

Explicit Steady-State Approximations for Parallel Server Systems with Heterogeneous Servers

J.G. Dai
Cornell University

Yaosheng Xu
University of Chicago

June 7, 2024

Abstract

The weighted-workload-task-allocation (WWTA) load-balancing policy is known to be throughput optimal for parallel server systems with heterogeneous servers. This work concerns the heavy traffic approximation of steady-state performance for parallel server systems operating under WWTA policy. Under a relaxed complete-resource-pooling condition, we prove that WWTA achieves a “strong form” of state-space collapse in heavy traffic and that the scaled workload for each server converges in distribution to an exponential random variable, whose parameter is explicitly given by system primitives. Various steady-state performance measures are shown to be approximated from this exponential random variable. Instead of proving a stochastic process limit followed by an interchange of limits – a method that dominates the literature, our method works directly with a pre-limit basic adjoint relationship (BAR) that characterizes the stationary distribution of each pre-limit system.

1 Introduction

Parallel server systems model data centers that are ubiquitous to support cloud computing; see, for example, [Wang et al. \(2014\)](#); [Xie et al. \(2016\)](#) and Chapter 11 of [Dai and Harrison \(2020\)](#). In such a system, there are multiple servers processing jobs in multiple classes. Servers are heterogeneous in that a server can be more efficient processing one class of jobs than another. An arriving job is immediately routed to one of the servers following a load-balancing algorithm, also called a *routing policy*. If the server is busy, the arriving job waits in the buffer for its class. Otherwise, the server processes the job immediately. Once the processing is completed, the job departs the system. See [Figure 1](#) for an example of a parallel server system with two servers processing two job classes, known as the N-model. In [Figure 1](#), server 2 processes jobs in two buffers, buffer “B2” that holds class 1 waiting jobs and buffer “B3” that holds class 2 waiting jobs. In addition to employing a routing policy, a *scheduling policy* is needed for server 2 to decide the order in which jobs in these two buffers will be processed. To be concrete, in our simulation




Figure 1: Architecture 1




Figure 2: Architecture 2




Figure 3: Mean completion time in the N-model

studies, we employ the shortest-mean-processing-first scheduling policy. It is one of the static buffer priority scheduling policies.

In this paper, we study the performance of a parallel server system under the weighted-workload-task-allocation (WWTA) routing policy, which will be formally defined in Section 2. There are several reasons to focus on the WWTA routing policy. First, WWTA has been proved to be throughput optimal; see Corollary 11.7 of [Dai and Harrison \(2020\)](#). Next, WWTA is robust to the varying arrival rates; it dynamically routes jobs to various servers, without using arrival rate information of each job class. The join-shortest-queue (JSQ) routing policy is a popular one that also does not use the arrival rate information. However, this seemingly attractive routing policy can be unstable because of class-dependent service times; see [Appendix A](#) for a simulation study of the X-model example. Third, the WWTA routing policy will be proven mathematically to enjoy many desired properties in heavy traffic; see the third last paragraph of this introduction.

In [Figure 1](#), each arriving job is immediately routed to one of the servers following a routing policy. Suppose that the system has an option to delay the routing of jobs to servers and each job class has an infinite-capacity buffer to hold arriving jobs. For future reference, we call the system with delayed routing “in Architecture 2”, and the system with immediate routing “in Architecture 1”. For a system in Architecture 2, a scheduling policy is needed to operate the system. The MaxWeight scheduling policy has been studied in literature extensively and is proven to be throughput optimal. [Figure 3](#) shows that, in terms of mean completion time, WWTA routing policy in Architecture 1 dominates MaxWeight scheduling policy in Architecture 2. Clearly, an optimal scheduling policy in Architecture 2 should dominate the WWTA routing policy combined with any scheduling policy. However, optimal policies in either architecture are difficult to obtain. Again in this paper, we focus on the WWTA routing policy in Architecture 1 and to understand its asymptotic performance in heavy traffic.

For more than 20 years, parallel server systems in Architecture 2 have been extensively studied. For example, [Bell and Williams \(2005\)](#); [Harrison \(2000\)](#); [Harrison and López \(1999\)](#) design various scheduling policies, and the authors in these papers prove that these policies are asymptotically optimal in heavy traffic under a complete resource pooling (CRP) condition. The notion of heavy traffic is defined through a *static allocation problem*, a linear program (referred to as the LP throughout the paper) that minimizes the utilization of the busiest server. [Stolyar \(2004\)](#) studied MaxWeight scheduling policies in generalized switch models that include the discrete-time version of parallel server systems as special cases.

In this paper, we focus on parallel systems in Architecture 1 operating under the WWTA routing policy together with *any* non-idling scheduling policy. When such a system is in heavy traffic, we provide simple explicit formulas for its steady-state analysis. Specifically, we prove that the vector of weighted steady-state workload has a strong-form state space collapse under a *relaxed* heavy traffic and CPR conditions, and the scaled steady-state workload of each server converges to an exponential random variable with the mean given explicitly through system parameters. In [Bell and Williams \(2005\)](#); [Harrison \(2000\)](#); [Harrison and López \(1999\)](#); [Stolyar \(2004\)](#), the LP is assumed to have a unique solution and their heavy traffic condition and the CPR condition are defined through this unique solution. In this paper, we do not assume the LP has a unique solution, and the

resulting conditions are referred to as the relaxed heavy traffic condition and the relaxed CRP condition. A recent work [Atar et al. \(2024\)](#) also assumes non-uniqueness of the LP and introduces the notion of “extended” heavy traffic condition.

The proof of our results uses the basic adjoint relationship (BAR), which has been used extensively under the name “drift method” in the literature for discrete-time versions of stochastic models [Eryilmaz and Srikant \(2012\)](#); [Maguluri and Srikant \(2016\)](#); [Hurtado-Lange and Maguluri \(2020\)](#). The parallel server systems in this paper and in [Bell and Williams \(2005\)](#); [Harrison \(2000\)](#); [Harrison and López \(1999\)](#) are all continuous-time models. Unlike [Bell and Williams \(2005\)](#); [Harrison \(2000\)](#), this paper stays within the continuous-time Markov chain (CTMC) framework by assuming Poisson arrival processes and exponentially distributed job sizes. In a future research, we plan to extend our results to parallel server systems with general arrival processes and general job size distributions, utilizing the BAR approach advanced recently by [Braverman et al. \(2017, 2024\)](#).

Recall that the LP defining the static allocation problem utilizes the system parameters including the arrival rates of job classes. The LP may have multiple solutions. Each solution provides a nominal plan prescribing the fraction of time that each server allocates to classes. Following [Bell and Williams \(2005\)](#); [Harrison \(2000\)](#); [Harrison and López \(1999\)](#), a combination of a server and a job class is called an activity. Thus, each LP solution prescribes the fraction of time that each activity should be activated. When an activity receives zero allocation from *any* LP solution, this activity is called a *non-basic* activity. Intuitively, a non-basic activity should not be activated. Thus, a good routing policy should not route any class jobs to a non-basic server. However, such a routing policy is highly non-robust to the changing arrival rates because the LP is highly sensitive to the arrival rates of job classes. As stated earlier, the WWTA routing policy is robust to changing arrival rates. As part of the proof of our main results, we prove that (a) the WWTA routing policy routes a “negligible” fraction of jobs to non-basic servers, (b) each server spends a “negligible” fraction of time processing non-basic job classes, (c) the steady-state number of jobs in non-basic buffers is negligible under the heavy traffic scaling. These corollary results mathematically establish the appealing features of the WWTA routing policy. In particular, the WWTA routing policy, being LP-blind, is able to achieve the performance prescribed by the LP.

The rest of the paper has the following structure. Section 2 formally introduces the WWTA policy. In Section 3, we outline the assumptions and present the main result. Section 4 introduces two types of service policies and implements an example “W” model with specified scheduling policies to provide the performance comparison. Sections 5 through 7 offer supporting results, with Section 6 delving into state-space Collapse. The proof of the main result is provided in Section 8.

2 Parallel server systems with heterogeneous servers and policies

This paper deals with parallel server systems with heterogeneous servers, as illustrated in Figure 4. In such a system, there are K servers that process I classes of jobs. Let $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, I\}$ be the set of classes, and $\mathcal{K} = \{1, \dots, K\}$ be the set of servers. For each




Figure 4: General parallel server system

class $i \in \mathcal{I}$, its job arrival process is assumed to be Poisson with rate λ_i . Each class i job is processed by one of the servers, determined by a load-balancing algorithm. After being processed by the selected server, the job leaves the system. Each server $k \in \mathcal{K}$ may be cross-trained, able to process jobs in multiple classes. The processing times for server k to process class i jobs are independent identically distributed exponential random variables with mean m_{ik} . We call it a type $j = (i, k)$ activity when server k processes a class i job. We set $\mu_{ik} = 1/m_{ik}$ to be the service rate for type $j = (i, k)$ activities. The total number of activities is denoted by J , which is at most $I \times K$. We denote $\mathcal{I}(k) \subset \mathcal{I}$ as the set of classes that server k can process, and $\mathcal{K}(i) \subset \mathcal{K}$ the set of servers that can process class i jobs.

Each class i arrival is immediately routed to one of the servers in $\mathcal{K}(i)$, say, server $k \in \mathcal{K}(i)$, following a load-balancing algorithm. If server k is free, the job enters processing immediately. Otherwise, it waits in buffer $j = (i, k)$ until the server is ready to process the job following a service policy to be specified below. Server k maintains multiple buffers, one for each type $j = (i, k)$ with $i \in \mathcal{I}(k)$. It is known that join-shortest-queue (JSQ) load-balancing algorithm is sometimes not throughput optimal; see the example in Appendix A. In this paper, we focus on the weighted workload task allocation (WWTA) load-balancing algorithm, also known as the WWTA routing policy, which we now formally introduce below.

Weighted workload task allocation (WWTA) routing policy. It is a load-balancing routing policy first proposed by Xie et al. (2016). Unlike JSQ routing policy, which simply compares the queue lengths among servers in its routing decisions, the WWTA policy compares workloads among servers in its decisions. In literature, the workload of a server at time t is defined to be the virtual waiting time at time t , which is the waiting time of a fictitious job arriving at the server at time t . In this paper, we assume the mean processing times are observable, but not the actual processing times. Thus, the virtual

waiting times are non-observable quantities for the load-balancing algorithm. For our purpose, we define workload for server k to be

$$W_k(z) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} m_{ik} z_{ik},$$

where $z = (z_{ik})$ is the vector of queue lengths in the system. Here, component z_{ik} is the number of jobs in buffer $j = (i, k)$, including possibly the one in service. We assume at each time t , the queue length vector z is observable. The WWTA policy routes an arriving job from class i to server k which achieves

$$\min_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} W_k(z).$$

Service policy. We further specify the service or scheduling policy that dictates, for each server, from which buffer to choose a job to process next. It is known that under the WWTA routing policy, any non-idling scheduling policy is throughput optimal; see, for example, Section 11.8 of [Dai and Harrison \(2020\)](#). By non-idling, we mean each server must be busy processing jobs whenever there are jobs waiting in its buffers. Throughout the paper, we use a general notation $\mathcal{P} = (P_{ik}(z))$ to represent such a non-idling scheduling policy, with $P_{ik}(z)$ indicating the fraction of effort that server k spends on class i jobs when the queue length vector is z . The limit results do not depend on the specific scheduling policies, we therefore delay the discussion of eligible scheduling policies by replacing $P_{ik}(z)$ with specific expressions in Section 4.

3 Assumptions and main results

In this section, we will formally introduce two critical assumptions and main results. One assumption is the heavy traffic and the other is the (relaxed) complete resource pooling. These two assumptions are formulated through solutions to a linear program (LP), which was first introduced in [Harrison and López \(1999\)](#). For that, it is useful to adopt the compact notational system in [Harrison and López \(1999\)](#). Central to that system is the concept of activities. In the setting of a parallel server system introduced in Section 2, an activity j corresponds to a buffer (i, k) for a certain job class i and a certain server k . We assume J is the total number of activities.

Define a $I \times J$ *constituency* matrix C and a $K \times J$ *resource-consumption* matrix A as follows.

$$C_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if activity } j \text{ processes class } i; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$A_{kj} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if server } k \text{ performs activity } j; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Given these two matrices, each activity $j \in \mathcal{J}$ is uniquely associated with a class i and a server k , allowing us to write $j = (i, k)$. We assume J activities are ordered from 1 to J . We denote the service rate vector of J activities by

$$\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_J)^T.$$

All vectors are envisioned as column vectors and the symbol T denotes the transpose. Define *output* matrix

$$R = C \operatorname{diag}(\mu),$$

where R_{ij} is the job departure rate from buffer (i, k) when $j = (i, k)$ and server k devotes all its effort on the buffer. We consider the following LP, which is known as the *static allocation problem*:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \rho \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Rx = \lambda, \\ & Ax \leq \rho e, \\ & x, \rho \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_J)^T$, $x = (x_1, \dots, x_J)^T$, $e = (1, \dots, 1)^T \in \mathbb{R}^K$. The vector x can be regarded as a processing plan, with each element x_j being interpreted as the long-run proportion of time that activity j is processed by its server and ρ being interpreted as the long-run utilization of the busiest server. As explained in [Harrison and López \(1999\)](#), the minimization problem (3.1) aims to minimize the utilization of the busiest server, producing a relatively even processing plan of allocation among servers. Following [Harrison and López \(1999\)](#), we define the following notion of balanced *heavy traffic*: even under the most efficient processing plan, *all* servers are 100% utilized. Formally, we state the following assumption.

Assumption 3.1 (Heavy Traffic). *The parallel server system is assumed to be in (balanced) heavy traffic, namely, the static allocation problem (3.1) has an optimal solution (x^*, ρ^*) that satisfies*

$$\rho^* = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad Ax^* = e. \tag{3.2}$$

Remark 3.1. *We do not assume linear program (3.1) has a unique solution. The uniqueness is assumed in [Bell and Williams \(2005\)](#); [Harrison \(2000\)](#); [Harrison and López \(1999\)](#). Analysis in these papers utilized the uniqueness property critically. Non-uniqueness of the LP solutions means that there might exist multiple plans to allocate servers with all servers being 100% busy. In a recent paper [Atar et al. \(2024\)](#), the authors also did not assume uniqueness in their definition of heavy traffic. They coined the term “extended heavy traffic condition” when $\rho^* = 1$ and x^* is not unique.*

Following [Harrison and López \(1999\)](#), we define basic activities, with possible non-uniqueness of LP solution (x^*, ρ^*) . Activity $j = (i, k)$ is called a *basic activity associated with some x^** if x^* satisfies (3.2) and $x_j^* > 0$. Otherwise, it is called *non-basic activities associated with x^** . We consider the communicating servers using similar definition as [Harrison and López \(1999\)](#):

Definition 3.1. *Servers k and k' are said to communicate directly, if there exists some x^* , such that both $j = (i, k)$ and $j' = (i, k')$, for some class i , are basic activities associated with x^* . Server k and k' are said to communicate, if there exist a sequence of servers k_1, \dots, k_ω such that $k_1 = k, k_\omega = k'$ and k_α communicates with $k_{\alpha+1}$ directly for $\alpha = 1, \dots, \omega - 1$.*

Then we introduce our second assumption as follows:

Assumption 3.2 ((Relaxed) Complete Resource Pooling). *There exists an optimal solution (x^*, ρ^*) that satisfies (3.2) and all servers communicate.*

Remark 3.2. *Assumption 3.2 contains Assumption 3.1. Under Assumption 3.2, when we search for basic activities to communicate among all the servers, we are allowed to utilize different optimal solutions x^* .*

Now we state two lemmas related to the dual of LP (3.1). The dual LP to the static allocation problem (3.1) is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & v\lambda \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & vR \leq uA, \\ & ue \leq 1, \\ & u \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where $v = (v_1, \dots, v_I)$, $u = (u_1, \dots, u_K)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Under Assumption 3.1 with x^* satisfying (3.2), the dual LP (3.3) has an optimal solution (v^*, u^*) , satisfying*

- (i) $\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i^* = 1$,
- (ii) $\sum_{k=1}^K u_k^* = 1$, $u_k^* \geq 0$,
- (iii) If $x_{ik}^* > 0$, then $\mu_{ik} v_i^* = u_k^*$.

Lemma 3.2. *If Assumptions 3.1 & 3.2 holds, then*

- (i) *The optimal dual LP solution (v^*, u^*) is unique.*
- (ii) $u_k^* > 0, v_i^* > 0, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, i \in \mathcal{I}$

Remark 3.3. *Lemma 3.2 is crucial in building up the explicit performance results, especially under the condition of non-unique optimal solutions of static allocation problem (3.1). Under Assumptions 3.1 & 3.2, if the primal solution of static allocation problem is further assumed to be unique, our lemma is fully covered by Harrison and López (1999); indeed, our Lemma 3.2(i) is one of the equivalent statements of the complete resource pooling, and our Lemma 3.2(ii) is a corollary in their paper. In the proof of Lemma 3.2, we provide a new analytical way to obtain the optimal dual solution, which does not depend on the uniqueness of primal solution.*

Remark 3.4. *We directly derive the unique dual solution via Lemma 3.2. Atar et al. (2024) argued differently by first assuming the dual LP solution is unique, then looked for this dual solution by assuming the decomposable service rates: there exist α_i, β_k s.t. $\mu_{ik} = \alpha_i \beta_k$ for any $(i, k) \in \mathcal{J}$.*

Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 will be proved in Appendices B.1 and B.2, respectively. Throughout the following discussion, we consider the system for which the Assumptions 3.1 & 3.2 hold, i.e. the heavy traffic system that satisfies the CRP condition. We have proved in

Lemma 3.2 that optimal dual solution (v^*, u^*) is unique, therefore, from now on, we will always use this unique dual solution, and we omit superscript “*” for simplicity.

In the discussion of the heavy traffic, we consider a sequence of parallel server systems indexed by $r \in (0, 1)$. To keep the presentation clean, only the arrival rates are parameterized by r . That is, each system in the sequence has an arrival rate

$$\lambda_i^{(r)} = \lambda_i(1 - r), 0 < r < 1$$

for class i , with other system parameters not depending on r . With $\lambda^{(r)}$ replacing λ , the LP (3.2) has optimal value $\rho^{r,*} = 1 - r$. Thus, the load of the sequence of systems approaches 100%, as r goes to zero. When $0 < r < 1$, the parallel server system with the WWTA policy is proven to be throughput optimal Dai and Harrison (2020); Xie et al. (2016). Thus, for each $r \in (0, 1)$, the queue length process, as a continuous-time Markov chain, has a unique stationary distribution. For each $r \in (0, 1)$, we use $Z^{(r)}$ be the queue length vector that has the stationary distribution. We call $Z^{(r)}$ the steady-state queue length in the r th system. Throughout the paper, all of the results will be discussed based on this steady-state queue length $Z^{(r)}$. We adopt the convention that $f(r) = O(g(r))$ and $f(r) = o(g(r))$ mean, respectively,

$$\limsup_{r \downarrow 0} \left| \frac{f(r)}{g(r)} \right| < \infty, \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \frac{f(r)}{g(r)} = 0.$$

Theorem 3.1 (Limit distribution for Individual Workload). *Assume Assumptions 3.1 & 3.2 hold. Under the WWTA policy and any non-idling scheduling policy \mathcal{P} , the limit distribution of scaled workload for each server is one-dimensional exponential distribution. Furthermore,*

$$\lim_{r \downarrow 0} r \left(W_1(Z^{(r)}), \dots, W_K(Z^{(r)}) \right) \xrightarrow{d} (u_1, \dots, u_K) X,$$

where X is a random variable that follows exponential distribution with mean

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K u_k^2}.$$

In Theorem 3.1, the limit distribution only depend on the arrival rates $\lambda_i, i \in \mathcal{I}$ and unique optimal dual solution (v, u) . It does not depend on the specific scheduling policy \mathcal{P} . The proof of Theorem 3.1 is provided in Section 8. The key ingredient for proving Theorem 3.1 is *state-space Collapse*, which will be presented in Section 6. Other supporting results for proving the theorem will be introduced in Section 5 and Section 7.

4 Service Policies and an Example

Recall each server $k \in \mathcal{K}$ can process different jobs in buffers $j = (i, k)$ for $i \in \mathcal{I}(k)$. A scheduling (service) policy is needed to decide which buffer jobs to process next. Here we introduce two types of scheduling policies to accompany with WWTA. Later in this section, one will see the performance difference between these two types in an example.

Free choice of service policy with WWTA will be shown to have more flexibility than the MaxWeight policy.

The first service policy is the head-of-line proportional processor sharing (HLPPS) scheduling policy studied in [Bramson \(1998\)](#). Under HLPPS, all nonempty buffers receive service simultaneously. For each server $k \in \mathcal{K}$, the proportion of effort that server k allocates among classes $\mathcal{I}(k)$ at any time is given by

$$P_{ik}(z) = \frac{z_{ik}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} z_{ik}}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}(k), \quad (4.4)$$

when the queue length is $z = (z_{ik})$. Here and later, we adopt the convention that $0/0 = 0$. Thus, when $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} z_{ik} = 0$, server k idles. Therefore, the dynamic service rate for activity $j = (i, k)$ is $\mu_{ik} P_{ik}(z)$.

Furthermore, the allocation in (4.4) can also be generalized to

$$P_{ik}(z) = \frac{c_{ik} z_{ik}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} c_{ik} z_{ik}}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}, k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (4.5)$$

where $c = (c_{ik}) > 0$ is a given vector of positive numbers. We call the service policy using allocation (4.5) a *generalized HLPPS* policy with weight $c = (c_{ik})$. The implementation of HLPPS policy does not require the knowledge of system parameters, such as arrival rates and service rates. It also does not depend on the routing policies, but only on the proportion of the queue sizes at each buffer of the servers.

The second type of service policies is the static buffer priority (SBP) scheduling policy. Each SBP policy corresponds to a ranking among buffers. Given a ranking, we use $(i', k) < (i, k)$ denotes that buffer (i', k) has a (preemptive) higher priority than buffer (i, k) . Formally, we define the SBP service policy for server k by specifying its utilization

$$P_{ik}(z) = \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{(i', k) < (i, k)} z_{i'k} = 0, z_{ik} > 0 \right).$$

Later in this section, by ranking buffers according to the shortest meaning processing time first, the corresponding SBP service policy is shown to have superior performance in some cases.

Now we present a simulation study. We compare performances of the system operating under three policies. The first two policies are the WWTA routing policy together with one of the two service policies introduced above; they are operated under Architecture 1. The third one is the MaxWeight scheduling policy operated under Architecture 2. The simulated system is called the W model since it has W-shaped system with three classes of jobs and two servers. Figure 5 describes W model under Architecture 1. Architecture 2 has same parameters but the different structure; see Figure 2 for reference. We set activity (3, 1) and (1, 2) as non-basic activities in the W model. The performance measure we focus on is the average completion time, starting from job arrival to the system until service completion and exit.

We perform a simulation study on the W model for eight system load levels, ranging from 96.0% to 99.5%. For each combination of a load level and a policy, we run discrete-event simulation of the system for 50000 time units, starting from an empty system.




Figure 5: W model

We run 30 independent replications to obtain the 95% confidence interval of the average completion time. As we see in Figure 6, WWTA with SBP scheduling and WWTA with HLPPS have shorter average completion time than the MaxWeight. Their 95% confidence intervals almost do not have any overlap, which shows significant differences among the three policies.

5 Preliminary Results I

In this section we will introduce the main technical tool, known as the basic adjoint relationship (BAR) approach. We also use the BAR to establish a few preliminary results that will be used to prove Theorem 3.1. Recall that under the WWTA routing policy with queue length vector z , each class i arrival is routed to a server, denoted as $L^{(i)}(z)$, that is in the set

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} W_k(z).$$

To be concrete, when more than one server achieve the minimum, we assume the job is routed to the server that has the smallest index. Our results do not depend on how the tie-breaking rule is used. It is clear that for each class $i \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) = 1.$$

Recall that $P_{ik}(z)$ is the fraction of effort that server k works on a class i job when the queue length is z under a generic non-idling scheduling policy \mathcal{P} . In addition, recall that for server $k \in \mathcal{K}$ and class $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we use $j = (i, k)$ to denote the activity j for server k processing a class i job. For activity $j = (i, k)$, we let $e_{ik} \triangleq e_j = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)^T \in \mathbb{R}^J$ be the unit vector with only the j th element being nonzero.

For the r th parallel server system in the sequence operating under the WWTA routing policy and a service policy \mathcal{P} , the queue length process is a continuous-time Markov chain




Figure 6: Mean completion time in W-model

with **generator**

$$\begin{aligned}
Gf(z) &= \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i^{(r)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \left[f(z + e_{ik}) - f(z) \right] \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} P_{ik}(z) \left[f(z - e_{ik}) - f(z) \right] \quad z \in \mathbb{Z}_+^J,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

for any function $f : \mathbb{Z}_+^J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The following lemma supports the main tool that we will use throughout the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Lemma 5.1. *Under Assumptions 3.1 & 3.2, with the WWTA and scheduling \mathcal{P} , let $f(z) : \mathbb{Z}_+^J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Suppose there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and some constant $C > 0$ such that $|f(z)| \leq C \sum_{k=1}^K W_k^n(z)$ for $z \in \mathbb{Z}_+^J$ (i.e. $f(z)$ is dominated by a polynomial function of workload). Then the vector of steady-state queue length $Z^{(r)}, 0 < r < 1$ satisfies the following basic adjoint relationship (BAR):*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[Gf \left(Z^{(r)} \right) \right] = 0. \tag{5.7}$$

Each function f that satisfies (5.7) is called a test function. It was argued in (Glynn and Zeevi, 2008, Proposition 3) that each bounded function $f : \mathbb{Z}_+^J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a test function. The proof of Lemma 5.1 is provided in Appendix B.3, utilizing a similar argument as in Lemma 1 of Braverman et al. (2016).

In Lemma 3.1, we have established that if (v, u) is the optimal dual solution, then each

activity $j = (i, k)$ satisfies $u_k \geq \mu_{ik}v_i$, and each basic activity satisfies $u_k = \mu_{ik}v_i$. Denote

$$d_{ik} = u_k - \mu_{ik}v_i. \quad (5.8)$$

This section ends with the following preliminary result.

Lemma 5.2. *Under Assumptions 3.1 & 3.2, with the WWTA and scheduling \mathcal{P} , for each $r \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\sum_{k=1}^K u_k \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0\right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \mathbb{E}[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})] = r, \quad (5.9)$$

$$\lambda_i^{(r)} \mathbb{P}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) = \mu_{ik} \mathbb{E}[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})]. \quad (5.10)$$

Equation (5.9) implies that each server's idle probability is at most $O(r)$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. This means that the WWTA routing policy is “efficient” in that it indeed drives each server to 100% utilization under the balanced heavy traffic condition and complete resource pooling condition. Equation (5.9) also implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})] = O(r), \quad \text{if } d_{ik} > 0. \quad (5.11)$$

When $d_{ik} > 0$, activity (i, k) is necessarily non-basic. For such a non-basic activity, the long-run fraction of time that server k processing class i jobs is negligible (of order $O(r)$). Equation (5.10) is a flow balance equation: rate into buffer (i, k) must be equal to rate out of the buffer. These two equations together conclude that WWTA dynamic routing policy is “smart”: for a non-basic activity with $d_{ik} > 0$, the fraction of class i jobs routing to server k is negligible, namely,

$$\mathbb{P}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) = O(r), \quad \text{if } d_{ik} > 0. \quad (5.12)$$

Proof of Lemma 5.2. To prove (5.9), we let $f(z) = \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i z_{ik}$. Applying the generator G in (5.6) to this test function, one has

$$\begin{aligned} Gf(z) &= \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} v_i P_{ik}(z) \\ &= -r + \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \mathbb{1}\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} z_{ik} = 0\right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} P_{ik}(z), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 3.1 and (5.8). Then (5.9) follows from (5.7).

To prove (5.10), we take $f(z) = z_{ik}$. Then,

$$Gf(z) = \lambda_i^{(r)} \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) - \mu_{ik} P_{ik}(z)$$

and (5.7) implies

$$\lambda_i^{(r)} \mathbb{P}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) = \mu_{ik} \mathbb{E}[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})],$$

which proves (5.10). \square

6 State-space collapse

In this section, we establish the following state-space collapse (SSC) result, which plays a critical role in proving Theorem 3.1. Recall $u \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is the vector defined in optimal dual solution. For each $k \in \mathcal{K}$, denote

$$T_k(z) = \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(z),$$

and given $z = (z_{ik})$, denote $T_{(k)}(z)$ the k th smallest value among $\{T_k(z), k \in \mathcal{K}\}$.

Proposition 6.1 (State-space collapse). *Assume Assumptions 3.1 & 3.2 hold. Under the WWTA policy and a scheduling \mathcal{P} , for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, there exists a constant $M_n > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[T_{(K)}(Z^{(r)}) - T_{(1)}(Z^{(r)}) \right]^n \leq M_n, \quad \text{for } r \in (0, r_0), \quad (6.13)$$

where $r_0 \in (0, 1)$ is some constant independent of n .

Inequality (6.13) implies that a weighted workload is balanced among all servers. It actually provides a much stronger state-space collapse than what we need in the proof of Theorem 3.1, which only requires (6.13) holds for $n = 2$. Throughout the paper, we adopt the convention: for a sequence $\{a(i)\}$,

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^b a(i) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k): d_{ik}=0} a(i), \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} a(i) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k): d_{ik}>0} a(i),$$

where the terms in the first sum include both the basic activities and possibly some non-basic activities (i, k) having $d_{ik} = 0$.

Inspired by pioneering paper [Eryilmaz and Srikant \(2012\)](#), before proving Proposition 6.1, we start with the following preparation. Denote $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ by the inner product and $\|u\|$ by the ℓ_2 norm on the Euclidean space. Denote by the unitized vector of $u = (u_1, \dots, u_K)^T$ as

$$c_u = \left(\frac{u_1}{\|u\|}, \dots, \frac{u_K}{\|u\|} \right)^T.$$

The projection of workload vector $W(z)$ on this unitized vector c_u is

$$\langle W(z), c_u \rangle c_u = \left(\frac{1}{\|u\|^2} \sum_{k=1}^K u_k W_k(z) \right) \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ \vdots \\ u_K \end{pmatrix} \triangleq W_{\parallel}(z).$$

where the dependency of $W_{\parallel}(z)$ on u is omitted when u is defined in the background. Then denote

$$W_{\perp}(z) \triangleq W(z) - W_{\parallel}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} W_1(z) - \frac{u_1}{\|u\|^2} \sum_{k=1}^K u_k W_k(z) \\ \vdots \\ W_K(z) - \frac{u_K}{\|u\|^2} \sum_{k=1}^K u_k W_k(z) \end{pmatrix}.$$

One can observe that when a class i job routing to server k , the incremental change on W_{\perp} is

$$\delta_{ik} = W(z) + m_{ik}e^{(k)} - [W_{\parallel}(z) + \langle m_{ik}e^{(k)}, c_u \rangle c_u] - [W(z) - W_{\parallel}(z)] = m_{ik}e^{(k)} + \langle m_{ik}e^{(k)}, c_u \rangle c_u. \quad (6.14)$$

Furthermore,

$$\delta_{ik}^T W_{\perp}(z) = m_{ik}e^{(k)} W_{\perp}(z) - \langle m_{ik}e^{(k)}, c_u \rangle c_u^T [W(z) - W_{\parallel}(z)] = m_{ik}e^{(k)} W_{\perp}(z) = m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z), \quad (6.15)$$

where $W_{\perp,k}(z)$ denote the k th element of vector $W_{\perp}(z)$. Similar observation applies for service completion on server k for a job from class i . For n th moment state-space collapse, $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we set the test function as

$$f(z) = \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1} = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K \left[W_k(z) - \frac{u_k}{\|u\|^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^K u_{\ell} W_{\ell}(z) \right]^2 \right\}^{\frac{n+1}{2}}. \quad (6.16)$$

Then we obtain the following lemma, whose detailed proof will be provided in Appendix C.1.

Lemma 6.1. *Given the test function set in (6.16), we have the following inequalities:*

$$\begin{aligned} f(z + e_{ik}) - f(z) &\leq (n+1)m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z)\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n-1} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} C_{\ell}^A \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{\ell} \\ f(z - e_{ik}) - f(z) &\leq -(n+1)m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z)\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n-1} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} C_{\ell}^S \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{\ell} \end{aligned}$$

where C_{ℓ}^A and C_{ℓ}^S denote the constants associated with arrivals(A) and service(S) for each $\ell < n+1, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$.

With Lemma 6.1, one can upper bound the generator as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Gf(z) &= \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i^{(r)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \left[f(z + e_{ik}) - f(z) \right] \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} P_{ik}(z) \left[f(z - e_{ik}) - f(z) \right] \\ &\leq (n+1) \left[\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i^{(r)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} W_{\perp,k}(z) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} P_{ik}(z) W_{\perp,k}(z) \right] \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n-1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i^{(r)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \left[\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} C_{\ell}^A \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{\ell} \right] \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \left[\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} C_{\ell}^S \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{\ell} \right] \\ &\leq (n+1) \left[\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} W_{\perp,k}(z) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) - \sum_{k=1}^K W_{\perp,k}(z) \right] \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n-1} \\ &\quad - r(n+1) \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} W_{\perp,k}(z) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} C_{\ell} \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{\ell}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.17)$$

where $C_{\ell} \triangleq C_{\ell}^A \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i^{(r)} + I \cdot K \cdot C_{\ell}^S$, and in the last inequality we apply

$$- \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} P_{ik}(z) W_{\perp,k}(z) = -W_{\perp,k}(z) + W_{\perp,k}(z) \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} z_{ik} = 0 \right) \leq -W_{\perp,k}(z).$$

Lemma 6.2. Denote $\lambda_{ik} = x_{ik}^* \mu_{ik}$, then one has

$$\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} W_{\perp, k}(z) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) - \sum_{k=1}^K W_{\perp, k}(z) \leq - \min_{i,k}^b v_i \lambda_{ik} [T_{(K)}(z) - T_{(1)}(z)]; \quad (6.18)$$

$$-r \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} W_{\perp, k}(z) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) \leq r \max_{i,k} \frac{u_k}{u_k - d_{ik}} [T_{(K)}(z) - T_{(1)}(z)]. \quad (6.19)$$

where the minimum in (6.18) is taken only among the basic activities having $\lambda_{ik} > 0$.

The proof of Lemma 6.2 will be provided in Appendix C.2.

Proof of Proposition 6.1. With Lemma 6.2, the generator can be further upper bounded:

$$\begin{aligned} Gf(z) &\leq -(n+1) \left\{ \min_{i,k}^b v_i \lambda_{ik} [T_{(K)}(z) - T_{(1)}(z)] \right\} \|W_{\perp}\|^{n-1} \\ &\quad + r(n+1) \left\{ \max_{i,k} \frac{u_k}{u_k - d_{ik}} [T_{(K)}(z) - T_{(1)}(z)] \right\} \|W_{\perp}\|^{n-1} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} C_{\ell} \|W_{\perp}\|^{\ell}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.20)$$

Note that $\|W_{\perp}\| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k (T_{(K)} - T_{(1)})^2} = (T_{(K)} - T_{(1)})$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|W_{\perp}\| &= \sqrt{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k \left(T_k - \frac{1}{\|u\|^2} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{K}} u_{\ell} W_{\ell} \right)^2} \geq \sqrt{\min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \left(T_k - \frac{1}{\|u\|^2} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{K}} u_{\ell} W_{\ell} \right)^2} \\ &\geq \sqrt{\min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k} (T_{(K)} - T_{(1)}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line is by triangle inequality, (6.20) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} Gf(z) &\leq -(n+1) \sqrt{\min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k} \cdot \left(\min_{i,k}^b v_i \lambda_{ik} \right) \cdot [T_{(K)}(z) - T_{(1)}(z)]^n \\ &\quad + r(n+1) \left(\max_{i,k} \frac{u_k}{u_k - d_{ik}} \right) [T_{(K)}(z) - T_{(1)}(z)]^n + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} C_{\ell} [T_{(K)}(z) - T_{(1)}(z)]^{\ell} \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

In the end, we will apply Lemma 5.1 and utilize the induction procedure to conclude our proof. For $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, taking expectation on both sides of (6.21), by choosing r_0 s.t. $\sqrt{\min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k} (\min_{i,k}^b v_i \lambda_{ik}) - r_0 (\max_{i,k} \frac{u_k}{u_k - d_{ik}}) = 0$, for any $r \in (0, r_0)$, one has

$$\mathbb{E} \left[T_{(K)}(Z^{(r)}) - T_{(1)}(Z^{(r)}) \right]^n \leq \frac{\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} C_{\ell} \mathbb{E} [T_{(K)}(Z^{(r)}) - T_{(1)}(Z^{(r)})]^{\ell}}{\sqrt{\min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k} (\min_{i,k}^b v_i \lambda_{ik}) - r (\max_{i,k} \frac{u_k}{u_k - d_{ik}})}.$$

Therefore, starting with $n = 1$, any moment of $T_{(K)}(Z^{(r)}) - T_{(1)}(Z^{(r)})$ can be proved by induction. \square

Eryilmaz and Srikant (2012) did not use mathematical induction on n . The authors prove an exponential version of the state space collapse. They are able to achieve this strong result in a (discrete-time) join-shortest-queue system when the stochastic primitives

are assumed to have bounded support, an assumption stronger than the usual “light tail” assumption. The proof technique in [Eryilmaz and Srikant \(2012\)](#) as well as many subsequent papers adopts the drift analysis and results developed in [Hajek \(1982\)](#); see the bounded support assumption in Lemma 1 of [Eryilmaz and Srikant \(2012\)](#). Our induction proof technique has the potential to prove moment state-space collapse for stochastic systems with only moment assumptions on stochastic primitives. See, for example, recent papers [Dai et al. \(2024\)](#) for the (continuous-time) join-shortest-queue systems and [Guang et al. \(2023\)](#) for the generalized Jackson networks.

7 Preliminary Results II

In this section and the next section, whenever state-space Collapse Proposition [6.1](#) is used, it is used for $n = 1$ and 2.

Lemma 7.1. *Under Assumptions [3.1](#) & [3.2](#), with WWTA routing policy and a scheduling policy \mathcal{P} , for each server $k \in \mathcal{K}$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) \right) \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right] = O(r^{1/2}) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) \right) \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k')} \frac{1}{\mu_{ik'}} Z_{ik'}^{(r)} - \sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'}^2 \frac{1}{u_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \frac{1}{\mu_{ik}} Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right| \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{u_{k'}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k')} \frac{1}{\mu_{ik'}} Z_{ik'}^{(r)} - \frac{1}{u_k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \frac{1}{\mu_{ik}} Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right| \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} T_k(Z^{(r)}) - \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} T_k(Z^{(r)}) \right) \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} T_k(Z^{(r)}) - \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} T_k(Z^{(r)}) \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} M_2^{1/2} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right)^{1/2} \stackrel{(d)}{=} O(r^{1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) is by Lemma [3.1](#), (b) is by Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality, (c) is by Proposition [6.1](#), and (d) is by Lemma [5.2](#). \square

Lemma 7.2 (Negligibility for non-basic activities). *Under Assumptions [3.1](#) & [3.2](#), with the WWTA and scheduling \mathcal{P} , for any non-basic activity (i, k) with $d_{ik} > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) \right) \mathbb{1} \left(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)}) \right) \right] = O(r^{1/2}), \quad (7.22)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) \right) \right] = O(r^{1/2}). \quad (7.23)$$

Besides, the scaled first moment of sum of non-basic activities is also negligible:

$$r \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] = O(r^{1/2}). \quad (7.24)$$

The proof of Lemma 7.2 is provided in Appendix D.1.

Lemma 7.3 (First moment boundedness). *There exists a constant $M > 0$,*

$$r \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] \leq M + O(r).$$

The proof of Lemma 7.3 is provided in Appendix D.2.

8 Proofs for Theorem 3.1

We first introduce Proposition 8.1, and Corollary 8.1. Then the presentation of the subsections is planned as following: we introduce two lemmas in Sections 8.1 and 8.2 which provide crucial ingredients in proving Proposition 8.1, In Section 8.3 we prove Proposition 8.1, followed by the proof of main result Theorem 3.1 in Section 8.4.

Define the exponential test function $f_\theta(z) : \mathbb{Z}_+^J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$f_\theta(z) = e^{r\theta(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i z_{ik})}, \quad \theta \leq 0. \quad (8.25)$$

Define the Laplace transform $\phi^{(r)}$ as following:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^{(r)}(\theta) &= \mathbb{E} [f_\theta(Z^{(r)})], \quad \theta \leq 0, \\ \phi_k^{(r)}(\theta) &= \mathbb{E} \left[f_\theta(Z^{(r)}) \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right], \quad k \in \mathcal{K}, \\ \phi_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) &= \mathbb{E} [P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) f_\theta(Z^{(r)})], \quad i \in \mathcal{I}, k \in \mathcal{K}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.26)$$

Proposition 8.1 (Limit distribution). *Assume Assumptions 3.1 & 3.2 hold. Under the WWTA policy and scheduling \mathcal{P} , for each $\theta \leq 0$,*

$$\lim_{r \downarrow 0} \phi^{(r)}(\theta) = \frac{1}{1 - \theta \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i^2},$$

that is, the limit is the Laplace transform of an exponential random variable with mean $m = \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i^2$. Therefore, if we denote by $\tilde{X} \sim \exp(1/m)$ an exponential random variable with mean m , the scaled sum of queue length, weighted by optimal dual solution, converges in distribution to \tilde{X} :

$$r \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{X} \sim \exp(1/m), \quad \text{as } r \downarrow 0.$$

Corollary 8.1 (Workload Version of Limit Distribution). *Under the same conditions of Proposition 8.1, the scaled sum of workload, weighted by optimal dual solution, converges in distribution to random variable \tilde{X} , i.e.*

$$r \left(\sum_{k=1}^K u_k W_k(Z^{(r)}) \right) \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{X}, \quad \text{as } r \downarrow 0$$

where $\tilde{X} \sim \exp(1/m)$.

Remark 8.1. *The equivalence between Corollary 8.1 and Proposition 8.1 is nontrivial. It is straightforward if all the activities are basic or having $d_{ik} = 0$ as in (5.8). However, if there exists non-basic activities with $d_{ik} > 0$, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \frac{u_k - d_{ik}}{\mu_{ik}} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = \sum_{k=1}^K u_k W_k(Z^{(r)}) - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \frac{d_{ik}}{\mu_{ik}} Z_{ik}^{(r)}, \quad (8.27)$$

where the additional term due to non-basic activities ($d_{ik} > 0$) needs to be handled further.

The proof of Corollary 8.1 can be found in Appendix E.1.

8.1 Ingredient I for Proposition 8.1

Lemma 8.1. *Under the condition of Proposition 8.1, $\forall \theta \leq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \phi_k^{(r)}(\theta) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \phi_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \right] + O(r^{3/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where d_{ik} comes from (5.8). Furthermore, by Lemma 5.2,

$$\sum_{k=1}^K u_k \phi_k^{(r)}(\theta) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \phi_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) = r + O(r^{3/2}).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - f_\theta(Z^{(r)})) \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right] + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) (1 - f_\theta(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} r |\theta| \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^K u_k W_k(Z^{(r)}) \right) \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right] \\ & \quad + r |\theta| \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K u_k W_k(Z^{(r)}) \right) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} O(r^{3/2}) \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the inequality $1 - e^{-x} \leq x$ for $x \geq 0$ and (8.27), (b) is by Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.2, where either $d_{ik} = 0$ or $d_{ik} > 0$ for non-basic activities. \square

8.2 Ingredient II for Proposition 8.1

Lemma 8.2. *Under the condition of Proposition 8.1, for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $\forall \theta \leq 0$,*

$$\lambda_i v_i \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \phi^{(r)}(\theta) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} u_k \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \phi_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) \quad (8.28)$$

Remark 8.2. *Equivalently, lemma 8.2 reflects the flow balance:*

$$\lambda_i \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \phi^{(r)}(\theta) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \mu_{ik} \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \phi_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) \quad (8.29)$$

The equivalence of (8.28) and (8.29) is straightforward because of (5.8) and Lemma 5.2 that

$$d_{ik} \phi_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) \leq d_{ik} \mathbb{E}[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})] = O(r) \quad (8.30)$$

Proof of Lemma 8.2. In the following proof, (i) will be the trivial case with $\theta = 0$. In case (ii) with $\theta < 0$, we will first show the following

$$\lim_{r \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\lambda_i v_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} u_k P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \right) f_\theta(Z^{(r)}) e^{r\theta \left(t \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i')} v_{i'} Z_{i'k}^{(r)} \right)} \right] = 0$$

is true for any $t > 0$, then we use Moore-Osgood Theorem (Graves (1946)) to perform the interchange of limits to prove the case holds with $t = 0$, which is (8.28) that we intend to prove.

- (i) Trivial case: $\theta = 0$. We let $f(z) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} z_{ik}$, $\forall i \in I$. With Lemma 5.1, the generator (5.6) becomes

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \mu_{ik} \mathbb{E}[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})] = \lambda_i^{(r)}.$$

Taking limit and multiply v_i on both sides, by (5.8), we have

$$\lambda_i v_i = \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} (u_k - d_{ik}) \mathbb{E}[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})] \stackrel{(a)}{=} \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} u_k \mathbb{E}[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})],$$

where (a) is by Lemma 5.2.

- (ii) When $\theta < 0$, we let the test function be $\tilde{f}_\theta(z) = e^{r\theta \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} c_i z_{ik} \right)}$, $c_i \geq 0$, then the generator (5.6) becomes

$$G\tilde{f}_\theta(z) = \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i^{(r)} (e^{c_i r \theta} - 1) \tilde{f}_\theta(z) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \frac{u_k - d_{ik}}{v_i} P_{ik}(z) (e^{-c_i r \theta} - 1) \tilde{f}_\theta(z).$$

By applying Lemma 5.1, with second order Taylor expansion and $0 \leq \tilde{f}_\theta(z) \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i c_i r \theta \tilde{\phi}^{(r)}(\theta) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \frac{u_k - d_{ik}}{v_i} (-c_i r \theta) \tilde{\phi}_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) - \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i c_i r^2 \theta^2 \tilde{\phi}^{(r)}(\theta) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i c_i^2 r^2 \theta^2 \tilde{\phi}^{(r)}(\theta) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \frac{u_k - d_{ik}}{v_i} (c_i^2 r^2 \theta^2) \tilde{\phi}_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) = O(r^3), \end{aligned} \quad (8.31)$$

where $\tilde{\phi}$, $\tilde{\phi}_{ik}$ are defined similarly as (8.26) by replacing f by \tilde{f} and we apply $\lambda_i^{(r)} = \lambda_i(1-r)$. For the moment we only focus on the first order terms w.r.t r , then (8.31) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i c_i r \theta \tilde{\phi}^{(r)}(\theta) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \frac{u_k - d_{ik}}{v_i} (-c_i r \theta) \tilde{\phi}_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) = O(r^2). \quad (8.32)$$

Now for each fixed $i' \in \mathcal{I}$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} c_{i'} &= v_{i'}(1+t), \quad t \geq 0, \\ c_i &= v_i, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, i \neq i'. \end{aligned}$$

Then (8.32) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda_{i'} v_{i'} t \tilde{\phi}^{(r)}(\theta) + \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i \tilde{\phi}^{(r)}(\theta) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i')} (u_k - d_{ik}) t \tilde{\phi}_{i'k}^{(r)}(\theta) \\ &- \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \tilde{\phi}^{(r)}(\theta) + \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \tilde{\phi}_k^{(r)}(\theta) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \tilde{\phi}_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) = O(r). \end{aligned}$$

We then further have

$$\lambda_{i'} v_{i'} t \tilde{\phi}^{(r)}(\theta) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i')} u_k t \tilde{\phi}_{i'k}^{(r)}(\theta) = O(r), \quad (8.33)$$

by applying Lemma 3.1 and the following via Lemma 5.2:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi}_k^{(r)}(\theta) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0\right) = O(r), \\ \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \tilde{\phi}_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \mathbb{E}[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})] = O(r). \end{aligned}$$

That is, to write (8.33) explicitly, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda_{i'} v_{i'} t \mathbb{E}\left[e^{r\theta(t \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i')} v_{i'} Z_{i'k}^{(r)})} f_\theta(Z^{(r)})\right] \\ &- \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i')} u_k t \mathbb{E}\left[P_{i'k}(Z^{(r)}) e^{r\theta(t \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i')} v_{i'} Z_{i'k}^{(r)})} f_\theta(Z^{(r)})\right] = O(r). \end{aligned} \quad (8.34)$$

There are two cases w.r.t $t \geq 0$ in (8.34):

- (a) If $t > 0$, divide t on both sides of (8.34), and take $r \downarrow 0$. For $\forall t > 0$, we have proved for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\lim_{r \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\lambda_i v_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} u_k P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})\right) e^{r\theta(t \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)})} f_\theta(Z^{(r)})\right] = 0. \quad (8.35)$$

- (b) When $t = 0$, we need to prove the following lemma:

Lemma 8.3. *Suppose (8.35) holds for $t > 0$. Then it also holds when $t=0$.*

We put the proof of Lemma 8.3 in Appendix E.2, where we use Moore-Osgood Theorem (Graves (1946)) to perform the interchange of limits.

□

8.3 Proof of Proposition 8.1

Proof. Let $f_\theta(z) = e^{r\theta(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i z_{ik})}$, $\theta \leq 0$. With the second order Taylor expansion with $0 \leq f(z) \leq 1$, and applying Lemma 5.1 on $f_\theta(z)$, we obtain the following BAR after dividing $r\theta$ on both sides:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \phi_k^{(r)}(\theta) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \phi_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) - \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i r \phi^{(r)}(\theta) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i^2 r \theta \phi^{(r)}(\theta) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} u_k v_i r \theta \phi_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) + O(r^2) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging in the result of Lemma 8.1, the BAR becomes

$$r + O(r^{3/2}) - \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i r \phi^{(r)}(\theta) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i^2 r \theta \phi^{(r)}(\theta) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} u_k v_i r \theta \phi_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) = 0.$$

By $\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i = 1$ in Lemma 3.1, and rearranging some terms, one has

$$r - r \phi^{(r)}(\theta) + \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i^2 r \theta \phi^{(r)}(\theta) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I v_i r \theta \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} u_k \phi_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) - \lambda_i v_i \phi^{(r)}(\theta) \right) = O(r^{3/2}).$$

Dividing r on both sides above, taking $r \downarrow 0$, and plugging in the result of Lemma 8.2 makes the last term on the LHS goes to 0. Therefore, one has

$$(1 - \theta \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i^2) \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \phi^{(r)}(\theta) = 1.$$

The proof of Proposition 8.1 is therefore complete. \square

8.4 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof. Denote

$$\tilde{X}^{(r)} \triangleq r \left(\sum_{k=1}^K u_k W_k(Z^{(r)}) \right) = r \left(\sum_{k=1}^K u_k^2 T_k(Z^{(r)}) \right),$$

then as shown by Corollary 8.1, and recall that $e = (1, \dots, 1)^T$, we have

$$\tilde{X}^{(r)} e \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{X} e, \quad \text{as } r \downarrow 0. \quad (8.36)$$

Now denote

$$Y_{k'}^{(r)} \triangleq r \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{u_k^2}{u_{k'}} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) = r \sum_{k=1}^K u_k^2 T_{k'}(Z^{(r)}), \quad k' \in \mathcal{K},$$

and $Y^{(r)} = (Y_1^{(r)}, \dots, Y_K^{(r)})^T$, then one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \tilde{X}^{(r)} e - Y^{(r)} \right\| \leq \sum_{k'=1}^K \left| \tilde{X}^{(r)} - Y_{k'}^{(r)} \right| = \sum_{k'=1}^K r \left[\sum_{k=1}^K u_k^2 |T_k(Z^{(r)}) - T_{k'}(Z^{(r)})| \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{k'=1}^K r \sum_{k=1}^K u_k^2 \left(\max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} T_k(Z^{(r)}) - \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} T_k(Z^{(r)}) \right) \leq rK \left(\max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} T_k(Z^{(r)}) - \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} T_k(Z^{(r)}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we utilize $\sum_{k=1}^K u_k^2 < 1$. By Proposition 6.1, it then follows from Markov Inequality that

$$\|\tilde{X}^{(r)}e - Y^{(r)}\| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \text{as } r \downarrow 0. \quad (8.37)$$

Combining (8.36) with (8.37), by Billingsley (1999) (Theorem 3.1), one has

$$Y^{(r)} \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{X}e, \quad \text{as } r \downarrow 0,$$

i.e.

$$r \left(\sum_{k=1}^K u_k^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{u_1} W_1(Z^{(r)}), \dots, \frac{1}{u_K} W_K(Z^{(r)}) \right)^T \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{X}e,$$

where $\tilde{X} \sim \exp(1/m) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i^2}\right)$. Then by scaling property of exponential distribution, one has

$$\lim_{r \downarrow 0} r \left(W_1(Z^{(r)}), \dots, W_K(Z^{(r)}) \right) \xrightarrow{d} (u_1, \dots, u_K) X,$$

where $X \sim \exp\left(\frac{\sum_{k=1}^K u_k^2}{\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i^2}\right)$. □

References

- ATAR, R., CASTIEL, E. and REIMAN, M. I. (2024). Parallel server systems under an extended heavy traffic condition: A lower bound. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **34** 1029 – 1071.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/23-AAP1984>
- BELL, S. L. and WILLIAMS, R. J. (2005). Dynamic scheduling of a parallel server system in heavy traffic with complete resource pooling: asymptotic optimality of a threshold policy. *Electronic Journal of Probability* **10** 1044–1115.
URL <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.ejp/1464816834>
- BILLINGSLEY, P. (1999). *Convergence of Probability Measures*. 2nd ed. Wiley, New York, NY.
- BRAMSON, M. (1998). Stability of two families of queueing networks and a discussion of fluid limits. *Queueing Systems Theory Appl.* **28** 7–31.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1019182619288>
- BRAVERMAN, A., DAI, J. and MIYAZAWA, M. (2017). Heavy traffic approximation for the stationary distribution of a generalized Jackson network: the BAR approach. *Stochastic Systems* **7** 143–196.
URL <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.ssy/1495785619>
- BRAVERMAN, A., DAI, J. and MIYAZAWA, M. (2024). The BAR approach for multiclass queueing networks with SBP service policies. *Stochastic Systems. Published online in Articles in Advance 02 May 2024* .
URL <https://doi.org/10.1287/stsy.2023.0011>
- BRAVERMAN, A., DAI, J. G. and FENG, J. (2016). Stein’s method for steady-state diffusion approximations: an introduction through the Erlang-A and Erlang-C models. *Stochastic Systems* **6** 301–366.
URL <http://www.i-journals.org/ssy/viewarticle.php?id=212&layout=abstract>

- DAI, J. and HARRISON, J. M. (2020). *Processing Networks: Fluid Models and Stability*. Cambridge University Press.
URL <https://spnbook.org>
- DAI, J. G., GUANG, J. and XU, Y. (2024). Steady-state convergence of the continuous-time JSQ system with general distributions in heavy traffic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05791* .
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.10876>
- ERYILMAZ, A. and SRIKANT, R. (2012). Asymptotically tight steady-state queue length bounds implied by drift conditions. *Queueing Systems* **72** 311–359.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11134-012-9305-y>
- GLYNN, P. W. and ZEEVI, A. (2008). Bounding stationary expectations of Markov processes. In *Markov processes and related topics: a Festschrift for Thomas G. Kurtz*, vol. 4 of *Inst. Math. Stat. Collect.* Inst. Math. Statist., Beachwood, OH, 195–214.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/074921708000000381>
- GRAVES, L. M. (1946). *The Theory of Functions of Real Variables*. McGRAW-HILL Book Company.
- GUANG, J., CHEN, X. and DAI, J. G. (2023). Uniform moment bounds for generalized Jackson networks in multi-scale heavy traffic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14647* .
URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.14647>
- HAJEK, B. (1982). Hitting-time and occupation-time bounds implied by drift analysis with applications. *Advances in Applied Probability* **14** 502–525.
URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1426671>
- HARRISON, J. M. (2000). Brownian models of open processing networks: canonical representation of workload. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **10** 75–103. Corrections: **13**, 390–393 (2003) and **16**, 1703–1732 (2006).
URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoap/1019737665>
- HARRISON, J. M. and LÓPEZ, M. J. (1999). Heavy traffic resource pooling in parallel-server systems. *Queueing Systems Theory Appl.* **33** 339–368.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1019188531950>
- HENDERSON, S. G. (1997). *Variance reduction via an approximating Markov process*. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Operations Research, Stanford University. <http://people.orie.cornell.edu/shane/pubs/thesis.pdf>.
- HURTADO-LANGE, D. and MAGULURI, S. T. (2020). Transform methods for heavy-traffic analysis. *Stochastic Systems* **10** 275–309.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1287/stsy.2019.0056>
- MAGULURI, S. T. and SRIKANT, R. (2016). Heavy traffic queue length behavior in a switch under the maxweight algorithm. *Stochastic Systems* **6** 211–250.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/15-SSY193>
- MEYN, S. P. and TWEEDIE, R. L. (1993). Stability of Markovian processes II: Continuous time processes and sample chains. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **25** 487–517.
URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1427521>
- STOLYAR, A. L. (2004). Maxweight scheduling in a generalized switch: state space collapse and workload minimization in heavy traffic. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **14** 1–53.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/aoap/1075828046>
- WANG, W., ZHU, K., YING, L., TAN, J. and ZHANG, L. (2014). Maptask scheduling in MapReduce with data locality: Throughput and heavy-traffic optimality. *IEEE/ACM*




Figure 7: (X model) Architecture 1




Figure 8: (X model) Architecture 2

Transactions on Networking **24** 190–203.

URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2014.2362745>

XIE, Q., YEKKEHKHANY, A. and LU, Y. (2016). Scheduling with multi-level data locality: throughput and heavy-traffic optimality. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2016, The 35th Annual IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications*.

URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFOCOM.2016.7524416>

A Simulation on X-model

In X model simulation, we set the same parameter as N model introduced in Figure 1, except a new activity (2, 1) is added with $\mu_4 = 1$ to make it X shape. That is

$$\lambda_1 = 1.3\rho, \quad \lambda_2 = 0.4\rho, \quad \mu_1 = \mu_3 = \mu_4 = 1, \quad \mu_2 = 0.5.$$

Recall for policies using "priority", we set shortest-mean-processing-first scheduling. In this simulation, jobs from class 2 will be processed first, if both classes have available jobs to be served immediately. JSQ with priority scheduling policy under Architecture 1 turns out to be unstable. Besides, simply implementing priority scheduling under Architecture 2 without routing policy is unstable. We also reveal that either MaxWeight scheduling policy with Architecture 1 or WWTA with priority scheduling policy with Architecture 2 is stable.




Figure 9: Stability comparison

B Proofs in Section 3 and Section 5

B.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1

Proof. Under Assumption 1, by strong duality, the dual LP also has optimal solution (v^*, u^*) , and the duality gap is zero. Therefore

$$\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i^* = \rho^* = 1.$$

For the second constrain in dual LP, complementary slackness gives

$$\sum_{k=1}^K u_k^* = 1.$$

Furthermore, complementary slackness also gives

$$(Ax^*)_k = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad u_k^* = 0, \quad k \in \mathcal{K},$$

$$x_j^* = 0 (x_{ik}^* = 0) \quad \text{or} \quad (vR)_j = (uA)_j, \quad j \in \mathcal{J},$$

where $(vR)_j = \mu_{ik} v_i^*$, $(uA)_j = u_k^*$. □

B.2 Proof of Lemma 3.2

Proof. Starting with any one of the servers, k , denote $u_k^* = a \geq 0$, and Assumption 3.2 guarantees that we can find at least one communicating server for it. Here suppose server k has two communicating servers k_1, k_2 , as illustration, that communicate directly with server k through some classes i_1, i_2 via basic activities:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{server } k & \xrightarrow{\text{class } i_1} & \text{server } k_1 \\ & \downarrow \text{class } i_2 & \\ & \text{server } k_2 & \end{array}$$

In other words, server k communicates with k_1 via basic activities (i_1, k) and (i_1, k_1) , k communicates with k_2 via basic activities (i_2, k) , (i_2, k_2) .

By Lemma 3.1(iii), each basic activity $x_{ik}^* > 0$ in the optimal solution x^* implies an equation $\mu_{ik}v_i^* = u_k^*$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_{i_1}^* &= \frac{u_k^*}{\mu_{i_1k}} = \frac{a}{\mu_{i_1k}}, & v_{i_2}^* &= \frac{u_k^*}{\mu_{i_2k}} = \frac{a}{\mu_{i_2k}}; \\ u_{k_1}^* &= v_{i_1}^* \mu_{i_1k_1} = a \frac{\mu_{i_1k_1}}{\mu_{i_1k}}, & u_{k_2}^* &= v_{i_2}^* \mu_{i_2k_2} = a \frac{\mu_{i_2k_2}}{\mu_{i_2k}}. \end{aligned}$$

That means $u_{k_1}^*, u_{k_2}^*$ for server k_1 and k_2 can be expressed as $u_k^* = a$ multiplied by the ratio of some mean service rates.

Similarly, starting with server k_1 and k_2 , we can also find other communicating servers, respectively, via the basic activities to obtain $u_{k_3}^*, u_{k_4}^* \dots$, and derive them as $u_k^* = a$ multiplied by ratios of some mean service rates. Continuingly, by Assumption 3.2, we will go over all the servers and obtain such expression for each server. As the last step, we can solve $u_k^* = a$ uniquely by Lemma 3.1: $\sum_{k=1}^K u_k^* = 1$. Then tracing back each element in (v, u) can also be solved explicitly.

In the discussion above, we pick one possible i_k in each step to obtain the solution (v^*, u^*) . Each choice of i_k might not be unique due to the multiple choices of basic activities for communication. Therefore, it is likely that there are some unused equations due to unused basic activities. While since Lemma 3.1 already guarantees the existence of optimal dual solution, this (v^*, u^*) should satisfy the unused equations, otherwise it is not an optimal solution. Therefore, the optimal dual solution is unique.

For proving Lemma 3.2(ii), it is obvious that $a > 0$, then from the equations utilized above, $u_k^* > 0, v_i^* > 0, \forall k \in K, \forall i \in I$. \square

B.3 Proof of Lemma 5.1

Proof. Assume $f(z) : \mathbb{Z}_+^J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $|f(z)| \leq C \sum_{k=1}^K W_k^n(z)$ for some $C > 0$. As discussed in Lemma 1 of Braverman et al. (2016), a sufficient condition to ensure

$$\mathbb{E} \left[Gf \left(Z^{(r)} \right) \right] = 0$$

is given by [Glynn and Zeevi \(2008\)](#); [Henderson \(1997\)](#), which requires

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| G(Z^{(r)}, Z^{(r)}) f(Z^{(r)}) \right| \right] < \infty,$$

where $G(z, z)$ is the diagonal element of the generator matrix G corresponding to state z . First, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| G(Z^{(r)}, Z^{(r)}) \right| \\ &= \left| - \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i^{(r)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by assumption, it is sufficient to show that $\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \left[W_k^n(Z^{(r)}) \right] \leq \infty$. Now denote

$$V(z) = \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{u_k^{n-1}} W_k^{n+1}(z).$$

Consider a binomial expansion. $\forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} (a+b)^{n+1} &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{\ell} b^\ell \cdot a^{n+1-\ell} \\ &= a^{n+1} + (n+1)b \cdot a^n + \sum_{\ell=2}^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{\ell} b^\ell \cdot a^{n+1-\ell}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.38}$$

Then by binomial expansion, the generator becomes

$$\begin{aligned} GV(z) &= \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i^{(r)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{1}{u_k^{n-1}} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{\ell} m_{ik}^\ell W_k^{n+1-\ell}(z) \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \frac{\mu_{ik} P_{ik}(z)}{u_k^{n-1}} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{\ell} (-m_{ik})^\ell W_k^{n+1-\ell}(z) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i^{(r)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{m_{ik}}{u_k^{n-1}} W_k^n(z) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{u_k^{n-1}} W_k^n(z) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} P_{ik}(z) + o(W_k^n(z)) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i^{(r)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{1}{v_i^{n-1}} (m_{ik} W_k(z))^n \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) - \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{u_k^{n-1}} W_k^n(z) + o(W_k^n(z)) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^I \frac{\lambda_i^{(r)}}{v_i^{n-1}} \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} (m_{ik} W_k(z))^n - \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{u_k^{n-1}} W_k^n(z) + o(W_k^n(z)), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) is by (5.8), (b) is by the definition of WWTA policy. According to [Dai and Harrison \(2020\)](#) (Lemma 11.2), there exist a set of $\lambda_{ik}^{(r)}$ such that parallel server system under WWTA policy satisfies $\lambda_i^{(r)} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \lambda_{ik}^{(r)}$ and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \lambda_{ik}^{(r)} m_{ik} < 1$. Then the generator

becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
GV(z) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^I \frac{1}{u_i^{n-1}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \lambda_{ik}^{(r)} \left(\frac{1}{\mu_{ik}} W_k(z) \right)^n - \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{u_k^{n-1}} W_k^n(z) + o\left(W_k^n(z)\right) \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{\lambda_{ik}^{(r)}}{\mu_{ik}} \frac{1}{u_k^{n-1}} W_k^n(z) + \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{\lambda_{ik}^{(r)}}{\mu_{ik}} \frac{1}{(u_k - d_{ik})^{n-1}} W_k^n(z) \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{u_k^{n-1}} W_k^n(z) + o\left(W_k^n(z)\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{\lambda_{ik}^{(r)}}{\mu_{ik}} \frac{1}{u_k^{n-1}} W_k^n(z) - \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{u_k^{n-1}} W_k^n(z) + o\left(W_k^n(z)\right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{\lambda_{ik}^{(r)}}{\mu_{ik}} \frac{1}{(u_k - d_{ik})^{n-1}} W_k^n(z) - \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{\lambda_{ik}^{(r)}}{\mu_{ik}} \frac{1}{u_k^{n-1}} W_k^n(z) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{u_k^{n-1}} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \frac{\lambda_{ik}^{(r)}}{\mu_{ik}} - 1 \right) W_k^n(z) + o\left(W_k^n(z)\right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{\lambda_{ik}^{(r)}}{\mu_{ik}} \left(\frac{d_{ik}}{u_k(u_k - d_{ik})} \right)^{n-1} W_k^n(z),
\end{aligned}$$

where (c) is by considering basic and non-basic activities separately using (5.8) again. Now we discuss the last term above from non-basic activities. We will further show that there exist a set of $\lambda_{ik}^{(r)}$, s.t. $\lambda_{ik}^{(r)} = 0$ if activity (i, k) is non-basic activity. By our Assumption 3.1, under the heavy traffic (equivalently, the model is critical as defined in Dai and Harrison (2020)), non-basic activity satisfies $x_{ik}^* = 0$ under any (if not unique) optimal solution of static allocation problem 3.1. This means the parallel server system can achieve the heavy traffic without working through any non-basic activities. Denote $\lambda_{ik} \triangleq x_{ik}^* \mu_{ik}$, then in Dai and Harrison (2020) (Lemma 11.2), λ_{ik} satisfies $\lambda_i = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \lambda_{ik}$ and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \lambda_{ik} m_{ik} = 1$. Suppose $x^{(r)}$ satisfying the constraints in the static allocation problem (3.1) with λ_i replaced by $\lambda_i^{(r)} = \lambda_i(1-r)$, and $\lambda_{ik}^{(r)} = \lambda_{ik}(1-r)$. Then $\lambda_{ik}^{(r)}$ satisfies all the subcritical condition in Dai and Harrison (2020) (Lemma 11.2), and $\lambda_{ik}^{(r)} = 0$ for any non-basic activity. Furthermore, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \lambda_{ik}^{(r)} m_{ik} = (1-r) < 1$. Therefore, we use this constructed set of $\lambda_{ik}^{(r)}$, and the generator becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
GV(z) &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{u_k^{n-1}} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \frac{\lambda_{ik}^{(r)}}{\mu_{ik}} - 1 \right) W_k^n(z) + o\left(W_k^n(z)\right) \\
&\leq -\frac{r}{\bar{u}^{n-1}} \sum_{k=1}^K W_k^n(z) + o\left(W_k^n(z)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{u} = \max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k > 0$. Then there exists some constant $c > 0$, such that for $\sum_{k=1}^K W_k^n(z) \geq c_w, k \in \mathcal{K}$,

$$-\frac{r}{\bar{u}^{n-1}} \sum_{k=1}^K W_k^n(z) + o\left(W_k^n(z)\right) \leq -cr \sum_{i=1}^I W_k^n(z).$$

Then $\exists d > 0$,

$$GV(z) \leq -cr \sum_{k=1}^K W_k^n(z) + d \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K W_k^n(z) < c_w \right),$$

invoking [Meyn and Tweedie (1993), Theorem 4.3], we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \left[W_k^n \left(Z^{(r)} \right) \right] < \infty.$$

□

C Proofs in Section 6

C.1 Proof of Lemma 6.1

Before proving Lemma 6.1m we first present the following lemma.

Lemma C.1. *For any $p, x \in \mathbb{R}$, if $p > 0, x \geq -1$, then the following inequality holds:*

$$\frac{x}{(1+x)^p + 1} \leq \frac{x}{2}.$$

Proof of Lemma C.1. If $x = 0$, the equality holds; if $x > 0$, then $(1+x)^p + 1 > 2$; if $-1 \leq x < 0$, $(1+x)^p + 1 < 2$; the inequality therefore holds for any $x \geq -1$. □

Proof. With the test function (6.16) and incremental change (6.14), one has

$$\begin{aligned} f(z + e_{ik}) - f(z) &= \|W_{\perp}(z) + \delta_{ik}\|^{n+1} - \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1} \\ &= \frac{\|W_{\perp}(z) + \delta_{ik}\|^{2(n+1)} - \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{2(n+1)}}{\|W_{\perp}(z) + \delta_{ik}\|^{n+1} + \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.39})$$

In the numerator, with (6.15) and binomial expansion (B.38), one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|W_{\perp}(z) + \delta_{ik}\|^{2(n+1)} &= \left[\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^2 + 2\delta'_{ik}W_{\perp}(z) + \|\delta_{ik}\|^2 \right]^{n+1} = \left[\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^2 + 2m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z) + \|\delta_{ik}\|^2 \right]^{n+1} \\ &= \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{2(n+1)} + (n+1) \left[2m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z) + \|\delta_{ik}\|^2 \right] \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{2n} + A_1, \end{aligned}$$

where $A_1 \triangleq \sum_{\ell=2}^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{\ell} [2m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z) + \|\delta_{ik}\|^2]^{\ell} \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{2(n+1-\ell)}$. Plugging this back into (C.39), one has

$$\begin{aligned} f(z + e_{ik}) - f(z) &= \frac{(n+1) [2m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z) + \|\delta_{ik}\|^2] \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{2n}}{\|W_{\perp}(z) + \delta_{ik}\|^{n+1} + \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1}} + \frac{A_1}{\|W_{\perp}(z) + \delta_{ik}\|^{n+1} + \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1}} \\ &= \frac{(n+1) [2m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z) + \|\delta_{ik}\|^2] \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n-1}}{\left[1 + \frac{2m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z) + \|\delta_{ik}\|^2}{\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^2} \right]^{\frac{n+1}{2}} + 1} + \frac{A_1}{\|W_{\perp}(z) + \delta_{ik}\|^{n+1} + \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1}} \\ &= \frac{(n+1) \frac{[2m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z) + \|\delta_{ik}\|^2]}{\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^2} \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1}}{\left[1 + \frac{2m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z) + \|\delta_{ik}\|^2}{\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^2} \right]^{\frac{n+1}{2}} + 1} + \frac{A_1}{\|W_{\perp}(z) + \delta_{ik}\|^{n+1} + \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1}} \\ &\leq (n+1) \frac{[2m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z) + \|\delta_{ik}\|^2]}{2\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^2} \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1} + \frac{A_1}{\|W_{\perp}(z) + \delta_{ik}\|^{n+1} + \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.40})$$

where in the second equality, we divide both the numerator and denominator by $\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1}$; in the last inequality, we apply Lemma C.1. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{A_1}{\|W_{\perp}(z) + \delta_{ik}\|^{n+1} + \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1}} &\leq \frac{\sum_{\ell=2}^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{\ell} [2m_{ik}|W_{\perp,k}(z)| + \|\delta_{ik}\|^2]^{\ell} \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{2(n+1-\ell)}}{\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1}} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=2}^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{\ell} [2m_{ik}\|W_{\perp}(z)\| + \|\delta_{ik}\|^2]^{\ell} \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1-2\ell} \triangleq \sum_{\ell=-(n+1)}^{n-1} c'_{\ell} \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{\ell} \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} c'_{\ell} \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{\ell}, \end{aligned}$$

where the triangle inequality means we rearrange the polynomials w.r.t the power of $\|W_{\perp}(z)\|$ and denotes the corresponding constants as $c'_{\ell} > 0$; in the last inequality we slightly assume $\|W_{\perp}(z)\| \geq 1$, since the overall proof of state-space collapse given by $\|W_{\perp}(z)\| < 1$ is trivial. Therefore, (C.40) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} f(z + e_{ik}) - f(z) &\leq (n+1) \frac{[2m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z) + \|\delta_{ik}\|^2]}{2\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^2} \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n+1} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} c'_{\ell} \|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{\ell} \\ &= (n+1)m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z)\|W_{\perp}\|^{n-1} + (n+1)\frac{\|\delta_{ik}\|^2}{2}\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n-1} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} c'_{\ell}\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{\ell} \\ &\triangleq (n+1)m_{ik}W_{\perp,k}(z)\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{n-1} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} c_{\ell}^A\|W_{\perp}(z)\|^{\ell}, \end{aligned} \tag{C.41}$$

where in the last equality, we only keep the first term, and all the other terms are treated as the polynomials w.r.t the power of $\|W_{\perp}(z)\|$ and denotes the corresponding constants as $c_{\ell}^A > 0$ for each ℓ . Therefore, the first inequality in this Lemma has been proved. The second inequality regarding $f(z - e_{ik}) - f(z)$ can be proved similarly. \square

C.2 Proof of Lemma 6.2

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} W_{\perp,k}(z) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) - \sum_{k=1}^K W_{\perp,k}(z) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} \left(W_k(z) - \frac{u_k}{\|u\|^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^K u_{\ell} W_{\ell}(z) \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) - \sum_{k=1}^K \left(W_k(z) - \frac{u_k}{\|u\|^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^K u_{\ell} W_{\ell}(z) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} W_k(z) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) - \sum_{k=1}^K W_k(z) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\|u\|^2} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^K u_{\ell} W_{\ell}(z) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{u_k}{\mu_{ik}} \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) - \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} W_k(z) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) - \sum_{k=1}^K W_k, \end{aligned} \tag{C.42}$$

where in the last inequality, we utilize Lemma 3.1, (5.8) to obtain $\sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) = \sum_{k=1}^K u_k = 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{u_k}{\mu_{ik}} \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) - \sum_{k=1}^K u_k = \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \left(v_i + \frac{d_{ik}}{\mu_{ik}} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) - \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{d_{ik}}{\mu_{ik}} \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by the definition of the WWTA policy,

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} W_k(z) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) = \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} W_k(z),$$

then by adding and subtracting a term, and replacing $\lambda_i = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \lambda_{ik}$, the last line in (C.42) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^I \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \lambda_{ik} \right) \min_{k' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik'} W_{k'}(z) - \sum_{k=1}^K W_k(z) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \lambda_{ik} \min_{k' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik'} W_{k'}(z) - \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \lambda_{ik} m_{ik} W_k(z) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \lambda_{ik} m_{ik} W_k(z) - \sum_{k=1}^K W_k(z) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \lambda_{ik} \min_{k' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik'} W_{k'}(z) - \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \lambda_{ik} m_{ik} W_k(z), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we apply $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \lambda_{ik} m_{ik} = 1$ for each $k \in \mathcal{K}$. Since $\lambda_{ik} = 0$ for non-basic activities, then one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \lambda_{ik} \left(\min_{k' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik'} W_{k'}(z) - m_{ik} W_k(z) \right) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^b \lambda_{ik} v_i \left(\min_{k' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{1}{\mu_{ik'} v_i} W_{k'}(z) - \frac{1}{\mu_{ik} v_i} W_k(z) \right) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^b \lambda_{ik} v_i \left(\min_{k' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{1}{u_{k'} - d_{ik'}} W_{k'}(z) - \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(z) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $d_{ik'}$ denotes the activity (i, k') , $k' \in \mathcal{K}(i)$, which achieves the minimum value, could be either basic ($d_{ik'} = 0$) or non-basic ($d_{ik'} \neq 0$), since WWTA policy does not restrict the routing decision based on the information of basic or non-basic activities. If we take the minimum value only among the basic activities, one has

$$\min_{k' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{1}{u_{k'} - d_{ik'}} W_{k'}(z) \leq \min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^b \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z).$$

Then by substracting and adding the minimum over the set of basic activities, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^b \lambda_{ik} v_i \left(\min_{k' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{1}{u_{k'} - d_{ik'}} W_{k'}(z) - \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(z) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^b \lambda_{ik} v_i \left(\min_{k' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{1}{u_{k'} - d_{ik'}} W_{k'}(z) - \min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) + \min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) - \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(z) \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^b \lambda_{ik} v_i \left(\min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) - \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(z) \right) \\
&\leq - \min_{i,k}^b (\lambda_{ik} v_i) \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^b \left| \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(z) - \min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) \right|,
\end{aligned} \tag{C.43}$$

where the last inequality is by observing for any $k \in \mathcal{K}(i)$ such that (i, k) is basic activity,

$$\min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) - \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(z) \leq 0.$$

Now we consider $T_{(1)}(z)$, $T_{(K)}(z)$. By Assumption 3.2, one can always find a way for server (1) and (K) to communicate, by probably several direct communicating servers. Therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume server (1) and (K) communicates by following link by a set of basic activities:

$$(1) \xrightarrow{i_1} k_1 \xrightarrow{i_2} k_2 \xrightarrow{i_3} k_3 \xrightarrow{i_4} (K),$$

In the last line of (C.43), we then only pick up this set of basic activities and upper bound all the other basic activities by zero:

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^b \left| \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(z) - \min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) \right| \\
&\leq - \left| T_{(1)}(z) - \min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i_1)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) \right| - \left| \frac{1}{u_{k_1}} W_{k_1}(z) - \min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i_1)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) \right| \\
&\quad - \left| \frac{1}{u_{k_1}} W_{k_1}(z) - \min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i_2)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) \right| - \left| \frac{1}{u_{k_2}} W_{k_2}(z) - \min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i_2)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) \right| \\
&\quad - \left| \frac{1}{u_{k_2}} W_{k_2}(z) - \min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i_3)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) \right| - \left| \frac{1}{u_{k_3}} W_{k_3}(z) - \min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i_3)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) \right| \\
&\quad - \left| \frac{1}{u_{k_3}} W_{k_3}(z) - \min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i_4)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) \right| - \left| T_{(K)}(z) - \min_{k'' \in \mathcal{K}(i_4)} \frac{1}{u_{k''}} W_{k''}(z) \right| \\
&\leq - \left| \frac{1}{u_{k_1}} W_{k_1}(z) - T_{(1)}(z) \right| - \left| \frac{1}{u_{k_1}} W_{k_1}(z) - \frac{1}{u_{k_2}} W_{k_2}(z) \right| \\
&\quad - \left| \frac{1}{u_{k_2}} W_{k_2}(z) - \frac{1}{u_{k_3}} W_{k_3}(z) \right| - \left| \frac{1}{u_{k_3}} W_{k_3}(z) - T_{(K)}(z) \right| \\
&\leq - (T_{(K)}(z) - T_{(1)}(z)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we apply the triangle inequality repeatedly in the last two inequalities. Therefore, we have proved (6.18). For (6.19), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& -r \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} m_{ik} W_{\perp,k}(z) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) \\
& = r \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{u_k}{u_k - d_{ik}} \left[\frac{1}{\|u\|^2} \sum_{\ell=1}^K u_\ell W_\ell(z) - \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(z) \right] \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) \\
& \leq r \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{u_k}{u_k - d_{ik}} [T_{(K)}(z) - T_{(1)}(z)] \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) \\
& \leq r \max_{i,k} \frac{u_k}{u_k - d_{ik}} \sum_{i=1}^I \lambda_i v_i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} [T_{(K)}(z) - T_{(1)}(z)] \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) \\
& = r \max_{i,k} \frac{u_k}{u_k - d_{ik}} [T_{(K)}(z) - T_{(1)}(z)].
\end{aligned}$$

□

D Proofs in Section 7

D.1 Proof of Lemma 7.2

Proof. 1. In (7.22), for non-basic activity (i, k) , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[d_{ik} \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(Z^{(r)}) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \quad (\text{D.44})$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{<} \mathbb{E} \left[d_{ik} \frac{1}{u_k - d_{ik}} W_k(Z^{(r)}) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \quad (\text{D.45})$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[d_{ik} \frac{1}{u_{k'}} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right], \quad (\text{D.46})$$

where (a) is due to $0 < d_{ik} < u_k$. For (b), when (i, k) is non-basic activity, there must exist a basic activity (i, k') according to complete resource pooling assumption. When $k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})$, following the definition of the WWTA policy, $\frac{1}{\mu_{ik}} W_k(Z^{(r)}) \leq \frac{1}{\mu_{ik'}} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)})$. If we divide both sides by v_i , it becomes

$$\frac{1}{u_k - d_{ik}} W_k(Z^{(r)}) \leq \frac{1}{u_{k'} - d_{ik'}} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) \leq \frac{1}{u_{k'}} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}).$$

Therefore, (D.45) – (D.44) \leq (D.46) – (D.44) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& 0 < \mathbb{E} \left[d_{ik} \frac{d_{ik}}{(u_k - d_{ik})u_k} W_k(Z^{(r)}) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[d_{ik} \left(\frac{1}{u_{k'}} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) - \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(Z^{(r)}) \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[d_{ik} \left[\max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(Z^{(r)}) - \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(Z^{(r)}) \right] \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\
& \stackrel{(c)}{=} d_{ik} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} T_k(Z^{(r)}) - \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} T_k(Z^{(r)}) \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{P}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)}))^{1/2} \\
& \stackrel{(d)}{=} O(r^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

where (c) is by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (d) uses Proposition 6.1 and (5.12). Therefore, we have proved for non-basic activity (i, k) with $d_{ik} > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[W_k(Z^{(r)}) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] = O(r^{1/2}). \quad (\text{D.47})$$

Furthermore, for non-basic activity (i, k) ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'}^2 \left(\frac{1}{u_{k'}} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) - \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(Z^{(r)}) \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\ & \quad + \sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'}^2 \frac{1}{u_k} \mathbb{E} \left[W_k(Z^{(r)}) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(e)}{\leq} \sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(Z^{(r)}) - \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(Z^{(r)}) \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] + O(r^{1/2}) \\ & \stackrel{(f)}{\leq} \sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(Z^{(r)}) - \min_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \frac{1}{u_k} W_k(Z^{(r)}) \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{P}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)}))^{1/2} + O(r^{1/2}) \\ & \stackrel{(g)}{=} O(r^{1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where (e) uses (D.47), (f) is by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (g) uses Proposition 6.1 and (5.12). The proof of (7.22) is complete.

2. (7.23) and (7.24) will be proved together:

Let $f(z) = (\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i z_{ik})^2$, then the generator (5.6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} Gf(z) &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i z_{ik} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) + \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i^2 \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) \\ & \quad - 2 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} v_i P_{ik}(z) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i z_{ik} \right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} v_i^2 P_{ik}(z). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 5.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i^2 \mathbb{P}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} v_i^2 \mathbb{E} [P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.48})$$

Let $f(z) = (\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^b v_i z_{ik})^2$, i.e., we consider only the basic activities. Then the generator (5.6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} Gf(z) &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^b \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^b v_i z_{ik} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) + \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^b \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i^2 \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) \\ & \quad - 2 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^b \mu_{ik} v_i P_{ik}(z) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^b z_{ik} \right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^b \mu_{ik} v_i^2 P_{ik}(z). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^b \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^b v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^b \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^b v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^b \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i^2 \mathbb{P}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^b \mu_{ik} v_i^2 \mathbb{E} [P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})].
\end{aligned} \tag{D.49}$$

Then let (D.48) – (D.49), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] \\
&+ \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^b \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^b \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i^2 \mathbb{P}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i^2 \mathbb{E} [P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^b \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] + O(r),
\end{aligned} \tag{D.50}$$

where the last equality is by Lemma 5.2.

Let $f(z) = (\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i z_{ik})^2$, then the generator (5.6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
Gf(z) &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i z_{ik} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) + \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i^2 \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(z)) \\
&- 2 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i P_{ik}(z) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i z_{ik} \right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i^2 P_{ik}(z).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.1, and Lemma 5.2 with (5.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] \\
& - \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i v_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i^2 \mathbb{P}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i^2 \mathbb{E} [P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})] \\
& = O(r).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.51}$$

Now, adding (D.50) to (D.51), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] + O(r),
\end{aligned}$$

then by rearranging some terms,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\
& - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] + O(r) \\
& = r \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] \\
& - \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that terms with d_{ik} exist only when (i, k) is non-basic activity, and with (8.27),

we can rewrite the equation above as

$$\begin{aligned}
& r\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)}\right)\right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)}\right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)}))\right] \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E}\left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K u_k W_k(Z^{(r)})\right)\right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E}\left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} \frac{d_{ik}}{\mu_{ik}} Z_{ik}^{(r)}\right)\right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} d_{ik} \mathbb{E}\left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)}\right)\right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)}\right) \mathbb{1}\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0\right)\right] + O(r).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.52}$$

Now we discuss each term on the RHS of (D.52). The first term by (8.27) and (7.22) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)}\right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)}))\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)})\right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)}))\right] \\
&= O(r^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For the third term, we take $C_1 > 0$ s.t. $\frac{d_{ik}}{\mu_{ik}} \leq C_1, \forall v_i, i \in \mathcal{I}, k \in \mathcal{K}$. By (D.51) and (8.27),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E}\left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} \frac{d_{ik}}{\mu_{ik}} Z_{ik}^{(r)}\right)\right] \\
&\leq C_1 \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E}\left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)}\right)\right] \\
&\stackrel{(D.51)}{=} C_1 \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i v_i \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)}\right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)}))\right] + O(r) \\
&\stackrel{(8.27)}{\leq} C_1 \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i v_i \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)})\right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)}))\right] + O(r) \\
&= O(r^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For the fourth term, we take $C_2 > 0$ s.t. $d_{ik} \leq C_2 \mu_{ik} v_i, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, k \in \mathcal{K}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} d_{ik} \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] \\
& \leq C_2 \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] \\
& \stackrel{(D.51)}{=} C_2 \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i v_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] + O(r) \\
& \stackrel{(8.27)}{\leq} C_2 \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)}^{nb} \lambda_i v_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] + O(r) \\
& = O(r^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For the fifth term, by Lemma 7.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right] \\
& \leq \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) \right) \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right] \\
& = O(r^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then by moving the second term to the left, (D.52) becomes

$$r \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)}^{nb} \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) \right) \right] \leq O(r^{1/2}). \tag{D.53}$$

from which we prove the (7.23), that is, for each non-basic activity (i, k) ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{k'=1}^K u_{k'} W_{k'}(Z^{(r)}) \right) \right] = O(r^{1/2}),$$

and (7.24):

$$r \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)}^{nb} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] = O(r^{1/2}).$$

□

D.2 Proof of Lemma 7.3

Proof. By rearranging (D.48), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i^2 \mathbb{P}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} v_i^2 \mathbb{E}[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) \right] \\
&= r \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By rearrange terms above, we further have

$$\begin{aligned}
& r \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \right] + \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right) \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} \lambda_i^{(r)} v_i^2 \mathbb{P}(k = L^{(i)}(Z^{(r)})) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} v_i^2 \mathbb{E}[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)})]. \\
&\stackrel{(8.27)}{\leq} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} d_{ik} \mathbb{E} \left[P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \left(\sum_{k=1}^K u_k W_k(Z^{(r)}) \right) \right] + \sum_{k=1}^K u_k \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^K u_k W_k(Z^{(r)}) \right) \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} Z_{ik}^{(r)} = 0 \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} \lambda_i v_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} v_i^2. \\
&\stackrel{(7.23)}{=} O(r) + M,
\end{aligned}$$

where $M \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} \lambda_i v_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(k)} \mu_{ik} v_i^2$ does not depend on r . □

E Proofs in Section 8

E.1 Proof of Corollary 8.1

Proof. Denote

$$\tilde{X}^{(r)} \triangleq r \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in K(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right).$$

Them by Proposition 8.1,

$$\tilde{X}^{(r)} \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{X}, \quad \text{as } r \downarrow 0 \quad (\text{E.54})$$

Denote

$$U^{(r)} \triangleq r \left(\sum_{k=1}^K u_k W_k(Z^{(r)}) \right),$$

then by Lemma 7.2 and (8.27), the difference

$$E[U^{(r)} - \tilde{X}^{(r)}] = r \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \frac{d_{ik}}{\mu_{ik}} Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right] \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } r \downarrow 0,$$

i.e.

$$r |U^{(r)} - \tilde{X}^{(r)}| \xrightarrow{L^1} 0, \quad \text{as } r \downarrow 0,$$

which means

$$r |U^{(r)} - \tilde{X}^{(r)}| \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad \text{as } r \downarrow 0. \quad (\text{E.55})$$

Combining (E.54) with (E.55), we have

$$U^{(r)} \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{X}, \quad \text{as } r \downarrow 0.$$

□

E.2 Proof Lemma 8.3

Proof. For each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \left(\lambda_i v_i \phi^{(r)}(\theta) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} u_k \phi_{ik}^{(r)}(\theta) \right) \\ &= \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \left(\lambda_i v_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} u_k P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \right) e^{r\theta(t \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)})} f_\theta(Z^{(r)}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\lambda_i v_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} u_k P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \right) e^{r\theta(t \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)})} f_\theta(Z^{(r)}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\lambda_i v_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} u_k P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \right) e^{r\theta(t \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)})} f_\theta(Z^{(r)}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{=} \lim_{t \downarrow 0} 0 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.56})$$

where (i) is by bounded convergence theorem with Lemma 3.1 and (iii) is directly by (8.35) in case (a). For the proof of (ii), we first introduce Moore-Osgood Theorem in (Graves, 1946, p. 100, Theorem 2):

Theorem E.1 (Moore-Osgood). *If $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x, y)$ exists point-wise for each y different from q and if $\lim_{y \rightarrow q} f(x, y)$ converges uniformly for $x \neq p$ then the double limit and the iterated limits exist and are equal, i.e.*

$$\lim_{(x,y) \rightarrow (p,q)} f(x, y) = \lim_{x \rightarrow p} \lim_{y \rightarrow q} f(x, y) = \lim_{y \rightarrow q} \lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x, y).$$

Now we discuss the interchange of limits w.r.t r and t on the function $g_i(r, t)$, for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$:

$$g_i(r, t) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\lambda_i v_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} u_k P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \right) e^{r\theta \left(t \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right)} f_\theta(Z^{(r)}) \right].$$

First, by (8.35), $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} g_i(r, t)$ exists point-wise for $t \neq 0$. Next we present the following Lemma E.1 to check the second condition of Moore-Osgood Theorem, and the proof is put in the Appendix E.3.

Lemma E.1. $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g_i(r, t)$ converges uniformly for $r \neq 0$, for $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

Then the conditions for Moore-Osgood Theorem E.1 are satisfied, therefore the limits can be interchanged, completing the proof of (ii). □

E.3 Proof of lemma E.1

Proof. This is to prove $\forall \xi > 0, \exists \delta_i > 0$, when $|t - 0| < \delta_i, \forall r \neq 0$ being sufficiently small, $|g_i(r, t) - g_i(r, 0)| < \xi$. For $i \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |g_i(r, t) - g_i(r, 0)| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\lambda_i v_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} u_k P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \right) e^{r\theta \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right)} \left(e^{r\theta v_i t Z_{ik}^{(r)}} - 1 \right) \right] \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \left(\lambda_i v_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} u_k P_{ik}(Z^{(r)}) \right) \right| \left| e^{r\theta \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right)} \right| \left| \left(e^{r\theta t \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)}} - 1 \right) \right| \right] \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left| \left(e^{r\theta t \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i Z_{ik}^{(r)}} - 1 \right) \right| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2|\theta| t r \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} v_i \mathbb{E} \left[Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2|\theta| v_i t M_0, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the inequality $1 - e^{-x} \leq x$ for $x \geq 0$; (b) is by Lemma 7.3 that $\exists M_0 > 0, r \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}(i)} \mathbb{E} \left[Z_{ik}^{(r)} \right] \leq M_0$. Hence, we let $\delta_i = \frac{\xi}{3v_i M_0 |\theta|}$. When $|t| < \delta_i$,

$$|g_i(r, t) - g_i(r, 0)| \leq 2v_i M_0 |\theta| \frac{\xi}{3v_i M_0 |\theta|} < \xi.$$

Therefore, $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} g_i(r, t)$ converges uniformly for $r > 0, i \in \mathcal{I}$. □