

“What, you’ve been working  
on the same problem too?”

— Conversation with Devavrat Shah<sup>†</sup>



## Proofs for Chapter 9

**Definition I.1. Domination:** Let  $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N)$ , and  $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N)$  denote the values of  $C(i, t)$  for two different systems of  $N$  counters at any time  $t$ . Let  $\pi, \sigma$  be an ordering of the counters  $(1, 2, 3, \dots, N)$  such that they are in descending order, i.e., for  $v$  we have,  $v_{\pi(1)} \geq v_{\pi(2)} \geq v_{\pi(3)} \geq \dots \geq v_{\pi(N)}$  and for  $u$  we have  $u_{\sigma(1)} \geq u_{\sigma(2)} \geq u_{\sigma(3)} \geq \dots \geq u_{\sigma(N)}$ .

We say that  $v$  dominates  $u$  denoted  $v \ggg u$ , if  $v_{\pi(i)} \geq u_{\sigma(i)}, \forall i$ . Every arrival can possibly increment any of  $N$  different counters. The set of all possible arrival patterns at time  $t$  can be defined as:  $\Omega_t = \{(w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_t), 1 \leq w_i \leq N, \forall i\}$ .

**Theorem I.1. (Optimality of LCF-CMA).** Under arrival sequence  $a(t) = (a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_t)$ , let  $q(a(t), P_c) = (q_1, q_2, q_3, \dots, q_N)$  denote the count  $C(i, t)$  of  $N$  counters at time  $t$  under service policy  $P_c$ . For any service policy  $P$ , there exists a 1 – 1 function  $f_{P,LCF}^t : (\Omega_t \rightarrow \Omega_t)$ , for any  $t$  such that  $q(f_{P,LCF}^t(w), P) \ggg q(w, LCF), \forall (w \in \Omega_t), \forall t$ .

*Proof.* We prove the existence of such a function  $f_{P,LCF}^t$  inductively over time  $t$ . Let us denote the counters of the LCF system by  $(l_1, l_2, l_3, \dots, l_N)$  and the counters of the  $P$  system by  $(p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots, p_N)$ . It is trivial to check that there exists such a function

---

<sup>†</sup>“Might as well submit a joint paper then!”, Stanford University, 2001.

for  $t = 1$ . Inductively assume that  $f_{P,LCF}^t$  exists with the desired property until time  $t$ , and we want to extend it to time  $t + 1$ . This means that there exists ordering  $\pi^t, \sigma^t$  such that,  $l_{\pi^t(i)} \leq p_{\sigma^t(i)}, \forall i$ . Now, at the time  $t + 1$ , a counter may be incremented and a counter may be completely served. We consider both these parts separately below:

- **Part 1: (Arrival)** Let a counter be incremented at time  $t + 1$  in both systems. Suppose that counter  $\pi^t(k)$  is incremented in the LCF system. Then extend  $f_{P,LCF}^t$  for  $t + 1$  by letting an arrival occur in counter  $\sigma^t(k)$  for the  $P$  system. By induction, we have  $l_{\pi^t(i)} \leq p_{\sigma^t(i)}, \forall i$ . Let  $\pi^{t+1}, \sigma^{t+1}$  be the new ordering of the counters of the LCF and  $P$  systems respectively. Since one arrival occurred to both the systems in a queue with the same relative order, the domination relation does not change.
- **Part 2: (Service)** Let one of the counters be served at time  $t + 1$ . Under the LCF policy, the counter  $\pi^t(1)$  with count  $l_{\pi^t(1)}$  will be served and its count is set to zero, *i.e.*,  $C(\pi^t(1), t + 1) = 0$ , while under  $P$  any queue can be served out, depending on the CMA prescribed by  $P$ . Let  $P$  serve the counter with rank  $k$ , *i.e.*, counter  $\sigma^t(k)$ . Then we can create a new ordering  $\pi^{t+1}, \sigma^{t+1}$  as follows:

$$\pi^{t+1}(i) = \pi^t(i + 1), \quad 1 \leq i \leq N - 1, \quad \pi^{t+1}(N) = \pi^t(1). \quad (\text{I.1})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{t+1}(i) &= \sigma^t(i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k - 1, \\ \sigma^{t+1}(i) &= \sigma^t(i + 1), \quad k \leq i \leq N - 1, \quad \sigma^{t+1}(N) = \sigma^t(k). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{I.2})$$

Under this definition, it is easy to check that,  $l_{\pi^{t+1}(i)} \leq p_{\sigma^{t+1}(i)}, \forall i$  given  $l_{\pi^t(i)} \leq p_{\sigma^t(i)}, \forall i$ . Thus we have shown explicitly how we can extend to  $f_{P,LCF}^t$  to  $f_{P,LCF}^{t+1}$  with the desired property. Hence it follows inductively that LCF is dominated by any other policy  $P$ .  $\square$