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\textbf{ABSTRACT}

This paper considers a multi-server queue with Markov-modulated Poisson input and server-dependent phase-type service times. We develop an efficient rare-event simulation technique to estimate the probability that the number of customers in this system reaches a high value. Relying on explicit bounds on the probability under consideration as well as the associated likelihood ratio, we succeed in proving that the proposed estimator is of bounded relative error. Simulation experiments illustrate the significant speed-up that can be achieved by the proposed algorithm.

\textbf{1. Introduction}

The multi-server queue is a well-studied object in operations research with widespread applications, for example in the modeling of call centres\textsuperscript{[11]} and healthcare systems\textsuperscript{[9]}. In many situations, the system needs to be designed in such a way that the service level offered is sufficiently high. This is usually translated into the requirement that the probability of the backlog exceeding some critical value should be below a given threshold value.

For the case of homogeneous servers (meaning that the service times at the various servers have a common distribution), a strand of research focuses on evaluating the probability that the number of customers waiting exceeds some high level $K$. A key result in this area concerns the situation in which the service-time distribution has a finite moment generating function around the zero (implying that all moments exist): it was proven by Sadowsky\textsuperscript{[20]} that for such GI/GI/$m$ queues the tail of the probability of interest decays effectively exponentially, cf. also the earlier paper by Takahashi\textsuperscript{[21]} for the setting with phase-type interarrival times and phase-type service times. In addition, Ref.\textsuperscript{[20]} provides a fast (importance-sampling based) simulation procedure to estimate this probability with provable optimality properties. More specifically, it was shown that the estimator is logarithmically...
efficient; this entails that the number of runs needed to obtain an estimate with a
given precision grows sub-exponentially in the level $K$.

In the above literature, it was assumed that the servers are homogeneous; this
implies, for example, that each service entity serves customers at the same average
speed. In many practical situations, however, this assumption is overly restrictive as
has been recognized in the work of, e.g., Refs. [1,14] (as well as in other references that
deal with the problem of routing in systems with heterogeneous servers). Not much
is known, however, about the tail distribution of such heterogeneous multi-server
systems.

Another aspect that is hardly covered in the importance-sampling literature
concerns the incorporation of overdispersion. Traditionally the arrival process is
modeled as a Poisson process (or more generally a renewal process), implying that
the mean and variance of the number of arrivals in an interval of given length
coincide. Empirical studies, however, indicate that the Poisson process is not always
appropriate to model the arrival stream's intrinsic variability. Arrival data turns
out to be often “overdispersed,” meaning that that the variance of the number of
arrivals in an interval of given length is significantly larger than the corresponding
mean value; see, e.g., Refs. [10,11,15,23]. This phenomenon is better captured by a Cox
process, which is a Poisson process but now with a randomly evolving (rather than
fixed) parameter. The traditional example of such an overdispersed arrival process
is the Markov-modulated Poisson (MMP) process. For an MMP process the arrival
rate is $\lambda_i$ when an independently evolving continuous-time, finite-state Markov
chain (typically referred to as the background process) is in state $i$. For results on
queues with Markov-modulated input we refer to, e.g., Ref., [2 Ch. XI].

Motivated by the above considerations, the object of study in this paper is the
multi-server queue with MMP input and server-dependent phase-type service times.
The main contribution is that we devise efficient simulation techniques for the pur-
pose of estimating the tail distribution of the number of customers in the system.
In more detail, our work extends the existing literature on importance sampling for
multi-server queues are as follows.

- In our set-up we allow the servers to be heterogeneous, whereas [20,21] assume
  server-homogeneity. We remark that Ref. [20] considers light-tailed service-time
distributions, whereas we focus on the subclass of phase-type distributions.
Recall, however, that general non-negative distributions can be approximated
arbitrarily closely by phase-type distributions so that in practical terms hardly
any generality is lost; see, e.g., Refs. [4,22] and Ref., [2 Thm. III.4.2]. The focus is still
on light-tailed distributions as for heavy-tailed distributions the number of
phases needed to adequately model the tails may be excessively large.

- In addition, we allow for the arrival process to be overdispersed. We focus on
  the case of MMP arrivals, but, as we will point out, other types of arrival pro-
cesses can be treated with similar techniques (such as the renewal processes
that were studied in Ref. [20]).
We show that our proposed importance-sampling estimator is strongly efficient, (or, equivalently, has bounded relative error). This means that the number of runs needed to obtain an estimate with given precision remains bounded (i.e., is smaller than some constant that does not depend on \( K \)). Recall that in Ref.\cite{20} just logarithmic efficiency was proven (implying that the number of runs needed grows sub-exponentially).

In summary, our model can be viewed as a generalization of that of Ref.\cite{20} in that we allow for heterogeneous servers as well as overdispersed arrival processes; the (minor) sacrifice that we make is that we assume the service times to be of phase-type, rather than just light-tailed. In more detail, the results obtained are the following.

(i) In the first place, for the queue under study, we propose efficient simulation algorithms for the estimation of the probability that the backlog (that is, the number of customers or jobs waiting in the queue) during a busy cycle (during which the system is non-empty) exceeds a given level \( K \). The procedure can be modified for the estimation of related quantities such as the fraction of customers or jobs entering the system while the backlog is larger than \( K \), or the fraction of customers lost in the corresponding model with a waiting room of finite size \( K \).

The algorithms are based on importance sampling, that is, the model is simulated under an alternative measure, under which the event under consideration is not rare. We identify an efficient change of measure by solving a particular eigensystem. As it turns out, this change of measure provides us with upper and lower bounds on the probability of interest that are both exponential (with decay rate \( \vartheta^* \)) in the exceedance level \( K \) (and that match up to a multiplicative constant). This property can be used to prove that our importance-sampling estimator is strongly efficient.

(ii) Since the eigensystem to be solved depends on both arrival and departure processes jointly, it can become prohibitively large when the dimension of the background process and/or the dimensions of the phase-type distributed service times grow large. In order to resolve this issue, we exploit the fact that there is an alternative way to compute the decay rate \( \vartheta^* \) that relies on properties of the arrival process and service processes in a decoupled fashion.

(iii) Finally, we point out how the change of measure can be found for various variants of the arrival and service processes.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the model and formulate our objectives in greater detail. In Section 3, we propose the change of measure that is to be used in the importance-sampling based procedure. We then establish bounds on the probability of interest, which we use to prove that the importance-sampling algorithm has bounded relative error. In Section 4, we show that the same change of measure can be obtained when considering the arrival and service processes separately, thus drastically reducing the computational effort needed to compute the change of measure. Section 5 contains illustrative
numerical experiments that give an impression of the typically achievable speed-up.
We conclude in Section 6 by discussing how the importance sampling algorithm can be adapted to estimate related quantities.

2. Framework

2.1. Model

In this paper, we primarily focus on the following MMP/Ph/m with heterogeneous servers. We now introduce the arrival process and service processes used.

Arrival process. Consider the following MMP arrival process. The transition rate matrix of the (finite-state) background process \((I_t)_{t \geq 0}\) is \(Q = (q_{ij})_{i,j=1}^d\); define \(q_i := -q_{ii} = \sum_{j \neq i} q_{ij}\). When the background process (assumed to be irreducible) is in state \(i\) arrivals occur according to a Poisson process with rate \(\lambda_i \geq 0\). Let the mean arrival rate be \(\lambda := \pi' \lambda\), with \(\pi\) the invariant probability measure of the background process, \(\pi'\) its transpose, and \(\lambda := (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d)'\).

Service processes. There are \(m\) heterogeneous servers. Service times at server \(\ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\}\) are i.i.d. samples distributed as the non-negative random variable \(B^{(\ell)}\). We let \(B^{(\ell)}\) be of phase-type \([2, \text{Ch. III}]\) with initial distribution \(\alpha^{(\ell)}\) concentrated on the transient states, and transition rate matrix

\[
T^{(\ell)} = \left( t^{(\ell)}_{ij} \right)_{i,j=1}^{D^{(\ell)}+1} = \begin{pmatrix} S^{(\ell)} & s^{(\ell)} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},
\]

for some \(D^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{N}\). We impose the usual requirement that \(t^{(\ell)}_{ij} \geq 0\) for \(i \in \{1, \ldots, D^{(\ell)}\}\) and \(j \in \{1, \ldots, D^{(\ell)} + 1\}\) with \(i \neq j\), and \(t^{(\ell)}_{D^{(\ell)}+1,j} = 0\) for \(j \in \{1, \ldots, D^{(\ell)} + 1\}\); in addition we define

\[
t^{(\ell)}_i := -t^{(\ell)}_{ii} = \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{D^{(\ell)}+1} t^{(\ell)}_{ij},
\]

so that the row sums are zero. In words, the above means that the service time at server \(\ell\) stays in phase \(i\) for an exponentially distributed amount of time with mean \((t^{(\ell)}_i)^{-1}\), and then jumps to state \(j \neq i\) with probability \(t^{(\ell)}_{ij}/t^{(\ell)}_i\).

Thus, the evolution of the system is recorded by the following trivariate process:

(i) The state of the background process \((I_t)_{t \geq 0}\) taking values in \(\mathcal{I} := \{1, \ldots, d\}\).
(ii) The state vector \((J_t)_{t \geq 0}\) of the phase-type distributions of the customers in service; with \(\dagger\) indicating that the corresponding server is idle, this takes values in

\[
\mathcal{D} := \{1, \ldots, D^{(1)}, \dagger\} \times \cdots \times \{1, \ldots, D^{(m)}, \dagger\}.
\]

We will sometimes use the suggestive notation \(t^{(\ell)}_{i,\dagger} := t^{(\ell)}_{i,D^{(\ell)}+1}\).
(iii) The number of customers in the system, \((N_t)_{t \geq 0}\), taking values in \(\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, \ldots\}\). We stress that this number includes the customers in service: when \(N_t = m + n\), then all servers are occupied, and \(n\) customers are waiting.

Observe that \((I_t, J_t, N_t)_{t \geq 0}\) is a continuous-time Markov chain on the state space \(\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{N}\). Throughout the queue is assumed to be stable, i.e., we impose the condition
\[
\lambda < \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\mathbb{E} B(\ell)},
\]
where \(\mathbb{E} B(\ell)\) can be evaluated in terms of \(\alpha(\ell)\) and \(T(\ell)\) as in Ref. \[2, \text{Prop. III.4.1}\]. This stability criterion can be interpreted as the average number of clients arriving to the multi-server queue per unit of time should be strictly majorized by the average number of clients that can be served (by the \(m\) queues together) per unit of time.

Since servers are heterogeneous, we shall assume that the free server with the lowest index serves the next customer arriving or waiting in the queue. In practice, one may wish to prioritize faster servers; a service policy of this type can be achieved by labeling servers in increasing order according to their average service times.

### 2.2. Objective and methodology

Our first objective is to estimate the probability that the backlog, \(\max\{N_t - m, 0\}\), exceeds a given level \(K \in \mathbb{N}\) during a busy cycle, which we define as an uninterrupted period during which the system has systematically been non-empty. Such a period is initiated by the arrival of a customer to an empty system, and ends by the departure of the last customer (leaving all servers idle). Notice that in our model busy cycles are not i.i.d., as the state of the background process at the beginning of the busy cycle has impact on its evolution (as opposed to for instance the situation with renewal-type arrivals that was studied in Ref. \[20\]). We denote by \(\mathcal{F}_i\) the event that a busy cycle started when the background process was in state \(i\). We focus on estimating the probability \(\varrho_i(K)\) that in a busy cycle the number of customers in the queue exceeds the value \(K\) conditional on \(\mathcal{F}_i\).

In practice, the probability \(\varrho_i(K)\) is usually required to be small, which makes estimating it by crude Monte Carlo simulation inefficient Ref. \[3, \text{Ch. VI}\]. We are therefore interested in an estimation procedure that relies on importance sampling Ref. \[3, \text{Section V.1}\] in order to limit the required simulation effort. Importance sampling is based on imposing a “change of measure” with respect to the original measure \(\mathbb{P}\). More concretely, the simulation is performed under a different probability measure \(\mathbb{Q}\), and the simulation output is corrected by the “likelihood ratios” \(d\mathbb{P}/d\mathbb{Q}\) evaluated at the observed outcome in order to retain an unbiased estimation procedure. The challenge is to find an alternative measure \(\mathbb{Q}\) that effectively reduces the variance of the estimator. This typically means that \(\mathbb{Q}\) should be such that the event under consideration becomes more likely to occur, but in addition it is required that the
likelihood ratio $dP/dQ$ on the event of interest should have a low variance. This is made explicit in Ref. [3, Section VI.1], where various efficiency measures for importance-sampling estimators are discussed.

Compared to the efficient simulation of tail probabilities in an $M/M/m$ queue, a number of complications arise in our set-up. In the first place, as mentioned above, busy cycles are not independent. Furthermore, since servers are heterogeneous, one needs to keep track not only of the number of busy servers but also of their indices and current phases. In addition, the arrival rate is not fixed but depends on the state of the background processes.

Observe, however, that during periods in which $N_t$ is larger than $m$, the dynamics of the process $(I_t, J_t, N_t)_{t \geq 0}$ depend on $I_t$ and $J_t$ only; one could say it is “level-homogeneous.” This motivates that we split each busy cycle into subintervals in which $N_t \in \{m + 1, m + 2, \ldots\}$ (i.e., the queue is not empty; we refer to these intervals as fully busy periods), and periods in which $N_t \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ (i.e., the queue is empty; we call these intervals partially busy periods). Thus, during a busy cycle the system alternates between partially and fully busy periods until the system becomes idle again.

Based on the above, we can decompose $\varrho_i(K)$ as follows. With $\varrho_i(K, n)$ the probability that the number of customers attains $m + K + 1$ for the first time in the $n$th fully busy period (conditional on $\mathcal{F}_i$), we can write

$$\varrho_i(K) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varrho_i(K, n).$$

With this decomposition in mind, we first consider the following approach to estimate $\varrho_i(K)$, which will be detailed in Section 3. During the fully busy periods, in which the system is level-homogeneous, we use an alternative probability measure $Q$ under which the queueing system is unstable (so that the rare event under study will occur frequently). During partially busy periods, in which the system is not level-homogeneous, we use the original measure $P$. To establish particular efficiency properties, the number of fully busy periods (per busy cycle) in which $Q$ is applied should be bounded by an arbitrary constant $C \in \mathbb{N}$; we return to this subtlety in Section 3. Based on the insights gained in Section 3, we then show in Section 4 how to obtain a change of measure that can be applied throughout the entire busy cycle.

### 3. Importance sampling procedure and its efficiency properties

In this section, we describe an importance sampling routine for estimating the quantity $\varrho_i(K)$. As this probability relates to the event that a given number of customers is reached before that number returns to 0, it suffices to track the evolution of the embedded discrete-time Markov process, i.e., of the continuous-time Markov chain $(I_t, J_t, N_t)_{t \geq 0}$ observed at its transition epochs. With a mild abuse of notation, we refer to the embedded process as

$$(I_n, J_n, N_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{N},$$

(2)
where \( n \) enumerates the epochs at which any of the three processes makes a transition. Note that at each transition epoch \( n \) of this embedded process typically only one of the state vector components changes, the exception being the occurrence of a departure (in which case \( J_n \) may change, and \( N_n \) decreases by one).

Define \( \sigma_k \) to be the first time that \((N_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) reaches level \( k \). Assuming that a busy cycle starts with the arrival of a first customer, the backlog exceeds \( K \) within that cycle if and only if \( \sigma_K = \sigma_m + 1 < \sigma_0 \). The objective of this section is to find an efficient algorithm for estimating the probability \( \varrho_i(K) \) that in a busy cycle the number of customers in the queue exceeds the value \( K \) given that the background process is in \( i \in \mathcal{I} \) at the start of the busy cycle; that is,

\[
\varrho_i(K) = \mathbb{P}(\sigma_K < \sigma_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_i)
\]

where \( \mathcal{F}_i \) corresponds to the event that \( I_0 = i \), \( J_0^{(1)} \) is sampled according to \( \alpha^{(1)} \), \( J_0^{(2)} = \cdots = J_0^{(m)} = \dagger \), and \( N_0 = 1 \) (recall from Section 2.1 that the first customer is attended to by the server with the lowest index).

The remainder of this section is organized as follows.

- First, in Section 3.1, we focus on a fully busy period; we conveniently shift time, such that the start of the busy period corresponds to time 0. We fix a state \((i, j) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{D} \), and consider the probability

\[
\rho_{i,j}(K) := \mathbb{P}_{i,j}(\sigma_K < \sigma_m \mid N_0 = m + 1)
\]

\[
:= \mathbb{P}(\sigma_K < \sigma_m \mid I_0 = i, J_0 = j, N_0 = m + 1) .
\] (3)

Observe that \( \rho_{i,j}(K) \) can be interpreted as the probability that the backlog exceeds \( K \) within a fully busy period given that such a period has started when the background process and the service times were in state \((i, j) \). Relying on the fact that during the fully busy period the system is level-homogeneous, we define a change of measure for estimating \( \rho_{i,j}(K) \). We then propose an importance sampling algorithm for estimating \( \varrho_i(K) \) which applies this change of measure during the first \( C \in \mathbb{N} \) fully busy periods. (In Section 4, we will see how the rates can be twisted in general, without the restriction of changing the measure only during the fully busy periods.)

- In Section 3.2, we investigate efficiency properties of the proposed estimators. In the first place, we show that the importance sampling procedure for estimating \( \rho_{i,j}(K) \) has bounded relative error. In addition, we show that \( \varrho_i(K) \) can be bounded in terms of \( \rho_{i,j}(K) \), so that the procedure for estimating \( \varrho_i(K) \) has bounded relative error as well.

- Section 3.3 presents a numerical example, in which the new measure \( Q \) is computed. It gives rise to a decomposition property, formalized in Section 3.4, which drastically reduces the computational efforts required to evaluate the measure \( Q \).
3.1. Change of measure

In this subsection, we focus on the estimation of \( r_{i,j}(K) \) as defined in (3), with fixed \( i \) and \( j \). We first sketch the reasoning we followed to come up with a guess for a promising change of measure. Later in Section 3.2, we prove that this change of measure indeed has the desired properties.

Observe that in order to decide whether or not \( \bar{\sigma}_K < \sigma_m \), we consider a time interval during which the value of \( N_n \) has not dropped below \( m + 1 \). In other words, the transition matrix of \((\bar{I}_n, \bar{J}_n, \bar{N}_n)\) does not depend on \( N_n \) during that interval. It is essentially this property that enables the following construction of the alternative measure, which mimics the construction in Ref.\([19]\) for the easier case of the Markov fluid queue.

The discrete-time Markov chain \((\bar{I}_n, \bar{J}_n, \bar{N}_n) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{D} \times \mathbb{Z}\) that behaves as \((I_n, J_n, N_n)\) during the fully busy period is characterized by the following transition probabilities. Define

\[
\varphi_{i,j} := \lambda_i + \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} t^{(\ell)}_{j_i} + q_i.
\]

Let \( e_\ell \) be a vector of dimension \( m \) with a one on position \( \ell \) and zeros otherwise. Then the probability of moving from \((i, j, n)\) to \((i, j, n + 1)\) is \( \lambda_i/\varphi_{i,j} \) (this corresponds to an arrival); the probability of moving from \((i, j, n)\) to \((i', j, n)\) is \( q_{ii}/\varphi_{i,j} \) (this corresponds to a transition of the background process); the probability of moving from \((i, j, n)\) to \((i, j + (k - j_\ell)e_\ell, n)\) is \( t^{(\ell)}_{j_i,k}/\varphi_{i,j} \) (this corresponds to a transition in the phase of one of the service times, without a departure); and the probability of moving from \((i, j, n)\) to \((i, j + (k - j_\ell)e_\ell, n - 1)\) is \( \bar{t}^{(\ell)}_{j_i,k}/\varphi_{i,j} \) with \( \bar{t}^{(\ell)}_{j_i,k} := t^{(\ell)}_{j_i,k} \alpha_{k}^{(\ell)} \) (this corresponds to a transition in the phase of one of the service times, but now with a departure).

We now point out how the alternative measure \( \mathbb{Q} \) is constructed. Let, for \((i, j) \neq (i^*, j^*)\), \( \xi_{i,j} \) denote the net increase of the number of customers \( \bar{N}_n \) from an epoch that \((\bar{I}_n, \bar{J}_n)\) is in \((i, j)\) until \((\bar{I}_n, \bar{J}_n)\) arrives at a given reference state \((i^*, j^*)\), whereas \( \xi_{i^*,j} \) is the net increase of \( \bar{N}_n \) between two subsequent visits of \((\bar{I}_n, \bar{J}_n)\) to \((i^*, j^*)\); we show below that the choice of the reference state does not affect the resulting new measure \( \mathbb{Q} \). Let \( x_{i,j}(\vartheta) := \mathbb{E} e^{\vartheta \xi_{i,j}} \) denote the moment generating function (MGF) of \( \xi_{i,j} \).

Relying on the usual “Markovian reasoning,” the MGFs satisfy, for any \((i, j) \neq (i^*, j^*)\),

\[
x_{i,j}(\vartheta) = \frac{\lambda_i}{\varphi_{i,j}} x_{i,j}(\vartheta) e^{\vartheta} + \sum_{i',1 \neq i} q_{i'i} x_{i',j}(\vartheta) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1,k \neq j_\ell}^{D^{(\ell)}_{j_i,k}} \frac{t^{(\ell)}_{j_i,k}}{\varphi_{i,j}} x_{i,j+(k-j_\ell)e_\ell}(\vartheta) e^{\vartheta} \quad + \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{D^{(\ell)}_{j_i,k}} \bar{t}^{(\ell)}_{j_i,k} x_{i,j+(k-j_\ell)e_\ell}(\vartheta) e^{-\vartheta} ,
\]

(4)
wherever \(x_{i^*, j^*}(\vartheta)\) appears in the right-hand side of (4), it equals 1 (as the process \((\tilde{T}_n, \tilde{J}_n)\) has arrived in the reference state). The system of Equation (4) can be interpreted as follows: the first term on the right-hand side corresponds to an arrival (hence, the factor \(e^\vartheta\)), the second to a jump of the background process, the third to a phase-transition of one of the service times (but not a departure), and the fourth to a departure and simultaneously the start of a new service (hence, the factor \(e^{-\vartheta}\)). For \((i, j) = (i^*, j^*)\) we obtain, by the same token,

\[
x_{i^*, j^*}(\vartheta) = \frac{\lambda_{i^*}}{q_{i^*, j^*}} e^{\vartheta} x_{i^*, j^*}(\vartheta) + \sum_{i=1, i \neq i^*} q_{i, j^*} x_{i, j^*}(\vartheta) \\
+ \sum_{\ell=1}^m \sum_{k=1, k \neq j^*_\ell} D^{(\ell)} j^*_\ell k \frac{t^{(\ell)}_{j^*_\ell k}}{q_{i^*, j^*}} x_{i^*, j^*+(k-j^*_\ell)} e_k(\vartheta) \\
+ \sum_{\ell=1}^m \sum_{k=1} D^{(\ell)} j^*_\ell k \frac{t^{(\ell)}_{j^*_\ell k}}{q_{i^*, j^*}} x_{i^*, j^*+(k-j^*_\ell)} e_k(\vartheta) e^{-\vartheta},
\]

(5)

For any value of \(\vartheta\), the MGFS \(x_{i^*, j^*}(\vartheta)\) now follow from solving the above system of linear equations.

Recall that \(\xi_{i^*, j^*}\) is the net increase of the number of customers between two subsequent visits of \((\tilde{T}_n, \tilde{J}_n)\) to the reference state \((i^*, j^*)\). From Ref. [3, Section VI.2a], we know that the alternative measure obtained by an exponential twist of the original measure \(P\) should be such that the MGF of \(\xi_{i^*, j^*}\) evaluated in \(\vartheta\) under \(Q\) matches the MGF of \(\xi_{i^*, j^*}\) evaluated in \(\vartheta + \vartheta^*\) under \(P\). In self-evident notation

\[
E^Q e^{\vartheta \xi_{i^*, j^*}} = E e^{(\vartheta + \vartheta^*) \xi_{i^*, j^*}},
\]

with the value of \(\vartheta^*\) such that \(x_{i^*, j^*}(\vartheta^*) \equiv E e^{\vartheta^* \xi_{i^*, j^*}} = 1\); \(\vartheta^*\) can thus be interpreted as the Cramér root [3, Section VI.2a] associated with the random variable \(\xi_{i^*, j^*}\). In the set of equations (4)–(5) at all places where \(x_{i^*, j^*}(\vartheta^*)\) appears it has been replaced by 1, and as a consequence it can be written in terms of an eigensystem \(A(\vartheta^*)x(\vartheta^*) = x(\vartheta^*)\) with \(x_{i^*, j^*}(\vartheta^*) = 1\); hence \(A(\vartheta^*)\) has eigenvalue/eigenvector pair \((1, x(\vartheta^*))\).

For the sake of readability in the sequel we write \(A := A(\vartheta^*), x := x(\vartheta^*)\) and \(x_{i,j} := x_{i,j}(\vartheta^*)\).

Two remarks are in place now. In the first place, the representation \(A(\vartheta^*)x(\vartheta^*) = x(\vartheta^*)\) reveals that the choice of the reference state has no impact: picking another reference state leads to (i) the same \(\vartheta^*\), and (ii) (up to a multiplicative constant) the same vector \(x(\vartheta^*)\) (recall that the component corresponding to the reference state equals 1). Second, as the components of the vector \(x(\vartheta^*)\) have the interpretation of MGFS, the vector is necessarily componentwise positive.

In practical terms, \(\vartheta^*\) and the corresponding eigenvector can be found as follows. We have already pointed out that for given \(\vartheta\) evaluating \(u(\vartheta) := E e^{\vartheta \xi_{i^*, j^*}}\) boils down to solving a system of linear equations. Observe that \(u(0) = 1, u'(0) < 0\) (due to the stability condition), \(u(\cdot)\) is convex and increasing to \(\infty\). As a consequence, \(\vartheta^* > 0\)
(solving \( u(\vartheta^*) = 1 \) exists and is unique (and can be numerically found by e.g. an elementary bisection procedure).

Inspired by the above eigensystem, we now propose the following new measure \( Q \) corresponding to an exponential twist of the distribution of \( \xi \), to be used to estimate \( r_{i,j}(K) \): when \((\bar{t}_n, \bar{j}_n) = (i, j)\),

\[
\lambda_i^\vartheta = \lambda_i e^{\vartheta^*}, \quad q_{ii}^\vartheta = q_{ii}^\vartheta, \quad \left( \bar{t}_{ji,k}^\vartheta \right)^\vartheta = \frac{t_{ji,k}^\vartheta}{x_{i,j}} X_{i,j}(k-j)_e^\vartheta, \quad \left( \bar{t}_{ji,k}^\vartheta \right)^\vartheta = \frac{t_{ji,k}^\vartheta}{x_{i,j}} e^{-\vartheta^*}. \tag{6}
\]

In the remainder of this subsection, we evaluate the likelihood ratio that results from this change of measure when estimating \( r_{i,j}(K) \); as it turns out, this has a surprisingly simple form. To this end, we consider an arbitrary path of the process \((\bar{t}_n, \bar{j}_n)\) starting when the fully busy period commences (that is, we have \( \bar{t}_0 = i, \bar{j}_0 = j \), and \( N_0 = m + 1 \)), and ending at time \( \tau = \min[\bar{\sigma}_K, \bar{\sigma}_m] \), visiting states \((i_n, j_n)\), where \( n \) denotes the \( n \)th transition epoch of the process \((2)\). Let \( \mathcal{N}_+ \) denote the \( n \in \mathcal{S} := \{1, \ldots, \tau\} \) corresponding to arrivals, \( \mathcal{N}_- \) corresponding to transitions of the background process, \( \mathcal{N}_\vartheta \) the \( n \in \mathcal{S} \) corresponding to a phase-transition of the service time at server \( \ell \) (not being a service completion), and \( \mathcal{N}_\vartheta \) corresponding to a service completion at server \( \ell \). The likelihood (under \( P \)) of such a path is thus given by, with \( i = i_0 \) and \( j = j_0 \),

\[
\prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}_+} \lambda_{in} q_{in,jn} \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}_-} q_{in,jn} \prod_{\ell = 1}^{m} \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}_\vartheta} t_{jn,jn+1}^\vartheta \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}_\vartheta} \bar{t}_{jn,jn+1}. \tag{7}
\]

The likelihood of the same path under the new measure \( Q \) has the same form, except that all probabilities in (7) are replaced by their counterparts under \( Q \), where, due to (4) and the definition of the new rates,

\[
\varphi_{i,j}^\vartheta = \lambda_i^\vartheta + \sum_{\ell = 1}^{m} \left( t_{ji}^\vartheta \right)^\vartheta + q_{ii}^\vartheta
\]

\[
= \lambda_i^\vartheta + \sum_{\ell = 1}^{m} \sum_{k=1,k\neq j}^{D_{ji}+1} t_{ji,k}^\vartheta + \sum_{\ell = 1}^{d} q_{ii}^\vartheta = \varphi_{i,j}.
\]

It follows that the likelihood ratio over the path takes the form

\[
L = \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}_+} \frac{\lambda_{in}}{\lambda_{in}^\vartheta} / q_{in,jn} / q_{in,jn} \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}_-} q_{in,jn}^\vartheta / q_{in,jn} \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}_\vartheta} \frac{t_{jn,jn+1}^\vartheta / q_{jn,jn}}{t_{jn,jn+1} / q_{jn,jn}} \prod_{\ell = 1}^{m} \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}_\vartheta} \frac{\bar{t}_{jn,jn+1}^\vartheta / q_{jn,jn}}{\bar{t}_{jn,jn+1} / q_{jn,jn}}.
\]
Because $\varphi_{i,j} = \varphi_{i,j}^\circ$, by (6) this reduces to the “telescopic product”

$$L = \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}} e^{\theta^*} \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}^*} x_{i_n,j_n}^{m} \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}^{(t)}} x_{i_n,j_n}^{\ell} \prod_{n \in \mathcal{N}^{(t)}} x_{i_n,j_n}^{e^{\theta^*}}$$

$$= e^{-\theta^*\Sigma_+} x_{i_0,j_0}^{m} e^{\theta^*\Sigma_-},$$

where $\Sigma_+$ is the number of arrivals in $\mathcal{S}$, and $\Sigma_-$ the number of departures. Observe that at the end of each fully busy period we either have $\Sigma_- - \Sigma_+ = -K$ if $\tau = \sigma_K$, or $\Sigma_- - \Sigma_+ = 1$ if $\tau = \sigma_m$. We find the following identities.

**Corollary 3.1.** Let $\bar{I}_0 = i$, $\bar{J}_0 = j$, and $\bar{N}_0 = m + 1$. For any $K \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$L \mathbb{I}\{\tau = \sigma_K\} = e^{-\theta^*K} \frac{x_{i,j}}{x_{i_0,j_0}} \quad L \mathbb{I}\{\tau = \sigma_m\} = e^{\theta^*} \frac{x_{i,j}}{x_{i_0,j_0}}.$$

**Remark 3.1.** It is reassuring to note that the proposed change of measure satisfies Juneja’s “equi-probable cycle” condition, which should hold for an asymptotically optimal change of measure\[12\]. Namely, if $(\bar{I}_n, \bar{J}_n, \bar{N}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ visits a specific state multiple times, the contribution to the likelihood ratio of the interval between two such subsequent visits is equal to one.

Based on the analysis in this section, we propose to change to the alternative measure $\mathbb{Q}$ during the fully busy periods, whereas during the partially busy periods $\mathbb{P}$ should be used; implementation details are provided in the appendix. If $\mathbb{Q}$ is applied only during the first $C$ fully busy periods, we prove in Section 3.2 that the procedure has bounded relative error. In practice, however, $C$ can be chosen arbitrarily large without compromising the estimator’s performance; see Section 5 for a numerical assessment.

### 3.2. Bounds and relative error

In this subsection, we derive bounds on $\varrho_i(K)$ in terms of the probability $r_{i,j}(K)$, which we then use to prove that the proposed importance sampling estimation procedure leads to bounded relative error.

The partially busy period before each fully busy period commences either when 1 customer is in the system (at the beginning of the busy cycle), or when $m$ customers are in the system (when we just exited a fully busy period). Accordingly, we define, in self-evident notation,

$$\overline{p}_i := \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{m+1} < \sigma_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_i), \quad p_{i,j} := \mathbb{P}_{i,j}(\sigma_{m+1} < \sigma_0 \mid N_0 = m).$$

Observe that the number of fully busy periods in a busy cycle is bounded from above by a geometric random variable $G$ with success probability

$$p_+ := \max \left\{ \max_i \overline{p}_i, \max_{i,j} p_{i,j} \right\} = \max_{i,j} p_{i,j} < 1, \quad (9)$$
The equation holds because the fully busy period is initiated with the \((m + 1)\)-th customer; evidently, the probability of this event is larger given \(N_0 = m\) than given \(N_0 = 1\).

In every one of these fully busy periods, level \(m + K + 1\) is reached with a probability that is bounded above by

\[ r_+(K) := \max_{i,j} r_{i,j}(K). \]

Supposing that \(G = k\), in each of the \(k\) attempts the level \(m + K + 1\) can be reached. The union bound then yields the following upper bound: uniformly in \(i \in \mathcal{I}\),

\[ \varrho_i(K) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p_+^k (1 - p_+) k r_+(K) = \frac{r_+(K)}{p_+}, \tag{10} \]

where the equation follows by evaluating the expectation of a geometric random variable. Now focus on establishing a lower bound based on the probability of reaching \(m + K + 1\) in the first fully busy period. To this end, we define

\[ p_- := \min_i \Pr(\sigma_{m+1} < \sigma_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_i), \quad r_-(K) := \min_{i,j} r_{i,j}(K). \]

Then, it follows directly that, uniformly in \(i \in \mathcal{I}\),

\[ \varrho_i(K) \geq p_- r_-(K). \tag{11} \]

In order to make the bounds on \(\varrho_i(K)\) more explicit, we now show how \(r_{i,j}(K)\) as defined in (3) can be bounded. These bounds are derived by using the change of measure \(\mathcal{Q}\) that we identified above. Denoting, as before, the likelihood ratio in the fully busy period by \(L\), we have

\[ r_{i,j}(K) = \mathbb{E}_{i,j}^\mathcal{Q} [L 1\{\bar{\sigma}_K < \sigma_m\} \mid N_0 = m + 1] \]

\[ = \mathbb{E}_{i,j}^\mathcal{Q} [L \mid \bar{\sigma}_K < \sigma_m, N_0 = m + 1] \mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(\bar{\sigma}_K < \sigma_m \mid N_0 = m + 1), \]

where the subscript \(i, j\) denotes conditioning on the initial states \(I_0 = i\) and \(J_0 = j\) as before. Using Equation (8) (or Corollary 3.1), we thus conclude

\[ \eta_- e^{-\theta^* K} \leq \mathbb{E}_{i,j}^\mathcal{Q} [L \mid \bar{\sigma}_K < \sigma_m, N_0 = m + 1] \leq \eta_+ e^{-\theta^* K}, \tag{12} \]

with the constants \(\eta_-\) and \(\eta_+\) defined by

\[ \eta_- := \min_{i,i' \in \mathcal{I}, j,j' \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{x_{i,j}}{x_{i',j'}}, \quad \eta_+ := \max_{i,i' \in \mathcal{I}, j,j' \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{x_{i,j}}{x_{i',j'}}. \]

Since \(\mathcal{I}\) and \(\mathcal{D}\) are finite, and recalling that \(x\) is componentwise positive, \(\eta_-\) and \(\eta_+\) are positive and finite.

Due to the fact that under \(\mathcal{Q}\) the queueing system is unstable\([3, \text{Section VI.2}]\), we have that, as \(K \to \infty\),

\[ \mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(\bar{\sigma}_K < \sigma_m \mid N_0 = m + 1) \downarrow \mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(\bar{\sigma}_\infty < \sigma_m \mid N_0 = m + 1) > 0. \]

Furthermore, note that (12) holds for any fixed \((i, j)\); thus, in particular, we can take the minimum or the maximum over such states. We have thus shown that there exist
positive and finite numbers $\kappa_-$ and $\kappa_+$, such that
\[ \kappa_- e^{-\theta^* K} \leq r_-(K) \leq r_+(K) \leq \kappa_+ e^{-\theta^* K}. \]

Combining this with (10) and (11), we have established the following result.

**Proposition 3.1.** For any $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and $j \in \mathcal{D}$, uniformly in $i \in \mathcal{I}$,
\[ p_- \kappa_- e^{-\theta^* K} \leq \varrho_i(K) \leq \frac{\kappa_+}{p_+} e^{-\theta^* K}. \]

Proposition 3.1 provides us with a lower and upper bound on $\varrho_i(K)$, which are valid across all $K \in \mathbb{N}$, and which differ just by a multiplicative constant. We now use these bounds to assess the estimator’s efficiency properties. We now use the above proposition to assess the estimator’s efficiency properties. Since $\theta^*$ is the Cramér root, it is positive, and hence both bounds tend to zero as $K$ grows large. Below we establish an upper bound on the relative error that is independent of $K$.

The probability $\varrho_i(K)$ is estimated by using $\overline{Q}$ during the fully busy periods, and the original measure $\mathbb{P}$ otherwise. Denoting this “composite measure” by $\overline{Q}$, we rely on the identity
\[ \varrho_i(K) = \mathbb{E}_{\overline{Q}}[L^1 \{\overline{\sigma}_K < \sigma_0\} | \mathcal{F}_i], \]
with the event $\mathcal{F}_i$ as defined above; cf. Ref. [3, Section V.1a]. The relative error of an estimator is defined by the ratio of the estimator’s standard deviation to its mean. Noting that the estimator is unbiased, we obtain that its per-sample standard deviation can be written as
\[ \nu^o = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\overline{Q}}[L^2 \{\overline{\sigma}_K < \sigma_0\} | \mathcal{F}_i]} - \varrho_i(K)^2. \]

Thus, the relative error based on $n$ simulation runs is
\[ \frac{\nu^o}{\sqrt{n}\varrho_i(K)} = \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\overline{Q}}[L^2 \{\overline{\sigma}_K < \sigma_0\} | \mathcal{F}_i]}{n\varrho_i(K)} - \frac{1}{n}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\overline{Q}}[L^2 \{\overline{\sigma}_K < \sigma_0\} | \mathcal{F}_i]}{n\varrho_i(K)^2}}. \tag{13} \]

Observe that the number of fully busy periods that are performed under $\overline{Q}$ is bounded from above by a geometric random variable with success probability $p_+$. Invoking Corollary 1, we thus obtain, for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$,
\[ \mathbb{E}_{\overline{Q}}[L^2 \{\overline{\sigma}_K < \sigma_0\} | \mathcal{F}_i] \leq e^{-2\theta^* K} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{2\theta^* k} p_+^k (1 - p_+) \eta_+^{2k}. \tag{14} \]

If $e^{2\theta^* p_+ \eta_+^2} < 1$, then the geometric series converges. Combining this with the lower bound $\varrho_i(K) \geq p_- \kappa_- e^{-\theta^* K}$, the bounded relative error follows: the expression in the left-hand side of (13) is bounded above by a finite expression that does not depend on $K$. 
Proposition 3.2. If $\eta^\circ := e^{2\vartheta^*} p_+ \eta^2_+ < 1$, then the estimator for $\varrho_i(K)$ based on $\overline{Q}$ has bounded relative error:

$$\frac{\nu^\circ}{\sqrt{n \varrho_i(K)}} \leq \frac{1}{p_- \kappa_-} \sqrt{\frac{(1 - p_+ ) \eta^\circ}{n(1 - \eta^\circ)}}$$

The question arises what can be done if the condition $\eta^\circ < 1$ is not fulfilled (in which case the geometric series in (14) does not converge). Various approaches are possible, of which we present two possibilities.

Approach 1. This approach is based on a truncation. We replace the probability $\varrho_i(K)$ by a corresponding probability $\varrho_{i,C}(K)$: this $\varrho_{i,C}(K)$ is defined precisely as $\varrho_i(K)$ but with the additional requirement that the number of customers exceeds $K$ in one of the first $C$ fully busy periods. It is clear that by choosing $C$ appropriately large, the bias can be made arbitrarily small. Indeed, by observing that $\varrho_{i,C}(K)$ only differ in scenarios in which there are more than $C$ fully busy periods in the busy cycle, and that after these $C$ fully busy periods the number of customers should exceed $K$ before the busy cycle ends, the absolute bias can be bounded as follows:

$$\varrho_i(K) - \varrho_{i,C}(K) \leq (p_+)^C \cdot \frac{\kappa_+}{p_+} e^{-\vartheta^* K};$$

recognize the factor $(\kappa_+/p_+) e^{-\vartheta^* K}$ from Proposition 3.1. Suppose now that a relative bias $\delta > 0$ is allowed; then, again by Proposition 3.1 it suffices to choose $C$ such that

$$\frac{(p_+)^C \cdot (\kappa_+/p_+) e^{-\vartheta^* K}}{p_- \kappa_- e^{-\vartheta^* K}} \leq \delta,$$

or, equivalently,

$$C \geq \frac{\log(p_- p_+ \kappa_+/\kappa_-)}{\log p_+}.$$

Obviously, the lower $\delta$, the larger the number of fully busy periods $C$.

Let $Q_C$ be the change of measure in which $\varrho_{i,C}(K)$ is estimated using $Q$ during the fully busy periods (where it is recalled that there are at most $C$ of them), and the original measure $P$ otherwise. We thus obtain that

$$E^{Q_C} \left[ L^2 1 \{ \bar{\sigma}_K < \sigma_0 \} | \mathcal{F}_i \right] \leq e^{-2\vartheta^* K} \sum_{k=1}^C e^{2\vartheta^* k} p_+^k (1 - p_+ ) \eta^2_+.$$

This leads to the following result, with $\nu^\circ_C$ denoting the counterpart of $\nu^\circ$ for the measure $Q_C$, which holds irrespective of the value of $\eta^\circ$.

Theorem 3.1. The estimator for $\varrho_{i,C}(K)$ based on $Q_C$ has bounded relative error:

$$\frac{\nu^\circ_C}{\sqrt{n \varrho_{i,C}(K)}} \leq \frac{1}{p_- \kappa_-} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^C e^{2\vartheta^* k} p_+^k (1 - p_+ ) \eta^2_+}$$
Approach 2. A pragmatic alternative is the following. We switch on the importance sampling (i.e., use measure $Q$) only during the first $C$ fully busy periods, and use the original measure $P$ otherwise. Evidently, in this approach no bias has to be taken care of. For $C = \infty$, it coincides with the measure $Q$. Pseudocode for this approach is presented in the appendix (but it can easily be adapted to Approach 1). In Section 5, we empirically study the impact of the choice of $C$.

3.3. Numerical example

In this subsection, we present a small numerical illustration. Consider a two-server system, with $d = 2$ and $D^{(1)} = D^{(2)} = 3$. The arrival rates, initial probabilities and transition rate matrices are

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} -0.5 & 0.5 \\ 0.1 & -0.1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 \\ 0.3 \\ 0.2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.9 & 0.2 & 0.1 & 0.6 \\ 0.5 & -1.5 & 0.5 & 0.5 \\ 0.2 & 0.2 & -0.8 & 0.4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} 0.1 \\ 0.5 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 \\ 0.2 \\ 0.3 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.6 \\ 1 & -2 & 0.5 & 0.5 \\ 0.2 & 0.2 & -1 & 0.6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$ 

We order the states lexicographically and solve the eigensystem (4) by first using bisection to find a value of $\vartheta$ such that the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $A$ defining the eigensystem equals one. One thus obtains $\vartheta^* = 0.86$. We normalize the eigenvector corresponding to this eigenvalue such that its first entry is one, and call the resulting vector $x$.

For example, for states $i = 1, i' = 2, j = (1, 1), j' = (2, 3)$, we then have $x_{i, j} = 1, x_{i', j'} \approx 1.09, x_{i, j} \approx 1.99, x_{i', j'} \approx 2.17$ (rounded to two decimal digits). We observe the remarkable property that (up to the rounding error) $x_{i', j}/x_{i', j'} = x_{i, j}/x_{i, j'}$. Generally, it turns out that the obtained mgfs $x$ are such that

$$\frac{x_{i, j}}{x_{i', j'}} = \frac{x_{i', j}}{x_{i, j'}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{x_{i, j}}{x_{i', j'}} = \frac{x_{i, j'}}{x_{i', j}}, \quad \text{for any} \quad i \neq i', j \neq j';$$

indicating that there is a certain decoupling among the servers as well as between servers and arrivals. The decoupling means that under $Q$ (as was the case under the original measure $P$), (i) the transition rates of the background process do not depend on the phases the customers in service are in, (ii) the service-time distribution at any particular server does not depend on the state of the background process nor the phases the other customers are in.

3.4. The structure of $A$

The observed decoupling can be formally established as follows. Note that if the states $(i_1, j_1, \ldots, j_m)$ are ordered lexicographically, then the matrix $A$ defining the
The eigensystem given in (4) can be decomposed as

\[ A \circ \varphi 1 = \Lambda e^\vartheta \otimes I_D + Q \otimes I_D + I_d \otimes R = \left[ \Lambda e^\vartheta + Q \right] \oplus R, \tag{15} \]

where \( \circ \) denotes the Hadamard product, \( \varphi \) is the column vector with entries \( \varphi_{i,j} \), \( \mathbf{1} \) is a row vector of ones, \( \Lambda := \text{diag}\{\lambda\} \); \( D := \prod_{\ell=1}^m D^{(\ell)} \); \( I_D \) is the \( D \times D \)-identity matrix, and \( I_d \) the \( d \times d \)-identity matrix; \( \oplus \) and \( \otimes \) denote the Kronecker sum and product, respectively; \( Q \) denotes the matrix \( Q - Q \circ I_d \); and the “remainder term” \( R \) is of dimension \( D \times D \) and depends on the matrices

\[ T^{(\ell)} = \left( t^{(\ell)}_{i,j} \right)_{i,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{T}^{(\ell)} = \left( \overline{t}^{(\ell)}_{i,j} \right)_{i,j} \]

but not on \( \lambda \) or \( Q \). Because the eigenvalues of a Kronecker sum are given by the sums of the eigenvalues of each Kronecker summand\(^{[17, \text{Thm. 13.16}]} \), this decomposition shows that the eigensystem can be split up into a part corresponding to arrivals and a part corresponding to services.

Let us now consider the remainder term \( R \), which corresponds to the service processes. We note that \( R \) contains

\[ D^+ := \prod_{\ell=1}^{m-1} D^{(\ell)} \]

block matrices of size \( D^{(m)} \times D^{(m)} \), which have the following structure.

(i) The block matrices on the diagonal are of the form

\[ \overline{T}^{(m)} + \overline{T}^{(m)} e^{-\vartheta} + I_{D^{(m)}} e^{-\vartheta} \sum_{\ell=1}^{m-1} \overline{t}^{(\ell)}_{j\ell,j\ell}, \]

where \( \overline{T}^{(m)} \) denotes the matrix \( T^{(m)} - T^{(m)} \circ I_{D^{(m)}} \).

(ii) Off-diagonal block matrices are either of the form \( [t^{(\ell)}_{j\ell,j\ell} + \overline{t}^{(\ell)}_{j\ell,j\ell} e^{-\vartheta}] I_{D^{(m)}} \) with \( \ell < m \), or they are zero.

As it turns out, \( R \) can thus be decomposed as

\[ R = \bigoplus_{\ell=1}^m \left( T^{(\ell)} + \overline{T}^{(\ell)} e^{-\vartheta} \right). \]

Inserting this expression in (15) we see (e.g., from Ref.\(^{[17, \text{Thm. 13.16}]} \)) that the MGF \( x \) that we found as an eigenvector of \( A \) can be computed as the Kronecker product of eigenvectors of \( m + 1 \) decoupled eigensystems, corresponding with the arrivals and the services for each of the \( m \) servers. In this way, while the dimension of \( A \) is \( dD \), the measure \( \mathbb{Q} \) can be found by solving a system of dimension just \( d + \sum_{\ell=1}^m D^{(\ell)} \); in the above example this would yield a reduction of dimension 18 to dimension 8. We detail such an alternative approach in the next section.

4. Efficient computation of change of measure

As mentioned above, an intrinsic problem of the change of measure defined in Section 3 is that the underlying eigensystem may become prohibitively large, and as a result the computation of \( \mathbb{Q} \) becomes problematic. Already for the small example of Section 3.3, the length of the vector \( x \) is 18; if one has 10 servers with 3-dimensional phase-type distributions, and if \( d = 4 \), the dimension of the matrix \( A \) is as high as \( 4 \cdot 3^{10} = 2.36 \cdot 10^5 \). This explains why we explore an alternative
approach to compute $Q$, in which the twist of the arrival processes and the service times do not interrelate. In the above example with 10 servers, this means that the alternative measure can be found by solving a system of dimension 34. The “catch” is that the decoupling-based approach requires function evaluations that are more involved, and thus for low-dimensional problems the approach of Section 3 may be preferred; see also Section 5, where we discuss simulation examples.

In the following, we explain how we can compute the (exponentially twisted) change of measure without having to solve a large eigensystem. This we do by relying on an auxiliary model that allows us to efficiently compute the alternative measure $Q$, but which, importantly, does not correspond directly to the setup of Section 3. We will get back to this issue below. Our reasoning in this section relies on specific earlier results from large deviations theory; we therefore start our reasoning by recalling these.

### 4.1. Preliminaries

Consider a sequence of i.i.d. positive random variables $(R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (with a bounded mgf around 0), and its associated counting process

$$R(t) := \sup \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i \leq t \right\}.$$

Define the associated limiting logarithmic mgf (ll-mgf):

$$\mathcal{R}(\vartheta) := \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{E} e^{\vartheta R(t)}.$$

We now introduce our auxiliary setup that helps us identifying the measure $Q$ for our model. Let $c$ be some number larger than $\mathbb{E} R$ (with $R$ being distributed as $R_1$). Consider a (stable) queue that drains at a constant rate $c$, where unit-sized jobs arrive with interarrival times $(R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. From, e.g., Ref. [5], we have the logarithmic decay rate of the probability $\mathbb{P}(W > u)$ that the stationary workload $W$ exceeds $u$,

$$\lim_{u \to \infty} \frac{1}{u} \log \mathbb{P}(W > u) = -\vartheta,$$

obeys $\mathcal{R}(\vartheta) - c\vartheta = 0$. The crucial insight, however, is that there is a second way to compute the same decay rate, viz. as the solution of $r(-c\vartheta)e^\vartheta = 1$, with $r(\vartheta) := \mathbb{E} e^{\vartheta R}$; see, e.g., Ref. [7]. This entails that both approaches lead to the same $(c, \vartheta)$-pairs. A minor computation then yields that

$$\mathcal{R}(\vartheta) = -r^{-1}(e^{-\vartheta}).$$

(16)

We have thus expressed the ll-mgf $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ in terms of the mgf of $R$. For instance, for $R$ having an exponential distribution with mean $\mu^{-1}$, this yields $\mathcal{R}(\vartheta) = \mu(e^\vartheta - 1)$, as it should (recall that in this case $R(t)$ is Poisson with mean $\mu t$). See [6] for more background on this type of inversion result. In the following section, we point out how we can use this principle to identify $Q$. 

4.2. Twist of our model

After having introduced the auxiliary system in the previous subsection, we now return to our queueing model. In Section 3, we developed a way to determine the decay rate $-\vartheta^*$ of the probability of our interest, leading to the alternative measure $Q$; as mentioned, the intrinsic drawback of this approach is that it requires a possibly large eigensystem. In this section, we present an alternative way to compute $-\vartheta^*$ that, importantly, decouples the arrival and service processes, thus leading to a substantial computational gain.

A crucial idea is that the probability of our interest (i.e., the probability that the number of customers in the queue exceeds $K$ in a busy cycle) has the same decay rate (denoted by $\vartheta^*$) as the probability the steady-state queue length exceeds $K$\[^7\]. This equivalence is due to the fact that, in a large-deviations sense, both events correspond to the same most likely path toward the rare event (along which the process essentially behaves as being generated by the measure $Q$). In this subsection, we further elaborate on this relation.

Let $\mathcal{A}(\vartheta)$ be the $ll$-MGF corresponding with the interarrival times $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $\mathcal{B}(\ell) (\vartheta)$ the $ll$-MGF corresponding with the service times $(B^{(\ell)}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (in case there would always be jobs to serve). That is,

$$
\mathcal{A}(\vartheta) := \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{E} e^{\vartheta A(t)}, \quad \mathcal{B}(\ell) (\vartheta) := \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{E} e^{\vartheta B^{(\ell)}(t)},
$$

where $A(t)$ and $B^{(\ell)}(t)$ are defined analogously to $R(t)$ above. Then, based on the theory of Section 4.1, the decay rate of the probability $\mathbb{P}(W_Q > K)$ that the stationary queue $W_Q$ exceeds $K$, i.e.,

$$
\lim_{K \to \infty} \frac{1}{K} \log \mathbb{P}(W_Q > K) = -\vartheta^*,
$$

is the solution $\vartheta^*$ of

$$
\mathcal{A}(\vartheta) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \mathcal{B}(\ell) (\vartheta) = 0.
$$

We have thus found an alternative way to determine the decay rate $-\vartheta^*$; observe that it uses the characteristics of the arrival and service processes in a decoupled way (which is a crucial advantage over the approach presented in Section 3, where the arrival and service processes were coupled). As we mentioned at the beginning of the section, a reference for this type of large deviations result is Ref.\[^7\] (see in particular Equation (1.19) in that paper) and Ref.\[^5\].

Invoking (16) we conclude that $\vartheta^*$ solves

$$
\mathcal{A}(\vartheta) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} (b^{(\ell)})^{-1} (e^{\vartheta}),
$$

where, with $S^{(\ell)}$ and $s^{(\ell)}$ as in Equation (1),

$$
b^{(\ell)}(\vartheta) = \alpha^{(\ell)} (-\vartheta p^{(\ell)} - S^{(\ell)})^{-1} s^{(\ell)}
$$
is the mgf associated with server $\ell$ (see, e.g., Ref.\textsuperscript{[4,Thm. 4.3]}). Now that we have determined the decay rate $-\vartheta^*$, the next goal is to find the corresponding exponentially twisted version of the arrival and service processes.

Regarding the arrival times this means that to obtain an exponentially twisted importance sampling distribution (with twist $\vartheta^*$), we have to find an MMP process such that its ll-mgf is $A^\circ \left( \vartheta^* \right) = A \left( \vartheta + \vartheta^* \right) - A \left( \vartheta^* \right)$. As can be found in e.g. Kesidis, Walrand, and Chang\textsuperscript{[13]}, $A \left( \vartheta \right)$ equals $\Xi(Q + (e^\vartheta - 1) \operatorname{diag}(\Lambda))$, where $\Xi(M)$ denotes the largest eigenvalue of $M$.

Regarding the service times, exponential twisting of $B^{(\ell)}$ requires us to construct $Q$ such that under this new measure the ll-mgf of the service times at server $\ell$ equals

$$\left( B^{(\ell)} \right)^\circ \left( \vartheta^* \right) = - \left( b^{(\ell)} \right)^{-1} (e^{\vartheta + \vartheta^*}) + \left( b^{(\ell)} \right)^{-1} (e^{\vartheta^*}).$$

(19)

We now point out how the corresponding changes of measure can be performed; Section 4.3 focuses on the arrival process and Section 4.4 on the service processes.

### 4.3. Twist of the arrival process

As mentioned, $A \left( \vartheta \right)$ equals $\Xi(Q + \Lambda(e^\vartheta - 1))$, and hence we wish to find $\Lambda^\circ := \operatorname{diag}(\Lambda^\circ)$ and $Q^\circ$ such that $A^\circ \left( \vartheta^* \right) = A \left( \vartheta + \vartheta^* \right) - A \left( \vartheta^* \right)$, i.e.,

$$\Xi(Q^\circ + \Lambda^\circ(e^\vartheta - 1)) = \Xi(Q + \Lambda(e^{\vartheta + \vartheta^*} - 1)) - A \left( \vartheta^* \right),$$

where it is noted that the right hand side of the previous expression can alternatively be written as, with $I_d$ denoting the $d \times d$-identity matrix, $\Xi(Q + \Lambda(e^{\vartheta^*} - 1) - I_d A \left( \vartheta^* \right))$.

To construct the exponentially twisted version of the arrival process, we again work with an auxiliary system. In this auxiliary system, the input MMP process, which is served at a constant rate $c$ (larger than the mean input rate of the MMP process). As we argued earlier in this section, the decay rate $\vartheta^*$ of the auxiliary system can be evaluated by solving $A \left( \vartheta \right) = c\vartheta$. Alternatively, we can find a system of equations that $\vartheta^*$ should satisfy, similar to the approach in Section 3.1. Let $z_i(\vartheta)$ denote the mgf of the net increase in the number of customers in the auxiliary system during a period in which the background process transitions from $i$ to an arbitrary reference state. Mimicking the way the change of measure was constructed in Section 3.1, we find that $(\vartheta^*, z_i)$ (with $z_i := z_i(\vartheta^*)$) should satisfy

$$z_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{q_{i,j}}{q_i} z_j \int_0^\infty q_i e^{-q_i t} e^{-\vartheta c t} e^{\lambda_i(e^\vartheta - 1)} dt = \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{q_{i,j}}{q_i - \lambda_i(e^\vartheta - 1) + c\vartheta} z_j,$$

which can be rewritten as

$$(-\lambda_i(e^\vartheta - 1) + c\vartheta) z_i = \sum_{j=1}^d q_{ij} z_j.$$
Inserting \( c \vartheta^{*} = \mathcal{A}(\vartheta^{*}) \), we conclude that for \( \vartheta = \vartheta^{*} \) there exists a componentwise positive vector \( z \) such that

\[
\left( - (e^{\vartheta^{*}} - 1) \Lambda + I_d \mathcal{A}(\vartheta^{*}) \right) z = Qz. \tag{20}
\]

Now, let \( Z \) denote \( \text{diag}[z] \). Observe that any eigenvalue of \( Q + (e^{\vartheta^{*}} - 1) \Lambda - I_d \mathcal{A}(\vartheta^{*}) \), is eigenvalue of

\[
Z^{-1} \left( Q + (e^{\vartheta^{*}} - 1) \Lambda - I_d \mathcal{A}(\vartheta^{*}) \right) Z = Z^{-1} QZ + (e^{\vartheta^{*}} - 1) \Lambda - I_d \mathcal{A}(\vartheta^{*})
\]

(with \( \Lambda_{o} := \Lambda e^{\vartheta^{*}} \)) as well. Now note that, by virtue of (20),

\[
Q_{o} := Z^{-1} QZ + (e^{\vartheta^{*}} - 1) \Lambda - I_d \mathcal{A}(\vartheta^{*})
\]

is a generator matrix. We have thus found that the desired change of measure is

\[
\lambda_{i}^{o} := \lambda_{i} e^{\vartheta^{*}}, \quad q_{ij}^{o} := \frac{q_{ij} z_{j}}{z_{i}}, \quad q_{i}^{o} := q_{i} - \lambda_{i} (e^{\vartheta^{*}} - 1) + \mathcal{A}(\vartheta^{*}). \tag{21}
\]

### 4.4. Twist of the service times

This subsection points out how to determine the exponential twist of the service processes. We start by pointing out that realizing the desired change of measure such that the \( \text{ll-MGF} \) becomes \( (19) \) amounts to exponentially twisting the service times at server \( \ell \) by some \( \zeta^{*}_{\ell} \) that we specify below. We wish to find service times (with \( \text{MGF} \) \( \overline{b}(\cdot) \)) such that \( (19) \) equals \( - (\overline{b}(\ell))^{-1}(e^{\vartheta^{*}}) \). Observe that (under the usual regularity conditions) \( f^{-1}(yu) = g^{-1}(y) + v \) (for all \( y \)) is equivalent to \( g(x) = f(x + v)/u \) (for all \( x \)). This means that we have to identify a \( \overline{b}(\cdot) \) such that

\[
\overline{b}(\ell)(\zeta) = \frac{b^{(\ell)}(\zeta + (b^{(\ell)})^{-1}(e^{\vartheta^{*}}))}{e^{\vartheta^{*}}},
\]

which corresponds to exponentially twisting the service times at the \( \ell \)th server with twist \( \zeta^{*}_{\ell} := (b^{(\ell)})^{-1}(e^{\vartheta^{*}}) \).

We proceed by explaining how the change of measure can be found for each server. Consider a generic server with phase-type distributed service times \( B \), parameterized by the initial distribution \( \alpha \), the transition matrix \( T \), and the dimension \( D + 1 \). The twisted measure should satisfy

\[
\mathbb{E}^{Q} e^{\zeta B} = \frac{\mathbb{E} e^{(\zeta^{*} + \zeta) B}}{\mathbb{E} e^{\zeta^{*} B}}, \tag{22}
\]

where \( \zeta^{*} = b^{-1}(e^{\vartheta^{*}}) \) as argued above. Consider all paths \( (i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_{\tau+1}) \) of the underlying Markov process, starting from \( i_0 \) (sampled according to \( \alpha \)) and ending at \( i_{\tau+1} = D + 1 \). Let \( h_j \) be the time spent between states \( i_j \) and \( i_{j+1} \). The probability
of such a realization is

$$\alpha_0 t_{i_0} t_0 e^{-t_0 h_0} \cdots t_{i_\tau} t_{i_\tau} e^{-t_{i_\tau} h_{\tau}} dh_0 \cdots dh_{\tau}. $$

Following the line of reasoning developed in Ref. [19], the right-hand side of (22) can be written as, with $\mathbb{E} e^{\xi^* B} = b(\xi^*) = e^{\theta^*}$,

$$e^{-\theta^*} \sum_{\text{all paths}} \int_0^\infty \int_{h_j: \sum_{j=0}^\tau h_j = h} \alpha_0 t_{i_0} t_0 e^{-t_0 h_0} \cdots t_{i_\tau} t_{i_\tau} e^{(\xi + \xi^*) h} dh_0 \cdots dh_{\tau} \, dh,$$

whereas the left hand side reads

$$\sum_{\text{all paths}} \int_0^\infty \int_{h_j: \sum_{j=0}^\tau h_j = h} \alpha_0^* t_{i_0}^* t_0^* e^{-t_0^* h_0} \cdots t_{i_\tau}^* t_{i_\tau}^* e^{\theta^* h} dh_0 \cdots dh_{\tau} \, dh.$$

We wish to identify $\alpha^*$ and $T^*$ such that both expressions match. To this end, solve the following eigensystem:

$$-\xi^* y_i = \sum_{j=1}^{D+1} t_{ij} y_j \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, D, \quad e^{\theta^*} y_{D+1} = \sum_{i=1}^D \alpha_i y_i.$$

Then, define

$$\alpha_i^* := \frac{\alpha_i}{e^{\theta^*} y_{D+1}}, \quad t_{ij}^* := \frac{t_{ij} y_j}{y_i}, \quad t_i^* := t_i - \xi^*. \quad (23)$$

The following two observations are crucial:

- $(\alpha^*, T^*)$ corresponds to a phase-type distribution. To this end, note that, by definition of the vector $y$, the new initial distribution $\alpha^*$ is non-negative and sums to 1. In addition,

$$\sum_{j \neq i} t_{ij}^* = \sum_{j \neq i} t_{ij} \frac{y_j}{y_i} = t_i + \xi^* = t_i^*.$$

- It is an easy verification that for the above defined $(\alpha^*, T^*)$ both mgfs match, as desired.

Thus, the proposed twist of the service times corresponds to a valid change of measure.

Note that the twisted rates we found in this and the previous subsection take the same form as those in Section 3.1, the only difference being the mgfs involved. The counterpart to the likelihood ratio given in Equation (8) is

$$L = \left( e^{-\theta^* \sum_j z_{i_0}} z_{i_\tau} \right) \times \left( e^{\theta^* \sum_{\ell=1}^m y_{j_{0\ell}}^{(\ell)}} \prod_{\ell=1}^m y_{j_{1\ell}}^{(\ell)} \right),$$

where, with a slight abuse of notation, $z_{i_0}$ and $z_{i_\tau}$ correspond to the first and last state of the background process, and $y_{j_{0\ell}}^{(\ell)}$ and $y_{j_{1\ell}}^{(\ell)}$ correspond to the first and last phase of server $\ell$, respectively, given that we observe a path of length $\tau$ as defined in Section 3.1. In line with the Kronecker decomposition found in Section 3.4, we thus see that $x_{i, j} = z_i \prod_{\ell=1}^m y_{j_{\ell}}^{(\ell)}.$
Remark 4.1. Recall that in the set-up of Section 3, we did not quite find the change of measure of the individual service times, as we only identified the twisted version of \( T_{j,i,k}^{(ℓ)} := t_{j,i}^{(ℓ)} \alpha_k^{(ℓ)} \) rather than the twisted version of \( t_{j,i}^{(ℓ)} \) and \( \alpha_k^{(ℓ)} \) individually. In this section, we showed how to twist the rates for each server independently. In other words, we can now use the twisted rates found in this section throughout the entire busy cycle, i.e., also outside of fully busy periods. Note that outside of the fully busy period the (total) rates of leaving state \((i,j)\), that is, the counterparts to \( \varphi_{i,j} \) and \( \varphi_{i,j}^c \) defined in Section 3.1, are not equal so that the corresponding terms in the likelihood ratio do not cancel. This means that to evaluate the likelihood ratio, it needs to be continuously updated when the process is not in a fully busy period as it does not have a clean form of the type \( (8) \).

Remark 4.2. There is one important situation in which all expressions simplify considerably: that of no modulation and identical servers. In fact, in this case the inter-arrival times do not need to be exponential, but any renewal sequence works. To see this, suppose the interarrival times have mgf \( a(\cdot) \) and the service times (at each of the servers) have mgf \( b(\cdot) \). Then, (17) reads

\[-a^{-1}(e^{-\vartheta}) = mb^{-1}(e^{\vartheta}),\]

which is solved by \( \vartheta^* := -\log a(-m\alpha) \), where \( \alpha \) is such that

\[\log a(-m\alpha) + \log b(\alpha) = 0,\]

which coincides with Equation (1.7) in Ref. [20].

Remark 4.3. To compute the change of measure, first \( \vartheta^* \) is found by solving (17); once \( \vartheta^* \) has been determined, we can twist the arrival and service processes as in (21) and (23), respectively. In order to solve (17), the following steps need to be performed:

- In the first place, it requires the evaluation of \( \mathcal{A}(\vartheta) \) and \( (b^{(ℓ)})^{-1}(e^{\vartheta}) \) (for \( ℓ = 1, \ldots, m \)) which typically cannot be done in closed-form so that we have to resort to numerics. (In the numerical example, in Section 5, we use a bisection procedure.) To determine \( \mathcal{A}(\vartheta) \) for every \( \vartheta \) the eigenvalues of a \( d \)-dimensional matrix need to be found; to determine \( (b^{(ℓ)})^{-1}(e^{\vartheta}) \) the inverse of the function \( b^{(ℓ)}(\zeta) \) as defined in (18) is to be evaluated.
- In the second place, a numerical solver needs to be used to solve (17) (we again use bisection to perform this step in Section 5).

5. Simulation examples

In this section, we investigate a number of numerical examples to assess the efficacy of the proposed procedure, and to learn about various aspects of the rare-event behavior of the multi-server queue under study.

We start by evaluating the impact of heterogeneity among servers on the speed of decay and the relative error of the estimation procedure. We consider a two-server system with Erlang distributed service times. The service times of Server 1 are
Figure 1. Ratio of $\log(\hat{\varrho}(K))/K$ and its limit $-\vartheta^*$ for a two-server system with service times that are Erlang-distributed with shape parameter 3 and rate parameters $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$, respectively. The horizontal line indicates a ratio of one.

distributed with shape parameter 3 and rate parameter $\mu_1$, while the service times of Server 2 are distributed with shape parameter 3 and rate parameter $\mu_2$; the initial phase is distributed as $\alpha = (0.5, 0.2, 0.3)$ in both cases. The arrival process is Poisson with rate 0.1 (i.e., not modulated). We estimate $\varrho_1(K)$ using the change of measure proposed in Section 3.1 during practically all fully busy periods; that is, we employ the algorithm stated in the appendix with $C$ chosen very large.

Figure 1 shows that the convergence of each scaled logarithmic importance sampling estimator (calculated from $10^7$ samples) to its corresponding limit $-\vartheta^*$ appears to be faster when servers are more heterogeneous. For $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ fixed, it turns out that the corresponding relative error values are roughly independent of $K$ (in line with our theoretical findings). More precisely, we obtained that for $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 1$ the relative error of a generic sample is approximately 2 (across a wide range of $K$-values, independently of $n$), for $\mu_1 = 1$, $\mu_2 = 2$ it is 2.82, for $\mu_1 = 1$, $\mu_2 = 3$ it is 3.96, and for $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 2$ it is 7.7. Thus, as one would expect, the deviation from the mean is larger when servers are more heterogeneous. The comparison of the two homogeneous examples suggests that faster service tends to have a negative impact on the relative error performance.

Furthermore, we can check numerically that, as it should be, the twisted rates are the same as those obtained in the way we described in Section 4.

For a small example as the ones just discussed, to find the alternative measure $Q$, the method of Section 3 may be preferred for its conceptual simplicity. For example, of a larger dimension on the other hand, the methodology of Section 3 quickly becomes slow or even infeasible due to memory constraints, and the method of Section 4 is to be preferred.

We now discuss such a large-scale example; it is too large to be able to efficiently find the measure $Q$ using the methodology of Section 3. We again assume that service times have an Erlang distribution with shape parameter 3. In a system with 10 servers, we set $\alpha^{(e)} = (0.5, 0.2, 0.3)$, and choose the Erlang rate parameter as $\ell/3$, for $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$. We set $d = 4, \lambda = (1, 2, 3, 4)$, and let $Q$ have off-diagonal entries 0.1 (and diagonal entries $-0.3$). Recall that the dimension of the matrix $A$ defining
the eigensystem (4) is as large as $2.36 \cdot 10^5$. Despite this dimension, it turns out that with the methodology of Section 4 the change of measure can be computed in less than a second. In Figure 2, we show the ratio of the scaled logarithmic importance sampling estimator and its limit $-\vartheta^*$ obtained in $10^5$ simulation runs for (A) the small example from Section 3.3, and (B) the large-scale example with 10 servers; in both cases the change of measure is evaluated as described in Section 4, and applied during all fully busy periods.

In the approach, we have developed, we use the alternative measure $\mathcal{Q}$ only during fully busy periods. As mentioned in Remark 4.1, thanks to the decoupling of servers that we described in Section 4, in principle the twisted rates can also be applied throughout – during the entire busy cycle – rather than only during fully busy periods. Considering again the example of Section 3.3, we compare the sample confidence interval obtained under crude Monte Carlo estimation to that achieved when the change of measure is applied either throughout, or only during fully busy periods (i.e., the measure $\mathcal{Q}$ featuring in Proposition 3.2, coinciding with Approach 2 in Section 3.2 with $C = \infty$). Figure 3 shows the scaled logarithmic unbiased estimate of $\varrho_1(K)$ averaged over $10^5$ runs. The limit $-\vartheta^*$ is indicated by the horizontal line. The
Figure 4. Logarithmic relative error values obtained for crude Monte Carlo (MC) estimation of $\varphi_1(K)$ compared to the values obtained under importance sampling when the change of measure is applied during the first $C > 0$ fully busy periods or throughout; the rates are chosen as in Section 3.3.

dashed lines indicate the scaled logarithmic upper bounds of the 95% standard normal confidence intervals. As one would expect, the change of measure significantly improves the accuracy of the estimation procedure for a fixed number of runs. In addition, we observe that when the change of measure is applied throughout (rather than only during fully busy periods) the confidence is noticeably more narrow.

We now investigate, for the same example, the impact of the choice of $C$ when using Approach 2 in Section 3.2. In Figure 4, we compare the relative errors obtained for various values of $C$ in $10^7$ runs, where $C$ denotes the number of fully busy periods during which the change of measure is applied. The values obtained when the twisted rates are used either never (crude Monte Carlo) or throughout the entire busy cycle are also shown. The relative error obtained for the crude Monte Carlo estimator (corresponding to $C = 0$) increases exponentially as $K$ grows large. For large $C$ indeed we see that relative error is independent of $K$. For smaller $C$ instead, the relative error does increase with $K$ until it drops sharply for $K$ large enough. It appears that for small $K$ if the event did not occur in the first period, then it may still occur afterwards even though the original measure is used, which causes a large variance.

Note that for large $K$ the relative error corresponding to $C = 1$ appears to be the smallest. For an explanation, recall that each fully busy period during which the change of measure is applied contributes to the likelihood ratio by a factor between $e^{\vartheta^*} \zeta_-$ and $e^{\vartheta^*} \zeta_+$ (cf. Corollary 3.1), and thus potentially increases the variance of the estimator (where it should be kept in mind that $\zeta_- < 1$, $\zeta_+ > 1$, and $\vartheta^* > 0$). In this sense, each additional fully busy period may have a negative impact on the quality of the estimator. Choosing a good value for $C$ amounts to finding a proper balance between increasing the likelihood of the event of interest and minimizing the possible additional contribution to the variance of the likelihood ratio.

In the experiments that we performed, if the change of measure is applied throughout, then the relative error is remarkably low at about 0.99, substantially lower than when it is applied only during fully busy periods. We see a similar improvement in terms of estimation accuracy for the other examples discussed in this section when $Q$ is applied throughout.
6. Discussion and concluding remarks

In this paper, we developed an algorithm for estimating the probability that the number of customers in a multi-server queueing system reaches a high value. The input is MPP, whereas the service-times have server-dependent phase-type distributions. We have identified explicit bounds on the probability under consideration as well as the associated likelihood ratio, which help quantifying the relative error. In particular, we have proven that the relative error of our estimator is bounded. We also develop a technique to efficiently compute the alternative measure to be used in our importance-sampling based algorithm, which remains tractable even when the dimension of the system (in terms of the number of servers and the dimensions of the phase-type distributions) is large.

A couple of experiments provide us with indications of the significant speed-up that can be achieved by the proposed algorithm relative to naive simulation. The focus is on estimating \( \varphi_i(K) \), i.e., the probability that the backlog (that is, the number of customers or jobs waiting in the queue) during a busy cycle exceeds a given level \( K \) (with the background process being in state \( i \) at the beginning of the busy cycle). The method, however, directly extends to a procedure for estimating the fraction of customers or jobs entering the system while the backlog is larger than \( K \). To this end, first note that this quantity can be written as the ratio of the mean number of customers that entered the system while the backlog is larger than \( K \) during a busy cycle, and the mean total number of customers that entered during a busy cycle. Then, the idea is to estimate the numerator and denominator of the ratio separately. The denominator does not contain a rare event, and hence can be estimated using the original measure. The numerator \( \textit{does} \) involve a rare event, but simulating under \( \mathcal{Q} \), corresponding to a positive drift, would mean that \( \text{terminating} \) the busy cycle would become a rare event. Following, e.g., Ref.\(^{[8]}\), this issue can be remedied by applying a \textit{measure-specific dynamic importance sampling} approach, where \( \mathcal{Q} \) is switched off as soon as \( K \) has been reached. Along the same lines, one could set up a procedure to estimate the fraction of customers lost in the corresponding model with a waiting room of finite size \( K \), as was done for a similar system in Ref.\(^{[18]}\).

In this paper, we considered specific arrival and service processes, but we anticipate that importance sampling procedures for related processes can be developed with the same techniques. As we argued, the MMP is suitable for modeling overdispersion, but there are various other processes that could be used to this end, such as the Cox processes advocated in Ref.\(^{[16]}\).

Appendix A. Importance sampling algorithm for the embedded Markov chain

We provide pseudo-code for a single run of the importance sampling algorithm as suggested in Approach 2 in Section 3. Note that in the description of the algorithm, \( q_i, \lambda_i, \) and \( t_{i,j}^{(\ell)} \) denote the \textit{current} rates, that is, they may correspond to either \( \mathcal{P} \) or \( \mathcal{Q} \) depending on how the rates were set in the previous step of the algorithm.
If the change of measure is computed as in Section 4 instead, then we need to replace \( x_{i,j} \) by \( z_i \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} y_{ij}^{(\ell)} \). Thanks to the decoupling, it is then also possible to apply the change of measure throughout the entire busy cycle (the algorithm needs be modified accordingly with due regard to Remark 4.1).

**Algorithm.** One run of the importance sampling algorithm that applies the change of measure only during the first \( C \) fully busy periods.

1: Set \( N = 1, L = 1, c = 0 \). Set \( i \) as the initial state of the background process. Generate \( j_1 \sim \alpha^{(1)} \), and set \( j_\ell = \dagger \) for \( \ell = 2, \ldots, m \).
2: **while** \( N \in \{1, \ldots, m + K\} \) **do**
3: \( \quad \) if \( N \leq m \) **then**
4: \( \quad \quad \) Set all rates to the original rates. Let \( \phi_{i,j} = \lambda_i + \sum_{j,j_i > 0} t_{j_i}^{(\ell)} + q_i \). Set \( \vec{p} \) to be the vector with entries \( \lambda_i, q_{ii} \) for all \( i \neq i \), and \( t_{j_i}^{(\ell)} \) for all \( \ell \) such that \( j_i \neq \dagger \) and \( k \in \{1, \ldots, D^{(\ell)}, \dagger\} \).
5: \( \quad \quad \) Generate the next event from the discrete distribution \( \vec{p}/\phi_{i,j} \).
6: \( \quad \) if Arrival **then**
7: \( \quad \quad \) \( N \leftarrow N + 1 \)
8: \( \quad \) if \( N > m \) **then**
9: \( \quad \quad \) \( c \leftarrow c + 1 \)
10: \( \quad \) if \( c \leq C \) **then**
11: \( \quad \quad \quad \) \( L \leftarrow L x_{i,j} \)
12: \( \quad \) **end if**
13: \( \quad \) **else if** Transition of the background process **then**
14: \( \quad \quad \) \( i \leftarrow \ell \), where \( \ell \) corresponds to entry \( q_{ii} \) of \( \vec{p} \)
15: \( \quad \) **else if** Phase transition at server \( \ell \) to \( k \leq D^{(\ell)} \) **then**
16: \( \quad \quad \) \( j_\ell \leftarrow k \)
17: \( \quad \) **else if** Phase transition at server \( \ell \) to \( \dagger \) **then**
18: \( \quad \quad \) \( j_\ell \leftarrow \dagger \), and \( N \leftarrow N - 1 \)
19: \( \quad \) **end if**
20: \( \quad \) **else if** \( N > m \) **then**
21: \( \quad \quad \) if \( c \leq C \) **then**
22: \( \quad \quad \quad \) Set all rates as in (6).
23: \( \quad \quad \) **end if**
24: \( \quad \quad \) Update \( \phi_{i,j} \), and set \( \vec{p} \) as for the partially busy period but including rates \( t_{j_i}^{(\ell)} \). Generate the next event from the discrete distribution \( \vec{p}/\phi_{i,j} \).
25: \( \quad \quad \) if Phase transition at server \( \ell \) with departure **then**
26: \( \quad \quad \quad \) \( j_\ell \leftarrow k \), where \( k \) corresponds to entry \( \bar{t}_{j_i}^{(\ell)} \) of \( \vec{p} \), and \( N \leftarrow N - 1 \)
27: \( \quad \quad \) if \( N = m \) and \( c \leq C \) **then**
28: \( \quad \quad \quad \) \( L \leftarrow L e^{\alpha}/x_{i,j} \)
29: \( \quad \quad \) **end if**
30: \( \quad \) **else if** Other transition **then**
31: \( \quad \quad \) Proceed as for the partially busy period.
32: \( \quad \) **end if**
33: **end if**
34: **end while**
35: **if** \( N > m + K \) and \( c \leq C \) **then**
36: \( \quad \) \( L \leftarrow L e^{-K\alpha}/x_{i,j} \)
37: **end if**
38: **return** \( L 1_{\{N > m + K\}} \)
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