Some Aspects of the Peakedness Concept in Teletraffic Theory[1])

By *Erik A. van Doorn*[2])

Abstract: In teletraffic engineering one commonly uses as a second order characterization of traffic its peakedness factor, which is defined as the variance-to-mean ratio for the trunk occupancy distribution resulting when the traffic is offered to an infinite trunk group. Assuming renewal input streams and exponentially distributed holding times, *Pearce* and others have given representations and bounds for the peakedness factors of primary and secondary traffic streams. Besides giving a survey of pertinent results, we generalize some of them, and obtain some new results in this vein.

1. Introduction

The customary basic model in teletraffic theory is that of a finite or infinite trunk group to which a renewal stream of calls with exponentially distributed holding times is offered. Considering that most traffic streams in a network will result from superposition of other streams (so that they are not in general renewal), it is of some interest to relax the renewal assumption and to investigate whether a more general setting yields to analysis. Therefore, we start out to formally define *traffic* as a stochastic marked point process, i.e., a sequence $\{(t_i, h_i): -\infty < i < \infty\}$, where the points t_i correspond to arrivals of calls and the marks h_i are the holding times associated with these calls. Throughout this paper we will assume that only one call can arrive at a particular point in time. Further, the marked point process is always supposed to be stationary and metrically transitive. A formal definition of a marked point process and the associated concepts may be found in, e.g., [14], [15], [17] and [27].

Traffic engineers tend to be interested in the stationary distribution of the number of busy trunks in an infinite or finite trunk group which is induced by a particular traffic stream. Indeed, traffic is often defined by the distribution it induces on an infinite trunk group. This is justified when the point process of arriving calls is a renewal process, and the associated holding times constitute a sequence of independent and exponentially distributed random variables with known, common mean, since then there is a one-to-one correspondence between the interarrival time distribution and the trunk occupancy distribution on the infinite group, as was shown by *Wallin* (private communication) and *Warmuth* [37]. In more general contexts, however, the offered traffic is probably not completely determined by the trunk occupancy distribution on the infinite trunk group. Anyhow, from a practical point of view even this distribution is unmanageable, so that interest centres on a few of its moments, usually the first two. Rather than mean and variance, one uses mean and variance-to-

mean ratio of the number of busy trunks on an infinite group as traffic characteristics. Indeed, these quantities are meant when one speaks of the *mean* and *peakedness (factor)*, respectively, of a particular traffic stream.

Note that carried traffic, i.e., that part of a traffic stream which consists of the calls (points in time) which are effectively served on a finite trunk group, and the associated holding times, induces the same distribution on an infinite trunk group as the original traffic stream on the finite carrier group. Thus mean and peakedness factor of carried traffic are equal to (and will be identified with) mean and variance-to-mean ratio, respectively, of the trunk occupancy distribution on the finite carrier group. We remark, however, that in the context of carried traffic some authors use another definition of peakedness (see the last paragraph of Section 3).

There are indications that a two-moment characterization of traffic is adequate in practice, provided the holding times are independent of the interarrival times ([39], cf. also [24]). But when the independence assumption is no longer valid (as is generally the case with carried traffic), it is doubtful whether mean and peakedness are sufficiently accurate in describing a traffic stream. However, we shall not be concerned with this problem in this paper, where we restrict ourselves to a theoretical analysis of mean and peakedness.

The important theoretical questions of whether a traffic stream as defined above induces a unique, stationary distribution of busy trunks on a finite or infinite trunk group was answered in the affirmative by *Franken* and *Kerstan* [16] and *Franken* [12], at least in the cases that we will consider (see [3], [14]—[18] and [27] for related and more general results). The above reservation refers to the fact that we assume throughout that holding times are mutually independent random variables with an exponential distribution of mean $1/\mu$. Further, we shall only consider *free traffic* and secondary forms thereof (carried traffic and overflow traffic), where free traffic is defined to be traffic where the holding times are independent of the point process of arriving calls. (See [9], [18] for a more general context.)

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we discuss a representation formula for the peakedness factor of free traffic and some of its consequences. In Sections 3 and 4 the peakedness factors of carried traffic and overflow traffic, respectively, will be studied and related to the peakedness factor of the associated (free) offered traffic. Section 5 contains some folklore results on the peakedness factor of *renewal traffic*, i.e., traffic where the point process of arriving calls constitutes a renewal process.

2. Free traffic

We start off with some notation. Consider a free traffic stream as defined in the previous section and suppose that it is offered to an infinite trunk group. The stationary distribution of the number of busy trunks at an arbitrary moment will be denoted by $\{p(n)\}$. We are also interested in the trunk occupancy distribution just prior to the arrival of a call, which will be denoted by $\{p'(n)\}$. Finally, $p^*(n)$ stands for the probability of n busy trunks just after the departure (end) of a call. The factorial moments of these distributions will be denoted by $M_{(k)}$, $M'_{(k)}$ and $M^*_{(k)}$, respectively, i.e., $M_{(0)} = 1$ and

$$M_{(k)} = \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} j(j-1) \dots (j - k + 1)\, p(j)\,, \qquad k = 1, 2, \dots\,,$$

etc. The first (factorial) moments will be denoted by M, M' and M^*, instead of $M_{(1)}$, $M'_{(1)}$ and $M^*_{(1)}$, respectively.

We shall now give the relations that exist between the above distributions. First, it is well known (see [13], [14] or [5, Section 5.2]) that

$$p'(n) = p^*(n) , \qquad n = 0, 1, \dots .$$ (1)

Further, we have the important relation

$$A p'(n) = (n + 1)\, p(n + 1) , \qquad n = 0, 1, \dots$$ (2)

(see [13], [14]), where A is the *traffic intensity*, which is defined as the intensity of the point process of arriving calls λ, say, times the mean holding time $1/\mu$. From (2) one readily deduces the relation that exists between the factorial moments $M_{(k)}$ and $M'_{(k)}$, viz.,

$$A M'_{(k)} = M_{(k+1)} , \qquad k = 0, 1, \dots ,$$ (3)

a result which was first given by *Franken* and *Kerstan* [16]. Note that formula (3) with $k = 0$ $(A = M)$ is implied by Little's formula.

The peakedness factor z of free traffic is defined as the variance-to-mean ratio of the distribution $\{p(n)\}$, i.e.,

$$z = V/M ,$$ (4)

where

$$V = M_{(2)} + M - M^2 .$$ (5)

By (3) we have $M_{(2)} = A M'$ (and $M = A$), so that the next theorem emerges.

Theorem 1. *For the mean M and peakedness factor z of free traffic with intensity A one has $M = A$ and*

$$z = 1 + M' - M . \quad \square$$ (6)

This theorem was first observed by *Descloux* [7] and later by *Pearce* and *Potter* [31] for renewal traffic. *Heffes* and *Holtzman* [20] proved its validity for a traffic stream whose point process is that of carried traffic of renewal offered traffic, but whose original holding times are replaced by new ones, which are then independent of the point process of calls (*freed carried traffic*).

Note that the dichotomy $z > 1$ (*peaked traffic*) vs. $z < 1$ (*smooth traffic*) has an interesting interpretation in the form $M' > M$ vs. $M' < M$.

A traffic stream will be called *regular* when the point process of arriving calls is a renewal process with constant interarrival times. The quantities pertaining to regular traffic will be pre-indexed by the letter R. We now cite an important result in [16], to the effect that for any traffic stream

$$M'_{(k)}(A) \geqq {}_R M'_{(k)}(A) ,$$ (7)

where we have indicated dependence on the traffic intensity A. In particular one has

$$M'(A) \geqq {}_R M'(A) ,$$ (8)

so that (6) yields

$$z(A) \geqq {}_R z(A) .$$ (9)

This result is in accordance with the usual interpretation of peakedness as a measure of variability of the input stream. To obtain an explicit lower bound for $z(A)$ we must calculate ${}_R z(A)$. The result of this calculation is given, e.g., in formula (41) of Section 5. Subsequent substitution in (9) yields the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *The peakedness factor $z(A)$ of free traffic with intensity A satisfies*

$$z(A) \geqq {}_R z(A) = \{1 - \exp(-1/A)\}^{-1} - A . \quad \square$$ (10)

The inequality in this theorem is essentially a relation between variances, in which form it was stated already by *Franken* and *Kerstan* [16]. The validity of the theorem when one restricts oneself to renewal traffic was observed by *Kuczura* [25]. (See also [1], [18], [22] and [29]).

It is easily seen that $_Rz(A)$ is a decreasing function with the values $_Rz(0) = 1$ and $_Rz(\infty) = \frac{1}{2}$. Hence we have the next corollary.

Corollary. *The peakedness factor z of any stream of free traffic satisfies*

$$z > \tfrac{1}{2} \cdot \square \tag{11}$$

The latter inequality has an interesting interpretation. Namely, let $\hat{M}$ denote the expected number of busy trunks on the infinite trunk group immediately before an event (either arrival or departure). Then, since each arrival corresponds to a departure and vice versa,

$$\hat{M} = \tfrac{1}{2} \left\{ M' + (M^* + 1) \right\}.$$

(Of course, $\hat{M}$ is also equal to the number of busy trunks immediately after an event.) From (1) we see that $M' = M^*$. Hence

$$\hat{M} = M' + \tfrac{1}{2}. \tag{12}$$

We now obtain

$$\hat{M} > M, \tag{13}$$

since, by (6) and (11), $M' + \frac{1}{2} = z + M - \frac{1}{2} > M$. Thus the expected number of busy trunks at an arbitrary moment is always smaller than at a moment where the system changes state. (Here "at" can have the interpretation "just prior to" as well as "just after"; in what follows, however, we shall always mean the former in the case of ambiguity.)

As a final remark in this section we mention the fact that peakedness of free traffic with fixed intensity can be made arbitrarily large. An example is provided by renewal traffic with an interarrival distribution which has a mass p at $x_0 > 0$ and a mass $1 - p$ at $x_1 > x_0$, where $p = (x_1 - 1/\lambda)/(x_1 - x_0)$. The well-known formula (35) for the peakedness factor z of renewal traffic readily yields that z exceeds any bound by choosing x_0 sufficiently small and x_1 sufficiently large. (Incidentally, this is the example used by *Beneš* [2] (see also [30]) to show that when traffic with fixed intensity is offered to a finite group of fixed size, the blocking probability can be arbitrarily close to unity.) If, however, the traffic is renewal and both mean and variance of the interarrival time are fixed, then an upper bound for z can be given [22].

3. Carried traffic

Consider a marked point process representing a stream of free traffic with traffic intensity $A = \lambda/\mu$, which we will designate as *offered traffic*. When offered to a finite trunk group of size N, this stream is split in two parts: carried traffic and overflow traffic. This section will be concerned with the former. A subindex "ca" will distinguish quantities pertaining to carried traffic from those belonging to the offered traffic. We recall that an analysis of the trunk occupancy distribution on an infinite trunk group offered this carried traffic amounts to a study of the trunk occupancy distribution on the trunk group of size N to which the original free traffic is offered. This latter distribution (at an arbitrary moment) will be denoted by $\{p_{ca}(n)\}$. The distri-

bution at an arrival moment (of the offered stream) is denoted by $\{p'_{ca}(n)\}$. The two distributions are related as

$$
\left.
\begin{array}{l}
A p'_{ca}(n) = (n+1)\, p_{ca}(n+1)\,, \qquad n = 0, 1, \dots, N-1 \\[2mm]
A p'_{ca}(N) = A - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (n+1)\, p_{ca}(n+1)
\end{array}
\right\}
\tag{14}
$$

([12]−[14]; see [32] for more general results). It is easy now to deduce from (14) that the factorial moments for these distributions are related as

$$
A M'_{ca(k)} = M_{ca(k+1)} + \frac{N!}{(N-k)!}\,(A - M_{ca})\,, \qquad k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1\,,
\tag{15}
$$

where the notation should be clear. The last equality of (14) can be written as

$$
M_{ca} = A(1 - B)\,,
\tag{16}
$$

where

$$
B = p'_{ca}(N) = M'_{ca(N)}/N!\,,
$$

i.e., B is the blocking probability or *call congestion*. Formulas (15) and (16) imply that $M_{ca(2)} = A(M'_{ca} - NB)$, so that the peakedness factor $z_{ca} = V_{ca}/M_{ca} = (M_{ca(2)} + M_{ca} - M_{ca}^2)/M_{ca}$ of carried traffic is given by

$$
z_{ca} = 1 - M_{ca} + (M'_{ca} - NB)/(1 - B)\,.
\tag{17}
$$

Clearly, M'_{ca}, the expected number of busy trunks in the finite group at an arrival moment, equals B times N, the number of busy trunks on the finite group at an overflow moment, plus $1 - B$ times the expected number of busy trunks at a moment where a call is accepted on that group. It follows that the latter quantity M_{ca}^{ca}, say, is given by

$$
M_{ca}^{ca} = (M'_{ca} - NB)/(1 - B)\,.
\tag{18}
$$

Substitution of (18) in (17) gives us the analogue of (6) for carried traffic

$$
z_{ca} = 1 + M_{ca}^{ca} - M_{ca}\,.
\tag{19}
$$

Note that (19) is not implied by Theorem 1, since carried traffic is not in general free traffic. Formula (19) was observed by *Descloux* [7] for renewal offered traffic. *Descloux* also considered a model where a finite waiting room is available for calls that arrive when the trunk group is full. His formula (26) is not correct, but it may be shown that (19) is valid for this model too, even if the offered traffic is non-renewal. Again M_{ca}^{ca} should be interpreted as the expected number of busy trunks in the group at a moment where a call is accepted on the group (this includes moments at which a call is shifted from a waiting position to a trunk, i.e., moments at which a call finishes while the waiting room is not empty.)

To obtain more explicit results on the peakedness factor of carried traffic we must impose an additional condition on the offered traffic.

Le m m a 1. *If the offered traffic is renewal then*

$$
M'_{ca} = (1 - B)\, M'\,.
\tag{20}
$$

Proof. Let M'_{ov} denote the expected number of busy trunks on an infinite overflow group at an arrival moment (of the offered stream). We must show that $M'_{ov}/M'_{ca} = B/(1 - B)$, since $M' = M'_{ca} + M'_{ov}$. It is not difficult to see that, because of the renewal character of the input stream and the exponentially distributed holding times, the ratio of the expected number of busy trunks on the overflow group and on the finite group just prior to an arrival will be equal to that ratio just after an

arrival. It follows that this ratio must be $B/(1 - B)$, since an arriving call will occupy a trunk on the overflow group with probability B and on the finite group with probability $1 - B$. $\square$

The relation (17) combined with (16) and the above lemma immediately yields the following theorem, which has not been published before, although an alternative proof can readily be given by using results that are available in the literature.

Theorem 3. *When renewal traffic with intensity A and peakedness factor z is offered to a group of N trunks, then the peakedness factor z_{ca} of the traffic carried by that group is given by*

$$z_{ca} = z + AB - NB/(1 - B) \, , \tag{21}$$

where B is the blocking probability experienced by the offered traffic. $\square$

Remark. In view of (16) formula (21) may be formulated alternatively as

$$z_{ca} = z - (A - M_{ca}) (N - M_{ca})/M_{ca} \, . \tag{21'}$$

The result (21) is well-known for offered Poisson traffic [39, p. 498]; for an offered stream which is overflow traffic of Poisson traffic, the validity of (21) was observed by *Heffes* (cf. [19, p. 819]).

Examples may be constructed showing that Theorem 3 is not generally valid for offered non-renewal traffic (cf. [18], [38]). The hitch is in the proof of Lemma 1 where we have used the independence of the trunk occupancy at an arrival moment and the time until the next arrival.

Corollary. *The peakedness factors z_{ca} and z of traffic carried on a finite group and the associated offered renewal traffic satisfy*

$$z_{ca} < z \tag{22}$$

and

$$z_{ca} < B + (1 - B) z \, . \tag{23}$$

Proof. We clearly have $N > M_{ca}$ and $N > M'_{ca}$. With (16) and (21), the former inequality leads to (22), while, using (20), (21) and Theorem 1, the latter inequality gives (23). $\square$

The inequality (22) contradicts a claim by *Pearce* [29] that for renewal offered traffic z_{ca} may be larger than z.

An interesting intuitive derivation of (23) is the following. Suppose a traffic stream with peakedness factor z is thinned randomly by rejecting each call with probability p. It is easy to verify (cf. [26, Section 3.2.4]) that the thinned stream will have peakedness factor

$$z_{th} = p + (1 - p) z \, . \tag{24}$$

Thus formula (23) expresses that the peakedness factor of a renewal stream which is thinned by rejecting overflow calls is smaller than when the stream is thinned randomly (with reject probability B), which is exactly what we would expect.

The question arises whether the extremal property of regular traffic given in (7) carries over to quantities related to a finite group. One would suspect, for instance, that the blocking experienced by calls from regular traffic offered to a trunk group of size N should be smaller than the blocking experienced by calls from any other type of free traffic with the same intensity. This was shown to be true for renewal offered traffic by *Beneš* [2] (see [33] and [34, Section 7.5] for more general inequalities). However, for the more general class of free traffic as defined in this paper, the conjecture has only been validated for $N = 1$ by *Franken* [12] and for $N = 2$ by *Fleischmann* [10].

Inequalities involving the peakedness factor of carried regular traffic are not known with the exception of the case $N = 1$. By (16) and (19) one then has $z_{ca} = z_{ca}(A)$ $= 1 - A(1 - B)$, so that, in view of Franken's result, $z_{ca}(A) \geqq {}_R z_{ca}(A)$.

In closing this section we remark that *Heffes* and *Holtzman* [20] define peakedness of carried traffic as (in our terminology) the peakedness factor of freed carried traffic, i.e., carried traffic where the calls are provided with new independent holding times of the same exponential distribution as the old ones. Indeed, one can argue that this definition of peakedness serves better the purpose of describing the variability of the input stream of calls than the usual definition. We will not digress at this point, however, and just give a conjecture involving the peakedness factor $\hat{z}_{ca}$ of freed carried traffic and the peakedness factors z_{ca} and z of the associated traffics, to the effect that in a renewal context $z_{ca} < \hat{z}_{ca} < z$.

4. Overflow traffic

As in the previous section we consider a stream of free traffic with traffic intensity $A = \lambda/\mu$, and suppose that it is offered to a group of N trunks. Those calls which are not carried on the finite group and their associated holding times constitute the overflow traffic. Clearly, overflow traffic of free traffic is free traffic, so that we can invoke Theorem 1 to conclude that

$$z_{ov} = 1 + M_{ov}^{ov} - M_{ov}, \tag{25}$$

where a subindex "ov" refers to the infinite overflow group and a superindex "ov" to the fact that the pertinent mean is defined at overflow moments.

Remark. The existence and uniqueness of a stationary trunk occupancy distribution (at an arbitrary moment) on the infinite overflow group follows readily from the results mentioned in the introduction. Consequently (see, e.g., [14], [15], [27]), there is also a unique stationary distribution at overflow moments.

By Little's formula, or, alternatively, by (16) and the fact that $A = M = M_{ca} + M_{ov}$, we have

$$M_{ov} = AB, \tag{26}$$

B being the call congestion experienced by the offered traffic, so that

$$z_{ov} = 1 + M_{ov}^{ov} - AB. \tag{27}$$

Again we cannot get much further unless we impose the additional condition of renewal input. Doing this, we can cite a result of *Pearce* [29] stating that

$$N = 1 \Rightarrow z_{ov} \geqq 1 - B + Bz, \tag{28}$$

with equality subsisting only if the offered traffic is regular. This result can be generalized as follows.

Theorem 4. *Let renewal traffic with peakedness factor z be offered to a finite trunk group of size N. In terms of z and the blocking probability B experienced by the offered traffic, the peakedness factor z_{ov} of the overflow traffic satisfies*

$$z_{ov} \geqq 1 - B + Bz, \tag{29}$$

with equality subsisting only if $N = 1$ and the offered traffic is regular.

Proof. Let the trunks in the finite group be numbered $1, 2, \ldots, N$ and suppose that an accepted call is carried on the lowest numbered free trunk. Let $z(i)$ denote the peakedness factor of the traffic which is offered to trunk $i + 1$, so that in particular

7*

$z(0) = z$ and $z(N) = z_{ov}$. Finally let B_i denote the blocking probability experienced on trunk i by the traffic offered to this trunk, so that, clearly,

$$B = B_1 B_2 \dots B_N .$$ (30)

By (28) and the well-known result of *Palm* [28] that overflow traffic is renewal when the offered traffic is renewal, we then have

$$z(i) \geqq 1 - B_i + B_i z(i - 1), \qquad i = 1, 2, \dots, N .$$ (31)

Consequently,

$$z_{ov} = z(N) \geqq 1 - (1 - z(0)) \prod_{i=1}^{N} B_i = 1 - B + Bz .$$

The remaining part is evident. □

Intuitively, the peakedness factor of a traffic stream which is thinned by rejecting the calls that are carried on a finite group will be greater than when the stream is thinned randomly (with reject probability $1 - B$). In view of (24), this is precisely what (29) expresses.

Theorem 4 is readily seen to imply Pearce's [29] result for renewal traffic

$$z_{ov} > \min(1, z) .$$ (32)

In this context we note that z_{ov} may be smaller than z as shown by *Pearce* [29]; also, z_{ov} may be smaller than 1 (see [23] and [31]).

We finally remark that the examples in [18] and [38] referred to in the previous section, can be used to show that (28) (and hence (29)) is not generally valid for non-renewal traffic.

5. Additional results on renewal traffic

In this section we will collect some results for the peakedness factor of renewal traffic, most of which are folklore. As usual we assume the offered traffic to be free and stationary (the latter amounts to considering equilibrium renewal processes in the terminology of *Cox* [6]) and holding times to be mutually independent, exponentially distributed random variables with a common mean $1/\mu$. Let $F(t)$, with $F(0+) = 0$, be the distribution function of the interarrival times and let

$$\varphi(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-st} dF(t) , \qquad \text{Re } s \geqq 0 ,$$

be its Laplace-Stieltjes transform. The intensity of the arrival stream is now given by λ where

$$\lambda^{-1} = \int_0^\infty t \, dF(t) = -\varphi'(0) .$$ (33)

Regarding the trunk occupancy distribution on an infinite trunk group, offered this renewal traffic, we clearly have $M = A = \lambda/\mu$. As for M', let u be the length of an interarrival interval and let n^+ (n^-) denote the number of busy trunks just after it has started (just before it ends). Then, with E denoting expectation,

$$M' = E\{n^-\} = E_u\{E_{n^+}\{E_{n^-}\{n^- \mid n^+, u\}\}\}$$
$$= E_u\{E_{n^+}\{n^+ e^{-\mu u} \mid u\}\} = E_{n^+}\{n^+\} E_u\{e^{-\mu u}\} .$$

Thus $M' = \varphi(\mu) E\{n^+\}$. Since $E\{n^+\} = 1 + M'$, it follows that

$$M' = \varphi(\mu)/(1 - \varphi(\mu)) .$$ (34)

Consequently, (6) yields

$$z = \frac{1}{1 - \varphi(\mu)} - \frac{\lambda}{\mu} , \tag{35}$$

which is a well-known result. One can obtain (34) also from *Cohen* [4] or *Takács* [35, Theorem 5]. Alternatively, one can use [35, Theorem 6] and the definition of z to obtain (35) directly, considering that the condition which *Takács* imposes on F (of being not a lattice distribution) is dictated only by his considering limiting distributions instead of stationary distributions. It may be shown (cf. [21]) that (35) remains valid if one allows $F(0+) > 0$.

Two types of renewal traffic deserve special mention because of their frequent occurrence in teletraffic theory.

1. *Hypo-exponential traffic* is defined by the relation

$$F = E_1 * E_2 * \ldots * E_k ,$$

where $*$ denotes convolution and E_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots , k$, an exponential distribution with mean $1/\lambda_i$, such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} 1/\lambda_i = 1/\lambda . \tag{36}$$

Thus an interarrival time may be thought of as consisting of k independent, exponentially distributed phases. Clearly, we have

$$\varphi(s) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} (\lambda_i/(\lambda_i + s)) , \tag{37}$$

whence the peakedness factor is given by

$$z = \frac{\prod(1 + \lambda_i/\mu)}{\prod(1 + \lambda_i/\mu) - \prod(\lambda_i/\mu)} - \frac{\lambda}{\mu} . \tag{38}$$

Considering that $u(x) = x/(x - c)$ is decreasing in x and

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k} (1 + \lambda_i/\mu) \geqq \prod_{i=1}^{k} (\lambda_i/\mu) + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \prod_{i \neq j} (\lambda_i/\mu) , \tag{39}$$

we can use (39) in both numerator and denominator of (38) to conclude that $z \leqq 1$, with equality subsisting only if $k = 1$ (exponential traffic, more commonly called *Poisson traffic*).

If the k phases have equal means $(k\lambda)^{-1}$ we speak of *Erlang traffic*. For $k \to \infty$ the interarrival time distribution of Erlang traffic tends to a degenerate distribution $_R F(t)$ which concentrates all mass at $1/\lambda$ and corresponds to regular traffic. For this particular case we have

$$_R\varphi(s) = \exp(-s/\lambda) , \tag{40}$$

whence

$$_R z = \{1 - \exp(-\mu/\lambda)\}^{-1} - \lambda/\mu , \tag{41}$$

a well-known result that we have used in Section 2.

2. *Hyper-exponential traffic* has an interarrival distribution of the form

$$F = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i E_i ,$$

where E_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots , k$, is an exponential distribution with mean $1/\lambda_i$ and

$$a_i > 0 , \qquad \sum_i a_i = 1 ., \qquad \sum_i a_i/\lambda_i = 1/\lambda . \tag{42}$$

Evidently, the Laplace-Stieltjes transform of F is

$$\varphi(s) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \lambda_i / (\lambda_i + s) , \tag{43}$$

so that the peakedness factor of hyperexponential traffic is given by

$$z = \{\Sigma_i a_i / (1 + \lambda_i/\mu)\}^{-1} - \lambda/\mu . \tag{44}$$

Considering that $u(x) = x/(1 + x)$ is strictly concave, the mean of $\{u(\mu/\lambda_i)\}_i$ weighted by the a_i's is smaller than the value of u in the point $\Sigma_i a_i \mu/\lambda_i = \mu/\lambda$. That is, for $k > 1$,

$$(\mu/\lambda)/(1 + \mu/\lambda) > \Sigma_i a_i(\mu/\lambda_i)/(1 + \mu/\lambda_i) .$$

Hence $z \geqq 1$, with equality subsisting only if $k = 1$ (Poisson traffic).

In conclusion we mention that *Palm* [28] (see also [36], and for more general results [8]) has shown that traffic which is overflowing from a finite number N of trunks offered Poisson traffic is hyper-exponential with $k = N + 1$, whence this type of traffic is peaked. The latter result, which was proven rigorously for the first time in [11], follows of course directly from Pearce's inequality (32).

References

[1] *Basharin, G. P., V. A. Kokotushkin, V. A. Naumov*, The method of equivalent substitutions for calculating fragments of communication networks for a digital computer, I. Engrg. Cybernetics **17** (1979), 66—73.

[2] *Beneš, V. E.*, On trunks with negative exponential holding times serving a renewal process. Bell System Tech. J. **38** (1959), 211—258.

[3] *Borovkov, A. A.*, Stochastic Process in Queueing Theory. Springer-Verlag, New York 1976.

[4] *Cohen, J. W.*, The full availability group of trunks with an arbitrary distribution of the inter-arrival times and a negative exponential holding time distribution. Simon Stevin **31** (1957), 169—181.

[5] *Cooper, R. B.*, Introduction to Queueing Theory. Edward Arnold Ltd, London 1981.

[6] *Cox, D. R.*, Renewal Theory. Methuen, London 1962.

[7] *Descloux, A.*, On Markovian servers with recurrent input. In: Proc. 6th International Teletraffic Congress, Munich, 1970; paper 331.

[8] *van Doorn, E. A.*, On the overflow process from a finite Markovian queue. Performance Evaluation **4** (1984), 233—240.

[9] *Eckberg, A. E.*, Generalized peakedness of teletraffic processes. In: Proc. 10th International Teletraffic Congress, Montreal, 1983; paper 4.4b.3.

[10] *Fleischmann, K.*, Optimal input for the loss system G/M/2. Math. Operationsforsch. Statist. **7** (1976), 129—137.

[11] *Franken, P.*, Asymptotische Untersuchung des Überlaufverkehrs. Wiss. Z. Friedrich-Schiller-Univ. Jena, Math.-Natur. Reihe, **14** (1965), 235—245.

[12] *Franken, P.*, Ein Stetigkeitssatz für Verlustsysteme. In: Operationsforschung und Mathematische Statistik II; Akademie-Verlag, Berlin 1970; pp. 9—23.

[13] *Franken, P.*, Stationary probabilities of states of queueing systems at different times. Engrg. Cybernetics **13** (1975), 84—89.

[14] *Franken, P.*, Einige Anwendungen der Theorie zufälliger Punktprozesse in der Bedienungstheorie, I. Math. Nachr. **70** (1976), 303—319.

[15] *Franken, P., U. Kalähne*, Existence, uniqueness and continuity of stationary distributions for queueing systems without delay. Math. Nachr. **86** (1978), 97—115.

[16] *Franken, P., J. Kerstan*, Bedienungssysteme mit unendlich vielen Bedienungsapparaten. In: Operationsforschung und Mathematische Statistik I; Akademie-Verlag, Berlin 1968; pp. 67—76.

[17] *Franken, P., D. König, U. Arndt, V. Schmidt,* Queues and Point Processes. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin 1981.

[18] *Franken, P., W. Warmuth,* Properties of stationary occupancy distributions. In: Proc. 3rd International Seminar on Teletraffic Theory, Moscow, 1984; pp. 117—129.

[19] *Fredericks, A. A.,* Congestion in blocking systems — A simple approximation technique. Bell System Tech. J. **59** (1980), 805—827.

[20] *Heffes, H., J. M. Holtzmann,* Peakedness of traffic carried by a finite trunk group with renewal input. Bell. System Tech. J. **52** (1973), 1617—1642.

[21] *Holtzmann, J. M., D. L. Jagerman,* Estimating peakedness from arrival counts. In: Proc. 9th International Teletraffic Congress, Torremolinos, 1979; paper 134.

[22] *Kirstein, B. M.,* Some monotonicity properties and bounds for GI/M/m systems without delay. Elektron. Inf.verarb. Kybern. EIK **14** (1978) 4, 203—216.

[23] *Kirstein, B. M.,* Some inequalities for Queues with Applications to Tandem and Overflow Systems. Elektron. Inf.verarb. Kybern. EIK **14** (1978) 9, 445—462. Correction: EIK **15** (1979) 5/6, p. 336).

[24] *Klincewitz, J. G., W. Whitt,* On the quality of two-moment approximations for queues; II: shape constraints. AT & T Bell Labs Tech. J. **63** (1984), 139—161.

[25] *Kuczura, A.,* Queues with mixed renewal and Poisson inputs. Bell System Tech. J. **51** (1972), 1305—1326.

[26] *Kühn, P. J.,* Approximate analysis of general queueing networks by decomposition. IEEE Trans. Comm. **COM-27** (1979), 113—126.

[27] *Lisek, B.,* Construction of stationary state distributions for loss systems. Math. Operationsforsch. Statist., Ser. Statist. **10** (1979), 561—581.

[28] *Palm, C.,* Intensitätsschwankungen im Fernsprechverkehr. Ericsson Technics no. **44** (1943), 1—189.

[29] *Pearce, C. E. M.,* On the peakedness of primary and secondary processes. Australian Telecomm. Res. **12** (1978), 18—24.

[30] *Pearce, C. E. M.,* Teletraffic theory and the renewal paradox. In: Operational Research '78; Ed.: *K. B. Haley;* North-Holland, Amsterdam 1979; pp. 1092—1103.

[31] *Pearce, C. E. M., R. M. Potter,* Some formulae old and new for overflow traffic in telephony. Austral. Telecomm. Res. **11** (1977), 92—97.

[32] *Schmidt, V.,* On some relations between time and customer state probabilities for queueing systems G/GI/s/r. Math. Operationsforsch. Statist., Ser. Optim. **9** (1978), 261—272.

[33] *Stoyan, D.,* „Teilordnungen" von Zufallsgrößen und ihre Verwendung in der Bedienungstheorie. Elektron. Inf.verarb. Kybern. EIK **7** (1971) 5/6, 287—296.

[34] *Stoyan, D.,* Comparison Methods for Queues and Other Stochastic Models. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., New York 1983.

[35] *Takács, L.,* On the generalization of Erlang's formula. Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung. **7** (1956), 419—433.

[36] *Wallin, J. F. E.,* Overflow traffic from the viewpoint of renewal theory. Statistica Neerlandica **31** (1977), 171—178.

[37] *Warmuth, W.,* On the Relation Between the Load Distribution and Offered Traffic. Elektron. Inf.verarb. Kybern. EIK **21** (1985) 10/11, 557—562.

[38] *Whitt, W.,* On the expected number of busy servers seen by a customer served by a given server. Bell Laboratories, 1982.

[39] *Wilkinson, R. I.,* Theories for toll traffic engineering in the U.S.A. Bell System Tech. J. **35** (1956), 421—514.

Kurzfassung

In Teletraffic-Untersuchungen ist es üblich, den ankommenden Forderungenstrom durch eine Charakteristik 2. Ordnung — den Belastungskoeffizienten z — zu beschreiben. Dieser ist als Quotient der Varianz und dem Mittelwert der Belastungsverteilung definiert, die dieser Forderungenstrom auf dem unendlichen Bündel erzeugen würde. Für rekurrente Eingangsströme und exponentielle Bedienungszeiten haben *Pearce* und andere Autoren

Formeln und Schranken für die Belastungskoeffizienten der verschiedenen Forderungen-ströme in Überlaufsystemen angegeben. In der Arbeit werden einige dieser Resultate verallgemeinert und durch neue Ergebnisse ergänzt.

Резюме

В теории телетраффика для описания характеристики второго порядка входящего потока используется коэффициент рассеяния $\varkappa = z - 1$. z определяется как отношение дисперсии к математическому ожиданию распределения нагрузки, которая создает этот поток на бесконечном пучке. Для рекуррентных входящих потоков и при экспоненциальном распределении времени обслуживания *Пирс* и другие авторы доказали формулы и границы для коэффициентов рассеяния разных потоков в системах с потерями. В статье некоторые из этих результатов обобщаются и дополняются новыми.

Present address:

E. A. van Doorn
Department of Applied Mathematics
Twente University of Technology
P.O. Box 217
7500 AE Enschede
The Netherlands