

# Characterizing the Age of Information with Multiple Coexisting Data Streams

Yoshiaki Inoue and Michel Mandjes

## Abstract

In this paper we analyze the distribution of the Age of Information (AoI) of a tagged data stream sharing a processor with a set of other data streams. We do so in the highly general setting in which the interarrival times pertaining to the tagged stream can have any distribution, and also the service times of both the tagged stream and the background stream are generally distributed. The packet arrival times of the background process are assumed to constitute a Poisson process, which is justified by the fact that it typically is a superposition of many relatively homogeneous streams. The first major contribution is that we derive an expression for the Laplace-Stieltjes transform of the AoI in the resulting GI+M/GI+GI/1 model. Second, we use stochastic ordering techniques to identify tight stochastic bounds on the AoI. In addition, when approximating the tagged stream's inter-generation times through a phase-type distribution (which can be done at any precision), we present a computational algorithm for the mean AoI. As illustrated through a sequence of numerical experiments, the analysis enables us to assess the impact of background traffic on the AoI of the tagged stream.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider the situation of an information source that is equipped with a sensor, feeding into a processor (often referred to as a server), and a monitor (cf. Figure 1). Due to the fact that the (typically packetized) information has to be processed by the server, it arrives with some delay at the monitor. The *Age of Information* (AoI) [1], [2] is a performance measure that quantifies the timeliness of the monitor's knowledge of the information produced by the source. To conveniently analyze the AoI, queueing theory has proven to be particularly useful [3], [4].

This work was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 21H03399 and the NWO Gravitation project NETWORKS under grant agreement no. 024.002.003.

Y. Inoue is with Department of Information and Communications Technology, Graduate School of Engineering, Osaka University, Suita 565-0871, Japan (e-mail: yoshiaki@comm.eng.osaka-u.ac.jp).

M. Mandjes is with Mathematical Institute, Leiden University, P.O. Box 9512, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands (e-mail: m.r.h.mandjes@math.leidenuniv.nl). He is also affiliated with Korteweg-de Vries Institute for Mathematics, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Eurandom, Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, The Netherlands; Amsterdam Business School, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.




Fig. 1: Schematic representation of status update systems.

In the theoretical analysis of the AoI, the focus has been primarily on a single data stream in isolation, in that the stream under consideration is the sole user of the processor [3], [5]–[7]. A few exceptions are studies on the AoI in multi-source queueing systems with Poisson input, where inter-generation times of information packets are assumed to be exponentially distributed [8]–[13]. In a more typical scenario, however, a tagged data stream corresponds to packet-generation intervals with relatively low variability, sharing the resource with a massive number of competing streams. This may entail that the characteristics of these background streams may significantly impact the AoI of the tagged stream. The main objective of this paper is to quantify this effect. In our analysis we rely on the well-known result that, with the number of background streams being typically large and relatively homogeneous, the corresponding aggregate packet arrival process can be accurately approximated by a Poisson process [14].

We proceed by discussing the three main contributions of this work.

- The first part of our analysis considers the AoI of the tagged stream in the context of our general model, which we refer to as a queueing system of the GI+M/GI+GI/1 type. We succeed in evaluating the distribution of the AoI in this multi-source context through its Laplace-Stieltjes transform (LST), with the resulting expression being in terms of the (known) transform of the stationary system delay.
- While techniques are available to accurately invert LSTs to obtain the underlying random variable’s cumulative distribution function, one would like obtain more explicit insight into the impact of the background data streams on the AoI of the tagged stream. Relying on stochastic ordering results, we manage to derive closed-form lower and upper bounds on this AoI.
- Informally, the class of phase-type distributions contains convolutions and mixture of exponential distributions. Owing to the fact that any distribution on the positive half-line can be approximated arbitrarily closely by a phase-type distribution [15, Th. III.4.2], we focus on the model in which the inter-sampling times of the tagged stream are of phase-type. We show how to stably compute the mean AoI, in the resulting multi-source model of the type

PH+M/GI+GI/1.

The model is more realistic than existing ones due to the fact that it allows renewal arrivals (of the tagged stream, that is), rather than just Poisson arrivals. In particular, it thus covers the practically relevant case when the tagged stream has constant interarrival times, and in addition the case that the interarrival times are ‘almost constant’ (i.e., constant plus some perturbation).

In previous work, all papers on multi-source models, involving a tagged stream sharing the processor with background streams, assume Poisson arrivals. The consequence is that one can deal with the heterogeneity of the service times in a straightforward manner: at any arrival one can probabilistically determine whether the arrived packet corresponds to the tagged stream or to the background stream. Put differently, for any multi-source M+M/GI+GI/1 model one can work with an equivalent single source M/GI/1 model. It is remarked that in [6] the AoI under renewal arrivals (i.e., the interarrival times stemming from an arbitrary distribution) is extensively studied, but in the context of a single-source model.

We proceed by an (non-exhaustive) account of papers on AoI in the multi-source context, primarily focusing on papers in which the underlying queueing discipline is first-come first-served (FCFS). The pioneering paper [8] quantifies the AoI of a tagged stream interfering with a background stream, but in a setting in which interarrival times as well as service times are exponentially distributed. For the resulting M+M/M+M/1 model, and actually also for the analogous model in which more than two streams share the queueing resource, the authors succeed in providing a closed-form for the mean of the AoI of each of the streams. This analysis is extended in [9], [10] to general service times (but still Poisson arrivals). The fact that it is reasonable to drop older packets when new packets arrive at the queue, justifies the interest in models with finite buffer capacity. In the single-stream case, it is natural to consider the case that the buffer can contain precisely one packet. The corresponding multi-source model (with a buffer size of one, that is) is dealt with in [11], but is remarked that in this setting with multiple coexisting sources it would be more appropriate to work with a setup in which *all* interfering streams are given a dedicated buffer of size one. In [12], relying on Palm calculus techniques, an expression for the joint transform of the AoIs is obtained, which is valid under fairly general conditions. It should be noted, however, that its application to specific situations requires additional non-trivial analysis, and so far such analysis has succeeded only in special cases (namely, the input is Poisson and the service discipline corresponding to preemptive last-come first-served). We finally mention [13], in which the uncertainty in the arrival and service processes is captured through the use of uncertainty sets. The analysis leads to bounds on the Peak-AoI (defined as the largest value of the AoI, before it drops due to a new update), accurate under both light and

heavy loads. This literature review confirms that, before our work, no results were available for the AoI distribution in systems of the practically relevant GI+M/GI+GI/1 type.

This paper has been organized as follows. Section II introduces the model, convenient notation, and some preliminaries. Then Section III provides an exact characterization of the AoI distribution through its LST. Explicit stochastic bounds on the AoI are presented in Section IV, including appealing lower and upper bounds on the mean AoI. In Section V we specialize to the PH+M/GI+GI/1 systems, which, as argued above, is dense in the class of all GI+M/GI+GI/1 systems (in that any instance in the latter class can be approximated arbitrarily closely by an instance in the former class); we develop computational algorithms to obtain the mean AoI. In Section VI we systematically assess the performance of the PH+M/GI+GI/1 system, also quantifying the errors that we would face when we would have worked with the simpler M+M/GI+GI/1 system. Section VII gives concluding remarks, including directions for potential follow-up research.

## II. MODEL, NOTATION, AND PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper, we follow a convention that for a non-negative random variable  $Y$ , its cumulative distribution function (CDF) and probability density function (if exists) are denoted by  $F_Y(\cdot)$  and  $f_Y(\cdot)$ . We also define  $\bar{F}_Y(\cdot)$  as its complementary CDF and  $f_Y^*(\cdot)$  as its LST:

$$\bar{F}_Y(x) = 1 - F_Y(x), \quad x \geq 0, \quad f_Y^*(s) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-sY}] = \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} dF_Y(x), \quad s \geq 0.$$

Suppose that a sensor observes (i.e., samples) the time-varying state of an information source at a rate  $\lambda > 0$ . At the sampling time instants, the sensor generates an information packet containing the obtained data and transmits this to a remote monitor. Each information packet experiences some delay at an intermediate communication channel or a processor which performs a computation to extract information from the raw data. More specifically, let  $(\alpha_n)_{n=0,1,\dots}$  denote the sequence of generation times of information packets, where  $\alpha_{n-1} \leq \alpha_n$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ). We refer to the information packet generated at time  $t = \alpha_n$  as the  $n$ th packet. By definition, the inter-generation time  $G_n$  between the  $(n-1)$ th and  $n$ th packets is given by

$$G_n = \alpha_n - \alpha_{n-1}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \quad (1)$$

The  $n$ th packet (more precisely, the information it contains) is received by the monitor at time  $\beta_n$ , i.e., the system delay  $D_n$  experienced by the  $n$ th packet is given by

$$D_n = \beta_n - \alpha_n, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots \quad (2)$$

We hereafter assume that the time axis is taken so that

$$\alpha_0 > 0, \quad (3)$$




Fig. 2: Schematic representation of queue with coexisting data streams. The grey blocks correspond to packets in the tagged stream  $X(t)$ , and the white blocks to packets in the background stream  $X_{bg}(t)$ .

which is convenient in defining the AoI, as we will see later.

In this paper, we model the sequence of system delays  $(D_n)_{n=0,1,\dots}$  via the use of a single-server queue. This queue is fed by a *tagged input*, corresponding to the sensor-monitor pair we focus on, as well as *additional exogenous inputs*, which represent the background traffic load generated by sources other than the tagged input (cf. Figure 2). More specifically, we consider a queueing system in which the arrival process consists of two different input streams, in the sequel denoted by  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  and  $(X_{bg}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ , where  $X(t)$  and  $X_{bg}(t)$  denote the cumulative amount of work brought into the system by the sensor and the background traffic, respectively. The workload in system  $V(t)$  at time  $t$  is then given by

$$V(t) = V(0) + X(t) + X_{bg}(t) - \mu t + \mu \int_{u \in [0,t)} \mathbb{1}\{V(u) = 0\} du, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mu > 0$  denotes the service rate. See Figure 3 for a graphical explanation. Assuming that the input processes  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  and  $(X_{bg}(t))_{t \geq 0}$  are *càdlàg* (i.e., right continuous with left limits), so is the associated workload process  $(V(t))_{t \geq 0}$ .

Letting  $H_n$  ( $n = 0, 1, \dots$ ) denote the service requirement of the  $n$ th packet generated by the sensor,  $X(t)$  can be represented as

$$X(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}\{0 \leq \alpha_n \leq t\} H_n.$$

In this paper, we let the inter-generation times pertaining to the sensor be denoted by  $(G_n)_{n=1,2,\dots}$ , and the corresponding service requirements by  $(H_n)_{n=0,1,\dots}$ . We assume that these are two sequences of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables, with the respective CDFs  $F_G(\cdot)$  and  $F_H(\cdot)$ , where it is in addition assumed that both sequences are independent of each other. On the other hand, we assume that the background traffic  $(X_{bg}(t))_{t \geq 0}$  is a compound Poisson process: it has upward jumps following a Poisson process with rate  $\lambda_{bg}$ , where the jump sizes are i.i.d. with CDF  $F_{H_{bg}}(\cdot)$ . The background traffic load is then characterized as

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{bg}(t) \leq x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\lambda_{bg}t} (\lambda_{bg}t)^k}{k!} \cdot F_{H_{bg}}^{*k}(x), \quad x \geq 0,$$




Fig. 3: The top graphs represent sample paths of the arrival times and service requirements corresponding to the processes  $X(t)$  and  $X_{\text{bg}}(t)$ . The bottom graphs represent the resulting workload process  $V(t)$  and AoI process  $A(t)$ . The service rate  $\mu$  is equal to 1. The tagged stream has interarrival times that are Erlang with 10 phases and mean 20, whereas the service requirements are Erlang with 5 phases and mean 1. The background stream is Poissonian with arrival rate 0.9, whereas the service requirements are Erlang with 5 phases and mean 1.

where  $F_{H_{\text{bg}}}^{*k}(\cdot)$  denotes the  $k$ -fold convolution of  $F_{H_{\text{bg}}}(\cdot)$ , being defined recursively via

$$F_{H_{\text{bg}}}^{*1}(x) = F_{H_{\text{bg}}}(x), \quad F_{H_{\text{bg}}}^{*k}(x) = \int_0^x F_{H_{\text{bg}}}^{*(k-1)}(x-y) dF_{H_{\text{bg}}}(y), \quad k = 2, 3, \dots$$

The processes  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  and  $(X_{\text{bg}}(t))_{t \geq 0}$  are assumed independent. The resulting queueing model could be denoted by GI+M/GI+GI/1, where the + symbol stands for ‘superposition’: a renewal input stream with generally distributed service times shares a single-server queueing resource with a Poisson input stream with generally distributed service times. As mentioned in the introduction, the Poissonian nature of the background arrivals is motivated by the fact that the number of background streams is typically large and fairly homogeneous.

In terms of the workload process, the system delay  $D_n$  of the  $n$ th packet is given by

$$D_n = \frac{V(\alpha_n^-) + H_n}{\mu} = \frac{V(\alpha_n)}{\mu}, \quad (5)$$

where the second equation follows from the right-continuity of  $(V(t))_{t \geq 0}$ . The AoI  $A(t)$  at time  $t$  is defined as the elapsed time since the generation time of the last packet received by the monitor (cf. Figure 3):

$$A(t) = \begin{cases} t - A(0), & 0 \leq t < \beta_0, \\ t - \max\{\alpha_n; \alpha_n + D_n \leq t\}, & t \geq \beta_0. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Recall that  $\alpha_n + D_n = \beta_n$  represents the reception time of the  $n$ th packet, so that  $t \geq \beta_0$  in the second case of (6) is required for the set  $\{\alpha_n; \alpha_n + D_n \leq t\}$  to be non-empty. Also, note that the condition (3) ensures  $\beta_0 > 0$ . Let  $A_{\text{peak},n}$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) denote the  $n$ th peak AoI, i.e., the value of the AoI just before the  $n$ th packet is received by the monitor:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\text{peak},n} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \beta_n^-} A(t) = \beta_n - \alpha_{n-1} = \beta_n - \alpha_n + \alpha_n - \alpha_{n-1} \\ &= D_n + G_n, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the last equation follows from (1) and (2).

Let  $G$ ,  $H$ , and  $H_{\text{bg}}$  respectively denote generic random variables following the CDFs  $F_G(\cdot)$ ,  $F_H(\cdot)$ , and  $F_{H_{\text{bg}}}(\cdot)$ . Also recall that  $\lambda := 1/\mathbb{E}[G]$  denotes the sampling rate of the sensor. We define the traffic intensity of respective streams as

$$\rho := \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[H]}{\mu}, \quad \rho_{\text{bg}} := \frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}} \mathbb{E}[H_{\text{bg}}]}{\mu}.$$

In the rest of this paper, we assume that the stability condition

$$\rho + \rho_{\text{bg}} < 1, \quad (8)$$

is in place. Because the system is regenerative and the regeneration time is almost surely (a.s.) finite under (8), the time-averaged distributions of  $(D_n)_{n=0,1,\dots}$ ,  $(A_{\text{peak},n})_{n=1,2,\dots}$ , and  $(A(t))_{t \geq 0}$  agree with their respective stationary distributions  $F_D(\cdot)$ ,  $F_{A_{\text{peak}}}(\cdot)$ , and  $F_A(\cdot)$ , i.e., the following relations hold a.s.:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{1}\{D_n \leq x\} &= F_D(x), \quad x \geq 0, \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{1}\{A_{\text{peak},n} \leq x\} &= F_{A_{\text{peak}}}(x), \quad x \geq 0, \\ \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{1}\{A(t) \leq x\} dt &= F_A(x), \quad x \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

We thus define  $D$ ,  $A_{\text{peak}}$ , and  $A$  as generic random variables corresponding to the stationary versions of  $D_n$ ,  $A_{\text{peak},n}$ , and  $A(t)$ , respectively.

### III. EXACT FORMULA FOR THE AOI DISTRIBUTION

In this section we derive an exact expression for the LST of the stationary AoI  $A$ , assuming that the tagged stream, corresponding to the sensor-monitor pair, has a general inter-sampling time distribution.

We utilize the following characterization of the stationary distribution of the AoI [6]:

$$F_A(x) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[G]} \int_0^x \{\bar{F}_{A_{\text{peak}}}(y) - \bar{F}_D(y)\} dy, \quad x \geq 0, \quad (10)$$

$$f_A^*(s) = \frac{f_D^*(s) - f_{A_{\text{peak}}}^*(s)}{s\mathbb{E}[G]}, \quad s > 0. \quad (11)$$

Note here that (7) implies  $\mathbb{E}[A_{\text{peak}}] - \mathbb{E}[D] = \mathbb{E}[G]$ , with which we can verify that  $F_A(\cdot)$  and  $f_A^*(\cdot)$  given by (10) and (11) satisfy  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} F_A(x) = 1$  and  $\lim_{s \downarrow 0} f_A^*(s) = 1$ . By (10) and (11), the analysis of the stationary AoI  $A$  is reduced to that of the stationary system delay  $D$  and the stationary peak AoI  $A_{\text{peak}}$ .

Let  $B_{\text{bg}}$  denote the length of a busy period of the M/G/1 queue only with the background traffic load; it is a standard result from queueing theory that its LST  $f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(s)$  satisfies the *Kendall functional equation* [16, Eq. (1)]

$$f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(s) = f_{H_{\text{bg}}}^* \left( \frac{s + \lambda_{\text{bg}} - \lambda_{\text{bg}} f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(s)}{\mu} \right).$$

It is easily seen that for each  $s \geq 0$ , this equation and the condition  $|f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(s)| \leq 1$  uniquely determine the value of  $f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(s)$ ; to this end, observe that  $f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(s)$  is the solution of the equation  $y = f^*(y)$  with a function

$$f^*(y) = f_{H_{\text{bg}}}^* \left( \frac{s + \lambda_{\text{bg}} - \lambda_{\text{bg}} y}{\mu} \right),$$

which is a convex function satisfying  $f^*(0) > 0$  and  $f^*(1) = f_{H_{\text{bg}}}^*(s/\mu) < 1$ .

**Lemma 1.** *The LST of the stationary peak AoI  $f_{A_{\text{peak}}}^*(\cdot)$  is given in terms of the LST of the stationary system delay  $f_D^*(\cdot)$  by*

$$f_{A_{\text{peak}}}^*(s) = f_H^*(s/\mu) \int_{y=0}^{\infty} e^{-sy} \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{\phi(s) - \omega} \left( \frac{s}{\psi(\omega)} \cdot f_D^*(\psi(\omega)) - f_D^*(s) \right) \right] (y) dF_G(y), \quad (12)$$

where  $\phi(s)$  and  $\psi(\omega)$  are defined as

$$\phi(s) := s - \lambda_{\text{bg}} + \lambda_{\text{bg}} f_{H_{\text{bg}}}^*(s/\mu), \quad (13)$$

$$\psi(\omega) := \omega + \lambda_{\text{bg}} - \lambda_{\text{bg}} f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(\omega), \quad (14)$$

and  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{-1}[f(s, \omega)]$  denotes the inverse Laplace transform of  $f(s, \omega)$  with respect to  $\omega$ :

$$f(s, \omega) = \int_0^{\infty} \mathcal{L}^{-1}[f(s, \omega)](t) e^{-\omega t} dt.$$



*Proof.* From (5) and (7), we have

$$A_{\text{peak},n} = \frac{V(\alpha_n-) + H_n}{\mu} + G_n = \hat{V}(\alpha_n-) + G_n + \frac{H_n}{\mu}, \quad (15)$$

where  $\hat{V}(t)$  denotes the virtual waiting time:

$$\hat{V}(t) = \frac{V(t)}{\mu}. \quad (16)$$

Because  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  has no jumps in  $t \in [\alpha_{n-1}, \alpha_n)$ , in this interval (4) can be rewritten as

$$V(t) = V(\alpha_{n-1}) + X_{\text{bg}}(t) - \mu t + \mu \int_{u \in [\alpha_{n-1}, t)} \mathbb{1}\{V(u) = 0\} du, \quad t \in [\alpha_{n-1}, \alpha_n),$$

i.e.,  $(V(t))_{t \in [\alpha_{n-1}, \alpha_n)}$  behaves as if it is the workload process of an ordinary M/GI/1 queue with the arrival rate  $\lambda_{\text{bg}}$ , the service requirement distribution  $F_{H_{\text{bg}}}(\cdot)$ , and the service rate  $\mu$ .

Let  $(V_{\text{M/G/1}}(t))_{t \geq 0}$  denote the workload process of such an M/G/1 queue and let  $\hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(t) = V_{\text{M/G/1}}(t)/\mu$  denote the corresponding virtual waiting time. It is known that the LST of  $\hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(t)$  satisfies [17, P. 83]

$$\int_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-s\hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(t)}] e^{-\omega t} dt = \frac{1}{\phi(s) - \omega} \left( \frac{s}{\psi(\omega)} \cdot f_{\hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(0)}^*(\psi(\omega)) - f_{\hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(0)}^*(s) \right). \quad (17)$$

Therefore, we have from (15),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{-sA_{\text{peak},n}}] &= f_H^*(s/\mu) \cdot \mathbb{E}[e^{-s(\hat{V}(\alpha_n-) + G_n)}] \\ &= f_H^*(s/\mu) \int_{x=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-s(\hat{V}(\alpha_n-) + G_n)} \mid \hat{V}(\alpha_{n-1}) = x] dF_{\hat{V}(\alpha_{n-1})}(x) \\ &= f_H^*(s/\mu) \int_{x=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-s(\hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(G_n) + G_n)} \mid \hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(0) = x] dF_{D_{n-1}}(x) \\ &= f_H^*(s/\mu) \int_{x=0}^{\infty} dF_{D_{n-1}}(x) \int_{y=0}^{\infty} e^{-sy} \mathbb{E}[e^{-s\hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(y)} \mid \hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(0) = x] dF_G(y) \\ &= f_H^*(s/\mu) \int_{y=0}^{\infty} e^{-sy} \left\{ \int_{x=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-s\hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(y)} \mid \hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(0) = x] dF_{D_{n-1}}(x) \right\} dF_G(y), \end{aligned}$$

which together with (17) implies (12).  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** *The LST  $f_A^*(\cdot)$  of the stationary AoI is given in terms of the LST  $f_D^*(\cdot)$  of the stationary system delay by*

$$f_A^*(s) = f_H^*(s/\mu) \int_{y=0}^{\infty} \frac{1 - e^{-sy}}{\mathbb{E}[G]s} \cdot \mathcal{L}_\omega^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{\phi(s) - \omega} \left( \frac{s}{\psi(\omega)} \cdot f_D^*(\psi(\omega)) - f_D^*(s) \right) \right] (y) dF_G(y). \quad (18)$$

*Proof.* Similarly to the proof of Lemma 1, we observe from  $D_n = (V(\alpha_n-) + H_n)/\mu$  that its distribution equals that of the sum of  $H/\mu$  and  $\hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(G_n)$  conditioned on  $\hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(0) = D_{n-1}$ .

We thus have for the stationary system delay  $D$  (cf. (17)),

$$f_D^*(s) = f_H^*(s/\mu) \int_{y=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_\omega^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{\phi(s) - \omega} \left( \frac{s}{\psi(\omega)} \cdot f_D^*(\psi(\omega)) - f_D^*(s) \right) \right] (y) dF_G(y). \quad (19)$$

Therefore, we obtain (18) by combining (11), (12), and (19).  $\square$

The LST of the stationary AoI is thus given in terms of that of the stationary system delay  $D$ . The characterization of  $D$  is known in the literature [18], [19], which takes a form of an intuitively appealing decomposition formula:

**Lemma 3** ([18], [19]). *Consider an GI/GI/1 queue which has inter-arrival times following the CDF  $F_G(\cdot)$  and service times with LST  $f_{W_\star}^*(s) := f_H^*((s + \lambda_{\text{bg}} - \lambda_{\text{bg}} f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(s))/\mu)$  ( $s \geq 0$ ). Let  $W_\star$  denote the stationary waiting time in this GI/GI/1 queue:*

$$f_{W_\star}^*(s) = \exp \left[ - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k} \int_0^{\infty} (1 - e^{-sx}) dF_{U_k}(x) \right], \quad s \geq 0, \quad (20)$$

where  $U_k$  denotes the sum of  $k$  i.i.d. copies of the difference  $H_\star - G$  of the inter-arrival and service times, i.e.,

$$F_{U_1}(x) = \int_0^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(H_\star \geq y - x) dF_G(y), \quad x \in (-\infty, \infty), \quad (21)$$

$$F_{U_k}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F_{U_{k-1}}(x - y) dF_{U_1}(y), \quad x \in (-\infty, \infty), \quad k = 2, 3, \dots \quad (22)$$

We then have for the original model with GI/GI and M/GI input streams, the LST of the system delay  $D$  experienced by the GI/GI stream is given by

$$f_D^*(s) = \frac{(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})s}{s - \lambda_{\text{bg}} + \lambda_{\text{bg}} f_{H_{\text{bg}}}^*(s/\mu)} \cdot f_{W_\star}^*(s - \lambda_{\text{bg}} + \lambda_{\text{bg}} f_{H_{\text{bg}}}^*(s/\mu)) \cdot f_H^*(s/\mu).$$

**Remark 1.** *The expression (20) for the stationary waiting time  $W_\star$  in the GI/GI/1 queue can be found in [20, P. 280]. Its mean  $\mathbb{E}[W_\star]$  is also given explicitly by [15, P. 232]:*

$$\mathbb{E}[W_\star] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k} \int_0^{\infty} x dF_{U_k}(x). \quad (23)$$

*Proof.* Lemma 3 readily follows from [18], [19]. Note that although these papers show the decomposition formula for only the time-depended and stationary virtual waiting time  $\hat{V}(t)$  and  $V$ , their discussion clearly carries over to the virtual waiting time just before arrivals of the GI/GI stream.  $\square$

Theorem 2 and Lemma 3 completely determine the AoI distribution. In particular, we can evaluate the value of  $f_A^*(s)$  and its derivatives numerically, which enables us to compute the moments and the CDF  $F_A(\cdot)$  of the stationary AoI; we refer to e.g. [21] for Laplace inversion methods to numerically compute the corresponding CDF. On the other hand, these formulas also enable us to gain further insights into the way the model parameters affect the AoI performance. In the next section, we explore this direction in detail utilizing stochastic ordering techniques.

#### IV. STOCHASTIC ORDERINGS AND BOUNDS OF THE AOI

In this section, we derive stochastic comparison results and closed-form bounds for the AoI based on the stochastic ordering techniques. In Section IV-A, we briefly review the definitions of several stochastic orders to be used. In Section IV-B, we prove several stochastic ordering properties of the AoI, which leads to its distributional bounds. We then derive closed-form bounds on the mean AoI in Section IV-C.

##### A. Stochastic Orders

Let us start by briefly reviewing the definitions of some stochastic orders (see [22] for more detailed explanations). Let  $Y_0$  and  $Y_1$  denote two non-negative random variables.  $Y_0$  is said to be smaller than  $Y_1$  in the *usual stochastic order* (denoted by  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{st}} Y_1$ ) when

$$\bar{F}_{Y_0}(x) \leq \bar{F}_{Y_1}(x), \quad \forall x \geq 0.$$

It is known that  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{st}} Y_1$  if and only if  $\mathbb{E}[h(Y_0)] \leq \mathbb{E}[h(Y_1)]$  holds for all non-decreasing functions  $h(\cdot)$  such that the expectations exist.

On the other hand,  $Y_0$  is said to be smaller than  $Y_1$  in the *increasing convex order* (denoted by  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{icx}} Y_1$ ) when

$$\int_x^\infty \bar{F}_{Y_0}(y) dy \leq \int_x^\infty \bar{F}_{Y_1}(y) dy, \quad \forall x \geq 0. \quad (24)$$

As the name suggests,  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{icx}} Y_1$  if and only if  $\mathbb{E}[h(Y_0)] \leq \mathbb{E}[h(Y_1)]$  holds for all non-decreasing convex functions  $h(\cdot)$  such that the expectations exist. Similarly,  $Y_0$  is said to be smaller than  $Y_1$  in the *increasing concave order* (denoted by  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{icv}} Y_1$ ) when

$$\int_0^x \bar{F}_{Y_0}(y) dy \leq \int_0^x \bar{F}_{Y_1}(y) dy, \quad \forall x \geq 0,$$

which is equivalent to that  $\mathbb{E}[h(Y_0)] \leq \mathbb{E}[h(Y_1)]$  holds for all non-decreasing concave functions  $h(\cdot)$  such that the expectations exist.

Furthermore,  $Y_0$  is said to be smaller than  $Y_1$  in the *convex order* (denoted by  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{cx}} Y_1$ ) when

$$Y_0 \leq_{\text{icx}} Y_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[Y_0] = \mathbb{E}[Y_1].$$

The convex ordering  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{cx}} Y_1$  holds if and only if  $\mathbb{E}[h(Y_0)] \leq \mathbb{E}[h(Y_1)]$  for all convex functions  $h(\cdot)$  such that the expectations exist. Because  $\mathbb{E}[Y_i] = \int_0^\infty \bar{F}_{Y_i}(y) dy$ , it is readily seen that  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{cx}} Y_1$  is also equivalent to  $Y_0 \geq_{\text{icv}} Y_1$  and  $\mathbb{E}[Y_0] = \mathbb{E}[Y_1]$ ; note that the inequalities have opposite directions here.

While the usual stochastic order  $\leq_{\text{st}}$  compares the magnitude of random variables, the convex order  $\leq_{\text{cx}}$  compares random variables in terms of the variability given the same mean. The increasing convex and increasing concave orders compare both the magnitude and variability.

Specifically,  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{icx}} Y_1$  implies that  $Y_0$  is smaller and less variable than  $Y_1$ , while  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{icv}} Y_1$  implies that  $Y_0$  is smaller but more variable than  $Y_1$ .

Notice however that  $\leq_{\text{st}}$  is stronger than  $\leq_{\text{icx}}$  in the sense that  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{st}} Y_1 \Rightarrow Y_0 \leq_{\text{icx}} Y_1$  (also we have  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{st}} Y_1 \Rightarrow Y_0 \leq_{\text{icv}} Y_1$ ). On the other hand, if  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{st}} Y_1$  and  $Y_0 \leq_{\text{cx}} Y_1$ , then  $Y_0 =_{\text{st}} Y_1$  [22, Th. 1.A.8], where  $=_{\text{st}}$  denotes the equality in distribution. Therefore, the usual stochastic order and the convex order compare random variables from essentially different viewpoints.

### B. Distributional Bounds for the AoI

As mentioned in the proof of Lemma 1, the virtual waiting time process  $(\hat{V}(t))_{t \in [\alpha_{n-1}, \alpha_n]}$  during an inter-sampling time behaves in the same way as the ordinary M/GI/1 queue with the arrival rate  $\lambda_{\text{bg}}$  and the service time distribution  $F_{\hat{H}_{\text{bg}}}(\cdot)$ , where  $\hat{H}_{\text{bg}} =_{\text{st}} H/\mu$ . Recall that the virtual waiting time and the system delay are related as  $D_n = \hat{V}(\alpha_n)$ . We then define  $(Z(t; D_n))_{t \geq 0}$  as the virtual waiting time process of the M/GI/1 queue with only the background traffic, whose initial value equals to the system delay  $D_n$ :

$$\bar{F}_{Z(t; D_n)}(x) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\hat{V}_{\text{M/GI/1}}(t) > x \mid \hat{V}_{\text{M/GI/1}}(0) = x_0) dF_{D_n}(x_0), \quad x \geq 0. \quad (25)$$

To make the notation simpler, we define

$$\bar{F}_Z(t, x; D_n) = \bar{F}_{Z(t; D_n)}(x), \quad x \geq 0. \quad (26)$$

Let  $W_n$  denote the waiting time of the  $n$ th packet (see (5) and (16)):

$$W_n = \frac{V(\alpha_n^-)}{\mu} = \hat{V}(\alpha_n^-).$$

By definition, we have

$$\bar{F}_{W_n}(x) = \int_0^\infty \bar{F}_Z(t, x; D_{n-1}) dF_G(t), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \quad (27)$$

Note that (27) along with

$$D_n = W_n + \frac{H_n}{\mu}, \quad (28)$$

defines a recursive relation for  $D_n$  ( $n = 0, 1, \dots$ ).

Imposing the following assumption on the initial virtual waiting time  $\hat{V}(0)$  largely simplifies the derivation of stochastic comparison results. It is by no means restrictive, as such an assumption on  $\hat{V}(0)$  does not affect any of the results on stationary distributions.

**Assumption 1.** *The initial virtual waiting time  $\hat{V}(0)$  is distributed according to the stationary virtual waiting time distribution in the M/GI/1 queue with only the background traffic existing, i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-s\hat{V}(0)}] = \frac{(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})s}{s - \lambda_{\text{bg}} + \lambda_{\text{bg}} f_{H_{\text{bg}}}^*(s/\mu)}, \quad s > 0.$$

**Remark 2.** *Assumption 1 represents the situation that the system had been running only with the background traffic until the first generation time  $\alpha_0$  of the packet by the sensor.*

Under this assumption, the following monotonicity property is known in the literature [19].

**Lemma 4** ([19, Th. 1.1]). *If Assumption 1 is satisfied, then  $Z(t; D_n)$  is stochastically decreasing in  $t$  for each  $n$ , i.e.,*

$$\bar{F}_Z(t_1, x; D_n) \geq \bar{F}_Z(t_2, x; D_n), \quad 0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2, \quad x \geq 0, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Informally, the virtual waiting time process  $\hat{V}(t)$  during the time-interval  $t \in [\alpha_{n-1}, \alpha_n)$  starts from the system delay  $D_{n-1} = \hat{V}(\alpha_{n-1})$  and it tends toward the stationary distribution of the M/GI/1 queue. Lemma 4 shows that this transition is in fact decreasing in the usual stochastic order.

Recall that the exact peak AoI distribution is characterized by the rather complicated expression in (12). The following lemma shows that *ignoring the dependence between  $D_n$  and  $G_n$*  in (7) yields a simple upper bound of the peak AoI in the convex order.

**Lemma 5.** *Under Assumption 1, the  $n$ th peak AoI  $A_{\text{peak},n}$  is bounded above in the convex order as*

$$A_{\text{peak},n} \leq_{\text{cx}} D_n + G,$$

where  $G$  denotes a generic random variable for inter-sampling times and it is independent of the system delay  $D_n$ .

*Proof.* We consider the joint distribution of  $W_n$  and the inter-sampling time  $G_n$  between  $(n-1)$ st and  $n$ th packets in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(W_n > x, G_n \leq y) \\ &= \int_{x_0=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(G_n) > x, G_n \leq y \mid \hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(0) = x_0) dF_{D_{n-1}}(x_0) \\ &= \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}\{t \leq y\} \int_{x_0=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(t) > x \mid \hat{V}_{\text{M/G/1}}(0) = x_0) dF_{D_{n-1}}(x_0) dF_G(t) \\ &= \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}\{t \leq y\} \bar{F}_Z(t, x; D_{n-1}) dF_G(t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{F}_Z(t, x; D_{n-1})$  is defined as in (25) and (26). We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(W_n > x, G_n \leq y) &= \mathbb{E}[\bar{F}_Z(G, x; D_{n-1}) \mathbb{1}\{G \leq y\}] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[\bar{F}_Z(G, x; D_{n-1})] \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{G \leq y\}], \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that for any random variable  $Y$  and non-increasing functions  $g_1(\cdot)$  and  $g_2(\cdot)$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[g_1(Y)g_2(Y)] \geq \mathbb{E}[g_1(Y)]\mathbb{E}[g_2(Y)]$  (see [23], [24]).

Because (27) implies  $\mathbb{P}(W_n > x) = \mathbb{E}[\bar{F}_Z(x, G; D_{n-1})]$ , we further obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(W_n > x, G_n \leq y) \geq \mathbb{P}(W_n > x)\mathbb{P}(G_n \leq y), \quad x \geq 0, \quad y \geq 0.$$

Therefore,  $W_n$  and  $G_n$  are *negatively quadrant dependent* [25, Lemma 1]. It then follows from [25, Th. 1 (ii) and Lemma 3] that for any non-decreasing functions  $h_1(\cdot)$  and  $h_2(\cdot)$ ,

$$\text{Cov}[h_1(W_n), h_2(G_n)] \leq 0.$$

We then have from [22, Th. 3.A.39],

$$W_n + G_n \leq_{\text{cx}} W_n + G, \tag{29}$$

where  $G$  on the right-hand side is taken to be independent of  $W_n$ . Because the convex order is preserved under the addition of an independent random variable [22, Eq. (3.A.46)], we obtain from (7), (28), and (29),

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\text{peak},n+1} &= W_n + G_n + \frac{H_n}{\mu} \\ &\leq_{\text{cx}} W_n + G + \frac{H_n}{\mu} = D_n + G. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

As an application of Lemma 5, a similar bound for the stationary version follows immediately, as stated in the next corollary.

**Corollary 6.** *The stationary peak AoI  $A_{\text{peak}}$  is bounded above in the convex order as*

$$A_{\text{peak}} \leq_{\text{cx}} D + G,$$

where the stationary system delay  $D$  and the inter-sampling time  $G$  are taken to be independent.

**Remark 3.** *Since Corollary 6 refers only to the stationary distribution, Assumption 1 is irrelevant here.*

With Corollary 6 and an additional analysis for a lower bound, we obtain surprisingly simple stochastic bounds for the stationary AoI:

**Theorem 7.** *The stationary AoI  $A$  is bounded by the sum of independent random variables as*

$$D^- + \tilde{G} \leq_{\text{st}} A \leq_{\text{st}} D + \tilde{G}, \tag{30}$$

where  $D$  denotes the stationary system delay as before,  $D^-$  denotes the system delay in the ordinary  $M/GI/1$  queue with only the background traffic existing, and  $\tilde{G}$  denotes the generic random variable for residual inter-sampling times:

$$f_{D^-}^*(s) = \frac{(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})s}{s - \lambda_{\text{bg}} + \lambda_{\text{bg}} f_{H_{\text{bg}}}^*(s/\mu)},$$

$$f_{\tilde{G}}^*(s) = \frac{1 - f_G^*(s)}{s\mathbb{E}[G]}, \quad f_{\tilde{G}}(x) = \frac{\bar{F}_G(x)}{\mathbb{E}[G]}.$$

*Proof.* We first derive the upper bound. From (7), (24), and Corollary 6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^x \bar{F}_{A_{\text{peak}}}(y) dy &= \mathbb{E}[A_{\text{peak}}] - \int_x^\infty \bar{F}_{A_{\text{peak}}}(y) dy \\ &= \mathbb{E}[D] + \mathbb{E}[G] - \int_x^\infty \bar{F}_{A_{\text{peak}}}(y) dy \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[D] + \mathbb{E}[G] - \int_x^\infty \bar{F}_{D+G}(y) dy = \int_0^x \bar{F}_{D+G}(y) dy, \quad \forall x \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from (10) that

$$\begin{aligned} F_A(x) &\geq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[G]} \left\{ \int_0^x \bar{F}_{D+G}(y) dy - \int_0^x \bar{F}_D(y) dy \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[G]} \left\{ \int_{y=0}^x \left( \bar{F}_D(y) + \int_{u=0}^y \bar{F}_G(y-u) dF_D(u) \right) dy - \int_0^x \bar{F}_D(y) dy \right\} \\ &= \int_{y=0}^x \left( \int_{u=0}^y \frac{\bar{F}_G(y-u)}{\mathbb{E}[G]} dF_D(u) \right) dy = F_{D+\tilde{G}}(x), \quad \forall x \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the upper bound  $A \leq_{\text{st}} D + \tilde{G}$ .

We then consider the lower bound. Consider a modified workload process  $(V^-(t))_{t \geq 0}$  where the workload brought by the sensor after time 0 is replaced by zero (cf. (4)):

$$V^-(t) = V(0) + X_{\text{bg}}^-(t) - \mu t + \mu \int_{u \in [0, t)} \mathbb{1}\{V^-(u) = 0\} du, \quad t \geq 0.$$

It is obvious that we have  $V^-(t) \leq V(t)$  (for  $t \geq 0$ ). We define  $D_n^-$  (for  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ ) by

$$D_n^- = \frac{V^-(\alpha_n) + H_n}{\mu}, \quad (31)$$

which, together with (5), implies  $D_n^- \leq D_n$  for each sample path. Let us then define  $A^-(t)$  as

$$A^-(t) := t - \max\{\alpha_n; \alpha_n + D_n^- \leq t\},$$

which clearly satisfies

$$A^-(t) \leq A(t), \quad (32)$$

for each sample path (cf. (6)). Furthermore, we define the corresponding peak AoI as (cf. (7))

$$A_{\text{peak}, n}^- := \lim_{t \rightarrow \alpha_n + D_n^-} A^-(t) = D_n^- + G_n. \quad (33)$$

Now suppose that the initial workload  $V(0)$  is distributed according to the stationary distribution of  $(V^-(t))_{t \geq 0}$ . Under this condition,  $D_n^-$  defined in (31) has the same distribution as  $D^-$  and it is independent of  $G_n$ . Therefore, we have from (33) that

$$\bar{F}_{A_{\text{peak},n}^-}(y) = \bar{F}_{D^-}(y) + \int_0^y \bar{F}_G(y-u) dF_{D^-}(u).$$

Applying (10) to the modified AoI process  $(A^-(t))_{t \geq 0}$ , we obtain its stationary random variable  $A^-$  as

$$F_{A^-}(x) = \int_{y=0}^x \left( \int_{u=0}^y \frac{\bar{F}_G(y-u)}{\mathbb{E}[G]} dF_{D^-}(u) \right) dy,$$

i.e., we have  $A^- \stackrel{\text{st}}{=} D^- + \tilde{G}$ . Because (32) still holds under this initial condition, their time-averaged distributions satisfy

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{1}\{A^-(t) > x\} dt \leq \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{1}\{A(t) > x\} dt, \quad T > 0, x \geq 0.$$

Letting  $T \rightarrow \infty$  in this equation (cf. (9)), we thus obtain the lower bound in (30).  $\square$

### C. Closed-Form Bounds for the Mean AoI

Theorem 7 enables us to obtain closed-form bounds for the mean AoI.

**Corollary 8.** *The mean AoI  $\mathbb{E}[A]$  is bounded by*

$$\mathbb{E}[A] \geq \frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}} \mathbb{E}[H_{\text{bg}}^2]}{2(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})\mu^2} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[H]}{\mu} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[G^2]}{2\mathbb{E}[G]}, \quad (34)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[A] \leq \frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}} \mathbb{E}[H_{\text{bg}}^2]}{2(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})\mu^2} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[H]}{\mu} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[G^2]}{2\mathbb{E}[G]} + (1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})\mathbb{E}[W_\star], \quad (35)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[W_\star]$  is given by (23).

*Proof.* From Lemma 3 and Theorem 7, we can readily verify (34) and (35).  $\square$

**Remark 4.** *Recall that  $\mathbb{E}[W_\star]$  denotes the mean waiting time in the GI/G/1 queue, where the LST of the service time  $H_\star$  is given by  $f_{H_\star}^*(s) = f_H^*((s + \lambda_{\text{bg}} - \lambda_{\text{bg}} f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(s))/\mu)$ . We can then replace  $\mathbb{E}[W_\star]$  in the upper bound (35) by an expression only with the first two moments of the model parameters [26]:*

$$\mathbb{E}[W_\star] \leq \frac{\text{Var}[H_\star] + \rho_\star(2 - \rho_\star)\text{Var}[G]}{2(1 - \rho_\star)\mathbb{E}[G]},$$

where

$$\rho_\star = \frac{\rho}{1 - \rho_{\text{bg}}}, \quad \mathbb{E}[H_\star] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[H]}{\mu(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})}, \quad \text{Var}[H_\star] = \frac{\text{Var}[H]}{\mu^2(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})^2} + \frac{\rho_{\text{bg}} \mathbb{E}[H_{\text{bg}}^2]}{\mu^2(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})^3}.$$

We can further simplify the upper bound by focusing on the case where *inter-sampling times have relatively small variability*. Note that choosing less variable inter-sampling times



is reasonable because it leads to the reduction in the AoI as known in the literature [3], [6]. Specifically, we derive a simpler bound on the mean AoI assuming that the inter-sampling time distribution is new better than used in expectation (NBUE), i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}[G - y | G > y] \leq \mathbb{E}[G], \quad \forall y \geq 0.$$

It is also known that  $G$  is NBUE if and only if [22, Th. 3.A.55]

$$G \leq_{\text{cx}} \text{Exp}(\mathbb{E}[G]), \quad (36)$$

where  $\text{Exp}(\mathbb{E}[G])$  denotes an exponentially distributed random variable with the same mean as  $G$ . The class of NBUE distributions includes gamma distributions with shape parameter not smaller than 1 and the deterministic distribution, which are typical choices when modeling inter-sampling times in monitoring systems.

**Theorem 9.** *If the inter-sampling time distribution  $F_G(\cdot)$  is NBUE, we have*

$$\frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}} \mathbb{E}[H_{\text{bg}}^2]}{2(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})\mu^2} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[H]}{\mu} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[G^2]}{2\mathbb{E}[G]} \leq \mathbb{E}[A] \leq \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[H] + \lambda_{\text{bg}} \mathbb{E}[H_{\text{bg}}^2]}{2(1 - \rho - \rho_{\text{bg}})\mu^2} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[H]}{\mu} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[G^2]}{2\mathbb{E}[G]}.$$

*Proof.* Owing to Corollary 8, it is sufficient to show that

$$\frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}} \mathbb{E}[H_{\text{bg}}^2]}{2(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})\mu^2} + (1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})\mathbb{E}[W_{\star}] \leq \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[H^2] + \lambda_{\text{bg}} \mathbb{E}[H_{\text{bg}}^2]}{2(1 - \rho - \rho_{\text{bg}})\mu^2}. \quad (37)$$

Recall that  $W_{\star}$  denotes the stationary waiting time in the GI/GI/1 queue as in Lemma 3, which has the inter-arrival time distribution  $F_G(\cdot)$  and the modified service time distribution  $F_{H_{\star}}(\cdot)$  with LST  $f_{H_{\star}}^*(s) = f_H^*((s + \lambda_{\text{bg}} - \lambda_{\text{bg}} f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(s))/\mu)$ . From (23),  $\mathbb{E}[W_{\star}]$  is given by

$$\mathbb{E}[W_{\star}] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\max(0, U_k)],$$

where  $U_k$  is defined as the sum of  $k$  i.i.d. copies of the difference  $H_{\star} - G$  of the inter-arrival and service times (see (21) and (22)). Because  $\max(0, x)$  is a convex function of  $x$ , (36) implies that if  $G$  is NBUE, then  $\mathbb{E}[W_{\star}]$  is bounded above by the mean stationary waiting time in the M/G/1 queue with the same arrival rate  $1/\mathbb{E}[G]$  and the same service time distribution, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}[W_{\star}] \leq \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[H_{\star}^2]}{2(1 - \lambda \mathbb{E}[H_{\star}])} = \frac{1}{1 - \rho_{\text{bg}}} \left\{ \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[H^2] + \lambda_{\text{bg}} \mathbb{E}[H_{\text{bg}}^2]}{2(1 - \rho - \rho_{\text{bg}})\mu^2} - \frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}} \mathbb{E}[H_{\text{bg}}^2]}{2(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})\mu^2} \right\}, \quad (38)$$

where the last equality can be verified with a straightforward calculation using

$$\lambda \mathbb{E}[H_{\star}] = \frac{\rho}{1 - \rho_{\text{bg}}}, \quad \lambda \mathbb{E}[H_{\star}^2] = \frac{\rho \lambda_{\text{bg}} \mathbb{E}[H_{\text{bg}}^2]}{(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})^3 \mu^2} + \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[H^2]}{(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})^2 \mu^2}.$$

We then obtain (37) from (38). □

## V. PHASE-TYPE INTER-SAMPLING TIME DISTRIBUTION

In this section, we develop a numerical algorithm to compute the exact mean AoI, which is particularly useful in evaluating the tightness of the closed-form bound derived in the previous section. To that end, we consider a special case where the inter-sampling times  $(G_n)_{n=1,2,\dots}$  follow an  $M$ -state ( $M = 1, 2, \dots$ ) phase-type distribution [15, Section III.4] with representation  $(\gamma, \mathbf{\Gamma})$ :

$$\begin{aligned} F_G(x) &= 1 - \gamma \exp[\mathbf{\Gamma}x]\mathbf{e}, \quad x \geq 0, \\ f_G(x) &= \gamma \exp[\mathbf{\Gamma}x](-\mathbf{\Gamma})\mathbf{e}, \quad x \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where  $\mathbf{e}$  denotes an  $M \times 1$  vector with all elements equal to one. The mean inter-sampling time is then given by

$$\mathbb{E}[G] = \gamma(-\mathbf{\Gamma})^{-1}\mathbf{e}. \quad (40)$$

The phase-type distribution represents the absorption time of a Markov chain with the transition rate matrix  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  started from an initial state distributed according to the probability vector  $\gamma$ . By definition, we have  $\gamma \geq 0$  and  $\gamma\mathbf{e} = 1$ . Also,  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  has negative diagonal elements and non-negative off-diagonal elements. Because the Markov chain governed by  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  is absorbing,  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$  is a *defective* transition rate matrix, i.e., its row sums are non-positive (i.e.,  $\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{e} \leq 0$ ) with at least one of them being strictly negative.

It is noted that one can approximate any distribution on the positive half-line arbitrarily closely by a distribution from the phase-type class described above [15, Th. III.4.2]. This legitimates considering the queueing model PH+M/GI+GI/1 (in self-evident notation), rather than the formally more general model GI+M/GI+GI/1.

We impose the common assumption that the transition rate matrix  $\mathbf{\Gamma} + (-\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{e})\gamma$  is irreducible, where  $(-\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{e})\gamma$  corresponds to the event of absorption and the transition to an initial state for the next inter-sampling time. It is then ensured that  $\mathbf{\Gamma} + (-\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{e})\gamma$  has a unique stationary probability vector  $\pi$ , which solves

$$\pi\{\mathbf{\Gamma} + (-\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{e})\gamma\} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \pi\mathbf{e} = 1.$$

By multiplying  $(\mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1})\mathbf{e}$  from the right on both sides of this equation and rearranging terms, we can verify that

$$\pi(-\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{e}) = \frac{1}{\gamma(-\mathbf{\Gamma})^{-1}\mathbf{e}} = \lambda,$$

where the last equality follows from (40) and  $\lambda = 1/\mathbb{E}[G]$ .

In this model, the total input process  $(X_{\text{total}}(t))_{t \geq 0} := (X(t) + X_{\text{bg}}(t))_{t \geq 0}$  follows a compound Markovian arrival process (MAP). To be more specific, let  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{D}(x)$  (for  $x \geq 0$ ) denote  $M \times M$  matrices defined as

$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{\Gamma} - \lambda_{\text{bg}} \mathbf{I}, \quad \mathbf{D}(x) = (-\mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{e}) \boldsymbol{\gamma} F_H(x) + \lambda_{\text{bg}} F_{H_{\text{bg}}}(x) \mathbf{I}, \quad (41)$$

where  $\mathbf{I}$  denotes an  $M \times M$  unit matrix. Let  $S(t) \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$  denote the phase of the system at time  $t$ , i.e., the state of the phase-type distribution of the inter-sampling time. We define  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{total}}(t, x)$  as a  $1 \times M$  vector whose  $j$ th element  $j = 1, 2, \dots, M$  is given by

$$[\mathbf{x}_{\text{total}}(t)]_j = \mathbb{P}(X(t) \leq x, S(t) = j).$$

The vector  $(X_{\text{total}}(t), S(t))_{t \geq 0}$  forms a bivariate Markov process and its transition law is completely determined by  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{D}(\cdot)$ : as  $\Delta t \downarrow 0+$ ,

$$\mathbf{x}_{\text{total}}(t + \Delta t, x) = \mathbf{x}_{\text{total}}(t, x) (\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{C} \Delta t) + \int_0^x \mathbf{x}_{\text{total}}(t, x - y) d\mathbf{D}(y) \Delta t + o(\Delta t).$$

The first and second term on the right-hand side of this equation correspond respectively the state-transitions without and with an upward jump in  $X_{\text{total}}(t)$ .

The following results are known for this model [27], [28]. Recall that  $V(t)$  denotes the workload in the system, and that  $\hat{V}(t)/\mu$  denotes the virtual waiting time. Let  $\hat{V}$  and  $S$  denote generic random variables following the (joint) stationary distribution of  $(\hat{V}(t), S(t))$ . Let  $\hat{v}(x)$  (for  $x \geq 0$ ) denote a  $1 \times M$  vector whose  $j$ th ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, M$ ) element represents the stationary joint probability that the virtual waiting time is not greater than  $x$  and the phase equals  $j$ :

$$[\hat{v}(x)]_j = \mathbb{P}(\hat{V} \leq x, S = j).$$

We define  $\mathbf{D}^*(\cdot)$  and  $\hat{v}^*(\cdot)$  as the LSTs of  $\mathbf{D}(\cdot)$  and  $\hat{v}(\cdot)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}^*(s) &= \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} d\mathbf{D}(x), \quad s \geq 0, \\ \hat{v}^*(s) &= \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} d\hat{v}(x), \quad s \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

We further define  $\hat{\mathbf{D}}(\cdot)$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{D}}^*(\cdot)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{D}}(x) &= \mathbf{D}(\mu x), \quad x \geq 0, \\ \hat{\mathbf{D}}^*(s) &= \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} d\hat{\mathbf{D}}(x) = \mathbf{D}^*(s/\mu), \quad s \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

which correspond to  $\mathbf{D}(\cdot)$  and  $\mathbf{D}^*(\cdot)$  with  $H$  and  $H_{\text{bg}}$  replaced with  $H/\mu$  and  $H_{\text{bg}}/\mu$ .

**Lemma 10** ([27]). Let  $(\mathbf{Q}^{(n)})_{n=0,1,\dots}$  denote a sequence of  $M \times M$  matrices defined as

$$\mathbf{Q}^{(0)} = \mathbf{C}, \quad \mathbf{Q}^{(n)} = \mathbf{C} + \int_0^\infty d\hat{\mathbf{D}}(x) \exp[\mathbf{Q}^{(n-1)}x], \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \quad (43)$$

$(\mathbf{Q}^{(n)})_{n=0,1,\dots}$  is an elementwise non-decreasing sequence and its limit  $\mathbf{Q} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{Q}^{(n)}$  represents a proper transition rate matrix of an irreducible continuous-time Markov chain with  $M$  states. Let  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$  denote the stationary probability vector associated with  $\mathbf{Q}$ :

$$\boldsymbol{\kappa}\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \boldsymbol{\kappa}\mathbf{e} = 1. \quad (44)$$

The vector LST  $\hat{\mathbf{v}}^*(s)$  of the stationary virtual waiting time is then given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}^*(s) = (1 - \rho - \rho_{\text{bg}})\boldsymbol{\kappa}[\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{R}^*(s)]^{-1}, \quad s \geq 0, \quad (45)$$

where  $\mathbf{R}^*(s)$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{R}^*(s) = \int_{x=0}^{\infty} e^{-sx} dx \int_{y=x}^{\infty} d\hat{\mathbf{D}}(y) \exp[\mathbf{Q}(y-x)], \quad (46)$$

and for  $s \geq 0$ , eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{R}^*(s)$  have absolute values strictly less than one, i.e.,

$$[\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{R}^*(s)]^{-1} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{R}^*(s))^m < \infty \quad (47)$$

holds.

**Remark 5.** For this model, we also have a more straightforward generalized version of the Pollaczek–Khinchine formula, as follows [28]:

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}^*(s)[s\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{C} + \hat{\mathbf{D}}^*(s)] = (1 - \rho - \rho_{\text{bg}})s\boldsymbol{\kappa}. \quad (48)$$

This equation is readily deduced from (44) and (45), by noting that (46) implies

$$[\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{R}^*(s)](s\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{Q}) = s\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{C} + \hat{\mathbf{D}}^*(s). \quad (49)$$

However, the advantage of the expression (45) over (48) is that  $[\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{R}^*(s)]^{-1}$  exists for all  $s \geq 0$  as stated in Lemma 10. This is not the case for  $s\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{C} + \hat{\mathbf{D}}^*(s)$  because (49) implies that  $\det(s\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{C} + \hat{\mathbf{D}}^*(s)) = 0$  when  $s$  equals an eigenvalue of  $-\mathbf{Q}$ , which all have non-negative real parts owing to the Perron–Frobenius theorem.

For reasons of numerical stability, the matrix exponentials  $\exp[\mathbf{Q}^{(n)}x]$  and  $\exp[\mathbf{Q}x]$  in (43) and (46) should be computed using the uniformization technique [29, P. 154]:

$$\begin{aligned} \exp[\mathbf{Q}^{(n)}x] &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\mathbf{Q}^{(n)}x)^k}{k!} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\zeta x}(\zeta x)^k}{k!} \cdot (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q}^{(n)})^k, \\ \exp[\mathbf{Q}x] &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\zeta x}(\zeta x)^k}{k!} \cdot (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q})^k, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\zeta$  denotes the maximum absolute value of the diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{C}$ :

$$\zeta = \max_i |[\mathbf{C}]_{i,i}| = \max_i |[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}]_{i,i}| + \lambda_{\text{bg}}. \quad (50)$$

Note here that  $\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q}^{(n)}$  represents a substochastic matrix, i.e., it has non-negative elements with row sums not exceeding one. Therefore, we rewrite the recursion (43) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}^{(n)} &= \mathbf{C} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\zeta x} (\zeta x)^k}{k!} d\hat{\mathbf{D}}(x) \cdot (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q}^{(n-1)})^k \\ &= \mathbf{C} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mathbf{D}}^{(k)} \cdot (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q}^{(n-1)})^k, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{D}}^{(m)} &:= \int_0^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\zeta x} (\zeta x)^m}{m!} d\hat{\mathbf{D}}(x) \\ &= (-\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{e})\boldsymbol{\gamma} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\zeta x/\mu} (\zeta x/\mu)^m}{m!} dF_H(x) + \mathbf{I}\lambda_{\text{bg}} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\zeta x/\mu} (\zeta x/\mu)^m}{m!} dF_{H_{\text{bg}}}(x) \\ &= (-\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{e})\boldsymbol{\gamma}\hat{h}^{(m)} + \mathbf{I}\lambda_{\text{bg}}\hat{h}_{\text{bg}}^{(m)}, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

and

$$\hat{h}^{(m)} := \int_0^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\zeta x/\mu} (\zeta x/\mu)^m}{m!} dF_H(x), \quad \hat{h}_{\text{bg}}^{(m)} := \int_0^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\zeta x/\mu} (\zeta x/\mu)^m}{m!} dF_{H_{\text{bg}}}(x). \quad (53)$$

Here it is observed that the second equality follows from the definitions (41) and (42) of  $\mathbf{D}(\cdot)$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{D}}(\cdot)$ . It is in addition noted that  $\hat{h}^{(m)}$  (and  $\hat{h}_{\text{bg}}^{(m)}$ , respectively) can be interpreted as the probability that a Poisson process of rate  $\zeta$  generates  $m$  arrivals in a random interval of length  $H/\mu$  ( $H_{\text{bg}}/\mu$ , respectively). As a consequence, the computation of  $\hat{h}^{(m)}$  and  $\hat{h}_{\text{bg}}^{(m)}$  is usually straightforward given specific distributions of the random variables  $H$  and  $H_{\text{bg}}$ .

Recall that the LST of the stationary AoI is given by (18), where the LST  $f_D^*(s)$  of the stationary system delay  $D$  is obtained from the conditional PASTA property [30]:

$$f_D^*(s) = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}^*(s)(-\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{e})f_H^*(s/\mu)}{\lambda}. \quad (54)$$

Therefore, it follows from (18) that the LST  $f_A^*(s)$  of the stationary AoI distribution is given in terms of the probability density function of the inter-sampling time  $G$  by

$$f_A^*(s) = f_H^*(s/\mu) \int_{y=0}^{\infty} \frac{1 - e^{-sy}}{s\mathbb{E}[G]} \cdot p(s, y) f_G(y) dy, \quad (55)$$

where  $p(s, y) := \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{-1}[p^*(s, \omega)](y)$  denotes the inverse Laplace transform of

$$p^*(s, \omega) := \frac{1}{\phi(s) - \omega} \left( \frac{s}{\psi(\omega)} \cdot f_D^*(\psi(\omega)) - f_D^*(s) \right), \quad (56)$$

i.e.,

$$p^*(s, \omega) = \int_0^{\infty} p(s, t) e^{-\omega t} dt.$$

Note here that  $p^*(s, t)$  represents the LST of the transient virtual waiting time of the M/GI/1 queue with only the background traffic, whose initial value follows the same distribution as the stationary system delay  $D$  (cf. (17)):

$$p(s, t) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-s\hat{V}_{\text{M/GI/1}}(t)} \mid \hat{V}_{\text{M/GI/1}}(0) \text{ is distributed as } D]. \quad (57)$$

The LST of the AoI  $f_A^*(s)$  is thus determined completely by (13), (14), (39), (45), (54), and (55). Similarly, we have the following expression for the mean AoI  $\mathbb{E}[A]$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[A] &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} (-1) \cdot \frac{df_A^*(s)}{ds} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[H]}{\mu} + \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[G]} \int_{y=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{y}{2} + q(y) \right) y \cdot f_G(y) dy,\end{aligned}\quad (58)$$

where  $q(y)$  (for  $y \geq 0$ ) is defined via

$$q(y) := (-1) \cdot \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\partial p(s, y)}{\partial s}.$$

From (57), we can verify that  $q(y)$  represents the mean transient virtual waiting time (at time  $y$ , that is) of the M/GI/1 queue with only the background traffic, whose initial value equals to the stationary system delay  $D$ :

$$q(y) = \mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_{M/G/1}(y) \mid \hat{V}_{M/G/1}(0) \text{ is distributed as } D]. \quad (59)$$

Because it follows from (56) that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{\infty} q(y) e^{-\omega y} dy &= (-1) \cdot \int_0^{\infty} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\partial p(s, y)}{\partial s} \cdot e^{-\omega y} dy \\ &= (-1) \cdot \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\partial p^*(s, \omega)}{\partial s} \\ &= -\frac{1 - \rho_{\text{bg}}}{\omega^2} + \frac{1}{\omega} \left( \frac{f_D^*(\psi(\omega))}{\psi(\omega)} + \mathbb{E}[D] \right),\end{aligned}$$

$q(y)$  is given by

$$q(y) = \mathcal{L}_{\omega}^{-1} \left[ -\frac{1 - \rho_{\text{bg}}}{\omega^2} + \frac{1}{\omega} \left( \frac{f_D^*(\psi(\omega))}{\psi(\omega)} + \mathbb{E}[D] \right) \right]. \quad (60)$$

Therefore, evaluating the expression for  $\mathbb{E}[A]$ , as given in (58), requires Laplace inversion as well as integration over  $y \in [0, \infty)$ . It is known that the accuracy of Laplace-inversion methods is highly dependent on the shape of the function under consideration, which sometimes leads to inconsistent numerical results between different inversion algorithms [31]. This led us to develop an alternative approach that utilizes our assumption of phase-type distributed inter-sampling times.

The key idea in this alternative approach lies in expanding  $f_G(\cdot)$ , as given by (39), as an Poisson-weighted average of non-negative numbers (cf. the uniformization technique [29, P. 154]); the favorable numerical properties of the resulting computation scheme are due to the fact that the weights used all have the same sign. Recall that  $\zeta$  was defined in (50). We define  $\theta := \max_i |[\mathbf{\Gamma}]_{i,i}|$  as the maximum absolute value of diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ , i.e., we have

$$\zeta = \theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}. \quad (61)$$

We then rewrite  $f_G(x)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} f_G(x) &= \gamma e^{-\theta x} \exp[(\theta \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Gamma})x] (-\mathbf{\Gamma}) \mathbf{e} \\ &= \gamma e^{-\theta x} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{[(\theta \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Gamma})x]^k}{k!} \cdot (-\mathbf{\Gamma}) \mathbf{e} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\theta x} (\theta x)^k}{k!} \cdot \gamma (\mathbf{I} + \theta^{-1} \mathbf{\Gamma})^k (-\mathbf{\Gamma}) \mathbf{e} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\theta x} (\theta x)^k}{k!} \cdot c_k, \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_k$  denotes the non-negative number given by

$$c_k = \gamma (\mathbf{I} + \theta^{-1} \mathbf{\Gamma})^k (-\mathbf{\Gamma}) \mathbf{e}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \quad (62)$$

With this expression, we rewrite (58) as

$$\mathbb{E}[A] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[H]}{\mu} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_k}{\theta \mathbb{E}[G]} \int_{y=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{y}{2} + q(y) \right) \cdot y \cdot \frac{e^{-\theta y} (\theta y)^k}{k!} \cdot \theta \, dy, \quad (63)$$

As an immediate consequence of the definition of the gamma-integral, we have

$$\int_{y=0}^{\infty} y^2 \cdot \frac{e^{-\theta y} (\theta y)^k}{k!} \cdot \theta \, dy = \frac{(k+1)(k+2)}{\theta^2}$$

Also,

$$\int_0^{\infty} q(y) \cdot y \cdot \frac{e^{-\theta y} (\theta y)^k}{k!} \cdot \theta \, dy = (k+1) \int_0^{\infty} q(y) \cdot \frac{e^{-\theta y} (\theta y)^{k+1}}{(k+1)!} \, dy = (k+1) q_{k+1},$$

where  $q_k$  (for  $k = 0, 1, \dots$ ) is defined as

$$q_k := \int_0^{\infty} q(y) \cdot \frac{e^{-\theta y} (\theta y)^k}{k!} \, dy. \quad (64)$$

We then obtain from (63),

$$\mathbb{E}[A] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[H]}{\mu} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_k}{\theta \mathbb{E}[G]} \left\{ \frac{(k+1)(k+2)}{2\theta^2} + (k+1)q_{k+1} \right\}. \quad (65)$$

Therefore, what remains is to determine  $q_k$  ( $k = 0, 1, \dots$ ). We take a transform approach to that end: let  $q^*(z)$  (for  $|z| < 1$ ) denote the  $z$ -transform of  $q_k$ :

$$q^*(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q_k z^k = \int_0^{\infty} q(y) e^{-(\theta - \theta z)y} \, dy.$$

From (60),

$$\begin{aligned} q^*(z) &= (-1) \cdot \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} p^*(s, \theta - \theta z) \\ &= (-1) \cdot \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left[ \frac{1}{\phi(s) - (\theta - \theta z)} \left( \frac{s}{\psi(\theta - \theta z)} \cdot f_D^*(\psi(\theta - \theta z)) - f_D^*(s) \right) \right] \\ &= -\frac{1 - \rho_{\text{bg}}}{(\theta - \theta z)^2} + \frac{1}{\theta - \theta z} \left( \frac{f_D^*(\psi(\theta - \theta z))}{\psi(\theta - \theta z)} + \mathbb{E}[D] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

To determine the coefficients  $q_k$  of  $q^*(z)$ , we first consider coefficients of  $\psi(\theta - \theta z)$  as a function of  $z$ . By definition (14),  $\psi(\theta - \theta z)$  is written as

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(\theta - \theta z) &= \theta - \theta z + \lambda_{\text{bg}} - \lambda_{\text{bg}} f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(\theta - \theta z) \\ &= \theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}} - (\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}) \cdot \left\{ \frac{\theta}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} \cdot z + \frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}}}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} \cdot f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(\theta - \theta z) \right\} \\ &= \zeta - \zeta b(z),\end{aligned}\tag{67}$$

where we used (61) and

$$b(z) := \frac{\theta}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} \cdot z + \frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}}}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} \cdot f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(\theta - \theta z),\tag{68}$$

which is a proper probability generating function. We then define  $b^{(i)}$  ( $i = 0, 1, \dots$ ) as the  $i$ th coefficient of  $b(z)$ :

$$b(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} b^{(i)} z^i.\tag{69}$$

The coefficients  $b^{(i)}$  are determined via Lemma 11; recall that  $\zeta$  and  $\theta$  are related as in (61). The proof of Lemma 11 is provided in Appendix A.

**Lemma 11.**  $b^{(i)}$  ( $i = 0, 1, \dots$ ) is given by

$$b^{(i)} = \frac{\mathbb{1}\{i = 1\}\theta}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} + \frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}}}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} \sum_{k=i}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k - i + 1} \binom{k}{i} \left( \frac{\theta}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} \right)^i \left( \frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}}}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} \right)^{k-i} y_{k-i+1}^{(k)},\tag{70}$$

where  $y_k^{(m)}$  given recursively by

$$y_1^{(m)} = \hat{h}_{\text{bg}}^{(m)}, \quad m = 0, 1, \dots,\tag{71}$$

$$y_k^{(m)} = \sum_{i=0}^m y_{k-1}^{(i)} \hat{h}_{\text{bg}}^{(m-i)}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m = 0, 1, \dots,\tag{72}$$

with  $\hat{h}_{\text{bg}}^{(m)}$  defined as (53).

We then proceed to computing  $f_D^*(\psi(\theta - \theta z))/\psi(\theta - \theta z)$  on the right-hand side of (66). We define  $b_\ell^{(k)}$  (for  $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, k = 0, 1, \dots$ ) as

$$b_0^{(k)} = \mathbb{1}\{k = 0\}, \quad b_\ell^{(k)} = \sum_{i=0}^k b_{\ell-1}^{(k-i)} b^{(i)}, \quad \ell = 1, 2, \dots.\tag{73}$$

By definition (73), it is obvious that

$$\{b(z)\}^\ell = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b_\ell^{(m)} z^m.$$

Let  $(d^{(m)})_{m=0,1,\dots}$  denote the coefficients of  $f_D^*(\zeta - \zeta z)$  as a function of  $z$ :

$$f_D^*(\zeta - \zeta z) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} d^{(m)} z^m.$$



We then have from (67) and (69),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{f_D^*(\psi(\theta - \theta z))}{\psi(\theta - \theta z)} &= \frac{f_D^*(\zeta - \zeta b(z))}{\zeta - \zeta b(z)} = \frac{1}{\zeta} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \{b(z)\}^k \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} d^{(m)} \{b(z)\}^m \\
&= \frac{1}{\zeta} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \{b(z)\}^{\ell} \sum_{m=0}^{\ell} d^{(m)} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} z^i \cdot \frac{1}{\zeta} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} b_{\ell}^{(i)} \sum_{m=0}^{\ell} d^{(m)}. \tag{74}
\end{aligned}$$

where we put  $\ell = m + k$  to obtain the second equality.

The sequence  $d^{(m)}$  ( $m = 0, 1, \dots$ ) is determined by Lemma 12 and Corollary 13 below. The proof of Lemma 12 is provided in Appendix B.

**Lemma 12.** *Let  $\hat{\mathbf{v}}^{(m)}$  (for  $m = 0, 1, \dots$ ) denote the  $m$ th coefficient of  $\hat{\mathbf{v}}^*(\zeta - \zeta z)$  as a function of  $z$ :*

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}^*(\zeta - \zeta z) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mathbf{v}}^{(m)} z^m.$$

$\hat{\mathbf{v}}^{(m)}$  ( $m = 0, 1, \dots$ ) is determined by the following recursion:

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}^{(0)} = (1 - \rho - \rho_{\text{bg}}) \boldsymbol{\kappa} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{R}^{(0)})^{-1}, \tag{75}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}^{(m)} = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \hat{\mathbf{v}}^{(k)} \mathbf{R}^{(m-k)} \right) (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{R}^{(0)})^{-1}, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots, \tag{76}$$

where  $\mathbf{R}^{(m)}$  (for  $m = 0, 1, \dots$ ) is given by

$$\mathbf{R}^{(m)} = \zeta^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mathbf{D}}^{(m+k+1)} (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1} \mathbf{Q})^k, \tag{77}$$

with  $\mathbf{Q}$  given in Lemma 10 and  $\hat{\mathbf{D}}^{(m)}$  ( $m = 0, 1, \dots$ ) given by (52).

**Remark 6.** *The existence of  $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{R}^{(0)})^{-1}$  is ensured by Lemma 10 because  $\mathbf{R}^{(0)} = \mathbf{R}^*(\zeta)$ .*

**Corollary 13.** *The coefficients  $d^{(m)}$  ( $m = 0, 1, \dots$ ) are given by*

$$d^{(m)} = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{k=0}^m \hat{\mathbf{v}}^{(k)} (-\Gamma \mathbf{e}) \hat{h}^{(m-k)}, \quad m = 0, 1, \dots, \tag{78}$$

where  $\hat{h}^{(m)}$  ( $m = 0, 1, \dots$ ) is given by (53). Furthermore, the mean system delay  $\mathbb{E}[D]$  is given by

$$\mathbb{E}[D] = \frac{1}{\zeta} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} m d^{(m)}. \tag{79}$$

*Proof.* (78) follows immediately from (54) and Lemma 12. Also, (79) is obvious because

$$\mathbb{E}[D] = (-1) \cdot \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{d}{ds} f_D^*(s) = \frac{1}{\zeta} \lim_{z \rightarrow 1} \frac{d}{dz} f_D^*(\zeta - \zeta z). \quad \square$$

We are now in a position to present a (numerically stable) computation scheme for the mean AoI  $\mathbb{E}[A]$ .

**Theorem 14.** *The mean AoI is given by (65) with  $q_k$  ( $k = 0, 1, \dots$ ) determined recursively by*

$$q_0 = -\frac{1 - \rho_{\text{bg}}}{\theta^2} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[D]}{\theta} + \frac{1}{\theta\zeta} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} b_{\ell}^{(0)} \sum_{m=0}^{\ell} d^{(m)}, \quad (80)$$

$$q_k = q_{k-1} - \frac{1 - \rho_{\text{bg}}}{\theta^2} + \frac{1}{\theta\zeta} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} b_{\ell}^{(k)} \sum_{m=0}^{\ell} d^{(m)}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (81)$$

where  $d^{(m)}$  ( $m = 0, 1, \dots$ ) and  $\mathbb{E}[D]$  are given in Corollary 13.

*Proof.* We have from (66) and (74),

$$q^*(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z^k \left( -\frac{(k+1)(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})}{\theta^2} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[D]}{\theta} + \frac{1}{\theta} \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{1}{\zeta} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} b_{\ell}^{(i)} \sum_{m=0}^{\ell} d^{(m)} \right),$$

i.e.,

$$q_k = -\frac{(k+1)(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}})}{\theta^2} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[D]}{\theta} + \frac{1}{\theta} \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{1}{\zeta} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} b_{\ell}^{(i)} \sum_{m=0}^{\ell} d^{(m)}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots$$

It is then readily verified that  $(q_k)_{k=0,1,\dots}$  satisfies the recursion (80) and (81).  $\square$

In Figure 4, we summarize the resulting computational algorithm for  $\mathbb{E}[A]$ . We note that in the computations it is necessary to truncate some infinite series; cf. (80) and (81). To check the numerical precision of the procedure, the interpretation (59) of  $q(y)$  as the mean transient workload in the M/GI/1 queue is useful. More specifically, we can verify from (64) that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} q_k &= \frac{1}{\theta} \cdot \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{\infty} q(y) \cdot \frac{e^{-\theta y} (\theta y)^k \theta}{k!} dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta} \cdot \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[q(E_{k+1})] \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta} \cdot \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} q(y), \end{aligned}$$

where  $E_k$  denotes a random variable following a  $k$ -stage Erlang distribution with rate  $\theta$ . Because  $q(y)$  represents the transient virtual waiting time in the M/GI/1 queue with only the background stream (cf. (59)), it tends to the stationary mean virtual waiting time in the M/GI/1 queue as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ . We thus have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} q_k = \frac{1}{\theta} \cdot \frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}} \mathbb{E}[H_{\text{bg}}^2]}{2(1 - \rho_{\text{bg}}) \mu^2}. \quad (82)$$

Therefore, for large values of  $k$ , the difference between the computed  $q_k$  and the right-hand side of (82) serves as a straightforward indication of the loss in numerical precision due to the truncation.




Fig. 4: The algorithm for computing the mean AoI  $\mathbb{E}[A]$  in the PH+M/GI+GI/1 queue.

## VI. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section we provide a sequence of numerical experiments that systematically assess the impact of the model parameters on the expectation of the AoI. We work with the setup of Section V where the inter-sampling times  $(G_n)_{n=1,2,\dots}$  follow a phase-type distribution. The idea is that we rely on the two-moments fit advocated in [29], which identifies a convenient low-dimensional phase-type distribution with a given mean and variance. With the coefficient of variation of the random variable  $G$  defined as

$$s_G = \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}[G]}{(\mathbb{E}[G])^2}},$$

it distinguishes between the cases  $s_G \leq 1$  and  $s_G > 1$ . In the former case, we fit a mixture of two Erlang distributions: with probability  $p$  the fitted distribution is of Erlang( $k, \nu$ ) type, and with probability  $1 - p$  of Erlang( $k + 1, \nu$ ) type. The integer-valued parameter  $k$  is chosen such that  $s_G$  lies in the interval between  $1/(k + 1)$  and  $1/k$ , and then the parameters  $p$  and  $\nu$  are chosen such that the mixed Erlang random variable has the given mean and variance. In the latter case, we fit a mixture of two Exponential distributions: with probability  $p$  the fitted distribution is exponential with parameter  $\nu_1$ , and with probability  $1 - p$  exponential with parameter  $\nu_2$ . Under the additional constraint of ‘balanced means’, one can uniquely pick the parameters  $p$ ,  $\nu_1$ , and  $\nu_2$  so that the resulting random variable has the given mean and variance.

In a first experiment we study the effect of the ‘variability’ of the inter-sampling times. Through this experiment we can quantify the error we would make by wrongly assuming that these inter-sampling times are exponentially distributed. We have picked the following parameters.

The sampling rate  $\lambda$  of the tagged stream, which is the reciprocal of the mean inter-sampling time  $\mathbb{E}[G]$ , was put equal to 0.05. The (Poissonian) arrival rate  $\lambda_{bg}$  corresponding to the background traffic equals 0.8, 0.85, and 0.9. The service times of the tagged stream as well as the background stream have been chosen deterministic of size 1, and time is normalized such that the service rate  $\mu$  equals 1. Figure 5 shows the mean AoI as a function of the coefficient of variation  $s_G$  pertaining to the inter-sampling times. As expected,  $\mathbb{E}[A]$  is an increasing function of  $s_G$ : more variability typically leads to longer queues. The more important conclusion, however, is that misspecifying our GI+M/GI+GI/1 model by its more elementary M+M/GI+GI/1 counterpart, that was covered by [9], [10], may lead to significant errors. Indeed, for the parameters considered, the difference between  $\mathbb{E}[A]$  in the M+M/GI+GI/1 case (i.e., the special case of the GI+M/GI+GI/1 system in which  $s_G = 1$ ) and the GI+M/GI+GI/1 can already be a factor 2.

From Figure 5, we also observe that these three curves with different  $\rho_{bg}$  appear to be in parallel with each other, i.e., the variability  $s_G$  of the inter-sampling times has a common impact on  $\mathbb{E}[A]$  regardless of the background traffic intensity. Notice that the mean AoI is approximated by the sum of the mean forward recurrence time  $\mathbb{E}[G^2]/(2\mathbb{E}[G]) = (1 + s_G^2)\mathbb{E}[G]/2$  of inter-sampling times and the mean system delay; cf. [6, Equation (2)], and also (34)–(35) in the present paper. Therefore, the effect of  $s_G$  on  $\mathbb{E}[A]$  is roughly evaluated as  $(1 + s_G^2)\mathbb{E}[G]/2$ ; this is indeed verified in Figure 6, where the ‘residual component’  $\mathbb{E}[A] - (1 + s_G^2)\mathbb{E}[G]/2$  as a function of  $s_G$  is shown to be almost constant.

In the second experiment, we pick the parameters as before, but now with  $s_G$  being fixed at 0.3 and varying  $\lambda$ . The result is shown in Figure 7, where the explicit bounds derived in Theorem 9 are also plotted. We observe a pattern that was found for more elementary AoI models: the mean AoI first decreases in  $\lambda$ , and later increases. The explanation for the phenomenon is that small values of  $\lambda$  mean that the monitor is provided with relatively little information, leading to untimely knowledge and hence a large AoI, whereas for large values of  $\lambda$  there will be more queueing delay and hence also a large AoI. The shape of the graph interestingly means that there is an optimal value of  $\lambda$ , i.e., a value of  $\lambda$  that minimizes  $\mathbb{E}[A]$ . In this experiment we also observe that the optimal  $\lambda$  decreases in  $\lambda_{bg}$ . To understand this, recall that the mean AoI is approximated by the sum of the mean forward recurrence time of inter-sampling times and the mean system delay as mentioned above. Then observe that the former is a decreasing function of the sampling rate  $\lambda$ , whereas the latter is an increasing function of  $\lambda$ . For smaller values of the rate  $\lambda_{bg}$ , the system delay significantly increases from a smaller value of  $\lambda$  on, entailing that the optimal  $\lambda$  becomes smaller.

In Figure 7, we observe that the explicit upper bound well resembles the exact curve of the




Fig. 5: The mean AoI, as a function of the coefficient of variation (CV) of the inter-sampling times  $s_G$ .




Fig. 6: The AoI value of Figure 5 subtracted by the mean forward-recurrence time of the inter-sampling times.

mean AoI  $\mathbb{E}[A]$  as a function of the sampling rate  $\lambda$ . The lower bound, on the other hand, significantly underestimates  $\mathbb{E}[A]$ ; this is in particular the case when  $\lambda$  has a large impact on the system congestion, i.e., in a situation where  $\rho$  is close to the ‘remaining capacity’  $1 - \rho_{bg}$  of the system. To obtain further insights related to this perspective, we set  $\lambda = 0.05$  and scale up  $\lambda_{bg}$  and  $\mu$  simultaneously while keeping  $\rho_{bg}$  fixed, where the other parameters are the same as those underlying Figure 7. Figure 8 plots the exact value of  $\mathbb{E}[A]$  as well as the corresponding bounds, as functions of the occupancy  $\rho_{bg}/(\rho + \rho_{bg})$  of the background traffic. From this figure, we




Fig. 7: The mean AoI, as a function of the coefficient of the sampling rate  $\lambda$ . The explicit bounds in Theorem 9 are also plotted.




Fig. 8: The mean AoI, as a function of the ratio of the traffic intensity  $\rho_{bg}/(\rho + \rho_{bg})$ , where  $\lambda_{bg}$  and  $\mu$  are scaled up simultaneously so that  $\rho_{bg}$  is kept fixed. The explicit bounds in Theorem 9 are also plotted.

observe that the explicit bounds in Theorem 9 are tight when the background traffic is dominant and the single sensor accounts for at most 1% of the traffic; in practice, modern broadband communication systems simultaneously serve vast numbers of data flows, thus resulting in the occupancy of a single sensor typically dropping far below 1%. In this sense, Theorem 9 provides a simple yet highly accurate measure of ‘information freshness’ for monitoring systems with coexisting background streams.

## VII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper has described a methodology to analyze the AoI in the context of the highly general GI+M/GI+GI/1 model. In a first main result, Theorem 2, we provide a closed-form expression for its Laplace-Stieltjes transform, enabling the numerical evaluation of the AoI moments. The second main result (Theorem 7) concerns stochastic lower and upper bounds on the AoI, leading to explicit, insightful lower and upper bounds on the mean AoI (Theorem 9). We then approximate the tagged stream's inter-generation times via a phase-type distribution, which can be done at any desired precision level. For the resulting PH+M/GI+GI/1 model we succeed, as a third main result, in developing a stable computational algorithm for the mean AoI; see Theorem 14 for the resulting expression.

While with our GI+M/GI+GI/1 model we have reached a great level of generality, some further extensions can be thought of. In our setup we have, to model the background packet arrival process, relied on the fact that the superposition of many relatively homogeneous streams behaves essentially Poissonian. This means that we have to develop alternative techniques for settings in which the background stream does not correspond to a large traffic aggregate. A relevant specific case could be the one in which the background stream is modeled as the superposition of relative few streams with deterministic inter-arrival times, each of them with a random 'phasing' (cf. the  $N*D/D/1$  queue [32, Section 15.2]).

A second challenge could lie in the algorithmic computation of the AoI moments. Concrete objectives could concern optimizing the precision and run time of the algorithm for the mean AoI, as presented in Figure 4, and its extension to higher moments.

### APPENDIX A

#### PROOF OF LEMMA 11

Using the integral representation of the M/GI/1 busy period length [20, P. 653], we have

$$f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(\theta - \theta z) = \int_0^\infty e^{-(\theta - \theta z)x} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{e^{-\lambda_{\text{bg}}x} (\lambda_{\text{bg}}x)^{k-1}}{k!} dF_{Y_k}(x),$$

where  $Y_n$  denotes the sum of  $k$  i.i.d random variables following the CDF  $F_{H_{\text{bg}}/\mu}(\cdot)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{B_{\text{bg}}}^*(\theta - \theta z) &= \sum_{m=0}^\infty z^m \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-\theta x} (\theta x)^m}{m!} \cdot \frac{e^{-\lambda_{\text{bg}}x} (\lambda_{\text{bg}}x)^{k-1}}{k!} dF_{Y_k}(x) \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^\infty z^m \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{1}{k} \cdot \frac{(m+k-1)!}{m!(k-1)!} \cdot \left( \frac{\theta}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} \right)^m \left( \frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}}}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} \right)^{k-1} \\ &\quad \cdot \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-(\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}})x} \{(\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}})x\}^{m+k-1}}{(m+k-1)!} dF_{Y_k}(x) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} z^m \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k} \binom{m+k-1}{m} \left( \frac{\theta}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} \right)^m \left( \frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}}}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} \right)^{k-1} y_k^{(m+k-1)} \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} z^m \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k-m+1} \binom{k}{m} \left( \frac{\theta}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} \right)^m \left( \frac{\lambda_{\text{bg}}}{\theta + \lambda_{\text{bg}}} \right)^{k-m} y_{k-m+1}^{(k)},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$y_k^{(m)} = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\zeta x} (\zeta x)^m}{m!} dF_{Y_k}(x), \quad m = 0, 1, \dots, k = 0, 1, \dots$$

By definition, it is readily verified that  $y_k^{(m)}$  satisfies the recursion (71) and (72). We thus obtain (70) from (68).  $\square$

## APPENDIX B

### PROOF OF LEMMA 12

From (46), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{R}^*(\zeta - \zeta z) &= \int_{x=0}^{\infty} e^{-(\zeta - \zeta z)x} dx \int_{y=x}^{\infty} d\hat{\mathbf{D}}(y) \exp[\mathbf{Q}(y-x)] \\
&= \int_{y=0}^{\infty} d\hat{\mathbf{D}}(y) \int_{x=0}^y \exp[\mathbf{Q}(y-x)] e^{-(\zeta - \zeta z)x} dx \\
&= \int_{y=0}^{\infty} d\hat{\mathbf{D}}(y) \int_{x=0}^y \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\zeta(y-x)} \{\zeta(y-x)\}^k}{k!} \cdot (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q})^k e^{-(\zeta - \zeta z)x} dx \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{y=0}^{\infty} e^{-\zeta y} d\hat{\mathbf{D}}(y) (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q})^k \int_{x=0}^y \frac{\{\zeta(y-x)\}^k}{k!} e^{\zeta z x} dx \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{y=0}^{\infty} e^{-(\zeta - \zeta z)y} d\hat{\mathbf{D}}(y) (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q})^k \int_{x=0}^y \frac{\{\zeta(y-x)\}^k}{k!} e^{-\zeta z(y-x)} dx \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z^{-(k+1)} \zeta^{-1} \int_{y=0}^{\infty} e^{-(\zeta - \zeta z)y} d\hat{\mathbf{D}}(y) (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q})^k \int_{x=0}^y \frac{e^{-\zeta z(y-x)} \{\zeta z(y-x)\}^k}{k!} \cdot \zeta z dx \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=k+1}^{\infty} z^{-(k+1)} \zeta^{-1} \int_{y=0}^{\infty} e^{-(\zeta - \zeta z)y} \cdot \frac{e^{-\zeta z y} (\zeta z y)^m}{m!} d\hat{\mathbf{D}}(y) (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q})^k \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=k+1}^{\infty} z^{m-k-1} \zeta^{-1} \int_{y=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\zeta y} (\zeta y)^m}{m!} d\hat{\mathbf{D}}(y) (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q})^k \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=k+1}^{\infty} z^{m-k-1} \zeta^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{D}}^{(m)} (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q})^k \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} z^m \zeta^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{D}}^{(m+k+1)} (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q})^k \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} z^m \zeta^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mathbf{D}}^{(m+k+1)} (\mathbf{I} + \zeta^{-1}\mathbf{Q})^k,
\end{aligned}$$



Therefore, we have proved

$$\mathbf{R}^*(\zeta - \zeta z) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{R}^{(m)} z^m.$$

Note that we have from (45),

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}(\zeta - \zeta z) = (1 - \rho - \rho_{\text{bg}})\boldsymbol{\kappa} + \hat{\mathbf{v}}(\zeta - \zeta z)\mathbf{R}^*(\zeta - \zeta z),$$

i.e.,

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mathbf{v}}^{(m)} z^m = (1 - \rho - \rho_{\text{bg}})\boldsymbol{\kappa} + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} z^m \sum_{k=0}^m \hat{\mathbf{v}}^{(k)} \mathbf{R}^{(m-k)}.$$

Comparing the coefficients of both sides of this equation and re-arranging terms, we have established the claim of Lemma 12.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Kaul, M. Gruteser, V. Rai, and J. Kenney, "Minimizing Age of Information in Vehicular Networks," in *Proc. IEEE SECON 2011*, pp. 350–358, 2011.
- [2] S. Kaul, R. Yates, and M. Gruteser, "On Piggybacking in Vehicular Networks," in *Proc. of IEEE GLOBECOM 2011*, 2011.
- [3] S. Kaul, R. Yates, and M. Gruteser, "Real-Time Status: How Often Should One Update?" in *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM 2012*, pp. 2731–2735, 2012.
- [4] R. Yates, Y. Sun, D. R. Brown, S. K. Kaul, E. Modiano, and S. Ulukus, "Age of Information: An Introduction and Survey," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1183–1210, 2021.
- [5] M. Costa, M. Codreanu, and A. Ephremides, "On the Age of Information in Status Update Systems with Packet Management," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 1897–1910, 2016.
- [6] Y. Inoue, H. Masuyama, T. Takine, and T. Tanaka, "A General Formula for the Stationary Distribution of the Age of Information and Its Application to Single-server Queues," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 65, no. 12, pp. 8305–8324, 2019.
- [7] J. P. Champati, H. Al-Zubaidy, and J. Gross, "On the Distribution of AoI for the GI/GI/1/1 and GI/GI/1/2\* Systems: Exact Expressions and Bounds," in *Proc. of IEEE INFOCOM 2019*, pp. 37–45, 2019.
- [8] R. Yates, S. K. Kaul, "The Age of Information: Real-Time Status Updating by Multiple Sources", *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 1807–1827, 2019.
- [9] M. Moltafet, M. Leinonen, M. Codreanu, "On the Age of Information in Multi-Source Queueing Models," *IEEE Trans. Comm.*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 5003–5017, 2020.
- [10] Y. Inoue and T. Takine, "Exact Analysis of the Age of Information in the Multi-Source M/GI/1 Queueing System," arXiv:2404.05167, 2024.
- [11] Z. Chen, D. Deng, C. She, Y. Jia, L. Liang, S. Fang, M. Wang, Y. Li, "Age of Information: The Multi-Stream M/G/1/1 Non-Preemptive System," *IEEE Trans. Comm.*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 2328–2341 2022.
- [12] Y. Jiang, N. Miyoshi, "Joint Performance Analysis of Ages of Information in a Multi-Source Pushout Server," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 965–975, 2021.
- [13] Z. Liu, Y. Sang, B. Li, B. Ji, "A Worst-Case Approximate Analysis of Peak Age-of-Information via Robust Queueing Approach," *IEEE INFOCOM 2021 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, Vancouver, BC, Canada, pp. 1–10, 2021.
- [14] E. Çinlar, "Superposition of Point Processes," In: *Stochastic Point Processes*, ed. P. A. W. Lewis, Wiley, New York, pp. 546–606, 1972.
- [15] S. Asmussen, *Applied Probability and Queues*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York, 2003.

- [16] J. Abate, G. Choudhury, and W. Whitt, "Calculating the M/G/1 Busy-Period Density and LIFO Waiting-Time Distribution by Direct Numerical Transform Inversion," *Oper. Res. Lett.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 113–119, 1995.
- [17] H. Takagi, *Queueing Analysis: Vacation and Priority Systems, Part 1*, Elsevier Science Publishers, Amsterdam, 1991.
- [18] J. Hooke, "A Priority Queue with Low-Priority Arrivals General," *Oper. Res.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 373–380, 1972.
- [19] T. Ott, "On the M/G/1 Queue with Additional Inputs," *J. Appl. Prob.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 129–142, 1984.
- [20] J. W. Cohen, *The Single-Server Queue*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982.
- [21] J. Abate and W. Whitt, "The Fourier-Series Method for Inverting Transforms of Probability Distributions," *Queueing Syst.*, vol. 10, nos. 1-2, pp. 5–87, 1992.
- [22] M. Shaked and J. G. Shanthikumar, *Stochastic Orders*, Springer, New York, 2007.
- [23] J. Gurland, "An Inequality Satisfied by the Expectation of the Reciprocal of a Random Variable," *Am. Stat.*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 24–25, 1967.
- [24] J. Behboodian, "Covariance Inequality and Its Applications," *Int. J. Math. Educ. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 643–647, 1994.
- [25] E. L. Lehmann, "Some Concepts of Dependence," *Ann. Math. Statist.*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 1137–1153, 1966.
- [26] D. J. Daley, "Inequalities for Moments of Tails of Random Variables, with a Queueing Application," *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeit*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 139–143, 1977.
- [27] T. Takine, "Matrix Product-Form solution for an LCFS-PR Single-Server Queue with Multiple Arrival Streams Governed by a Markov Chain," *Queueing Syst.*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 131–151, 2002.
- [28] T. Takine and T. Hasegawa, "The Workload in the MAP/G/1 Queue with State-Dependent Services: Its Application to a Queue with Preemptive Resume Priority," *Stoch. Models*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 183–204, 1994.
- [29] H. C. Tijms, *Stochastic Models, An Algorithmic Approach*, Wiley, Chichester, 1994.
- [30] E. A. van Doorn and G. J. K. Regterschot, "Conditional PASTA," *Oper. Res. Lett.*, vol. 7, pp. 229–232, 1988.
- [31] B. Davies and B. Martin, "Numerical Inversion of the Laplace Transform: A Survey and Comparison of Methods," *J. Comput. Phys.* vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 1–32, 1979.
- [32] J. Roberts, U. Mocci, and J. Virtamo (eds.), *Broadband Network Teletraffic*, Springer, New York, 1996.