

(2)

NW

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL Monterey, California

AD A032370



DDC
RECEIVED
NOV 23 1976
B

THESIS

A PRACTICAL COMPUTATION METHOD FOR
 STEADY STATE SOLUTION OF $M/E_k/c$ QUEUE

by

Mehmet Celayir

September 1976

Thesis Advisor: R. R. Read

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
	sub/k	9
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED	
A Practical Computation Method for Steady State Solution of M/E _k /c Queue.	Master's Thesis September 1976	
7. AUTHOR(s)	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
Mehmet Celayir		
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS	
Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE	
Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	September 1976	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	13. NUMBER OF PAGES	
Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	56	
	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)	
	Unclassified	
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)		
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
<p>Numerical tables available for M/E_k/c queueing systems are discussed. A new approximation method for steady-state information and waiting time distribution of this queueing system was developed. Validity of approximation was established directly for the large waiting times and by simulation for the smaller values. The developed method enables one to find delay probability, expected number in the queue and in the system,</p>		

251450 1

JB

expected time to be spent in the queue and in the system, and probability of waiting for more than a specified time t.

ACCESSION for	
NTIS	White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC	Buff Section <input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED	<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION	
BY	
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES	
Dist.	AVAIL. and/or SPECIAL
A	

DD Form 1473
1 Jan 73
S/N 0102-014-6601

A Practical Computation Method for
Steady State Solution of $M/E_k/c$ Queue

by

Mehmet Celayir
Lieutenant, Turkish Navy
Turkish Naval Academy, 1970

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN OPERATIONS RESEARCH

from the
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
September 1976

Author

Mehmet Celayir

Approved by:

R. R. Ford Thesis Advisor

Kurt T. Marshall Second Reader

Michael J. Freerigis
Chairman, Department of Operations Research

J. M. ... Academic Dean

*Poisson arrivals and Erlang service
time type*

ABSTRACT

↘ Numerical tables available for $M/E_k/C$ queueing systems are discussed. A new approximation method for steady-state information and waiting time distribution of this queueing system was developed. Validity of approximation was established directly for the large waiting times and by simulation for the smaller values. The developed method enables one to find delay probability, expected number in the queue and in the system, expected time to be spent in the queue and in the system, and probability of waiting for more than a specified time t .

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	9
II.	THE $M/E_k/c$ QUEUE	11
	A. DESCRIPTION OF THE SYSTEM	11
	1. Definitions of Parameters	12
	a. Arrival Rate and Service Rate	12
	b. Traffic Intensity	12
	c. Offered Load	12
	d. Coefficient of Variation	12
	2. System Variables	13
	a. Number in the System	13
	b. Waiting Time	13
	c. State Probabilities	13
	d. Delay Probability	13
	3. The Steady-State Solution	14
	4. Assumptions	14
	B. FORMER STUDIES	15
III.	DISCUSSION OF NUMERICAL TABLES AND DEVELOPING A NEW COMPUTATION METHOD	17
	A. DISCUSSION OF NUMERICAL TABLES	17
	1. General Description	17
	2. Use of Tables	18
	a. Interpolation	18
	b. Waiting Times	19

3.	Discussion	20
a.	Delay Probabilities	20
b.	Average Queue Length and Number in the System	22
c.	Waiting Times	25
B.	NEW COMPUTATION METHOD	26
1.	Delay Probability	26
2.	Average Queue Length and Average Waiting Time	27
3.	Waiting Time Distribution	29
IV.	COMPUTER SIMULATION	32
A.	COMPUTER PROGRAM	32
1.	Model	32
2.	Variance Reduction	33
3.	Data Collection	36
a.	Selection of Input Parameters	36
b.	Initial and Final Conditions of the System	36
B.	RESULTS	37
V.	CONCLUSION	39
A.	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED COMPUTATION METHOD	39
1.	Delay Probability	39
2.	Average Waiting Time and Average Queue Length	40
3.	Average Time in System and Average Number in System	40
4.	Waiting Time Distribution	40

B. DISCUSSION	41
1. Advantages of the Method	41
2. Disadvantages of the Method	41
3. Applications	41
4. Final Remarks	42
APPENDIX A Charts for Delay Probability	43
APPENDIX B Sample Pages from Numerical Tables	46
COMPUTER PROGRAM	48
LIST OF REFERENCES	54
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	56

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to acknowledge the help and guidance of Professor R. R. Read of Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California. The author is also indebted to his wife Saba, whose understanding during the preparation and typing the draft of this thesis meant a lot to him.

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Multi-server queues constitute a large proportion of queueing systems which arise in practice. Among those, queues with Poisson arrivals and Erlang service times (which will be denoted as $M/E_k/c$) occupy an important position, as seen in the banks, airport check-in counters, hotels, supermarkets etc. However, no significant theoretical work was done until the late 60's. In recent years, methods for the steady state solution of $M/E_k/c$ queues became available, followed by the numerical tables which were obtained by implementation of these methods. Even so, there is still some computational difficulty involved obtaining some particular information about above-mentioned queues, such as probability of delay exceeding a specified time length.

The importance of the $M/E_k/c$ queue is due to the fact that it is used to model any queueing system whose service time distribution is believed to be unimodal. The solutions are known for extreme values of k : exponential service time distribution for $k=1$ and constant service times as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Usable solutions for multi-server queues having either exponential or constant service times are readily available. The $M/E_k/c$ queue is also important by providing a large variety of service time distributions in between these two extremes.

The purpose of this study is, by means of computer simulation and examination of numerical tables published earlier, to present a simple and accurate computation method for obtaining information about steady-state solution of the $M/E_k/c$ queue.

For this purpose, a general description of $M/E_k/c$ queueing model with definitions and assumptions for the analysis of it are given in Chapter II, followed by a summary of former studies.

In Chapter III, the numerical tables are analyzed and some conclusions are drawn in terms of a simple form approximation for steady-state distribution of waiting times.

This approximation for the distribution of waiting times needed verification for small values of them. These cases were studied by computer simulation. The procedure and the results of simulation are given in Chapter IV.

The results of the analysis of numerical tables and simulation are combined and generalized in Chapter V. Then the computational method developed by this generalization is described on a step-by-step basis. With this method, there is no need for numerical tables, computations are very simple, and the results are accurate for most practical purposes (the error being about 2% in general). To demonstrate the advantages of the proposed method, a comparison of it with the other method which uses numerical tables is given at the end of that chapter.

II. The M/E_k/c Queue

The description of the M/E_k/c queueing model with assumptions, definition of parameters and system variables along with some basic definitions in the queueing theory forms the first half of this chapter. A brief discussion of the previous studies on this model then follows.

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE SYSTEM

The M/E_k/c queue is a multi-server queueing system with c servers, where arrivals occur according to a Poisson process with rate λ , and service times have Erlang distribution with shape parameter k . It is also an infinite queue, i.e. there is no limitation for the number of customers in the system.

The distribution of interarrival times X is given by

$$f_X(x) = \lambda e^{-\lambda x}, \quad x \geq 0$$

and the service times have the following probability density function:

$$f_Y(y) = \frac{1}{(k-1)! \beta^k} y^{k-1} e^{-y/\beta}, \quad y \geq 0$$

with mean $k\beta$ and variance $k\beta^2$.

1. Definitions of Parameters

a. Arrival Rate and Service Rate

Arrival rate to the system is the reciprocal of mean interarrival time and denoted by λ . Similarly, service rate of a server is defined as reciprocal of mean service time and represented by μ . Then, $\mu = \frac{1}{k\beta}$.

b. Traffic Intensity

Traffic intensity ρ is defined by the following expression:

$$\rho = \lambda/c\mu .$$

c. Offered Load

Offered load is the ratio of arrival rate λ to service rate μ and denoted by α . It can also be expressed by product of number of servers c and traffic intensity ρ as follows

$$\alpha = c\rho .$$

d. Coefficient of Variation

The ratio of standard deviation to mean is defined as coefficient of variation of a probability distribution. It is denoted by V . For Erlang distribution coefficient of variation is expressed as

$$V = \frac{\sqrt{k\beta^2}}{k\beta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} .$$

2. System Variables

a. Number in the System

The total of the number of customers waiting in the queue and those in the service is defined as number in the system and denoted by N . The number of customers only in the queue is represented by N_q . Expected values of N and N_q are denoted by L (average number in the system) and L_q (average number in the queue), respectively.

b. Waiting Time

The time spent in the queue by a customer is defined to be the waiting time of a customer. The time spent in the system is then the sum of waiting time and service time of a customer. T_q denotes waiting time and T denotes the time spent in the system. Expected values of T and T_q are denoted by W (average time in the system) and W_q (average waiting time) respectively.

c. State Probabilities

The number in the system at a particular time is defined as the state of the system. Then state probability $P(N = n|t)$ is the probability of the system being in state n at time t .

d. Delay Probability

Delay probability is the probability that the arriving customer finds all the servers busy and enters the waiting line. It is denoted by $P(T_q > 0)$. Also, by definition it follows that

$$P(T_q > 0) = P(N \geq c).$$

3. The Steady-State Solution

The steady-state solution is defined to be the probability distribution of the number in the system when the system achieves statistical equilibrium. In the steady-state, the state probabilities do not depend on t , i.e. $P(N = n|t) = P(N = n)$. Also it follows that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P(N = n) = 1 .$$

In queueing theory, it is a well-known fact that [1] the steady-state is achieved if and only if the traffic intensity ρ is less than 1.

4. Assumptions

The $M/E_k/c$ queueing system under study is assumed to have the following properties:

(i) There is only one waiting line no matter how many servers there are.

(ii) The customer at the head of the waiting line starts getting service immediately whenever a server becomes available.

(iii) Order of service is first-come first-served.

(iv) If an arriving customer finds all servers busy, he joins the waiting line. The waiting line has unlimited capacity.

(v) The service channels (servers) are indexed consecutively. If an arriving customer finds more than one

server vacant, he goes to the server with smallest index (this assumption doesn't cause any loss of generality, but is convenient for the computer simulation model).

(vi) The servers are homogeneous, i.e. the service distribution is the same for all servers.

(vii) Only one customer at a time can be served by a server.

B. FORMER STUDIES

There are numerous studies in the literature of queueing theory, done for the steady-state solution of $M/E_k/c$ queue. But most of them cover only some particular values of k and c , and their results cannot be generalized. Therefore, such studies will not be mentioned here individually.

The earliest suggestion known by the author about the solution of general $M/E_k/c$ system was mentioned by Lee [2]. He stated referring to a case study done in 1956 that mean waiting time can be approximated by use of David Owen's suggestion. The formula given in [2] was said to be usable for $0.7 \leq V \leq 1.0$ and as follows,

$$W_q = \frac{1}{2} W_{q1} (1+V^2)$$

where

W_q : mean waiting time for $M/E_k/c$ queue

W_{q1} : mean waiting time for $M/M/c$ queue

V : coefficient of variation of Erlang (k) distribution, $V^2 = 1/k$.

The validity of the approximation was demonstrated by comparing its results with simulation results for different

cases. However, the approximation is just for mean waiting time or queue length, hence it isn't possible to approximate state probabilities. Also, no reference was given for details of David Owen's suggestion. This approximation will be mentioned again later in this study.

The steady-state solution of the general $M/E_k/c$ queue was first studied by Mayhugh and McCormick [3]. The results can be applied to the cases with any value of k and c . However, the computation procedure is so complex that it requires a very considerable amount of work.

A parallel study was also done by Heffer [4]. The solution method proposed by Heffer differs from Mayhugh and McCormick's, but it also is very complex.

The reader is referred to the references [5] and [6] for more detailed discussion of these two studies.

The most recent study was done by Yu [5]. It concerned the $E_m/E_k/c$ queue with heterogeneous servers, but results were also stated for homogeneous server case. Then letting $m = 1$ gives the solution procedure for $M/E_k/c$ queue. However, like the other two studies, the computations required still demand an enormous amount of work.

The theoretical results obtained by Heffer [4] and Yu [5] formed the basis of the only numerical tables available for $M/E_k/c$ queue, prepared by Hillier and Lo [6]. The tables have cases of $M/E_k/c$ queue with limited values of k and c ($k \leq 8$, $c \leq 10$), and a few cases for $E_m/E_k/c$ queue. These tables will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

III. DISCUSSION OF NUMERICAL TABLES AND DEVELOPING A NEW COMPUTATION METHOD

In this chapter, a detailed review and discussion of the numerical tables given in [6] will be made. Then, using the results of these discussions, a new computation method will be developed.

Sample pages from the numerical tables are given in Appendix B.

A. DISCUSSION OF NUMERICAL TABLES

1. General Description

The tables under consideration were designed for general $E_m/E_k/c$ systems. The analysis however will be focused on the cases in which $m = 1$ (i.e. $M/E_k/c$ system), which forms a large porportion of the tables. As mentioned earlier, the values of k and c for various tables are as follows:

$$k=2; c=1,2,\dots, 10$$

$$k=3; c=1,2,\dots, 5$$

$$k=4; c=2,3$$

$$k=5,6,\dots,8; c=2$$

The information given in each table is:

- (i) State probabilities, $P(N=n)$, and
- (ii) Cumulative state probabilities, $P(N \leq n)$, for $n=1,2,\dots;$
- (iii) Delay probability, $P(T_q > 0)$;
- (iv) Expected number in the system, L ;

(v) Average queue length, L_q ;

(vi) Average queue length for the equivalent M/M/c system with the same arrival and service rates, L_{q1} .

(vii) The ratio L_q/L_{q1} .

All this information is given in each case and for the following values of traffic intensity ρ :

$\rho = 0.10, 0.20, \dots, 0.50, 0.55, \dots, 0.95, 0.98, 0.99.$

So, all the information is given for steady-state conditions.

Average queue length L_{q1} for the equivalent M/M/c system is computed by using the following formula [7],

$$L_{q1} = \frac{(c\rho)^c}{c!(1-\rho)^2} p_0 \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$\frac{1}{p_0} = \sum_{j=0}^{c-1} \frac{(c\rho)^j}{j!} + \frac{(c\rho)^c}{c!(1-\rho)}$$

The rest of the information given in the tables was computed by the results of theoretical work mentioned in the last chapter, done by Heffer and Yu.

2. Use of Tables

The kind of information listed above can be obtained directly from the tables. However, by making use of some general relationships in the queueing theory, some other information can be obtained besides those mentioned above.

a. Interpolation

No interpolation method is specified in the explanation sections for the tables in [6], for the values of

ρ different from those given above. The default position taken is linear interpolation.

b. Waiting Times

The average waiting time W_q and average time in the system W are frequently of interest in the analysis of queueing systems. These values can be obtained from the tabulated values of L_q and L respectively, by using the following relationships [8],

$$W_q = \frac{L_q}{\lambda}, \quad W = \frac{L}{\lambda}.$$

The probability $P(T_q > t)$ that waiting time exceeding t is also important in the analysis of queueing systems. Although this kind of information is not given in the tables, $P(T_q > t)$ can be approximated from the state probabilities, $P(N=n)$, as follows:

$$P(T_q > t) = \sum_{n=c}^{\infty} P(N=n) P\{D \leq [k(n-c+1)-1]\}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3.2)$$

where D is a Poisson random variable with mean $ck\mu t$. The reader is referred to the discussion in [6] for the stochastic reasoning of this relationship. The quantity $P\{D \leq [k(n-c+1)-1]\}$ can be obtained from Poisson distribution tables with mean $ck\mu t$. If this mean exceeds 25, then the

normal distribution with the same mean and variance can be used as an approximation to Poisson distribution.

3. Discussion

a. Delay Probabilities

Similar to $M/E_k/c$, $M/M/c$ denotes a multi-server queueing system with Poisson arrivals of rate λ and exponential service times of service rate μ . The delay probabilities for $M/M/c$ queue can be computed by using the formula [7],

$$P(T_q > 0) = \frac{(c\rho)^c}{c!(1-\rho)} \frac{1}{\left(\sum_{j=0}^{c-1} \frac{(c\rho)^j}{j!} + \frac{(c\rho)^c}{c!(1-\rho)} \right)} \quad (3.3)$$

A chart is also available in Appendix A for $c=2, 3, \dots, 15$ and $0 < \rho < 1$, for $P(T_q > 0)$.

A comparison of delay probabilities of $M/E_k/c$ and $M/M/c$ systems for selected values of ρ , c and k is given in Table I of this study. A careful examination of this table shows that the corresponding delay probabilities of the two systems for the same value of ρ are very close. Since the formula or charts are available for $M/M/c$ system, this comparison shows that they can also be used to estimate delay probabilities for $M/E_k/c$ system with a very small error, usually less than 0.01.

TABLE I

Comparison of Delay Probabilities in Different Systems

ρ	$c=2$				$c=10$				$c=20$			
	$k=1$	$k=2$	$k=8$	$k=\infty$	$k=1$	$k=2$	$k=\infty$	$k=1$	$k=2$	$k=\infty$	$k=1$	$k=\infty$
0.10	0.0182	0.0181	0.0179	0.0178	$\sim 10^{-6}$	$\sim 10^{-6}$	$\sim 10^{-6}$	$\sim 10^{-6}$	$\sim 10^{-6}$	$\sim 10^{-6}$	$\sim 10^{-7}$	$\sim 10^{-7}$
0.30	0.1385	0.1373	0.1352	0.1336	0.0012	0.0011	0.0011	0.0011	0.0011	0.0011	0.0037	0.0035
0.50	0.3333	0.3308	0.3265	0.3232	0.0361	0.0352	0.0352	0.0352	0.0352	0.0352	0.0241	0.0220
0.60	0.4499	0.4471	0.4423	0.4387	0.1013	0.0987	0.0987	0.0987	0.0987	0.0987	0.0241	0.0220
0.70	0.5765	0.5736	0.5688	0.5653	0.2217	0.2167	0.2167	0.2167	0.2167	0.2167	0.0936	0.0844
0.80	0.7111	0.7087	0.7047	0.7018	0.4092	0.4021	0.4021	0.4021	0.4021	0.4021	0.2561	0.2345
0.90	0.8526	0.8512	0.8488	0.8488	0.6687	0.6625	0.6625	0.6687	0.6625	0.6687	0.6687	0.6625
0.95	0.9256	0.9248	0.9235	0.9235	0.8256	0.8216	0.8216	0.8256	0.8216	0.8256	0.8256	0.8216

$k=1$: M/M/c system

$k=\infty$: M/D/c system

$k>1$: M/E_k/c system

b. Average Queue Length and Number in the System

A careful examination of the "Ratio" column of Table I in [6] indicates that

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 1} \frac{L_q}{L_{q1}} = \frac{k+1}{2k} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + v^2) \quad (3.4)$$

which is essentially the same as Owen's suggestion [2]. However, it works beyond the limits of coefficient of variation V that were stated by Owen. Also (3.4) is true even when ρ is markedly less than one. The theoretical verification for (3.4) was developed by Yu in [9].

A more precise approximation formula was also developed by Hillier and Lo in [6] which provides more accuracy for small values of ρ . In this case, the approximation formula is given by

$$L_q \approx \frac{1}{2} (1+g) \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right) L_{q1} \quad (3.5)$$

where $g = f(\rho, k, c)$. Then the expression for g has been obtained by linear regression. The exact coefficients for $g(\rho, k, c)$ are given in [6]. However, a rougher expression which is more convenient for computations will be used here, given as

$$g = \frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{k-1}{k+1}\right) (c-1)^{2/3} \{(1-\rho) + (1-\rho)^2\} \quad (3.6)$$

The main purpose of Hillier and Lo for introducing g into approximation formula (3.5) was to provide means of approximation for the cases with larger k and c values which were not covered in [6], namely, extrapolation for larger values of c and k . One way to check the validity of the computational formula for g is to first let k go to infinity, then compare the values of average waiting time W_q computed by the formula given below with average waiting time W_{qD} of M/D/c queue. This latter queue has Poisson arrivals with rate λ and constant service times of length $1/\mu$ (or $k\beta$), and one can use the fact that the distribution of service times can be approximated by constant service time distribution for very large k as mentioned in Chapter I.

The computation formula for W_{qD} of M/D/c queue is given in [2] as follows,

$$W_{qD} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} e^{-i\alpha} \left[\sum_{j=ic}^{\infty} \frac{(i\alpha)^j}{j!} - \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{j=ic+1}^{\infty} \frac{(i\alpha)^j}{j!} \right]$$

However, a more convenient form for computations can be obtained as

$$W_{qD} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{e^{-i\alpha} (i\alpha)^{ic}}{(ic)!} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\rho}\right) \sum_{j=ic+1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-i\alpha} (i\alpha)^j}{j!} \right] \quad (3.7)$$

which permits the use of Poisson distribution tables. But it still requires a great deal of computational work. Fortunately, a very convenient chart was developed by Shelton [10] for W_{qD} for $1 \leq c \leq 100$ and $0.10 \leq \rho \leq 0.96$.

The comparison mentioned above can be made having the necessary tools available and Table II can be used for this purpose. The values of W_{qD} for M/D/c system were obtained from Shelton's charts. Average waiting time W_q for M/E_k/c system is computed by using the following formula,

$$W_q = \frac{1}{2\lambda} \left[1 + \frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{k-1}{k+1} \right) (c-1)^{2/3} \{ (1-\rho) + (1-\rho)^2 \} \right] \left(1 + \frac{1}{k} \right) L_{q1}$$

where L_{q1} is computed from (3.1). If the expression given by (3.6) is true for very large values of k , then it should also be true that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} W_q = W_{qD}$$

Taking the limit of W_q gives

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} W_q = \frac{1}{2\lambda} \left[1 + \frac{1}{12} (c-1)^{2/3} \{ (1-\rho) + (1-\rho)^2 \} \right] L_{q1}$$

On the other hand, if g is omitted, the limit will then be

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} W_q = \frac{1}{2\lambda} L_{q1} = \frac{1}{2} W_{q1}$$

A comparison of W_{qD} and these two limits for eight different cases is given in Table II. Investigation

TABLE II.

Comparison of W_{qD} and Limits of W_q With or Without g

Case No	c	ρ	$\frac{1}{2} W_{q1}$	$W_q (k=\infty)$	W_{qD}
1	2	0.80	1.185	1.209	1.08
2	2	0.80	1.422	1.451	1.296
3	5	0.90	2.287	2.34	2.16
4	5	0.90	1.144	1.17	1.08
5	10	0.90	1.337	1.391	1.36
6	10	0.90	1.505	1.563	1.53
7	20	0.90	3.305	3.766	3.36
8	20	0.90	5.508	5.88	5.6

of these results shows that, for almost all the cases the limit with g omitted is closer to W_{qD} than the other limit. This indicates that the formula (3.6) should be reviewed for large k values. However, this revision can be done only after some additional tables become available for the cases not covered in [6].

c. Waiting Times

The method of approximating the probability $P(T_q > t)$ that the waiting time will exceed t using the state probabilities $P(N=n)$ was described earlier in the chapter. However, this method assumes that an arriving customer will

have to wait for approximately $k(n-c+1)$ service phase (exponentially distributed with mean β) completions before a server becomes available to start his service. It is stated in [6] that this approximation for $P(T_q > t)$ should be better for larger values of ρ and t due to this assumption. It should be added that, for large k and small t , the approximation fails greatly in representing the actual distribution of waiting times for the same reason.

B. NEW COMPUTATION METHOD

The construction of a practical computation method using the facts obtained from the preceding discussions will form the rest of the chapter. This new method is desired to be applicable to the queueing problems involving $M/E_k/c$ systems met in practice, with simple and quick computational work without any need for tables, interpolations etc.

The kinds of information which are desired to be able to compute by the new method for $M/E_k/c$ queueing system are mainly

- (i) Delay probability,
- (ii) Average waiting time, average time in the system, average queue length and average number in the system,
- (iii) Probability distribution of delay times and probability that waiting time will exceed a specified time length.

1. Delay Probability

In the discussion earlier it was pointed out that the delay probabilities $P(T_q > 0)$ for the systems $M/E_k/c$ and

M/M/c are very close for the same value of ρ . An examination of the comparisons given in Table I shows that the delay probabilities are very close for M/M/c ($k=1$), M/E_k/c ($k>1$) and M/D/c ($k=\infty$) systems with the same value of ρ . The differences between the delay probabilities for the same ρ are less than 0.01 for almost all the cases and gets even smaller for ρ close to one. This comparison suggests that delay probabilities of the M/M/c system can be used for corresponding M/E_k/c system also. These delay probabilities are computed by using formula (3.3). The formula is not suitable for large values of c , however, and a chart is given in Appendix A for up to about 16. For greater values of c , the charts are also available in [10] and [11].

2. Average Queue Length and Average Waiting Time

In the previous discussion, after examination of the tables in [6] it was concluded that the average queue length for M/E_k/c system can be approximated by

$$L_q = \frac{1}{2}(1+g) \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)L_{q1} \quad (3.8)$$

where L_{q1} is computed according to (3.1), and g is computed by

$$g = \frac{2}{12} \frac{k-1}{k+1} (c-1)^{2/3} \{ (1-\rho) + (1-\rho)^2 \} .$$

Contribution of g in equation (3.8) is negligible for practical purposes in most cases. Also it was shown earlier in this chapter that the formula g requires some

modifications. Therefore it will be omitted in further discussions.

Now, attention will be focused on equations (3.1) and (3.3). Rewriting equation (3.1) in a different form, then substituting (3.3) gives

$$L_{q1} = \frac{\rho}{(1-\rho)} \cdot \frac{(c\rho)^c}{c!(1-\rho) \left[\sum_{j=0}^{c-1} \frac{(c\rho)^j}{j!} + \frac{(c\rho)^c}{c!(1-\rho)} \right]} \quad \text{and}$$

$$L_{q1} = \frac{\rho \cdot P(T_q > 0)}{(1-\rho)}$$

Then it follows that

$$W_{q1} = \frac{L_{q1}}{\lambda} = \frac{P(T_q > 0)}{c\mu(1-\rho)}$$

Using (3.8) with $g=0$, some approximation formulas for average queue length and average waiting time are obtained respectively as follows

$$L_q = \frac{1}{2} \rho \frac{P(T_q > 0)}{(1-\rho)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{k} \right) \quad (3.9)$$

$$W_q = \frac{1}{2} \frac{P(T_q > 0)}{c\mu(1-\rho)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{k} \right) \quad (3.10)$$

where $P(T_q > 0)$ is delay probability for M/M/c system which can be obtained from the charts very easily. Then it is very simple to compute L_q and W_q using equations (3.9) and (3.10).

The average number in the system L and average time in the system W can be computed by following well-known relationships of queueing theory,

$$L = L_q + \frac{\lambda}{\mu} , \quad W = \frac{L}{\lambda} .$$

3. Waiting Time Distribution

Suppose that the conditional waiting time distribution given $T_q > 0$ for $M/E_k/c$ queueing system can be approximated by

$$P(T_q > t | T_q > 0) = e^{-bt} .$$

Then using Bayes' theorem it follows that

$$P(T_q > t) = P(T_q > t | T_q > 0) P(T_q > 0) = e^{-bt} P(T_q > 0) . \quad (3.11)$$

Let F_{T_q} be the CDF of waiting times. Then

$$F_{T_q}(t) = 1 - P(T_q > 0) e^{-bt} , \quad t \geq 0 .$$

Now average waiting time can be computed as follows

$$W_q = E(T_q) = \int_0^{\infty} (1 - F_{T_q}(t)) dt = \int_0^{\infty} P(T_q > 0) e^{-bt} dt$$

$$W_q = \frac{P(T_q > 0)}{b} . \quad (3.12)$$

Suppose the parameter b is modeled as

$$b = \frac{2c\mu(1-\rho)}{(1+V^2)}$$

Then,

$$W_q = \frac{P(T_q > 0)}{2c\mu(1-\rho)} (1+V^2) \quad (3.13)$$

where V is coefficient of variation of service time distribution. Notice that equation (3.13) is exactly the same as equation (3.10). However, there can exist some other waiting time distribution to give the same average waiting time as given by (3.13), so it must be shown that for $M/E_k/c$ system, the distribution of waiting times can be approximated by

$$F_{T_q}(t) = 1 - P(T_q > 0) e^{-\frac{2c\mu(1-\rho)t}{(1+V^2)}}, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (3.14)$$

If (3.14) is true, then $P(T_q > t)$ computed by (3.11) should be approximately equal to the one obtained by the procedure suggested by Hillier and Lo [6] which uses state probabilities as described earlier by equation (3.2). Table III gives the comparison of $P(T_q > t)$ values obtained by these two different formulas for various values of t . It should be recalled that approximation by state probabilities is poor for small values of t . However, for $t \geq W_q$ the two results agree very well. The difference is ease of computations. Equation (3.11) is much easier than equation (3.2) to compute the same value.

The validity of approximation (3.14) for small values of t will be shown by simulation, which forms the next chapter. Then the suggested computation method will formally be described on a step-by-step basis in last chapter.

TABLE III.

Comparison of the Two Approximation Methods

System Parameters			P(T _q > t) Probability that waiting time exceeds t									
c	k	ρ	w _q	Case	t=0.1	t=0.5	t=1.0	t=2.0	t=3.0	t=4.0	t=5.0	
2	8	0.8	1.60	I	0.510	0.523	0.433	0.303	0.202	0.129	0.080	
				II	0.680	0.569	0.456	0.290	0.187	0.120	0.077	
2	8	0.9	3.84	I	0.726	0.716	0.646	0.544	0.437	0.352	0.279	
				II	0.834	0.763	0.683	0.546	0.437	0.350	0.280	
3	3	0.8	0.85	I	0.506	0.447	0.321	0.152	0.068	0.030	0.013	
				II	0.600	0.445	0.307	0.145	0.061	0.032	0.015	
4	2	0.9	1.47	I	0.688	0.585	0.454	0.299	0.159	0.087	0.052	
				II	0.746	0.605	0.460	0.271	0.159	0.093	0.054	
10	2	0.9	1.00	I	0.583	0.468	0.342	0.178	0.088	0.036	0.013	
				II	0.625	0.479	0.343	0.176	0.090	0.046	0.023	

I. Computed by the procedure with state probabilities, eq. (3.2)

II. Computed by using exponential approximation, eq. (3.11)

IV. COMPUTER SIMULATION

A computer simulation model for $M/E_k/c$ system is used to investigate the validity of approximation for waiting time distribution introduced in the preceding chapter. Validity of this approximation for moderate and large values of t was demonstrated in the same chapter. Therefore, analysis will now be focused on the approximation for small values of t .

A. COMPUTER PROGRAM

1. Model

Since the model used to construct the simulation program is based on the same assumptions as stated in Chapter II, it won't be described again in this chapter. The computer language selected was SIMSCRIPT which is especially convenient for simulation of multi-server queueing systems. The reader is referred to [12] and [13] for a brief idea about SIMSCRIPT if he is not familiar with this language. Main reference for SIMSCRIPT however is [14].

One way to check for small t the validity of approximation distribution developed earlier is to keep the frequency table of waiting times of the customers during the simulation. Let $M(t)$ be the number of customers with waiting time greater than t and M be total number of customers

served during simulation period. Then the estimator for probability of waiting time greater than t is

$$\widehat{P}(T_q > t) = \frac{M(t)}{M} \quad (4.1)$$

This value can be compared with the value given by the approximation formula to check its validity.

The computer program is given in Appendix B. It is written in the way that it would be possible to obtain the estimates of all kinds of information about the queueing system being simulated; average waiting time and average queue length, state probabilities, delay probability etc. However, only the estimates given by (4.1) will be discussed here.

2. Variance Reduction

One of the problems encountered in the simulation of queueing systems is the high variability of waiting times, especially when traffic intensity ρ is high. Also strong positive correlation between the waiting times of consecutive customers causes serious errors if the standard formula is used to estimate the sample variance of waiting times since this formula will underestimate the true variance [1].

There are several methods developed to overcome this difficulty with high variability. Interested reader can find comprehensive information in references [12], [15] and [16]. The variance reduction method which will be used here is antithetic variates.

In the simulation program, two different random number streams are used to generate interarrival and service times. Once a uniform variate between 0 and 1 is generated, then the random variate from a desired distribution can be obtained by

$$X = F_X^{-1}(u) \quad (4.2)$$

where u is a uniform variate between 0 and 1 and F_X^{-1} denotes the inverse of CDF of X [12]. Then, for example, a sequence of exponentially distributed random variates with mean $1/\lambda$ can be obtained from a stream of uniform variates by using

$$X = \frac{-1}{\lambda} \ln(u) \quad (4.3)$$

Let Z_1 and Z_2 be estimators of a parameter, obtained from two different simulation samples and $Z_3 = \frac{1}{2} (Z_1 + Z_2)$. Then

$$\text{Var}(Z_3) = \frac{1}{4} \text{Var}(Z_1+Z_2) = \frac{1}{4} [\text{Var}(Z_1)+\text{Var}(Z_2)+\text{Cov}(Z_1,Z_2)] \quad (4.4)$$

which implies that maximum negative correlation between Z_1 and Z_2 would minimize $\text{Var}(Z_3)$. This can be obtained by using $1-u$ in (4.2) in place of u for random variate generation in the second simulation run.

During the simulation, a random sequence of large service times or short interarrival times would cause long

waiting times and conversely. Using the procedure described above, a sequence of large waiting times would become sequence of short waiting times in the second run; in other words, the waiting times in two different runs will be negatively correlated. Let $P_i(t)$ be the probability that waiting times will exceed t in the i th run, $i = 1, 2$. Using antithetic variates, $P_1(t)$ and $P_2(t)$ will be negatively correlated; then the estimator will be computed by

$$\widehat{P(T_q > t)} = \frac{1}{2}(P_1(t) + P_2(t))$$

where $P_1(t)$ and $P_2(t)$ are computed according to (4.1).

Generation of antithetic exponential variates for interarrival times is given by (4.3). However, it is not straightforward to generate antithetic Erlang variates since the CDF cannot be inverted in closed form. Generating Erlang variates as sum of k exponential variates with mean β does not help since equation (4.2) cannot be utilized to obtain antithetic variates. Nevertheless, one way to solve this problem is to store the CDF table of chi-square distribution in an array, then compute $F_x^{-1}(u)$ by linear interpolation to get a chi-square random variate, and obtain the Erlang variate by the following transformation

$$E_k = \frac{1}{2} \beta C_k$$

where E_k is the Erlang variate with mean $k\beta$ and C_k is the chi-square variate with degrees of freedom k . The tables for CDF of chi-square distribution are available in [17].

3. Data Collection

a. Selection of Input Parameters

The input values for each pair of runs were arbitrarily selected to give certain traffic intensity ρ values, usually 0.8 and 0.9 in order to get a wider range of waiting times even though they cause high variability. The width of frequency intervals was chosen to be 0.25 min. so that f_1 , for example, would show the number of customers with waiting time less than 0.25 minutes. Then $M(t)$, the number of customers with waiting time greater than t can be computed by

$$M(t) = \sum_{i=4t+1}^{\infty} f_i$$

since t will be in multiples of 0.25. This computation is done in the computer program.

b. Initial and Final Conditions of the System

Initial and final conditions of the simulated system are important since they effect the value of parameter estimated. The approach taken in this study was to use epochs. If the time at which the number in the system N changes from 0 to 1 by an arrival is defined as a regeneration point, then the interval between two successive regeneration points can be defined as an epoch [12]. It is obvious that the sequences of waiting times in two different epochs will be independent from each other. The epochs tend to be lengthy with high traffic intensity ρ , large arrival

rate λ , with large number of servers c , or a combination of these three factors. Before each simulation run, the number of epochs for which the simulation is to be run was determined as an input considering those three factors. Experience showed that the first few epochs tend to have waiting times smaller than usual, so they were omitted for data analysis. This isn't feasible for cases with long epochs; however the first couple of epochs have enough information. The simulation runs were started with $N = 0$ and an arrival so that starting time would be a regeneration point and stopped after the number of epochs determined earlier is completed, i.e. $N = 0$ was the final condition.

$P_1(t)$ or $P_2(t)$ are given in the output of program for $t = 0.25, 0.50, 0.75, \dots$ etc. Then to get the estimators $P(T_q > t)$, all one has to do is to average them for corresponding t values.

B. RESULTS

A comparison of waiting time probabilities obtained from simulation and approximation method is given in Table IV. Investigation of this table indicates that the approximation method agrees quite well with the results of simulation for small t values. The difference between the corresponding values for moderate or large values of t for which the validity of approximation was demonstrated earlier explains the difference between the values when t is small.

TABLE IV.

Comparison of Simulation and Approximation Results

System Parameters			P($T_q > t$) Probability that waiting time exceeds t									
c	k	ρ	W_q	Case	t=0.25	t=0.50	t=0.75	t=1.0	t=2.0	t=3.0	t=4.0	
3	5	0.6	0.355	S	0.289	0.236	0.188	0.141	0.017	0.005	0.001	
				A	0.276	0.215	0.167	0.131	0.048	0.018	0.006	
5	5	0.8	1.33	S	0.506	0.467	0.429	0.394	0.259	0.170	0.109	
				A	0.499	0.450	0.405	0.365	0.241	0.159	0.105	
3	5	0.8	1.942	S	0.592	0.548	0.513	0.475	0.344	0.226	0.147	
				A	0.595	0.548	0.504	0.464	0.332	0.238	0.171	
4	5	0.8	3.579	S	0.570	0.553	0.536	0.518	0.460	0.398	0.337	
				A	0.572	0.549	0.526	0.505	0.427	0.362	0.306	
10	15	0.9	1.605	S	0.595	0.551	0.507	0.465	0.313	0.193	0.115	
				A	0.603	0.543	0.477	0.441	0.291	0.191	0.126	

S: Simulation
A: Approximation

V. CONCLUSION

It was shown in the last chapter that the approximation method developed earlier for the distribution of waiting times can also be used for small values of t . The method for computing steady-state information of $M/E_k/c$ queueing system can now be formally described.

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED COMPUTATION METHOD

After analysis of data and the decision has been made that the particular system under study can be approximated by $M/E_k/c$ system as described in Chapter II, and also having the estimators for λ , k and β obtained (by maximum likelihood or method of moments), one is ready for computations to get the desired information for the system.

1. Delay Probability

First compute service rate μ as

$$\mu = \frac{1}{k\beta} .$$

Then compute traffic intensity ρ and offered load α by

$$\rho = \frac{\lambda}{c\mu} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha = \frac{\lambda}{\mu}$$

respectively. Then enter the chart in Appendix A with α to get delay probability $P(T_q > 0)$. Use the charts in [10] or [11] if number of servers $c > 16$.

2. Average Waiting Time and Average Queue Length

First compute a system constant, namely b , by

$$b = \frac{2c\mu(1-\rho)}{1 + \frac{1}{k}}$$

Then average waiting time W_q is computed as follows

$$W_q = \frac{P(T_q > 0)}{b}$$

Also, average queue length L_q is given by

$$L_q = \lambda W_q .$$

3. Average Time in System and Average Number in System

Average time in system W and average number in system L will be computed by

$$W = W_q + \frac{1}{\mu} \quad \text{and} \quad L = L_q + \frac{\lambda}{\mu}$$

respectively.

4. Waiting Time Distribution

The CDF of waiting times is given by

$$F_{T_q}(t) = 1 - P(T_q > 0)e^{-bt}, \quad t \geq 0$$

where b is the system constant computed in step 2.

Then the following probabilities can be computed

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad P(T_q > t_1) &= P(T_q > 0)e^{-bt_1} \\ \text{(ii)} \quad P(t_1 < T_q < t_2) &= P(T_q > 0)(e^{-bt_1} - e^{-bt_2}) \\ \text{(iii)} \quad P(T_q < t_1) &= 1 - P(T_q > 0)e^{-bt_1} \end{aligned}$$

as needed by the user.

B. DISCUSSION

1. Advantages of the Method

(i) Needless to say, the most important advantage of the method is simplicity. The kind of information listed above can be computed in minutes given c , λ , k and μ which would be needed to compute anyway. All of the computations can be laid down on one regular size page so that it is very easy to follow by somebody else.

(ii) In most cases, one has to compute the above listed information to determine the effect of changing the number of servers c on the selected system variables. This multiplies the savings of time and computational effort.

(iii) No tables are necessary except for the delay probability chart. No interpolation would be needed.

2. Disadvantages of the Method

(i) Since the method gives an approximation, it is not too precise even though the results are almost always in ± 5 percent of the actual value, and in ± 2 percent for most cases.

(ii) The approximation of state probabilities with this method does not appear to be direct.

3. Applications

One of the characteristic applications of the queueing theory is to investigate the effect of changing the parameters or number of servers on the measure of effectiveness (MOE) assigned by the management. This measure of effectiveness can be delay probability, average waiting time

or probability of waiting time exceeding time t etc. The marginal utility of $c + 1$ st server will be the difference between the values of MOE's for c and $c+1$ servers. Then the decision criterion whether or not to hire the $c+1$ st server is how his cost compares to his marginal utility.

Another managerial objective may be to require, for example, the probability of waiting time exceeds 4 min., $P(T_q > 4) = 0.05$. The number of servers necessary to achieve this purpose will then be of interest.

It is possible to extend the variety of examples. The common property of the above examples is that precision greater than that of suggested approximation is not needed to make the decision.


4. Final Remarks

The author wishes to emphasize that without the numerical tables provided by Hillier and Lo [6], it would have been impossible to develop such an approximation method. The method may need some modifications as new tables for the cases not covered in [6] become available.


APPENDIX A

CHARTS FOR DELAY PROBABILITY

In the two following charts, the delay probabilities can be found for M/M/c system which were shown to be very close to those of M/E_k/c system, with number of servers c up to about 16. One has to enter to chart with offered load α as abscissa, then delay probability $P(T_q > 0)$ is the ordinate value of the point on the proper c curve which has α as abscissa value.



Offered Load α



Offered Load α

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE PAGES FROM NUMERICAL TABLES

M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.10					M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.65						
STATE I	PIN(I)	PINC(I)	STATE I	PIN(I)	PINC(I)	STATE I	PIN(I)	PINC(I)	STATE I	PIN(I)	PINC(I)
0	0.8179210	0.8179210	7	5.599422*-09	0.9999999	0	0.2042024	0.2042029	13	0.0001066769	0.9999002
1	0.1061578	0.9820789	8	2.117467*-12	0.9999999	1	0.2914361	0.4957170	14	5.150224*-05	0.9999518
2	0.01666797	0.9987669	9	7.716000*-10	0.9999999	2	0.2225955	0.7231226	15	2.490176*-05	0.9999727
3	0.001182862	0.9999297	10	2.749422*-13	0.9999999	3	0.1550281	0.6592975	16	1.203133*-07	0.9999687
4	0.001044*-05	0.9999966	11	9.683172*-15	0.9999999	4	0.07154669	0.9102641	17	5.812366*-06	0.9999749
5	3.236087*-06	0.9999998	12	3.395385*-16	0.9999999	5	0.03557288	0.9684370	18	2.808564*-06	0.9999973
6	1.400809*-07	0.9999999	13	1.190273*-17	0.9999999	6	0.01733463	0.9617719	19	1.354953*-06	0.9999967
M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.20					M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.70						
7	0.000817768	0.9921595	14	0.008387768	0.9921595	7	0.008387768	0.9921595	20	4.556168*-07	0.9999993
8	0.004052620	0.9962122	15	0.004052620	0.9962122	8	0.004052620	0.9962122	21	3.167615*-07	0.9999997
9	0.01957785	0.9981700	16	0.01957785	0.9981700	9	0.01957785	0.9981700	22	1.930440*-07	0.9999998
10	0.0009456677	0.9991139	17	0.0009456677	0.9991139	10	0.0009456677	0.9991139	23	7.356365*-08	0.9999999
11	0.0002207896	0.9997936	18	0.0002207896	0.9997936	11	0.0002207896	0.9997936	24	1.726136*-08	0.9999999
M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.30					M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.40						
12	0.00001024607	0.9999892	14	3.303564*-14	1.0000000	12	0.1688107	0.1688107	16	0.0002079035	0.99997511
13	9.799626*-06	0.9999990	15	2.863789*-15	1.0000000	13	0.2623786	0.4311892	17	0.0001132721	0.9999664
14	0.896805*-07	0.9999999	16	2.482800*-16	1.0000000	14	0.2167728	0.6561821	18	6.171602*-05	0.9999261
15	7.833804*-08	0.9999999	17	2.152598*-17	1.0000000	15	0.1486635	0.8050057	19	3.362367*-05	0.9999597
M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.50					M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.60						
16	0.5352489	0.5352489	9	4.466650*-07	0.9999999	16	0.08739370	0.8923994	18	1.831919*-05	0.9999741
17	0.3295022	0.6667510	10	8.726358*-08	0.9999999	17	0.04879264	0.9411919	19	9.980260*-06	0.9999800
18	0.1053992	0.9015013	11	1.617004*-08	0.9999999	18	0.02675223	0.9679441	20	5.437867*-06	0.9999934
19	0.02428864	0.9666387	12	1.533943*-09	0.9999999	19	0.01459134	0.9823536	21	2.762711*-06	0.9999966
20	0.004626255	0.9906050	13	2.329388*-10	0.9999999	20	0.007969822	0.9979922	22	1.616175*-06	0.9999980
21	0.0007067496	0.9998917	14	3.526266*-11	0.9999999	21	0.004330816	0.9942162	23	8.734515*-07	0.9999989
22	0.0002156372	0.9999772	15	5.338370*-12	0.9999999	22	0.002359518	0.9971737	24	4.791571*-07	0.9999996
23	1.936617*-05	0.9999965	16	8.081664*-13	0.9999999	23	0.001285522	0.9984512	25	2.610562*-07	0.9999996
24	2.960745*-06	0.9999995	17	1.223493*-13	0.9999999	24	0.000380895	0.9991616	26	1.422311*-07	0.9999996
M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.70					M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.75						
25	0.3326025	0.9565089	15	1.390464*-09	0.9999999	25	0.0003815931	0.9995632	27	7.749165*-08	0.9999999
26	0.1197532	0.9906675	16	2.055931*-10	0.9999999	STATE I PIN(I) PINC(I) STATE I PIN(I) PINC(I)					
27	0.03542166	0.9966382	17	2.898893*-09	0.9999999	0	0.1356713	0.1356713	16	0.0002794797	0.9999621
28	0.009426255	0.9996256	18	4.178976*-08	0.9999999	1	0.2286572	0.3643204	17	0.0001705865	0.9999732
29	0.001100940	0.9999841	19	5.994603*-07	0.9999999	2	0.2142547	0.5785834	18	0.0001041187	0.9999839
30	0.0001165765	0.9999946	20	8.781472*-06	0.9999999	3	0.1562144	0.7367978	19	6.355061*-05	0.9999904
31	1.282953*-05	0.9999993	21	1.912210*-11	0.9999999	4	0.1018311	0.8366290	20	3.878832*-05	0.9999932
M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.80					M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.85						
32	0.3265101	0.3265101	12	3.613901*-06	0.9999999	5	0.08364114	0.9000702	21	2.367538*-05	0.9999969
33	0.1669799	0.6734899	13	1.157233*-07	0.9999999	6	0.03991752	0.9369977	22	1.465262*-05	0.9999974
34	0.1972866	0.8707746	14	3.106718*-07	0.9999999	7	0.02577329	0.9527610	23	8.820148*-06	0.9999967
35	0.09362625	0.9563948	15	8.063334*-09	0.9999999	8	0.01451033	0.9772713	24	5.383507*-06	0.9999919
36	0.03029493	0.9848256	16	1.898464*-09	0.9999999	9	0.008580043	0.9861274	25	3.289022*-06	0.9999948
37	0.01025498	0.9950806	17	1.216919*-08	0.9999999	10	0.005405270	0.9919327	26	2.005598*-06	0.9999964
38	0.003397470	0.9991204	18	3.898893*-09	0.9999999	11	0.003299183	0.9946318	27	1.224146*-06	0.9999990
39	0.001073734	0.9996941	19	1.267638*-09	0.9999999	12	0.002013691	0.9968655	28	7.471757*-07	0.9999963
40	0.0003439242	0.9998381	20	3.994603*-10	0.9999999	13	0.001229033	0.9980746	29	4.460846*-07	0.9999993
41	0.0001100940	0.9999841	21	1.273995*-10	0.9999999	14	0.0007501702	0.9986268	30	2.783565*-07	0.9999993
42	0.00001165765	0.9999946	22	4.697780*-11	0.9999999	15	0.0004578894	0.9992827	31	1.694990*-07	0.9999997
M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.90					M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 0.95						
43	0.3265101	0.3265101	12	3.613901*-06	0.9999999	43	0.07578546	0.07578546	23	0.0003038200	0.9999715
44	0.1669799	0.6734899	13	1.157233*-07	0.9999999	44	0.1484290	0.2242145	24	0.000260153	0.9999304
45	0.1972866	0.8707746	14	3.106718*-07	0.9999999	45	0.1641668	0.3083164	25	0.0001726796	0.9999729
46	0.09362625	0.9563948	15	8.063334*-09	0.9999999	46	0.1436229	0.5320042	26	0.0001299566	0.9999608
47	0.03029493	0.9848256	16	1.898464*-09	0.9999999	47	0.1138889	0.6458931	27	9.791527*-05	0.9999707
48	0.01025498	0.9950806	17	1.216919*-08	0.9999999	48	0.08706796	0.7329611	28	7.377695*-05	0.9999765
49	0.003397470	0.9991204	18	3.898893*-09	0.9999999	49	0.05181450	0.8181450	29	5.258625*-05	0.9999801
50	0.001073734	0.9996941	19	1.267638*-09	0.9999999	50	0.0461175	0.8683673	30	3.188165*-05	0.9999870
51	0.0003439242	0.9998381	20	3.994603*-10	0.9999999	51	0.03738017	0.9457675	31	1.951641*-05	0.9999936
52	0.0001100940	0.9999841	21	1.273995*-10	0.9999999	52	0.02816390	0.9193101	32	2.377623*-05	0.9999723
53	0.00001165765	0.9999946	22	4.697780*-11	0.9999999	53	0.1436229	0.9351307	33	1.791437*-05	0.9999579
M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 1.00					M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 1.00						
54	0.3265101	0.3265101	12	3.613901*-06	0.9999999	54	0.08706796	0.7329611	34	1.359770*-05	0.9999587
55	0.1669799	0.6734899	13	1.157233*-07	0.9999999	55	0.05120682	0.6418931	35	1.014976*-05	0.9999689
56	0.1972866	0.8707746	14	3.106718*-07	0.9999999	56	0.03120682	0.4618931	36	0.737623*-05	0.9999723
57	0.09362625	0.9563948	15	8.063334*-09	0.9999999	57	0.02121974	0.351307	37	0.531307*-05	0.9999579
58	0.03029493	0.9848256	16	1.898464*-09	0.9999999	58	0.01596812	0.2513089	38	0.359770*-05	0.9999587
59	0.01025498	0.9950806	17	1.216919*-08	0.9999999	59	0.0120682	0.1893101	39	0.237623*-05	0.9999723
60	0.003397470	0.9991204	18	3.898893*-09	0.9999999	60	0.00942906	0.120682	40	0.140197*-05	0.9999689
61	0.001073734	0.9996941	19	1.267638*-09	0.9999999	61	0.00706796	0.08706796	41	0.08706796	0.9999689
62	0.0003439242	0.9998381	20	3.994603*-10	0.9999999	62	0.005181450	0.05181450	42	0.05181450	0.9999689
63	0.0001100940	0.9999841	21	1.273995*-10	0.9999999	63	0.003738017	0.03738017	43	0.03738017	0.9999689
64	0.00001165765	0.9999946	22	4.697780*-11	0.9999999	64	0.002816390	0.02816390	44	0.02816390	0.9999689
M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 1.00					M = 1, K = B, C = Z, RHO = 1.00						
65	0.3265101	0.3265101	12	3.613901*-06	0.9999999	65	0.002121974	0.02121974	45	0.02121974	0.9999689
66	0.1669799	0.6734899	13	1.157233*-07	0.9999999	66	0.001596812	0.01596812	46	0.01596812	0.9999689
67	0.1972866	0.8707746	14	3.106718*-07	0.9999999	67	0.00120682	0.0120682	47	0.0120682	0.9999689
68	0.09362625	0.9563948	15	8.063334*-09	0.9999999	68	0.000942906	0.00942906	48	0.00942906	0.9999689
69	0.03029493	0.9848256	16	1.898464*-09	0.9999999	69	0.000706796	0.00706796	49	0.00706796	0.9999689
70	0.01025498	0.9950806	17	1.216919*-08	0.9999999	70	0.0005181450	0.005181450	50	0.005181450	0.9999689
71	0.003397470	0.9991204	18	3.898893*-09	0.9999999	71	0.0003738017	0.003738017	51	0.003738017	0.9999689
72	0.001073734	0.9996941	19	1.267638*-09	0.9999999	72	0.0002816390	0.002816390	52	0.002816390	0.9999689
73	0.0003439242	0.9998381	20	3.994603*-10	0.9999999	73	0.0002121974	0.002121974	53	0.002121974	0.9999689
74	0.0001100940	0.9999841	21	1.273995*-10	0.9999999	74	0.0001596812	0.001596812	54	0.001596812	0.9999689

M = 1 , K = 8 , C = 2

RHO	P(DELAY)	L(GIVEN K)	LQ(GIVEN K)	LQ FOR K=1	RATIO
0.10	0.01792109	0.2013269	0.001326923	0.002020202	0.6568266
0.20	0.06526637	0.4105492	0.01054924	0.01666667	0.6329545
0.30	0.1352489	0.6365210	0.03652108	0.05934066	0.6154479
0.40	0.2233869	0.8917542	0.09175420	0.1523809	0.6021371
0.50	0.3265101	1.197244	0.1972441	0.3333333	0.5917324
0.55	0.3829307	1.380202	0.2802032	0.4770609	0.5873531
0.60	0.4422594	1.593808	0.3938082	0.6750000	0.5834197
0.65	0.5042829	1.851505	0.5515060	0.9510822	0.5798720
0.70	0.5688107	2.175664	0.7756644	1.345098	0.5766602
0.75	0.6356713	2.606503	1.106503	1.928571	0.5737424
0.80	0.7047099	3.224415	1.624415	2.844444	0.5710835
0.85	0.7757854	4.216932	2.516932	4.426126	0.5686536
0.90	0.8487694	6.146583	4.346582	7.673684	0.5664272
0.95	0.9235438	11.82589	9.925892	17.58717	0.5643823
0.98	0.9692222	28.73332	26.77332	47.53494	0.5632344
0.99	0.9845791	56.86909	54.88910	97.51749	0.5628642

COPY AVAILABLE TO DDC DOES NOT
PERMIT FULLY LEGIBLE PRODUCTION

COMPUTER PROGRAM

```

PREAMBLE
PERMANENT ENTITIES
THE SYSTEM OWNS A QUEUE
EVERY SERVER HAS A STATE, AN IDENTIFI
TEMPORARY ENTITIES
EVERY JOB HAS AN ARR. TIME AND MAY BELONG TO THE QUEUE
EVENT NOTICES INCLUDE ARRIVAL, END. OF. SIMULATION
EVERY DEPARTURE HAS A CODE
PRIORITY ORDER IS ARRIVAL, DEPARTURE, END. OF. SIMULATION
NORMALLY, MODE IS REAL
TALLY AV. Q. T AS THE MEAN AND VAR. Q AS THE VARIANCE OF R
TALLY FREQ(0 TO 15 BY 0.25) AS THE HISTOGRAM OF R
TALLY AVER AS THE MEAN AND VARER AS THE VARIANCE OF ERLG
ACCUMULATE MMM AS THE MEAN OF K
ACCUMULATE KKK AS THE SUM OF MM
ACCUMULATE FRES(0 TO 40 BY 1) AS THE HISTOGRAM OF K
DEFINE FREE TO MEAN 0
DEFINE BUSY TO MEAN 1
DEFINE X, Y, XX AND YY AS REAL, 1-DIMENSIONAL ARRAYS
DEFINE F, Z AS REAL, 1-DIMENSIONAL ARRAYS
DEFINE NN, KK, STP, EP STP, ST. N, EP AS INTEGER VARIABLES
DEFINE U, ERLG, TOT1, AVG, MM AS REAL VARIABLES
DEFINE STS1, STS2, STS3 AS INTEGER VARIABLES
DEFINE SD1, SD2, SD3 AS INTEGER VARIABLES
DEFINE FLAG AS AN INTEGER VARIABLE
DEFINE LAMBDA, MU, S, TOT. Q. TIME, R, SUMSQR, D, BETA, ST, STT, START. T
    AS REAL VARIABLES
DEFINE CUSTOMER, J, K, DELAYER, AR, M, N, ALPHA#CAZE. NO, I, EFLAG
    AS INTEGER VARIABLES
END
    
```

```

MAIN
READ CASE. NO
READ J
    ' J IS THE NUMBER OF SERVERS
READ ALPHA
    ' ALPHA IS SHAPE PARAMETER OF THE SERVICE TIME DISTRIBUTION
READ BETA
    ' BETA IS SCALE PARAMETER OF THE SERVICE TIME DISTRIBUTION
READ LAMBDA
    ' LAMBDA IS ARRIVAL RATE
READ EPSTP
    ' EPSTP IS TOTAL NUMBER OF EPOCHS FOR THIS SIMULATION RUN
READ FLAG
    ' FLAG INDICATES WHICH PAIR OF ANTITHETIC VARIATES WILL BE
    ' USED
READ SD1, SD2, SD3
READ NN, KK
    ' NN IS DIMENSION OF ARRAY F
    ' KK IS NUMBER OF ELEMENTS NE 1 IN ARRAY F
RESERVE F(*) AS NN AND Z(*) AS NN
    ' READ COF TABLE OF THE CHI-SQR DISTN. WITH 2*ALPHA
    ' DEGREES OF FREEDOM
FOR I=1 TO KK, DO
    READ F(I)
    LET F(I)=1.0-F(I)
LOOP
FOR I=1 TO KK, DO
    READ Z(I)
LOOP
FOR I=KK+1 TO NN, DO
    LET F(I)=1.0
LOOP
    
```

COPY AVAILABLE TO DDC DOES NOT
PERMIT FULLY LEGIBLE PRODUCTION

```

LET N. SERVER=J
CREATE EACH SERVER
LET K=0
LET STP=0
LET STS1=SEED.V(SD1)
LET STS2=SEED.V(SD2)
LET STS3=SEED.V(SD3)
START NEW PAGE
SCHEDULE AN ARRIVAL NOW
START SIMULATION
STOP
END

```

```

EVENT ARRIVAL SAVING THE EVENT NOTICE
DEFINE JJ AS AN INTEGER VARIABLE
ADD 1 TO AR
LET T=TIME.V*1440
IF STP EQ 1
DESTROY THIS ARRIVAL
RETURN
OTHERWISE
ADD 1 TO K
'' GENERATE INTERARRIVAL TIME
LET U=UNIFORM.F(0.0,1.0,SD1)
IF FLAG EQ 1
LET U=1.0-U
ALWAYS
LET AR.TIME=-LOG.E.F(U)/LAMBDA
RESCHEDULE THIS ARRIVAL IN AR.TIME MINUTES
LET JJ=0
FOR EVERY SERVER,DO
IF STATE(SERVER)=BUSY
ADD 1 TO JJ
ALWAYS
LOOP
IF JJ=0
LET EFLAG=1
CALL EPOCH
GO TO AA
ALWAYS
LET J1=J-1
IF JJ EQ J1
LET MM=1.0
ALWAYS
''AA''
''NEXT'' FOR EVERY SERVER,DO
IF STATE(SERVER)=FREE
LET STATE(SERVER)=BUSY
LET R=0.0
''ADD'' ADD 1 TO CUSTOMER
'' GENERATE SERVICE TIME
LET U=UNIFORM.F(0.0,1.0,SD2)
IF FLAG EQ 1
LET U=1.0-U
ALWAYS
CALL ERLNG
LET DEP.TIME=ERLG
LET IDENTI(SERVER)=DEP.TIME
SCHEDULE A DEPARTURE GIVEN DEP.TIME IN DEP.TIME MINUTES
RETURN
OTHERWISE
LOOP
CREATE A JOB
LET ARR.TIME(JOB)=TIME.V*1440
FIL: THIS JOB IN THE QUEUE
RETURN
END

```

COPY AVAILABLE TO DDC DOES NOT
PERMIT FULLY LEGIBLE PRODUCTION

```

EVENT DEPARTURE SAVING THE EVENT NOTICE
DEFINE JJ AS AN INTEGER VARIABLE
LET T=TIME.V*1440
IF STP EQ 1
DESTROY THIS DEPARTURE
RETURN
OTHERWISE
SUBTRACT 1 FROM K
LET JJ=0
FOR EACH SERVER,DO
  IF STATE(SERVER)=BUSY
    ADD 1 TO JJ
  ALWAYS
LOOP
IF JJ EQ 1
  LET EFLAG=0
  CALL EPOCH
  GO TO AA
OTHERWISE
IF JJ EQ J
  IF N.QUEUE EQ 0
    LET MM=0.0
  ALWAYS
ALWAYS
'AA'
FOR EVERY SERVER,DO
  IF IDENTI(SERVER)=CODE(DEPARTURE)
  IF THE QUEUE IS EMPTY
    LET STATE(SERVER)=FREE
  DESTROY THE DEPARTURE
  RETURN
  OTHERWISE
  LET A.T=ARR.TIME(F.QUEUE)
  REMOVE FIRST JOB FROM THE QUEUE
  DESTROY THIS JOB
  LET R=T-A.T
  ADD 1 TO CUSTOMER
  ADD 1 TO DELAYER
  ADD R TO TOT.Q.TIME
  ADD R**2 TO SUMSQR
  ' GENERATE SERVICE TIME
  LET U=UNIFORM.F(0.0,1.0,SD3)
  IF FLAG EQ 1
  LET L=1.0-U
  ALWAYS
  CALL ERLNG
  LET DEP.TIME=ERLG
  LET IDENTI(SERVER)=DEP.TIME
  SCHEDULE A DEPARTURE GIVEN DEP.TIME IN DEP.TIME MINUTES
  RETURN
  OTHERWISE
  LOOP
END

```

```

EVENT END.OF.SIMULATION
DEFINE FR,LUCKY AS INTEGER VARIABLES
DEFINE DELI AS AN INTEGER VARIABLE
RESERVE X(*) AS 60,Y(*) AS 60 AND YY(*) AS 60
RESERVE XX(*) AS 60
LET S=TIME.V*1440
START NEW PAGE
LET MU=1.0/(ALPHA*BETA)
' MU IS SERVICE RATE
LET G=LAMBDA/MU
' G IS OFFERED LOAD
LET RO=G/J

```

**COPY AVAILABLE TO DDC DOES NOT
PERMIT FULLY LEGIBLE PRODUCTION**

```

** RO IS TRAFFIC INTENSITY
** COMPUTE AVG. WAIT. TIME FOR EQUIVALENT M/M/C QUEUE
LET JFAC=1
FOR I=1 TO J-1, DO
  LET JFAC=JFAC*(I+1)
LOOP
LET C=((J*RO)**J)/(JFAC*(1.0-RO))
LET B=1.0
FOR K=1 TO J-1, DO
  LET KFAC=1
  FOR L=1 TO K-1, DO
    LET KFAC=KFAC*(L+1)
  LOOP
  ADD ((J*RO)**K)/KFAC TO B
LOOP
LET PONE=B+C
LET PNOT=1.0/(B+C)
LET E=PNOT*((J*RO)**J)/(J*JFAC*((1.0-RO)**2)*MU)
LET VSQR=1.0/ALPHA
LET V=SQRT.F(VSQR)
LET W=(E/2.0)*(1.0+VSQR)
LET PMMC=E*J*MU*(1.0-RO)
PRINT 1 LINE WITH CASE.NO AND FLAG AS FOLLOWS
      CASE NO=****          FLAG=*
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 2 LINES AS FOLLOWS
INPUT INFORMATION:
-----
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 5 LINES WITH STS1, SEED.V(SD1), STS2, SEED.V(SD2),
      STS3, SEED.V(SD3) AS FOLLOWS
      STARTING SEEDS:          FINAL SEEDS:
      I. *****              *****
      II. *****              *****
      III. *****              *****
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH ALPHA AND BETA AS FOLLOWS
      ALPHA=****          BETA=***.****
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH LAMBDA AS FOLLOWS
      LAMBDA=****.****
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH MU AS FOLLOWS
      MU=***.****
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH RO AS FOLLOWS
TRAFFIC INTENSITY, RO=*.*.****
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH J AS FOLLOWS
NUMBER OF SERVERS=**
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH G AS FOLLOWS
OFFERED LOAD=***.****
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH V AS FOLLOWS
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION=***.****
START NEW PAGE
IF EFLAG=1
ADD S-START.T TO SUMP
ALWAYS
LET LUCKY=CUSTOMER-DElayer
LET PD=DElayer/CUSTOMER
PRINT 2 LINES AS FOLLOWS
OUTPUT INFORMATION:
-----
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH AV.Q.T AS FOLLOWS
MEAN QUEUEING TIME FROM SIMULATION=***.****
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH W AS FOLLOWS
COMPUTED MEAN QUEUEING TIME=***.**** MINUTES

```

```

SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH W-AV.Q.T AS FOLLOWS
DIFFERENCE=**.****
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH VAR.Q AS FOLLOWS
VARIANCE OF QUEUEING-TIME=**.****
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH MMM AS FOLLOWS
AVERAGE QUEUE LENGTH=**.****
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH CUSTOMER AS FOLLOWS
TOTAL NUMBER SERVED IN SIMULATION PERIOD=*****
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH DELAYER AS FOLLOWS
TOTAL NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS WITH DELAY GREATER THAN ZERO=*****
LET PERIOD=S-STT
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH PD AS FOLLOWS
PROB(W>0)=*.*****
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH PMMC AS FOLLOWS
PMMC=*.*****
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH PERIOD AS FOLLOWS
SIMULATION TIME=*****.**** MINUTES
SKIP 2 LINES
PRINT 1 LINE WITH KKK*1440 AS FOLLOWS
TOTAL BUSY PERIOD=*****.**** MINUTES
FOR I=1 TO 60,00
  LET XX(I)=FREQ(I)
  LOOP
  SUBTRACT LUCKY FROM XX(I)
  ' COMPUTE AND PRINT F SUB I
  FOR I=1 TO N,00
  ADD XX(I) TO FR
  LET Y(I)=1.0-(FR/DElayer)
  IF FLAG EQ 0
  IF FR EQ DELAYER
  LET N=I-1
  GO TO REG
  OTHERWISE
  ALWAYS
  LET Y(I)=LOG.E.F(Y(I))
  LET X(I)=I/4.0
  LOOP
  'REG'
  LET CUMFREQ=0
  START NEW PAGE
  ' COMPUTE AND PRINT STATE PROBABILITIES
  PRINT 2 LINES AS FOLLOWS
  I          X(I)          FREQ(I)          CUMFREQ
  -----
  FOR I=1 TO N,00
  ADD XX(I) TO CUMFREQ
  SKIP 1 LINE
  PRINT 1 LINE WITH I,X(I),XX(I) AND CUMFREQ AS FOLLOWS
  **          **.* **          *****          *****
  LOOP
  IF FLAG EQ 1
  CALL REGRESSION
  ALWAYS
  START NEW PAGE
  PRINT 2 LINES AS FOLLOWS
  N          T(N)          P(N)
  -----
  FOR I=1 TO 40,00
  PRINT 1 LINE WITH I,FRES(I)*1440.0 AND (FRES(I)*1440.)/PERIO
  AS FOLLOWS
  **          *****          *.*****
  LOOP
  RETURN
  END

```

COPY AVAILABLE TO DDC DOES NOT
PERMIT FULLY LEGIBLE PRODUCTION

```

ROUTINE EPOCH
DEFINE FI.N AS AN INTEGER VARIABLE
LET T=TIME.V*1440
IF EFLAG EQUALS 1
  '' EPOCH STARTS
  LET START.T=T
  LET ST.N=CUSTOMER
  LET TOT1=TOT.Q.TIME
  ADD 1 TO EP
  RETURN
  OTHERWISE
  '' EPOCH ENDS
  LET FINISH.T=T
  LET FI.N=CUSTOMER
  LET TOT2=TOT.Q.TIME
  LET AVG=(TOT2-TOT1)/((FI.N-ST.N)*1.0)
  LET PERIOD=FINISH.T-START.T
  LET CUM.AVG=TOT2/FI.N
  SKIP 1 LINE
  LIST EP,START.T,FINISH.T,ST.N,FI.N,TOT1,TOT2
  LIST PERIOD,TOT2-TOT1,FI.N-ST.N,AVG,CUM.AVG
  '' CHECK FOR END OF SIMULATION
  IF EP EQ EPSTP
    LET STP=1
    SCHEDULE AN END.OF.SIMULATION NOW
  ALWAYS
  RETURN
END

```

```

ROUTINE ERLNG
DEFINE RL,LH,RH AS INTEGER VARIABLES
IF U LT F(1)
  LET CHSQR=Z(1)*(U/F(1))
  GO TO ERLANG
  ALWAYS
  '' START BISECTION SEARCH
  IF U GT F(KK)
    LET CHSQR=Z(KK)+(Z(KK)-Z(KK-1))*(U-F(KK))
    GO TO ERLANG
  ALWAYS
  LET LH=0
  LET KH=NN
  'AA' LET RL=(LH+RH)/2
  IF U LT F(RL)
    LET RH=RL
    GO TO BB
  ALWAYS
  LET LH=RL
  'BB' IF RH=LH+1
    GO TO QUIT
  ALWAYS
  GO TO AA
  'QUIT'
  '' DO LINEAR INTERPOLATION
  LET CHSQR=Z(LH)+((U-F(LH))*(Z(RH)-Z(LH)))/(F(RH)-F(LH))
  'ERLANG'
  LET ERLG=(BETA*CHSQR)/2.0
  RETURN
END

```

COPY AVAILABLE TO DDC DOES NOT
PERMIT FULLY LEGIBLE PRODUCTION

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Cox, D. R. and W. L. Smith, Queues, Methuen, 1961
2. Lee, A. M., Applied Queueing Theory, Macmillan, 1966.
3. Mayhugh, J. O. and R. E. McCormick, "Steady-State Solution of the Queue $M/E_k/r$," Management Science, Vol. 14, p. 692-712, 1968.
4. Heffer, J. C., "Steady-State Solution of the $M/E_k/c$ (, FIFO) Queueing System," CORS J, Vol. 7, p. 16-30, 1969.
5. Stanford University Technical Report No. 13, On the Steady-State Solution of an $E_k E_k/r$ Queue with Heterogeneous Servers, by Yu, O. S., 27 December 1971.
6. Stanford University Technical Report No. 31, Tables for Multiple-Server Queueing Systems Involving Erlang Distributions, by F. S. Hillier and F. D. Lo, 28 December 1971.
7. Saaty, T. L., Elements of Queueing Theory, McGraw-Hill, 1961.
8. Hillier, F. S. and G. J. Lieberman, Introduction to Operations Research, Holden-Day, 1967.
9. Yu, O. S., On the Steady-State Solution of a Heterogeneous-Server Queue with Recurrent Input and Erlangian Service Times, Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1972.
10. Shelton, J. R., "Solution Methods for Waiting Line Problems," J. Industr. Engr., V. 11, No. 4, p. 293-303, August 1960.
11. Cooper, R. B., Introduction to Queueing Theory, Macmillan, 1972.
12. Fishman, G. S., Concepts and Methods in Discrete Event Digital Simulation, Wiley, 1973.
13. Reitman, J., Computer Simulation Applications, Wiley, 1971.

14. Kiviat, P. J., R. Villanueva and H. M. Markowitz, Simsript II, 5 Programming Language, C.A.C.I., 1973.
15. Gaven, D. P. and G. L. Thompson, Programming and Probability Models in Operations Research, Brook/Cole, 1973.
16. Hammersley, J. M. and D. C. Handscomb, Monte Carlo Methods, Methuen, 1964.
17. Pearson, E. S. and H. O. Hartley, Biometrika Tables for Statisticians, Vol. 1, Biometrika, 1966.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	No. Copies
1. Defense Documentation Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	2
2. Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	2
3. Department Chairman Department of Operations Research Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
4. Professor R. R. Read Department of Operations Research Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
5. Professor K. T. Marshall Department of Operations Research Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
6. Lt. Mehmet Celayir, Turkish Navy Baglayan sok. No. 10/5 Kucukesat, Ankara Turkey	2
7. Deniz Harb Okulu Komutanligi Heybeliada, Istanbul Turkey	1
8. Orta-Dogu Teknik Universitesi Yon-Eylem Arastirmasi Bolumu Ankara Turkey	1
9. Stanford University Stanford, California Attn: Prof. F. S. Hillier Dept. of Operations Research	1