Performance analysis of statistical multiplexing of heterogeneous discrete-time Markovian arrival processes in an ATM network
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Abstract

The cell loss probability and the mean cell delay are major performance metrics in analyzing a statistical multiplexer loaded with a superposition of independent and heterogeneous bursty sources. In this paper, we model each arrival process by a two-state discrete-time Markovian arrival process (D-MAP). We discuss that this traffic modeling is more realistic than the other ones in ATM networks. Then we model the superposition of r types of the two-state D-MAPS into a discrete-time batch Markovian arrival process (D-BMAP) with 2^r states. By using the steady-state analysis of the D-BMAP/D/1/K queueing model, we obtain the exact cell loss probabilities and the mean cell delays for each type of traffic in the statistical multiplexer. In particular, we derive the formulas concerned with these performance metrics under two buffer access strategies of the simultaneous cell arrivals at the same slot: (1) fair access, and (2) priority access. From some numerical examples, we show that the performance of each traffic at the statistical multiplexer may be severely affected by its own traffic characteristics and priority of buffer access, as well as the traffic characteristics of the others. © 1997 Elsevier Science B.V.
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1. Introduction

Among the techniques proposed to implement broadband ISDN (B-ISDN), asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) is regarded as a desirable transfer mode which supports a wide variety of traffic for diverse service and performance requirements [1,2]. ATM is efficient to integrate bursty traffic and to achieve flexible bandwidth sharing because of its inherent capability of statistical multiplexing. But, before statistically multiplexing a new type of traffic with traffic existing in the network, it is necessary to estimate the characteristics of each traffic since its performance may be changed by the new type of traffic to be integrated in the network. The cells from the bursty traffic may be delayed and lost in the network because the allocated bandwidth is lower than its peak bit rate. Thus, the cell loss probability and the mean cell delay are major performance metrics in analyzing the ATM nodes (switch or multiplexer) [3-13].

The Poisson assumption used as an arrival process in the conventional packet-switched networks is no longer valid in ATM networks because the stream types of the packetized voice and video traffic as well as data traffic cause high correlation between adjacent cell arrivals [3,4,6,7]. Thus an input process to a statistical multiplexer must be capable of representing such a correlation, which is crucial to understand the queueing behavior of the statistical multiplexer. For this reason, point processes [14] whose arrival rates vary randomly over time arise in many applications of interest, notably in communications modeling [4,7,8]. The versatile Markovian point process was introduced by Neuts in [15]. It is very rich class that contains many well known arrival point processes as special cases. This process has also been used extensively to model the input traffic for ATM networks because it models the time-varying arrival rate qualitatively and captures some of the important correlations between the interarrival times while still remaining analytically tractable [5-13].

In the literature, there are two main categories — continuous and discrete time models — for evaluating the performance of the ATM nodes. In continuous time models [3-9], it is assumed that cell arrivals can occur at any time instant. But in discrete time models [10-13], the cell arrivals and departures occur only at discrete time instants. Generally, the time axes of input and output lines of the ATM nodes are slotted with the slot size equal to the transmission time of a cell, and the slot boundaries on all input lines are synchronized [16-19]. Thus the actual cell arrivals and departures to and from the statistical multiplexer are
2. Model description

We model a statistical multiplexer by the queueing system as shown in Fig. 1. The statistical multiplexer transmits incoming cells from each of \( r \) input sources on the outgoing link. All incoming cells are stored in a common buffer, the capacity of which is \( K \) cells. When the buffer is full, arriving cells are blocked and lost, and those cells queued in the buffer are serviced on the first-come first-served (FCFS) basis. We consider that all input and output ports of the statistical multiplexer have the same transmission capacity, the time axis is slotted with the slot size equal to the transmission time \( T \) of a cell, and that the slot boundaries on all input ports are synchronized (i.e., the operation of the statistical multiplexer is synchronous). Hence all new cells are assumed to arrive at the beginning of the slot and a cell stored in the buffer departs at the end of the slot. Each input traffic to the statistical multiplexer is modeled by a two-state D-MAP. As shown in Fig. 2, the input traffic has two states, \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \). When the input traffic is in \( S_1 \) (or \( S_2 \)) state, one cell is generated with a constant probability \( p_1 \) (or \( p_2 \)) in each time slot. Suppose that the input source is in \( S_1 \) (or \( S_2 \)) state in the time slot \( s \). Then, in the next time slot \( s + 1 \), it will change to \( S_2 \) (or \( S_1 \)) state with probability \( a \), (or \( a_2 \)), or it will remain in \( S_1 \) (or \( S_2 \)) state with probability \( 1 - a \) (or \( 1 - a_2 \)).

In this paper, we suppose that the \( r \) types of arrival processes, one per input port, are independent and heterogeneous from each other. Then, the two-state D-MAP of arrival process \( j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, r \), is characterized by a transition probability matrix \( M_j \) of the underlying Markov process and a cell generation probability matrix \( P_j \) in each state and slot, which have the form

\[
M_j = \begin{bmatrix}
1 - \alpha_{1,j} & \alpha_{1,j} \\
\alpha_{2,j} & 1 - \alpha_{2,j}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad P_j = \begin{bmatrix}
p_{1,j} & 0 \\
0 & p_{2,j}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\( j = 1, 2, \ldots, r. \) (1)

The superposition of \( r \) types of these two-state D-MAPS parameterized by \( (M_j, P_j), 1 \leq j \leq r \), which are independent and synchronous with each other at the time slot instant, yields a D-BMAP with transition matrix \( D \) having \( m(=2^r) \) states as follows

\[
D = M_1 \otimes M_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes M_r,
\]

where \( \otimes \) is the Kronecker product. The Kronecker product [22] of an \( (n_1 \times m_1) \) matrix \( A \) and an \( (n_2 \times m_2) \) matrix \( B \) is the \( (n_1n_2 \times m_1m_2) \) matrix \( A \otimes B \) with elements \( A_{ij}B \).

![Fig. 2. Two-state discrete-time Markovian arrival process.](image-url)
For the D-BMAP, the steady-state probability vector $\theta$ of the Markov process is given by solving the following equations:

$$\theta D = \theta,$$

$$\theta e = 1,$$

where $e$ is a column vector of all ones.

Suppose that at time slot $s$ the D-BMAP is in some state $i$, $1 \leq i \leq m$. At the next time slot $s + 1$, a transition to another or possibly the same state takes place and a batch arrival may or may not occur. With probability $(d_{0})_{i,j}$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, there is a transition to state $j$ without an arrival, and with probability $(d_{n})_{i,j}$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, there is a transition to state $j$ with a batch arrival of size $n$, $1 \leq n \leq r$. We have that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{m} (d_{n})_{i,j} = 1.$$

Clearly the matrix $D_{0}$ with elements $(d_{0})_{i,j}$ governs transitions that correspond to no arrivals, while the matrices $D_{n}$ with elements $(d_{n})_{i,j}$, $1 \leq n \leq r$, govern transitions that correspond to arrivals of batches of size $n$. Hence the $(m \times m)$ matrix, $D_{n}$, $n = 0, 1, \ldots, r$, is a matrix whose $(i,j)$th element is the probability that during a time slot there are $n$ arrivals and that at the end the phase is $j$, given that at the beginning of the slot the phase was $i$.

Let $c(i)$ denote the probability of having $k$ arrivals during a time slot when D-BMAP is in state $i$, then we can obtain $c(i), k = 0, 1, \ldots, r$, of which the computational complexity is $O(r^{2})$ (see Appendix A). Hence $D_{n}$ is given by

$$D_{n} = C_{n} D,$$

where $C_{n}$ is the following diagonal matrix

$$C_{n} = \text{Diag}(c_{0}(i), \ldots, c_{n}(i), \ldots, c_{r}(m)).$$

The effective arrival rate $\lambda^{*}$ of the D-BMAP, which is a superposition of $r$ types of the two-state D-MAPS, is given by

$$\lambda^{*} = \theta \sum_{n=0}^{r} n D_{n} e.$$

and the arrival rate from the two-state D-MAP $j$, $1 \leq j \leq r$, input traffic is represented by

$$P(j) = \theta (I_{2} \otimes \cdots \otimes I_{2} \otimes P_{j} \otimes 0 \oplus \cdots \oplus 0),$$

where $\otimes$ is the Kronecker sum [22] and $I_{2}$ is the $(2 \times 2)$ identity matrix. The Kronecker sum $\oplus$ is defined as $A \oplus B = (A \otimes I_{2}) \oplus (I_{2} \otimes B)$, where $I_{2}$ and $I_{r}$ are the identity matrices of the same order as the matrices $A$ and $B$ respectively. The effective arrival rate from the two-state D-MAP $j$ input traffic is also given by

$$\lambda_{j} = \theta P(j)e, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, r.$$

### 3. Performance analysis

As shown in Fig. 1, the cells may arrive simultaneously at the same slot on input lines of the statistical multiplexer. Since we focus on the performance analysis of individual traffic types, the buffer access strategies for those cells are crucial as will be shown in the numerical results, even if the mean performance of the superposed traffic is not affected by the access strategies. Let us define two access strategies for such cells as follows:

- fair access strategy — the cells arriving at the same slot join the finite capacity buffer with equal probability, hence they are blocked and lost randomly as much as the excess cells are overflowed owing to buffer-full;
- priority access strategy — the cells arriving at the same slot join the finite capacity buffer with pre-determined priorities.

### 3.1. Queue length distribution embedded at slot ending-time instant

Consider the statistical multiplexer whose input consists of the superposition of the $r$ types of the two-state D-MAPS as described in the previous section. We consider this multiplexer at discrete time epochs $0, T, 2T, \ldots$. Hence the multiplexer is modeled as a D-BMAP/D/1/K queue, where the service time is equal to one time slot. Let $L_{n}$ and $J_{n}$ be, respectively, the number of cells queued in the buffer excluding a cell which has just been removed for transmission, and the state of the input process at time instant $nT$. We assume that an arriving cell departs at the end of its arriving time slot if the buffer is empty. Then, the process $\{L_{n}, J_{n}, n \geq 0\}$ forms a finite-state Markov chain with state space $\{0, 1, \ldots, K - 1\} \times \{1, \ldots, m\}$, and the transition probability matrix $Q^{K}$ of the Markov chain is given by

$$Q^{K} = \begin{bmatrix}
D_{0} + D_{1} & D_{2} & \cdots & D_{K-1} & \sum_{k=K}^{r} D_{k} \\
D_{0} & D_{1} & \cdots & D_{K-2} & \sum_{k=K-1}^{r} D_{k} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & D_{0} & \sum_{k=1}^{r} D_{k}
\end{bmatrix}.$$

For the Markov chain with this transition probability matrix $Q^{K}$, define the limiting probability distribution $x_{k,i}$ as

$$x_{k,i} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \text{Prob}\{L_{n} = k, J_{n} = i\}, \quad (11)$$

and let the vector $x = (x_{0}, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{K-1})$ be the steady-state probability vector with $x_{k} = (x_{k,1}, x_{k,2}, \ldots, x_{k,m})$, $0 \leq k \leq K - 1$. Then the steady-state probability vector $x$ is obtained
from the equations
\[ x^Q = x, \quad x = 1. \]  

(12)

3.2. Performance measures under the fair access strategy

The following quantities are easily calculated by using the queue length distribution obtained previously. The mean number of cells lost due to buffer overflow is given by

\[ L = \sum_{j=K+1}^{r} \frac{(l-K)x_0D_j e}{l+1} + \frac{K-1}{r} \sum_{k=1}^{r} \frac{[l-K+k]^+}{l+1} x_k P_j D_j e, \]

where \([x]^+ = \max(x,0)\). The cell loss probability \(P_b\) for an arbitrary cell of the superposition of input B-MAPS is obtained by

\[ P_b = \frac{L}{x^Q}. \]

(14)

In the fair access strategy, since cells arriving at the same slot join the finite capacity buffer with equal probability, they are blocked and lost randomly as much as the excess cells are overflowed owing to buffer-full. Hence the mean number of cells lost arriving from the two-state D-MAP \(j\) is given by

\[ \sum_{j=1}^{r} \frac{[l-K+k]^+}{l+1} x_k P_j D_j e, \]

(13)

where \(j = 1, 2, \ldots, r\), the matrices \(D_j\) govern transitions that correspond to arrivals of batches of size \(n\) excluding the arrival from the two-state D-MAP \(j\) (see Appendix B). The cell loss probability \(P_{b_j}\) for cells arriving from the type \(j\) traffic, \(1 \leq j \leq r\), is then given by

\[ P_{b_j} = \frac{L_j}{x^Q_j}. \]

(15)

For the mean cell delay \(W\) for cells of the superposition of input D-MAPS, we consider \(n, n = 1, 2, \ldots, r\), cells arriving at time \(kT\) and tag them. The tagged cells may find the system in one of the following states.

- There is no cell queued in the buffer. In this case, if \(n \leq K - 1\), the tagged cell will be served at an arbitrary time slot between \(T\) and \((n+1)T\). Hence the mean waiting time of the tagged cell is \(T_{0}\) and tag it. Because all new cells from the two-state D-MAPs are assumed to arrive at the beginning of the time slot simultaneously, the mean waiting time of the tagged cell is dependent on the arrivals of batches of size \(n\) excluding the arrival from the two-state D-MAP j as well as the queue length distribution that the tagged arrival of cell finds. The tagged cell may find the system in one of the following states.

- There is no cell queued in the buffer. In this case, if \(n \leq K - 1\), the tagged cell will be served at an arbitrary time slot between \(T\) and \((n+1)T\). Hence if \(n > K - m, n - K + m\) cells are blocked. Hence if \(n > K - m\), the total waiting time of each arrival of non-blocked cells is \((K - m)m + [m(m+1)/2])T\). Finally, we can obtain the mean cell delay \(W\) for an arbitrary cell which is not blocked as follows

\[ W = \frac{T_0 + \sum_{m=1}^{K-1} T_m}{(1 - P_b) \theta \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} nD_n e}, \]

(17)

where \(T_m, m = 0, 1, \ldots, K - 1\), denotes the total waiting time of each arrival of cells which is non-blocked and finds that the queue length is \(m\). Hence \(T_{as}\) are given by

\[ T_0 = \sum_{n=1}^{K} \frac{n(n+1)T}{2} x_0 D_n e + \sum_{n=K+1}^{r} \frac{K(K+1)T}{2} x_0 D_n e, \]

(18)

Similarly, for the mean cell delay \(W_j\) for cells arriving from the type \(j\) traffic, we consider an arbitrary cell arriving from the two-state D-MAP \(j\) traffic at time \(kT\) and tag it. Because all new cells from the two-state D-MAPs are assumed to arrive at the beginning of the time slot simultaneously, the mean waiting time of the tagged cell is dependent on the arrivals of batches of size \(n\) excluding the arrival from the two-state D-MAP \(j\) as well as the queue length distribution that the tagged arrival of cell finds. The tagged cell may find the system in one of the following states.

- There is no cell queued in the buffer. In this case, if \(n \leq K - 1\), the tagged cell will be served at an arbitrary time slot between \(T\) and \((n+1)T\). Hence if \(n > K - m, n - K + m\) cells are blocked. Hence if \(n > K - m\), the total waiting time of each arrival of non-blocked cells is \((K - m)m + [m(m+1)/2])T\). If \(n > K - m\), the total waiting time of each arrival of non-blocked cells is \((K - m)m + [m(m+1)/2])T\).
Finally, we can obtain the mean cell delay $W^j$ for cells arriving from D-MAP $j$ which are not blocked as follows

$$W^j = \frac{T_{0}^j + \sum_{m=1}^{K} T_{m}^j}{(1 - P_h^j) \theta P(j)e}, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, r,$$

(20)

where $T_m^j$ are given by

$$T_{0}^j = \sum_{n=0}^{K-1} \frac{(n+2)T}{2} x_0 P(j) D_{n}^j e + \sum_{n=K}^{r-1} \frac{K(K+1)T}{2(n+1)} x_0 P(j) D_{n}^j e,$$

(21)

$$\sum_{m=1}^{K-1} T_{m}^j = \sum_{m=1}^{K-1} \left[ \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \left( m + \frac{n+2}{2} \right) T x_m P(j) D_{n}^j e \right] + \sum_{n=K-m}^{r-1} \frac{(K-m)(K+m+1)}{2(n+1)} T x_m P(j) D_{n}^j e. $$

(22)

3.3. Performance measures under the priority access strategy

Now, in order to analyze the performance of the priority access strategy, we assume, w.l.o.g, that the priority of type $j$ is higher than that of type $i$ to access the finite capacity buffer when $1 \leq j < i \leq r$. Hence the mean number of cells lost arriving from the D-MAP $j$ is given by

$$I_{j} = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{s=K-k}^{r-1} x_k P(j) G_s(1,j-1), \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, r,$$

(23)

where $G_s(1,j-1)$ is the following $(m \times m)$ diagonal matrix

$$G_s(1,j-1) = \text{Diag}[G_{s(1)}(1,j-1), G_{s(2)}(1,j-1), \ldots, G_{s(m)}(1,j-1)].$$

(24)

where $G_{s(i)}(x,y)$ as the probability of generation of $s$ cells during a time slot between two-state D-MAP $x$ and $y$, when D-BMAP is $i$ state (see Appendix A). We note that if $j = 1$, then $I_1^j = 0$. The cell loss probability $P_h^j$ for cells arriving from the type $j$ traffic considering the buffer access priority is then given by

$$P_h^j = \frac{I_j}{\lambda_j}, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, r.$$

(25)

The mean waiting time $W_h^j$ for cells arriving from D-MAP $j$ which are not blocked is as follows

$$W_h^j = \frac{T_{0}^j}{(1 - P_h^j) \theta P(j)e}$$

(26)

where $T_{0}^j$ is given by

$$T_{0}^j = \sum_{m=0}^{K-1} \sum_{n=0}^{m+1} (n+1+m) T x_m P(j) G_n(1,j-1).$$

(27)

4. Numerical results and discussion

In this section, some numerical results are presented to illustrate the effects of each traffic’s characteristic and the two buffer access strategies on the performance of statistical multiplexing.

We investigate the performance of a statistical multiplexer with three two-state D-MAPS. These D-MAPS are parameterized by $(M_1, P_1)$, $(M_2, P_2)$ and $(M_3, P_3)$ as shown in Eq. (1), respectively. In Figs. 3 and 4, we show the cell-loss probability $P_h$ and the mean cell delay $W$ for an arbitrary cell when these D-MAPS are homogeneous and aggregated, for which the ratio of cell generation probabilities in each state $p_{1i}/p_{2i}$ is kept constant at 3 with $\alpha_{1,1}$ and $\alpha_{2,1}$ as parameters. The effective arrival rate $\lambda_j^*$ of the two-state D-MAP $j$ is given by

$$\lambda_j^* = \frac{\alpha_{1,j} p_{2,j} + \alpha_{2,j} p_{1,j}}{\alpha_{1,j} + \alpha_{2,j}}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$  

(28)

Fig. 3. Effects of the arrival state duration parameters $\alpha_{1,1}$ and $\alpha_{2,1}$ on the cell loss probability ($P_h$) for three homogeneous two-state D-MAPS with $K = 25$ and $p_{1,j}/p_{2,j} = 3$.

Fig. 4. Effects of the arrival state duration parameters $\alpha_{1,1}$ and $\alpha_{2,1}$ on the mean cell delay ($W$) for three homogeneous two-state D-MAPS with and $p_{1,j}/p_{2,j} = 3$. 
and the squared coefficient of variation of the interarrival time, $C_j^2$, which can be used as the basis for determining the degree of bursty nature of the cell arrival process, is given by (see [13])

$$C_j^2 = \frac{2\lambda_j^2 \left( \alpha_1,j + \alpha_2,j \right)^2 + \left( \alpha_1,j P_{1,j} + \alpha_2,j P_{2,j} \right) \left( 1 - \alpha_1,j - \alpha_2,j \right)}{\left( \alpha_1,j + \alpha_2,j \right) \alpha_2,j P_{1,j} + \alpha_1,j P_{2,j} + P_{1,j} P_{2,j} \left( 1 - \alpha_1,j - \alpha_2,j \right)} - \lambda_j^2 - 1, \quad j = 1, 2, 3. \quad (29)$$

In this example and the following ones, we set the slot duration $T$ equal to one, so that the unit of time for the mean cell delay is the slot duration. From these figures, as could be expected, the cell loss probability and the mean cell delay increase as the mean sojourn times in each arrival state of the two-state D-MAP, i.e., the inverses of $\alpha_1,j$ and $\alpha_2,j$, increase. This means that an increase in the burstiness of a cell stream results in a worse performance at the multiplexer.

In Figs. 5 and 6, we also show the cell loss probability $P_{1,j}$ and the mean cell delay $W_{1,j}$ for the two-state D-MAP $j, j = 1, 2, 3$, at a statistical multiplexer employing the priority access strategy. We assume that type $j$'s priority is higher than type $i$'s to access the finite capacity buffer when $1 \leq j < i \leq 3$. As could be also expected, the priority access strategy discriminates the performances of each D-MAP based on its priority even though the input sources are homogeneous, while the numerical results of the fair access strategy are the same as shown in Figs. 3 and 4. In particular, $P_{1,j}$ results in zero because the cells from type 1 always find the buffer occupancy distribution such that $\text{Prob}[x < K] = 1$, where $K$ is buffer size.

In Figs. 7 and 8, we investigate the performance of a statistical multiplexer employing the fair access strategy with the three heterogeneous types of traffic: we have $(\alpha_{1,1}, \alpha_{2,1}) = (0.2, 0.1)$, $(\alpha_{1,2}, \alpha_{2,2}) = (0.02, 0.01)$, $(\alpha_{1,3}, \alpha_{2,3}) = (0.002, 0.001)$, $p_{1,1} = p_{1,2} = p_{1,3} = 0$, and $K = 25$ in case of the fair access strategy.
I

Fig. 9. A comparison of the cell loss probabilities \((P_b, P_a', P_a, P_a')\) for three heterogeneous D-MAPS with parameters \((\alpha_{1,1}, \alpha_{2,1}) = (0.2, 0.1), (\alpha_{1,2}, \alpha_{2,2}) = (0.02, 0.01), (\alpha_{1,3}, \alpha_{2,3}) = (0.002, 0.001)\), \(p_{1,1} = p_{2,2} = p_{2,3} = 0\), and \(K = 25\) in case of the priority access strategy, where \(P_a = 0\).

\(=(0.002, 0.001)\) and vary the arrival probabilities \(p_{1,1}, p_{1,2}\) and \(p_{1,3}\) while setting \(p_{2,1}, p_{2,2}\) and \(p_{2,3}\) equal to zero. From these figures, we can see that the cell loss probability and the mean cell delay are different from each type of traffic in the heterogeneous traffic case, but there are no sharp differences of loss performance based on the traffic characteristics of each type as we might expect in Fig. 3. This means that the more bursty stream influences severely the overall performance of the multiplexer and the less bursty streams are penalized. Moreover, this is because the behavior of cell loss at the multiplexer is bursty as much as input streams, such that the influence of the more bursty stream is dominant.

In Figs. 9–12, we investigate the performance of a statistical multiplexer employing the priority access strategy with three heterogeneous types of traffic. In order to investigate the effect of this buffer access strategy on the performance in detail, we have \((\alpha_{1,1}, \alpha_{2,1}) = (0.2, 0.1), (\alpha_{1,2}, \alpha_{2,2}) = (0.02, 0.01), (\alpha_{1,3}, \alpha_{2,3}) = (0.002, 0.001)\) in Figs. 9 and 10, and \((\alpha_{1,1}, \alpha_{2,1}) = (0.002, 0.001), (\alpha_{1,2}, \alpha_{2,2}) = (0.02, 0.01), (\alpha_{1,3}, \alpha_{2,3}) = (0.2, 0.1)\) in Figs. 11 and 12, in which the characteristics of each type of traffic are fully reversed. We note that \(P_a\) equals to zero in Figs. 9, and 11. We also note that the mean delays of type 3 in Figs. 10, and 12 do not increase monotonically for increasing mean offered load due to the loss of cells, and that the more bursty traffic gets high priority to buffer access, the more discrimination of the delay performance occurs. From these figures, we conclude that in the heterogeneous traffic case, the performance of each traffic at the statistical multiplexer is different, depending strongly on its traffic characteristic and the priority of buffer access, as well as on the traffic characteristics of the others.

Fig. 10. A comparison of the mean cell delays \((W, W_1, W_2, W_3)\) for three heterogeneous D-MAPS with parameters \((\alpha_{1,1}, \alpha_{2,1}) = (0.2, 0.1), (\alpha_{1,2}, \alpha_{2,2}) = (0.02, 0.01), (\alpha_{1,3}, \alpha_{2,3}) = (0.002, 0.001)\), \(p_{1,1} = p_{1,2} = p_{2,1} = 0\), and \(K = 25\) in case of the priority access strategy.

Fig. 11. A comparison of the cell loss probabilities \((P_b, P_a', P_a, P_a')\) for three heterogeneous D-MAPS with parameters \((\alpha_{1,1}, \alpha_{2,1}) = (0.002, 0.001), (\alpha_{1,2}, \alpha_{2,2}) = (0.02, 0.01), (\alpha_{1,3}, \alpha_{2,3}) = (0.2, 0.01)\), \(p_{1,1} = p_{2,2} = p_{2,3} = 0\), and \(K = 25\) in case of the priority access strategy, where \(P_a = 0\).

Fig. 12. A comparison of the mean cell delays \((W, W_1, W_2, W_3)\) for three heterogeneous D-MAPS with parameters \((\alpha_{1,1}, \alpha_{2,1}) = (0.002, 0.001), (\alpha_{1,2}, \alpha_{2,2}) = (0.02, 0.01), (\alpha_{1,3}, \alpha_{2,3}) = (0.2, 0.01)\), \(p_{1,1} = p_{1,2} = p_{2,1} = 0\), and \(K = 25\) in case of the priority access strategy.
5. Conclusion

We have analyzed the performance of a statistical multiplexer for heterogeneous types of bursty traffic in an ATM network. We first modeled each bursty traffic by a two-state D-MAP, and discussed that this two-state D-MAP modeling is more realistic than the other existing traffic models in ATM networks. The different burstiness of each traffic was represented by changing the parameters of the two-state D-MAP. The superposition of \( r \) types of these two-state D-MAPS was modeled by a D-BMAP with \( m(=2^r) \) states. With these traffic and system modeling, we obtained the exact formulas for the cell loss probability and the mean cell delay for the superposed heterogeneous bursty traffic. We also derived formulas for these performance metrics of each type of traffic separately under two buffer access strategies of the simultaneous cell arrivals: (1) fair access, and yields a D-BMAP having \( m(-2^r) \) states. We assume that the probability of cell generation of the two-state D-MAP \( j \) is \( p_{x,j} \) when the D-BMAP is in the \( i \), \( 1 \leq i \leq m \), state, where \( j(i) = 1 \) or \( 2 \) from Eq. (1). Let \( c_k(i) \) denote the probability of having \( k \) arrivals during a time slot when the D-BMAP is \( i \) state. We assume, w.l.o.g., that these two-state D-MAPS indexed by \( j, j = 1,2, \ldots, r, \) are ordered in increasing order, and define \( G_{k|x,y} \) as the probability of \( s \) cells generation during a time slot between the D-MAP \( x \) and \( y, 1 \leq x \leq y \leq r, \) when the D-BMAP is \( i \) state. Then we can obtain \( G_{k|x,y} \), \( 0 \leq s \leq y - x + 1, \) by the following recursive formulas:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{s=0; } & G_{k|x,y} = \prod_{i=x}^{y} (1 - p_{i,1}) \\
\text{s=1; } & G_{k|i,x,y} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{p_{x,i}}{p_{x,i}} & \text{if } y = x, \\
\frac{p_{x,i}}{p_{x,i}} \cdot G_{k|x+1,y} + \sum_{l=i+1}^{y-1} G_{k|i,l} \cdot p_{i,l} \cdot G_{k|i,l+1,y} + G_{k|i,y-1} \cdot p_{i,y} & \text{if } y - x \geq 1,
\end{cases} \\
2 \leq s \leq r; & G_{k|i,x,y} = \begin{cases} 
\prod_{l=x}^{y} p_{i,l} & \text{if } y - x + 1 = s, \\
p_{x,i} \cdot G_{k-1|x,y} + \sum_{l=x+1}^{y-s+1} G_{k|i,l-1} \cdot p_{i,l} \cdot G_{k-1|i,l+1,y} & \text{if } y - x + 1 \geq s + 1, \\
0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

Finally, we can obtain \( c_k(i) = G_{k|i}, k = 0,1,\ldots,r \) and \( i = 1,2,\ldots,m \). We can notice that \( G_{k|i}, l \leq k \leq r, \) is given recursively by \( G_{k-1|i}, 2 \leq t \leq r - k + 2, \) and \( G_{k|i}, 1 \leq t \leq r - k. \) Since the computational complexity for calculating \( G_{k-1|i}, 2 \leq t \leq r - k + 2, \) by Eqs. (A1), (A2) and (A3) is \( O(r) \), the computation complexity for obtaining \( c_k(i), k = 0,1,\ldots,r, \) is \( O(r^2) \).

Appendix B

Let \( c_{j}^{k}(i), j = 1,2,\ldots,r, \) denote the probability of having \( k \) arrivals during a time slot when the D-BMAP is state \( i \) excluding the arrival from the two-state D-MAP \( j, \) from Eqs. (A1), (A2) and (A3) discussed in Appendix A, \( c_{k}^{1}(i) \) and \( c_{k}^{r}(i) \) at the boundaries \( j = 1, r \) are obtained as follows

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Appendix A}
\end{align*}
\]

The superposition of \( r \) types of the two-state D-MAPS parameterized by \( (D_{j}P_{j}), 1 \leq j \leq r, \) which are independent and synchronous with each other at the time slot instants,
If $r > 2$ and $j \neq 1$ (or $r$), then $c'_k(i)$ are obtained as follows

$$c'_k(i) = \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} G_{k,0}(1,j-1) G_{k,n}(j+1,r), \quad j = 2, 3, \ldots, r - 1.$$  

(B3)

Similar to $D_4$ in Eq. (5), matrices $D'_k$ govern transitions that correspond to arrivals of batches of size $n$ excluding the traffic type $j$ and that at the end of the phase is $k$, given that at the beginning of the slot the phase was $i$. Finally, $D'_k$ is given by

$$D'_k = C'_k D$$  

(B4)

where $C'_k$ is the following diagonal matrix

$$C'_k = \text{Diag}(c'_k(1), \ldots, c'_k(i), \ldots, c'_k(m)).$$  

(B5)
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