \dots s_{M-1}$ . This means

$$\bar{n}(s) \leq \bar{n}(s_1 \dots s_M) + 1(s_0 = 2)$$

must hold. Clearly this is the case given that  $n(s) \leq n(s_1 \dots s_M) + 1(s_0 = 2)$  holds, as  $\bar{n}(s) = n(s) - 1$  while the right-hand side is the same in both equations. The second case assumes  $s = s_1 \dots s_M$  and we must verify whether

$$\bar{n}(s_0 \dots s_{M-1}) \leq \bar{n}(s) + 1(s_0 = 2)$$

holds. When  $s_0 = 2$ , this inequality simplifies to  $\bar{n}(s_0 \dots s_{M-1}) \leq \bar{n}(s) + 1 = n(s)$ , which holds as  $n(s)$  was maximal. When  $s_0 = 1$ , the inequality can be rewritten as  $\bar{n}(s_0 \dots s_{M-1}) = n(1s_1 \dots s_{M-1}) \leq \bar{n}(s) = n(s) - 1$ , or  $n(1s_1 \dots s_{M-1}) < n(s)$ . As  $n(s)$  was maximal, this can only cause a problem if  $n(1s_1 \dots s_{M-1}) = n(s)$ . However, in that case the string  $1s_1 \dots s_{M-1}$  would be selected before  $s = s_1 \dots s_M$  as it has the same  $n$  value while its  $n(s)$ -st two appears in position  $k' + 1$ . Note that  $n(s) > t(s_1 \dots s_{M_{opt}})$  and  $n(s) = n(1s_1 \dots s_{M-1})$  imply that  $n(1s_1 \dots s_{M-1}) > t(1s_1 \dots s_{M_{opt}-1})$  as  $t(s_1 \dots s_{M_{opt}}) \geq t(1s_1 \dots s_{M_{opt}-1})$ .

As  $n(s) > t(s_1 \dots s_{M_{opt}})$ , the position  $k'$  of the  $n(s)$ -st two in  $s$  is beyond  $M_{opt}$ , which implies this change from  $n$  to  $\bar{n}$  improves the ATIR due to Theorem 6. □

Theorem 6 also allows us to establish the following structural results for the Nudge- $K, M$ , Nudge- $M, L$  and Nudge- $K, L$  scheduling algorithms:

- For Nudge- $K, M$  or Nudge- $M, L$  with  $M \leq M_{opt}$  increasing  $K$  or  $L$  always improves the ATIR. Given a  $K$  fixed, the best value for  $M$  is  $\max(K, M_{opt})$ . The same holds with respect to  $L$ .
- For the Nudge- $K, L$  scheduling algorithm denote the optimal  $K$  and  $L$  as  $(K^*, L^*)$ , then  $K^* + L^* - 1 \in [M_{opt}, 2M_{opt} - 1]$ . The lower bound is due to the fact that otherwise increasing  $K$  or  $L$  improves the ATIR and the upper bound follows from noting that  $K^*, L^* \leq M_{opt}$ . Explicit results for  $K^*$  and  $L^*$  appear hard to obtain.

Figure 3 illustrates Theorem 7 when both job sizes are exponential. It compares the ATIR of five different scheduling algorithms with optimized parameters (for Nudge- $K, L$  the optimization was done by brute force). The figure shows significant gains in the ATIR for Nudge- $M$  over Nudge- $K$  and Nudge- $L$  when the load is sufficiently high. Note that four of the five scheduling algorithms coincide when  $M_{opt} \leq 1$ . The difference between Nudge- $K, L$  and Nudge- $M$  is small in case  $K$  and  $L$  are optimized. Finally the  $\gamma$ -Boost algorithm outperforms Nudge- $M$  as proven in [18] by exploiting arrival time information, but the gain tends to zero as the load tends to one (see Corollary 1).




Fig. 3. The asymptotic tail improvement ratio of Nudge-K, Nudge-L, Nudge-K, L, Nudge-M, and  $\gamma$ -Boost (with optimized  $K, L, M$ , and boost), over FCFS with exponential job sizes. Nudge-M outperforms the other Nudge algorithms, but the difference with Nudge-K, L is small.  $\gamma$ -Boost outperforms the different Nudge algorithms by exploiting the arrival time information.

## 5 NUDGE-M SWAP DISTRIBUTION FOR A TAGGED TYPE-2 JOB

In this section we determine the distribution of the number of swaps for a tagged type-2 job that sees a workload of  $s$  on arrival, which we denote as  $X_{s\text{swap}}(s)$ . For this section onwards we assume type-1 and type-2 jobs follow a phase-type distribution as stated in Section 2. This distribution is not simply binomial as fewer than  $M$  arrivals may occur while the tagged type-2 job waits. Further, even if fewer than  $M$  jobs arrive in time  $s$ , there can be additional type-1 arrivals that occur during the service of a type-1 job that passed the tagged type-2 job. This significantly complicates the computation of the distribution of  $X_{s\text{swap}}(s)$ . Only when  $M = 1$  the computation is easy as there should be a single type-1 arrival by time  $s$  that occurred before any type-2 arrival in order to have a swap with the tagged job.

We first introduce a simple Markov chain (MC) that is used to count the number of type-1 and type-2 arrivals among the first  $M$  arrivals in  $(0, s)$ . The states of this MC are given by  $\mathcal{W}_M = \{(i, j) \mid 0 \leq i, j \leq M, i + j \leq M\}$  and  $|\mathcal{W}_M| = (M + 1)(M + 2)/2$  as we have  $k + 1$  states with  $i + j = k$  for  $k = 0, \dots, M$ . Let  $i$  reflect the number of type-1 jobs and  $j$  the number of type-2 jobs. The transition rate matrix of this MC is denoted as  $W_M$  with

$$(W_M)_{(i,j),(i',j')} = \begin{cases} \lambda p & i' = i + 1, j' = j, \\ \lambda(1 - p) & i' = i, j' = j + 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

for  $(i, j) \neq (i', j')$  and  $(W_M)_{(i,j),(i,j)} = -\lambda$  if  $i + j < M$  and zero otherwise. The states with  $i + j = M$  are thus absorbing states.

We first compute the state at time  $s$  of this Markov chain (as  $e_1^* e^{W_M s}$  if  $(0, 0)$  is the first state). If the state is of the form  $(0, j)$  at time  $s$ , no type-1 arrivals occurred and  $X_{s\text{swap}}(s)$  equals zero. If instead the state  $(i, j)$  at time  $s$  is such that  $i \geq 1$ , a type-1 job arrived among the next  $i + j \leq M$  arrivals and this type-1 job is swapped with the tagged type-2 job. Notice that it does not matter in which order we perform (a) the work  $s$  that was present when the tagged job arrived and (b) the work of the type-1 job that passed the tagged job. In other words we can continue running this Markov chain for a time equal to the service time of a type-1 job. When doing so, we first decrease

$i$  by one, as this type-1 job is no longer relevant for what happens next and also reduce  $M$  by one to take into account that one type-1 job was already accounted for. In other words we now use the Markov chain with rate matrix  $W_{M-1}$  where the initial state is determined by the state of  $W_M$  at time  $s$ , that is, we start in state  $(i, j)$  if the state of the Markov chain corresponding to  $W_M$  is  $(i + 1, j)$  at time  $s$ . Next we compute the state of the Markov chain corresponding to  $W_{M-1}$  a time  $X_1$ , which is the random variable representing the type-1 job size. There are again two possibilities: either the state is of the form  $(0, j)$  and we conclude that a single swap occurred, or we need to repeat this process with the Markov chain with rate matrix  $W_{M-2}$ . Clearly this process is repeated  $M - 1$  times in total.

If we order the states of the MC with rate matrix  $W_M$  in lexicographic order, the states of the form  $(0, j)$  are the first  $M + 1$  states and the matrix  $W_{M-1}$  is the submatrix of  $W_M$  located in the lower right corner. This implies that we get the initial vector for the MC with rate matrix  $W_{M-1}$  by removing the probabilities of the first  $M + 1$  states from the state of the MC with rate matrix  $W_M$  at time  $s$ . We therefore define the matrix  $U_M$  (of size  $(M + 1)(M + 2)/2 \times M(M + 1)/2$ ), which removes the first  $M + 1$  values from the state:

$$U_M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I_{M(M+1)/2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We also define the vector  $F_M$  which accumulates the removed probability mass by summing over the first  $M + 1$  values:  $F_M$  is a size  $(M + 1)(M + 2)/2$  vector with its first  $M + 1$  entries equal to one and zeros elsewhere.

Using the above matrices and Markov chains we can now express  $P[X_{s\text{wap}}(s) = k]$  in the following manner as explained below:

$$P[X_{s\text{wap}}(s) = k] = e_1^* e^{W_M s} \left( \prod_{\ell=0}^{k-1} (U_{M-\ell} \otimes \alpha_1) (-(W_{M-\ell-1} \oplus S_1))^{-1} (I \otimes s_1^*) \right) F_{M-k}, \quad (22)$$

for  $k = 0, \dots, M - 1$  and  $P[X_{s\text{wap}}(s) = M] = 1 - P[X_{s\text{wap}}(s) < M]$ . Notice that  $(I \otimes \alpha_1) (-(W_{M-\ell-1} \oplus S_1))^{-1} (I \otimes s_1^*)$  indicates how the state of the MC with rate matrix  $W_{M-\ell-1}$  evolves during the service time of a single type-1 job. The matrix  $U_{M-\ell}$  takes care of the transitions of the states in between the Markov chains and  $F_{M-k}$  accumulates the probability mass after the MC with rate matrix  $W_{M-k}$  is finished, which corresponds to having exactly  $k$  swaps. The expected number of swaps  $E[X_{s\text{wap}}(s)]$  for a type-2 job can be expressed as

$$E[X_{s\text{wap}}(s)] = e_1^* e^{W_M s} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \left( \prod_{\ell=0}^{k-1} (U_{M-\ell} \otimes \alpha_1) (-(W_{M-\ell-1} \oplus S_1))^{-1} (I \otimes s_1^*) \right) (1 - F_{M-k}), \quad (23)$$

as  $E[X_{s\text{wap}}(s)] = \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} P[X_{s\text{wap}}(s) > k]$ . For further use we define

$$v_M^{s\text{wap}} = \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \left( \prod_{\ell=0}^{k-1} (U_{M-\ell} \otimes \alpha_1) (-(W_{M-\ell-1} \oplus S_1))^{-1} (I \otimes s_1^*) \right) (1 - F_{M-k}), \quad (24)$$

such that  $E[X_{s\text{wap}}(s)] = e_1^* e^{W_M s} v_M^{s\text{wap}}$ . Regarding the computation time of the distribution of  $X_{s\text{wap}}(s)$ , note that  $e_1^* e^{W_M s}$  times the product in (22) can be reused when we increase  $k$  by one, which speeds up the computation time. Moreover as  $W_M$  is a block triangular matrix with  $W_{M-1}$  in its lower right corner all the inverse matrices are submatrices of  $(-W_{M-1} \oplus S_1)^{-1}$ . As such the overall computation time is  $O(M^6 n_1^3)$  with  $n_1$  the size of  $S_1$ . By exploiting the structure of  $(-W_{M-1} \oplus S_1)$  when computing the inverse, it is possible to reduce the computation time to  $O(M^5 n_1^3)$ .



## 6 MEAN RESPONSE TIME OF NUDGE-M

Using the results from the previous section, the expected number of swaps for an arriving type-2 job can be calculated. For further use we also restate the following result:

**THEOREM 8 (FROM [16]).** *Let  $Z$  be the workload in the system (for any work conserving scheduler), then*

$$P[Z > t] = \lambda \alpha e^{Tt} (-S)^{-1} \mathbf{1} = \lambda \beta e^{Tt} (-T)^{-1} \mathbf{1}, \quad (25)$$

with  $\beta = (1 - \lambda)\alpha$  and  $T = S + \lambda \mathbf{1}\alpha$ .

**THEOREM 9.** *Let  $E[X_{s\text{swap}}]$  be the mean number of swaps for a tagged type-2 job, then*

$$E[X_{s\text{swap}}] = -\lambda(\beta \otimes e_1^*)(T \oplus W_M)^{-1}(\mathbf{1} \otimes v_M^{s\text{swap}}),$$

with  $v_M^{s\text{swap}}$  given by (24).

**PROOF.** As the workload observed by a tagged type-2 job is the same as the steady state workload in an M/G/1 queue, we have by Theorem 8

$$\begin{aligned} E[X_{s\text{swap}}] &= \int_0^\infty \lambda \beta e^{Ts} \mathbf{1} E[X_{s\text{swap}}(s)] ds = \int_0^\infty \lambda \beta e^{Ts} \mathbf{1} e_1^* e^{sW_M} v_M^{s\text{swap}} ds \\ &= \lambda \int_0^\infty (\beta \otimes e_1^*) e^{s(T \oplus W_M)} (\mathbf{1} \otimes v_M^{s\text{swap}}) ds = -\lambda(\beta \otimes e_1^*)(T \oplus W_M)^{-1}(\mathbf{1} \otimes v_M^{s\text{swap}}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda \beta e^{Ts} \mathbf{1}$  is the density of the workload in  $s$ . The probability that the workload is 0 (i.e. the queue is empty) is  $1 - \lambda$ , but with this probability the arriving type-2 job goes into service immediately and is never swapped.  $\square$

**THEOREM 10.** *The mean response time of Nudge-M can be expressed as*

$$E[R_{\text{Nudge-M}}] = E[R] + (1 - p)E[X_{s\text{swap}}](E[X_1] - E[X_2])$$

where  $E[R] = 1 + \lambda \beta T^{-2} \mathbf{1}$  is the mean response time of FCFS.

**PROOF.** An arriving job is type-2 with probability  $1 - p$ , and is swapped on average  $E[X_{s\text{swap}}]$  times. This means per arriving job of any type, the average number of swaps is  $(1 - p)E[X_{s\text{swap}}]$ , and as each swap moves a type-1 job in front of a type-2 job, the response time of the type-1 job decreases by  $E[X_2]$  while that of the type-2 job increases by  $E[X_1]$ .  $\square$

In Figure 4 we plot the mean response time improvement ratio (MTIR) of Nudge-M and a non-preemptive priority scheduler [14] over FCFS. The MTIR is defined as  $1 - E[R_A]/E[R_{FCFS}]$  for a scheduling algorithm  $A$ . The non-preemptive priority scheduler serves as an upper bound here as it minimizes the mean response time when the server only knows job types (and  $E[X_1] < E[X_2]$ ). We first note that Nudge-M with  $M = M_{opt}$  achieves a significant gain in the mean response time over FCFS. It also captures a substantial part of the gain achieved by the priority scheduler. The priority scheduler however has a poor tail performance as its tail only decays exponentially fast for sufficiently small loads [2]. We further note that Nudge-20 acts as a priority scheduler for small loads, but it does not have the same guarantees in terms of the tail behavior of the response time as Nudge-M with  $M = M_{opt}$ .




Fig. 4. The mean response time improvement ratio (MTIR) of Nudge- $M$  with  $M = M_{opt}$ , Nudge- $M$  with  $M = 20$ , and a priority queue over FCFS with  $p = 2/3$ , and  $E[X_2]/E[X_1] = 4$ . For low loads, Nudge- $M$  with a high parameter coincides with the priority queue. This plot also shows how Nudge- $M$  improves the mean response time without making the tail worse than FCFS.

## 7 RESPONSE TIME DISTRIBUTION OF TYPE-2 JOBS

In this section we develop a numerical method to compute the response time distribution of a type-2 job under Nudge- $M$ . This is considerably more involved than in [16] for Nudge- $K$  as in Nudge- $K$  at most one jobs can pass a tagged type-2 job and this type-1 job must arrive within time  $s$ , where  $s$  is the workload observed by the tagged type-2 job upon arrival.

Although we have the probabilities that a tagged type-2 job is swapped  $k$  times with a type-1 job given that it observed a workload of  $s$  upon arrival, we cannot directly use these to compute the waiting time distribution of a tagged type-2 job. This is due to the fact that these  $k$  arrivals do not necessarily occur in time  $s$ , meaning the waiting time of a tagged type-2 job is *not* simply given by  $s$  plus a sum over  $k$  of  $P[X_{s_{swap}}(s) = k]$  times the convolution of  $k$  type-1 jobs. For this reason we need to introduce a more involved method to compute the distribution of the extra waiting time  $W_{extra}(s)$  that a type-2 job experiences that sees a workload of  $s$  upon arrival.

We will show that the distribution  $W_{extra}(s)$  is a phase-type distribution characterized by  $(\gamma(s), Q)$ . It is based on the approach used to compute the distribution of the number of swaps  $X_{s_{swap}}(s)$  that a type-2 job experiences. The main difference is that when computing  $X_{s_{swap}}(s)$  we did not measure time. We can nevertheless make use of the same Markov chains with rate matrices  $W_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, M$ , and matrices  $U_i$  to construct the following block bidiagonal subgenerator matrix  $Q$ :

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} W_{M-1} \oplus S_1 & U_{M-1} \otimes s_1^* \alpha_1 & & & \\ & W_{M-2} \oplus S_1 & U_{M-2} \otimes s_1^* \alpha_1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & W_1 \oplus S_1 & U_1 \otimes s_1^* \alpha_1 \\ & & & & S_1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (26)$$

This subgenerator  $Q$  consists of  $M$  block rows, where the phases belonging to the  $k$ -th block row correspond to work that is added by the  $k$ -th job that passed the tagged type-2 job. The matrix  $S_1$

captures the evolution of work added by the type-1 job. The matrix  $W_{M-k}$  counts the number of type-1 and type-2 arrivals, using the counters  $i$  and  $j$ . As we are adding the work of the  $k$ -th type-1 job,  $(i, j)$  is such that  $i + j \leq M - k$ , which is why we make use of  $W_{M-k}$  instead of  $W_M$  in block row  $k$ . When the work of the  $k$ -th type-1 job is added (which occurs at the rates given by  $s_1^*$ ), we move on to block row  $k + 1$  provided that counter  $i > 0$ . This is exactly what the matrix  $U_{M-k}$  does: it changes the counters  $(i, j)$  to  $(i - 1, j)$  if  $i > 0$ . When the counter  $i = 0$  there is no transition to a phase belonging to block row  $k + 1$  and the underlying Markov chain of the phase-type distribution moves to the implicit absorbing state. Note that when we are adding the work of the  $M$ -th type-1 job, the counters  $i$  and  $j$  are both zero and cannot change, so we only need to keep track of the phase of the work of the type-1 job.

The initial phase vector  $\gamma(s)$  depends on the arrivals that occurred in the first interval of length  $s$ . If at least one type-1 arrival occurred (among the first  $M$ ), the initial phase is such that we start in the first block row (i.e.,  $k = 1$ ) and the counters  $i$  and  $j$  are such that  $j$  matches the number of type-2 arrivals among the first  $M$  arrivals in  $(0, s)$  and  $i$  is one less than the number of type-1 arrivals among the first  $M$  arrivals in  $(0, s)$ . We can therefore use the Markov chain with rate matrix  $W_M$  and the matrix  $U_M$  to determine the initial phase vector as follows

$$\gamma(s) = (e_1^* e^{W_M s} U_M) \otimes \alpha_1, 0),$$

where the number of padded zeros is such that  $\gamma(s)$  has the same length as the size of  $Q$ . The vector  $\alpha_1$  is used to determine the initial phase of the work offered by the first type-1 job that passes the tagged type-2 job. Notice that the vector  $\gamma(s)$  does not sum to one, meaning the phase-type distribution  $(\gamma(s), Q)$  has a mass in zero, corresponding to the probability that the tagged type-2 job is not swapped. Given the above discussion it should now be clear that the extra waiting time for a type-2 job that sees a workload  $s$  on arrival is given by the following formula:

$$P[W_{extra}(s) > t] = \gamma(s) e^{Q t} \mathbf{1} \quad (27)$$

**THEOREM 11.** *Let  $W^{(2)}$  be the waiting time distribution of a type-2 job, then*

$$P[W^{(2)} > t] = (e_1^* \otimes \lambda \beta, 0) e^{T_M t} v_2 \quad (28)$$

where  $\mathbf{1}_W$  is a column vector with the same size as  $W_M$ ,

$$T_M = \begin{bmatrix} W_M \oplus T & U_M \otimes \mathbf{1} \alpha_1 & 0 \\ 0 & Q & \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad v_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_W \otimes ((-T)^{-1} \mathbf{1}) \\ \mathbf{1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (29)$$

**PROOF.** The waiting time for a type-2 job is larger than  $t$  if the workload is larger than  $t$ , or if the workload is  $s < t$  and the extra time  $W_{extra}(s) > t - s$ . The workload is 0 with probability  $1 - \lambda$ , but in that case, the job goes into service immediately and so the waiting time is never larger than  $t$ .

$$\begin{aligned} P[W^{(2)} > t] &= P[Z > t] + \int_0^t \lambda \beta e^{T s} \mathbf{1} P[W_{extra}(s) > t - s] ds \\ &= P[Z > t] + \int_0^t \lambda \beta e^{T s} \mathbf{1} (e_1^* e^{W_M s} U_M \otimes \alpha_1, 0) e^{Q(t-s)} \mathbf{1} ds \\ &= P[Z > t] + \int_0^t \lambda \beta e^{T s} \mathbf{1} (e_1^* e^{W_M s}) (U_M \otimes \alpha_1, 0) e^{Q(t-s)} \mathbf{1} ds \\ &= P[Z > t] + \int_0^t (\lambda \beta \otimes e_1^*) (e^{T s} \otimes e^{W_M s}) (\mathbf{1} \otimes (U_M \otimes \alpha_1, 0)) e^{Q(t-s)} \mathbf{1} ds \\ &= P[Z > t] + \int_0^t (e_1^* \otimes \lambda \beta) e^{(W_M \oplus T) s} ((U_M \otimes \alpha_1, 0) \otimes \mathbf{1}) e^{Q(t-s)} \mathbf{1} ds \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 1 from [16] we get

$$P[W^{(2)} > t] = P[Z > t] + (e_1^* \otimes \lambda\beta, 0)e^{T_M t} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{1} \end{bmatrix} = (e_1^* \otimes \lambda\beta, 0)e^{T_M t} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_W \otimes ((-T)^{-1}\mathbf{1}) \\ \mathbf{1} \end{bmatrix},$$

where the last equality holds as

$$\begin{aligned} (e_1^* \otimes \lambda\beta)e^{(W_M \oplus T)t}(\mathbf{1}_W \otimes ((-T)^{-1}\mathbf{1})) &= (e_1^* e^{W_M t} \mathbf{1}_W)(\lambda\beta e^{Tt} (-T)^{-1}\mathbf{1}) \\ &= \lambda\beta e^{Tt} (-T)^{-1}\mathbf{1} = P[Z > t], \end{aligned}$$

as  $W_M$  is the rate matrix of a Markov chain, meaning  $e_1^* e^{W_M t}$  is a row vector of probabilities that sum to 1.  $\square$

**THEOREM 12.** *Let  $R^{(2)}$  be the response time distribution of a type-2 job, then*

$$P[R^{(2)} > t] = P[W^{(2)} > t] + (1 - \lambda)\alpha_2 e^{S_2 t} \mathbf{1} - (e_1^* \otimes \lambda\beta, 0)e^{Bt} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (30)$$

where

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} T_M & T_M v_2 \alpha_2 \\ 0 & S_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (31)$$

**PROOF.** A type-2 job's response time consists of its waiting time combined with its service time. The response time is larger than  $t$  if the waiting time is. If the waiting time is  $s < t$ , the response time may still be larger than  $t$  if the job's service time is longer than  $t - s$ . The waiting time is 0 if the queue is empty with probability  $1 - \lambda$ .

$$\begin{aligned} P[R^{(2)} > t] &= P[W^{(2)} > t] + (1 - \lambda)P[X_2 > t] + \int_0^t f_{W^{(2)}}(s)P[X_2 > t - s] ds \\ &= P[W^{(2)} > t] + (1 - \lambda)\alpha_2 e^{S_2 t} \mathbf{1} + \int_0^t ((e_1^* \otimes \lambda\beta, 0)e^{T_M s} (-T_M)v_2)(\alpha_2 e^{S_2(t-s)} \mathbf{1}) ds \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

This gives the desired formula using Lemma 1 from [16].  $\square$

## 8 RESPONSE TIME DISTRIBUTION OF TYPE-1 JOBS

This section focuses on the computation of the response time distribution of a type-1 job under Nudge- $M$ . In [16] the response time of a type-1 job under Nudge- $K$  could be computed by creating a coupling with the FCFS queue. To illustrate that this approach can no longer be used, consider the following example with  $M = 2$ . A type-2 job is in service and the queue is empty at time 0. Next a type-2 job arrives followed by a type-1 job. In Nudge- $M$  the type-1 is swapped with the type-2 job. Suppose the type-2 job now completes service. In Nudge- $M$  the type-1 job enters the server, while in the coupled FCFS system the type-2 job starts service. Assume the next arrival is another type-1 job, call it job J. In Nudge- $M$  there are 2 cases: (1) the type-1 job was small and already left the system and the type-2 is in service, in this case job J is not swapped, (2) the type-1 job is still in service, in this case job J is swapped. When we look at the FCFS system when job J arrives, it simply has a type-2 job in service and a type-1 waiting (if the type-2 job is large enough), so it is unclear how one could determine which of the two cases occurred under Nudge- $M$  simply by looking at the FCFS state. We therefore need to develop a radically different approach compared to one taken in [16].

We proceed by showing how a Markov Modulated Fluid Queue (MMFQ) with jumps [5, 15] can be used to model the waiting time distribution of a type-1 job. A fluid queue *without jumps* consists of a non-negative fluid that evolves over time depending on a background CTMC's state [4, 9]. This background process' states are partitioned into two sets when the fluid is non-zero. The first set

$\mathcal{S}^-$  makes the fluid decrease at rate 1, while the second set  $\mathcal{S}^+$  makes the fluid increase at rate 1. When the fluid is exactly zero, the set  $\mathcal{S}^-$  is replaced by another set  $\mathcal{S}^0$ , in which the fluid remains at zero until a transition to  $\mathcal{S}^+$  is made. The difference with a MMFQ with jumps is that the time intervals in which the fluid increases at rate 1 are replaced by instantaneous upward jumps. In other words the MMFQ with jumps is identical to the one without jumps, except that we censor out the time intervals in which the fluid increases, that is, when the background process's state is in  $\mathcal{S}^+$ . This implies that we can compute the stationary distribution of the fluid of the MMFQ with jumps from the stationary distribution of the MMFQ without jumps.

The MMFQ without jumps used in this section is defined using three matrices: a rate matrix  $T$  that captures the evolution of the background process when the fluid is nonzero, a second rate matrix  $T^*$  for the background process when the fluid is exactly zero, and a transition probability matrix  $P$  which allows for the background process to make a transition when fluid reaches zero. The matrix  $P$  is of size  $|\mathcal{S}^-| \times (|\mathcal{S}^0| + |\mathcal{S}^+|)$  as the fluid can reach zero only from states where the fluid decreases. The matrix  $T^*$  is of size  $|\mathcal{S}^0| \times (|\mathcal{S}^0| + |\mathcal{S}^+|)$  as the fluid can only stay at zero from states in  $\mathcal{S}^0$ . The matrix  $T$  is clearly a square matrix of size  $|\mathcal{S}^-| + |\mathcal{S}^+|$ . These matrices are partitioned as

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} T_{--} & T_{-+} \\ T_{+-} & T_{++} \end{bmatrix}, \quad T^* = \begin{bmatrix} T_{00}^* & T_{0+}^* \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad P = \begin{bmatrix} P_{-0} & P_{-+} \end{bmatrix} \quad (34)$$

in the obvious manner. Notice that if  $P_{-+}$  is nonzero, the fluid immediately starts to increase again when hitting the zero boundary in some cases. The idea is to let the fluid level of the MMFQ *with jumps* represent the waiting time of a virtual type-1 arrival. We first illustrate this with two simpler scheduling policies before moving on to Nudge-M.

Before doing is, we briefly explain how the stationary distribution of the fluid with jumps can be found using these matrices (see [9] for more details). Let  $\Psi$  be the smallest non-negative solution to the algebraic Riccati equation

$$T_{+-} + \Psi T_{--} + T_{++} \Psi + \Psi T_{-+} \Psi = 0, \quad (35)$$

which can be solved efficiently using the Structure-preserving Doubling Algorithm (SDA) [8], the computation time of which can be slightly improved upon by the ADDA algorithm [17]. Alternatively, one can also construct a Quasi-Birth-Death Markov chain to compute  $\Psi$  as explained in [13]. Define two matrices

$$\tilde{P} = P_{-+} - P_{-0}(T_{00}^*)^{-1}T_{0+}^*, \quad (36)$$

$$K = T_{++} + \Psi T_{-+}, \quad (37)$$

and  $\pi_+$  as a non-zero solution of  $\pi_+ \tilde{P} = \pi_+$ . The normalizing constant  $\eta$  is then calculated as:

$$\eta = -\pi_+(K^{-1}\Psi\mathbf{1} + \Psi P_{-0}(T_{00}^*)^{-1}\mathbf{1}). \quad (38)$$

Normalize  $\pi_+$  so that  $\eta$  is equal to 1. Finally, the probability mass  $c_0$  that the fluid is exactly 0 (which is the probability that the queue is empty), the density of the fluid (i.e. the density of the waiting time distribution for a type-1 job), and its complementary distribution function are given by the following formulas:

$$c_0 = -\pi_+ \Psi P_{-0} (T_{00}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{1} \quad (39)$$

$$f_{W^{(1)}}(t) = \pi_+ e^{Kt} \Psi \mathbf{1} \quad (40)$$

$$P[W^{(1)} > t] = \int_t^\infty f_{W^{(1)}}(x) dx = \pi_+ e^{Kt} (-K)^{-1} \Psi \mathbf{1} \quad (41)$$

### 8.1 FCFS scheduling:

In case of FCFS scheduling the waiting time of a virtual type-1 arrival is simply the workload in the queue, so the fluid level should reflect the workload. Thus whenever a job arrives (of any type), its workload is added to the fluid of the MMFQ via the states  $\mathcal{S}^+$ . This implies that  $T_{-+} = \lambda\alpha$ ,  $T_{++} = S$  and  $T_{+-} = s^*$ . In between arrivals, the fluid decreases at rate 1 as the FCFS scheduler is work-conserving. The set  $\mathcal{S}^-$  contains only one state and is equal to  $\mathcal{S}^0$ , so  $T_{--} = -\lambda$ . If the fluid is at 0, it remains at 0 until the next arrival occurs. Hence,  $P_{-+} = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $P_{-0} = 1$ ,  $T_{00}^* = -\lambda$  and  $T_{0+}^* = \lambda\alpha$ . This can be summarized as follows:

$$T = \left[ \begin{array}{c|cc} -\lambda & \lambda p \alpha_1 & \lambda(1-p)\alpha_2 \\ \hline s_1^* & S_1 & 0 \\ s_2^* & 0 & S_2 \end{array} \right], \quad T^* = \left[ -\lambda \mid \lambda\alpha \right], \quad \text{and} \quad P = \left[ 1 \mid \mathbf{0} \right] \quad (42)$$

In this particular case the solution  $\Psi$  to (35) is a column vector of ones as  $|\mathcal{S}^-| = 1$  and  $\lambda < 1$ . This implies that  $K = T_{++} + \Psi T_{-+} = S + \lambda 1\alpha$ , which is the  $T$  matrix of the workload process, and  $\pi_+ = \lambda(1-\lambda)\alpha = \lambda\beta$  so that  $P[W^{(1)} > t] = \lambda\beta e^{Tt}(-T)^{-1}\mathbf{1} = P[Z > t]$ .

### 8.2 Nudge-1 scheduling:

In the second example, we show how a MMFQ can be used to model the virtual waiting time of a type-1 job in Nudge-1, which is Nudge- $K$  with  $K = 1$ , but also Nudge- $M$  with  $M = 1$ . In this case, an arriving type-1 job may skip ahead of a single type-2 job at the end of the queue, but only if the type-2 job has not been swapped before. Such a type-2 job should not have its workload added to the fluid yet as it does not add to the virtual waiting time of an arriving type-1 job. This indicates that we need more than one state in  $\mathcal{S}^-$  as we have to remember whether such a type-2 job exists at the back of the queue, the workload of which has not yet been added to the fluid. More specifically  $\mathcal{S}^-$  now has two states: one state for when there is no type-2 job at the back of the queue that has not been swapped (and workload of which has not been added), which we denote as 0, and one state for when there is such a type-2 job, which we denote as 1.  $\mathcal{S}^0$  still has only one state denoted as 0, as it is only possible for the fluid to remain at zero when there is no type-2 job in the state. When a new arrival occurs, one of the following 4 cases occurs:

- (1) If the current state is  $0 \in \mathcal{S}^-$  and the arrival is type-2, the state remains within  $\mathcal{S}^-$  and simply changes from 0 to 1. So contrary to the FCFS case, we refrain from adding the work to the fluid at this stage as the type-2 job can potentially be passed by a later type-1 arrival.
- (2) If the current state is  $0 \in \mathcal{S}^-$  and the arrival is type-1, the state transitions to  $\mathcal{S}^+$  to add the workload of the arriving type-1 job. After adding this work, the state returns to  $0 \in \mathcal{S}^-$ .
- (3) If the current state is  $1 \in \mathcal{S}^-$  and a type-2 arrival occurs, we end up with a queue ending with two type-2 jobs that have not been swapped. As an incoming type-1 job can only pass one of these, we do not need to remember both. We therefore add the workload of one type-2 job to the fluid before returning to state 1. In other words, in this case the state changes to  $\mathcal{S}^+$  to add the work of a type-2 job and then returns to state 1  $\in \mathcal{S}^-$ .
- (4) Finally, if the current state is  $1 \in \mathcal{S}^-$  and a type-1 arrival occurs, this type-1 job passes the type-2 job stored in the state 1  $\in \mathcal{S}^-$ . As a result it can no longer be swapped again and its workload should be added to the fluid, as well as the type-1 job's workload. After adding the workload of both jobs the state should transition back to  $0 \in \mathcal{S}^-$ .

To accommodate these 4 types of events, the set  $\mathcal{S}^+$  is partitioned into four subsets. The first subset covers case (2) and adds the workload of a type-1 job before returning to state  $0 \in \mathcal{S}^-$ . The second subset covers case (4) and first adds a type-2 job, then transitions to the first set to add a type-1 job before returning to state  $0 \in \mathcal{S}^-$ . The third and fourth subset add a type-2 job after which they

transition to state  $1 \in \mathcal{S}^-$  and  $0 \in \mathcal{S}^-$ , respectively. The third subset covers case (3), so the fourth subset may seem redundant at this point. However, its use will become clear when discussing the matrix  $T^*$  and  $P$ . This results in the following  $T$  matrix:

$$T = \left[ \begin{array}{cc|ccc} -\lambda & \lambda(1-p) & \lambda p \alpha_1 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & -\lambda & \mathbf{0} & \lambda p \alpha_2 & \lambda(1-p)\alpha_2 & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline s_1^* & \mathbf{0} & S_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & s_2^* \alpha_1 & S_2 & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{0} & s_2^* & 0 & 0 & S_2 & 0 \\ s_2^* & \mathbf{0} & 0 & 0 & 0 & S_2 \end{array} \right] \quad (43)$$

In the case where the fluid reaches zero from state  $1 \in \mathcal{S}^-$ , the stored type-2 job goes into service and so its workload must be added to the fluid. After the work has been added, the state is changed to  $0 \in \mathcal{S}^-$ , this explain the use of the fourth subset of  $\mathcal{S}^+$  introduced above. This indicates that  $P_{-,+}$  is nonzero. While the fluid is zero (which can only happen in state  $0 \in \mathcal{S}^0$ ), any incoming job's workload is added to the fluid as it immediately goes into service, i.e. no type-2 jobs are added to the state. This yields the following expressions for  $T^*$  and  $P$ :

$$T^* = \left[ -\lambda \mid \lambda p \alpha_1 \quad \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{0} \quad \lambda(1-p)\alpha_2 \right] \quad \text{and} \quad P = \left[ \begin{array}{c|cccc} 1 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline 0 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \alpha_2 \end{array} \right] \quad (44)$$

### 8.3 Nudge-M scheduling:

This whole idea can then expanded for Nudge-M. As before, the state keeps track of type-2 jobs at the end of the queue which have not been added to the fluid thus far, as these are the jobs that would be passed by an arriving type-1 job. While for Nudge-1 the state was a number  $k \in \{0, 1\}$  representing whether or not the queue ends with a type-2 job that can be passed, this now becomes an  $M$ -dimensional vector of zeroes and ones. For (at most) the last  $M$  arrivals, we need to remember which ones were type-2 jobs as well as their positions among the last  $M$  arrivals. For instance, if  $M = 6$  and the state equals  $(1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)$ , it means the last four arrivals were (from newest to oldest) type-2, type-2, type-1 and type-2 and the workload of the three type-2 jobs is not yet added to the fluid. The zeros in the back of the state, being the last two zeros in our example, do not imply that the fifth and sixth last arrivals were type-1. For instance, it could also be that the fifth last arrival was a type-2 job that is in service or that already left the system.

As such the state  $s = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_M) \in \{0, 1\}^M$  is an  $M$ -dimensional vector where entry  $i$  is one if and only if the  $i$ -th last arrival was a type-2 job that is still waiting in the queue, meaning its workload was not yet added to the fluid. These states make up the set  $\mathcal{H} = \{0, 1\}^M$ .

Define two functions to manipulate states:

$$dec : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$$

$$shift : \mathcal{H} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$$

$dec$  removes the oldest type-2 job that is being remembered in the state: it decrements the rightmost non-zero entry of  $s$ . For instance,  $dec((1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)) = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ .  $shift$  is used when an arrival occurs and moves all the waiting type-2 jobs stored in the state and adds a 0 or 1 in front:  $shift(s, v) = (v, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{M-1})$  such that  $s_M$  is dropped from the state.

The set of phases in  $\mathcal{S}^-$  is therefore denoted as

$$\mathcal{S}^- = \{\langle s, 0 \rangle \mid s \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

As in Nudge-1, the fluid can only remain at zero from one state which denotes that there are no type-2 jobs in the last  $M$  arrivals that are still waiting in the queue:  $\mathcal{S}^0 = \{\langle \mathbf{0}, 0 \rangle\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}^-$ .

When a new arrival occurs in state  $\langle s, 0 \rangle$  with  $s = (s_1, \dots, s_M)$ , one of the following 4 cases occurs, depending on  $s_M$  and the type of the new arrival. These 4 cases are similar to those for Nudge-1.

- (1) If  $s_M = 0$  and the arrival is type-2, the state simply changes from  $\langle s, 0 \rangle$  to  $\langle \text{shift}(s, 1), 0 \rangle$ . This change indicates that the arrivals stored in the state are shifted over by a new type-2 job. The requirement  $s_M = 0$  means that this new arrival does not move a stored type-2 job out of the last  $M$ , as in such case its workload must be added to the fluid.
- (2) If  $s_M = 0$  and the arrival is type-1, the workload of the arriving type-1 job is added via a set of states that we will denote as  $\mathcal{S}_1^+$ . After adding this work, the state returns to  $\langle \text{shift}(s, 0), 0 \rangle$  as the stored arrivals are shifted over by a new type-1 job.
- (3) If  $s_M = 1$  and a type-2 arrival occurs, we end up with a queue that includes a type-2 job followed by  $M$  arrivals. This type-2 job was stored in  $s$ , but can no longer be passed by arriving type-1 jobs. As a result, we add the workload of one type-2 job (via a set of states defined further as  $\mathcal{S}_3^+$ ) to the fluid before returning to state  $\langle \text{shift}(s, 1), 0 \rangle$ , which no longer includes this type-2 job.
- (4) Finally, if  $s_M = 1$  and a type-1 arrival occurs, we again have a type-2 job that is now safe, like in the previous case. This means the workload of one type-2 job must be added to the fluid, as well as the type-1 job's workload. Afterwards, the state changes to  $\langle \text{shift}(s, 0), 0 \rangle$ .

To accommodate these 4 types of events, the set  $\mathcal{S}^+$  is partitioned into three subsets  $\mathcal{S}_1^+$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_2^+$  and  $\mathcal{S}_3^+$ . The first subset

$$\mathcal{S}_1^+ = \{ \langle s, i, 1 \rangle \mid s \in \mathcal{H} \wedge s_1 = 0 \wedge i \in \{1, \dots, n_1\} \}$$

adds the workload of a type-1 job to the fluid, transitioning to state  $\langle s, 0 \rangle \in \mathcal{S}^-$  afterwards. This covers case (2) and happens when a type-1 job has arrived, and so there is a type-1 job at the end of the queue, explaining the extra condition  $s_1 = 0$ .

The second subset

$$\mathcal{S}_2^+ = \{ \langle s, i, 2 \rangle \mid s \in \mathcal{H} \wedge s_1 = 0 \wedge i \in \{1, \dots, n_2\} \}$$

is used to cover case (4), where the workload of a type-2 job followed by the workload of a type-1 job is added to the fluid. The set  $\mathcal{S}_2^+$  is used to add the type-2 work, then a transition is made to the set  $\mathcal{S}_1^+$  to add the work of the type-1 job, before finally transitioning to state  $\langle s, 0 \rangle \in \mathcal{S}^-$ . This set has the same requirement that  $s_1 = 0$  as the set  $\mathcal{S}_1^+$  because case (4) also involves a type-1 arrival.

Finally the third subset

$$\mathcal{S}_3^+ = \{ \langle s, i, 3 \rangle \mid s \in \mathcal{H} \wedge i \in \{1, \dots, n_2\} \}$$

adds the workload of a type-2 job to the fluid and then transitions to  $\langle s, 0 \rangle \in \mathcal{S}^-$ . This subset covers case (3).

These three subsets are similar to the four subsets in the Nudge-1 example. In particular, subsets 1 and 2 have the same purpose as the first two subsets in the Nudge-1 example, while  $\mathcal{S}_3^+$  can be regarded as the union of the third and fourth subset, as this set adds the workload of type-2 jobs to the fluid before transitioning to some state in  $\mathcal{S}^-$ .

We now define all the necessary transitions between states, based on the four cases when an arrival occurs. Transitions from  $\mathcal{S}^-$  are for the four cases that were previously described, depending



on the type of the arrival and  $s_M$ .

$$(T_{--})_{\langle s,0 \rangle, \langle s',0 \rangle} = \begin{cases} -\lambda & s' = s, \\ \lambda(1-p) & s_M = 0, s' = \text{shift}(s, 1), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

$$(T_{-+})_{\langle s,0 \rangle, \langle s',j,k \rangle} = \begin{cases} (\lambda p \alpha_1)_j & s_M = 0, s' = \text{shift}(s, 0), k = 1, \\ (\lambda p \alpha_2)_j & s_M = 1, s' = \text{shift}(s, 0), k = 2, \\ (\lambda(1-p)\alpha_2)_j & s_M = 1, s' = \text{shift}(s, 1), k = 3, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

In  $S_1^+$ , a type-1 job's workload is added to the fluid before returning to  $S^-$ . This gives two sets of transitions:

$$(T_{1+})_{\langle s,i,1 \rangle, \langle s',j,k \rangle} = \begin{cases} (S_1)_{i,j} & s' = s, k = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

$$(T_{1-})_{\langle s,i,1 \rangle, \langle s',0 \rangle} = \begin{cases} (s_1^*)_i & s' = s, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

In  $S_2^+$ , a type-2 job is added to the fluid after which the state moves to  $S_1^+$  to add one type-1 job.

$$(T_{2+})_{\langle s,i,2 \rangle, \langle s',j,k \rangle} = \begin{cases} (s_2^* \alpha_1)_{i,j} & s' = s, k = 1, \\ (S_2)_{i,j} & s' = s, k = 2, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (49)$$

$$(T_{2-})_{\langle s,i,2 \rangle, \langle s',0 \rangle} = 0 \quad (50)$$

In  $S_3^+$ , only a type-2 job is added:

$$(T_{3+})_{\langle s,i,3 \rangle, \langle s',j,k \rangle} = \begin{cases} (S_2)_{i,j} & s' = s, k = 3, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

$$(T_{3-})_{\langle s,i,3 \rangle, \langle s',0 \rangle} = \begin{cases} (s_2^*)_i & s' = s, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (52)$$

We also need to define  $T^*$ , which gives transitions when the fluid level is exactly zero. This can only happen in state  $\langle 0, 0 \rangle \in S^0$ . With fluid level 0, any arriving job is immediately added to the fluid. There's also the matrix  $P$  which gives transition probabilities to immediately move to a different state when reaching fluid level 0. In state  $\langle 0, 0 \rangle$  no transition is made, while in other states the oldest type-2 job is added to the fluid and removed from the state.

$$(T_{00}^*)_{\langle 0,0 \rangle, \langle 0,0 \rangle} = -\lambda \quad (53)$$

$$(T_{0+}^*)_{\langle 0,0 \rangle, \langle s',j,k \rangle} = \begin{cases} (\lambda p \alpha_1)_j & s' = \mathbf{0}, k = 1, \\ (\lambda(1-p)\alpha_2)_j & s' = \mathbf{0}, k = 3, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

$$(P_{-0})_{\langle s,0 \rangle, \langle 0,0 \rangle} = \begin{cases} 1 & s = \mathbf{0}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

$$(P_{-+})_{\langle s,0 \rangle, \langle s',j,k \rangle} = \begin{cases} (\alpha_2)_j & s \neq \mathbf{0}, s' = \text{dec}(s), k = 3, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

With the definition of the matrices  $T$ ,  $T^*$  and  $P$ , the stationary distribution of the fluid can be calculated as shown before, yielding the density  $f_{W^{(1)}}(t)$  and complementary distribution function  $P[W^{(1)} > t]$  of the waiting time of a type-1 job using  $\pi_+$  and the matrices  $K$  and  $\Psi$ .

**THEOREM 13.** *Let  $R^{(1)}$  be the response time distribution of a type-1 job, then*

$$P[R^{(1)} > t] = P[W^{(1)} > t] + (1 - \lambda)\alpha_1 e^{S_1 t} \mathbf{1} + (\pi_+, 0)e^{Bt} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (57)$$

where

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} K & \Psi \mathbf{1} \alpha_1 \\ 0 & S_1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (58)$$

$$(59)$$

**PROOF.** A type-1 job's response time consists of its waiting time combined with its service time. The response time is larger than  $t$  if the waiting time is. If the waiting time is  $s < t$ , the response time may still be larger than  $t$  if the job's service time is longer than  $t - s$ . The waiting time is 0 if the queue is empty with probability  $1 - \lambda$ .

$$P[R^{(1)} > t] = P[W^{(1)} > t] + (1 - \lambda)P[X_1 > t] + \int_0^t f_{W^{(1)}}(s)P[X_1 > t - s] ds \quad (60)$$

$$= P[W^{(1)} > t] + (1 - \lambda)\alpha_1 e^{S_1 t} \mathbf{1} + \int_0^t \pi_+ e^{Ks} \Psi \mathbf{1} \alpha_1 e^{S_1(t-s)} \mathbf{1} ds \quad (61)$$

This gives the desired formula using Lemma 1 from [16].  $\square$

We end this section by comparing the tail improvement ratio in  $t$  (TIR( $t$ )) over FCFS, defined as  $1 - P[R_A > t]/P[R_{FCFS} > t]$  for scheduling algorithm  $A$ , of Nudge- $K$ , Nudge- $L$ , Nudge- $M$  and Nudge- $K, L$ . In all cases the parameters  $K, L$  and  $M$  were set such that the ATIR was maximized. To compute this ratio for Nudge- $K, L$  we also developed a computational approach for Nudge- $K, L$  similar to the one for Nudge- $M$  presented in Sections 7 and 8. The numerical results show that the asymptotic improvement often corresponds to a stochastic improvement, though examples as in [16, Figure 3] can be constructed where this is not the case.

## 9 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK


The Nudge- $M$  scheduling algorithm was introduced in this paper in a setting where jobs are partitioned into two types and the scheduler only knows the type of a job (but not its size) upon arrival. Nudge- $M$  was shown to be strongly tail optimal within a large family  $\mathcal{F}$  of Nudge scheduling algorithms. A computational method to evaluate the response time distribution of Nudge- $M$  (and its mean) was developed. Interesting future directions for research include the case with a more general arrival process or when the jobs are partitioned into more than 2 types.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors like to thank Ziv Scully for his suggestion that Nudge- $M$  could be optimal among scheduling algorithms that only use job type information and their order of arrival. This work was supported by the FWO project G0A9823N.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Abate, L.G. Choudhury, and W. Whitt. Waiting-time tail probabilities in queues with long-tail service-time distributions. *Queueing Systems*, 16:311–338, 1994.
- [2] J. Abate and W. Whitt. Asymptotics for M/G/1 low-priority waiting-time tail probabilities. *Queueing Systems*, 25(1):173–233, 1997.



(a) Exponential type-1 and type-2 job sizes,  $K_{opt} = L_{opt} = M_{opt} = 5$ , Nudge-K, L with  $(K, L) = (3, 4)$  (b) Exponential type-1 jobs, Hyperexponential type-2 jobs,  $K_{opt} = L_{opt} = M_{opt} = 7$ , Nudge-K, L with  $(K, L) = (4, 6)$  (SCV = 2,  $f = 1/2$ )

Fig. 5. The tail improvement ratio of Nudge-K, Nudge-L, Nudge-K, L and Nudge-M (with parameters that maximize the ATIR) over FCFS with  $E[X_2]/E[X_1] = 4$ ,  $p = 2/3$ ,  $\lambda = 0.7$ . Nudge-M outperforms the other Nudge algorithms asymptotically, but the difference with Nudge-K, L is often small. The second plot shows that Nudge-M does not always stochastically improve upon Nudge-K, L.

- [3] O. Boxma and B. Zwart. Tails in scheduling. *SIGMETRICS Perform. Eval. Rev.*, 34(4):13–20, mar 2007.
- [4] A. da Silva Soares. *Fluid Queues: Building Upon the Analogy with QBD Processes*. PhD thesis, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 2005.
- [5] T. Dzial, L. Breuer, A. da Silva Soares, G. Latouche, and M. Remiche. Fluid queues to solve jump processes. *Perform. Eval.*, 62:132–146, October 2005.
- [6] A. Feldmann and W. Whitt. Fitting mixtures of exponentials to long-tail distributions to analyze network performance models. *Performance Evaluation*, 31(3):245 – 279, 1998.
- [7] I. Groszof, K. Yang, Z. Scully, and M. Harchol-Balter. Nudge: Stochastically improving upon FCFS. *Proc. ACM Meas. Anal. Comput. Syst.*, 5(2), jun 2021.
- [8] C.-H. Guo, B. Iannazzo, and B. Meini. On the doubling algorithm for a (shifted) nonsymmetric algebraic Riccati equation. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 29:1083–1100, 2007.
- [9] G'bor Horv'ath and Benny Van Houdt. A multi-layer fluid queue with boundary phase transitions and its application to the analysis of multi-type queues with general customer impatience. In *Proc. of QEST*, pages 23–32, 2012.
- [10] J. Krieger and P. Buchholz. *PH and MAP Fitting with Aggregated Traffic Traces*, pages 1–15. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2014.
- [11] G. Latouche and V. Ramaswami. *Introduction to Matrix Analytic Methods and stochastic modeling*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 1999.
- [12] A. Panchenko and A. Thümmler. Efficient phase-type fitting with aggregated traffic traces. *Perform. Eval.*, 64(7-8):629–645, August 2007.
- [13] V. Ramaswami. Matrix analytic methods for stochastic fluid flows. In *Teletraffic Engineering in a Competitive World - Proc. of the 16th International Teletraffic Congress (ITC 16)*, pages 1019–1030. Elsevier Science B.V., 1999.
- [14] L. Takács. Priority queues. *Operations Research*, 12(1):63–74, 1964.
- [15] B. Van Houdt. Analysis of the adaptive MMAP[K]/PH[K]/1 queue: a multi-type queue with adaptive arrivals and general impatience. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 220(3):695–704, 2012.
- [16] B. Van Houdt. On the stochastic and asymptotic improvement of first-come first-served and nudge scheduling. *Proc. ACM Meas. Anal. Comput. Syst.*, 6(3):1–22, dec 2022.
- [17] W.-G. Wang, W.-C. Wang, and R.-C. Li. ADDA: Alternating-Directional Doubling Algorithm for M-matrix algebraic Riccati equations. Technical Report 2011-04, The University of Texas Arlington, 2011.
- [18] G. Yu and Z. Scully. Strongly tail-optimal scheduling in the light-tailed M/G/1. *To appear in Proc. ACM Meas. Anal. Comput. Syst.*, 2024.

## A NUDGE- $K, M$ VERSUS NUDGE- $M, L$

In this section we compare the ATIR of Nudge- $K, M$  and Nudge- $M, L$  when  $K = L$ . Let  $ATIR_{K,M}(i)$  denote the ATIR of Nudge- $K, M$  when  $K = i$ ,  $ATIR_{M,L}(i)$  the ATIR of Nudge- $M, L$  when  $L = i$  and define  $\Delta ATIR_{K,M}(i) = ATIR_{K,M+1}(i) - ATIR_{K,M}(i)$  and  $\Delta ATIR_{M,L}(i) = ATIR_{M+1,L}(i) - ATIR_{M,L}(i)$ .

**THEOREM 14.** *For any  $M \in \{i + 1, \dots, M_{opt}\}$ , we have*

$$ATIR_{K,M}(i) > ATIR_{M,L}(i),$$

*if and only if  $\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) > (1-p)/p$ , which always holds if  $p \geq 1/2$ .*

**PROOF.** Consider Nudge- $K, M$  with  $K = i$  and assume we increase  $M$  by one. In terms of the  $n$  function, this implies that we need to increase  $n(s)$  by one for all the strings  $s$  of length  $M + 1$  with a two in position  $M + 1$  and at most  $i - 1$  twos in the first  $M$  positions. As the  $n(s) + 1$ -st two is located in the last position, the order in which we increase these  $n(s)$  values has no impact on the change in the ATIR. Further for these strings  $s$  we have  $t(s) = n(s) + 1$  and  $k = 1$  in (19). This implies that for a specific string  $s$ , we get a change of

$$c_Z p^{M-n(s)} (1-p)^{t(s)} \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z)^{M-n(s)} p \left( \frac{1}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{M+1}} \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) (1 - \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)) + \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z) (\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) - 1) \right),$$

in  $p \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) \Delta c_{W^{(1)}} + (1-p) \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z) \Delta c_{W^{(2)}}$  according to (19). Given that we have  $\binom{M}{j}$  choices to place  $j$  twos in the first  $M$  positions, the change due to all the strings  $s$  for which  $n(s)$  increases by one can be expressed as

$$c_Z \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{M}{j} (1-p)^{j+1} (p \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z))^{M-j} p \left( \frac{1}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{M+1}} \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) (1 - \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)) + \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z) (\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) - 1) \right).$$

The same reasoning can be applied for Nudge- $M, L$  with  $L = i$  when we increase  $M$  by one. The main difference is that the strings  $s$  for which  $n(s)$  increases are those with at most  $i - 1$  ones in the first  $M$  positions (and a two in position  $M + 1$ ). This results in the following change

$$c_Z \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{M}{j} (1-p)^{M-j+1} (p \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z))^j p \left( \frac{1}{\tilde{S}(-\theta_Z)^{M+1}} \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) (1 - \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z)) + \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z) (\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) - 1) \right).$$

in  $p \tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) \Delta c_{W^{(1)}} + (1-p) \tilde{S}_2(-\theta_Z) \Delta c_{W^{(2)}}$ . This implies that

$$\frac{\Delta ATIR_{K,M}(i)}{\Delta ATIR_{M,L}(i)} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{M}{j} w_1^{M-j} w^j}{\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \binom{M}{j} w^{M-j} w_1^j} \quad (62)$$

$$= \frac{(w_1 + w)^M - \sum_{j=i}^M \binom{M}{j} w_1^{M-j} w^j}{(w_1 + w)^M - \sum_{j=i}^M \binom{M}{j} w^{M-j} w_1^j} \quad (63)$$

For  $i \leq M/2$ , each term  $j \in \{0, \dots, i - 1\}$  in the numerator of (62) is larger than term  $j$  in the denominator if  $w_1^{M-j} w^j > w^{M-j} w_1^j$  which can be rewritten as  $w_1^{M-2j} > w^{M-2j}$ . As  $j < M/2$ , the exponent is positive and the inequality holds if and only if  $w_1 > w$ . This implies that the ratio is larger than 1. For  $i > M/2$ , each term  $j \in \{i, \dots, M\}$  in the summation in the numerator of (63) is smaller than term  $j$  in the denominator's summation if  $w_1^{M-j} w^j < w^{M-j} w_1^j$  which can again be rewritten as  $w_1^{M-2j} < w^{M-2j}$ . The exponent is now negative so that the inequality holds if and only if  $w_1 > w$ , which is the same condition as before. Therefore, the numerator in (63) is larger than the denominator when this condition holds. This implies that the ratio is larger than 1 if and only if  $w_1 > w$  which can be written as  $\tilde{S}_1(-\theta_Z) > (1-p)/p$ . As Nudge- $K, M$  and Nudge- $M, L$  coincide

when  $K = L = M$  and have a positive  $\Delta ATIR$  for  $M < M_{opt}$ , this gives a necessary and sufficient condition for when  $ATIR_{K,M}(i)$  is larger than  $ATIR_{M,L}(i)$ , for  $1 \leq i < M \leq M_{opt}$ .

□