

Gaussian queues in light and heavy-traffic

Citation for published version (APA):

Debicki, K. G., Kosinski, K. M., & Mandjes, M. R. H. (2012). Gaussian queues in light and heavy-traffic. *Queueing Systems: Theory and Applications*, 71(1-2), 137-149. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11134-011-9270-x>

DOI:

[10.1007/s11134-011-9270-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11134-011-9270-x)

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2012

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.tue.nl/taverne

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

openaccess@tue.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Gaussian queues in light and heavy traffic

K. Dębicki · K.M. Kosiński · M. Mandjes

Received: 30 March 2011 / Published online: 5 January 2012
© The Author(s) 2012. This article is published with open access at Springerlink.com

Abstract In this paper we investigate Gaussian queues in the light-traffic and in the heavy-traffic regime. Let $Q_X^{(c)} \equiv \{Q_X^{(c)}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ denote a stationary buffer content process for a fluid queue fed by the centered Gaussian process $X \equiv \{X(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ with stationary increments, $X(0) = 0$, continuous sample paths and variance function $\sigma^2(\cdot)$. The system is drained at a constant rate $c > 0$, so that for any $t \geq 0$,

$$Q_X^{(c)}(t) = \sup_{-\infty < s \leq t} (X(t) - X(s) - c(t - s)).$$

We study $Q_X^{(c)} \equiv \{Q_X^{(c)}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ in the regimes $c \rightarrow 0$ (heavy traffic) and $c \rightarrow \infty$ (light traffic). We show for both limiting regimes that, under mild regularity conditions on σ , there exists a normalizing function $\delta(c)$ such that $Q_X^{(c)}(\delta(c)\cdot)/\sigma(\delta(c))$ converges to $Q_{B_H}^{(1)}(\cdot)$ in $C[0, \infty)$, where B_H is a fractional Brownian motion with suitably chosen Hurst parameter H .

K. Dębicki
Instytut Matematyczny, University of Wrocław, pl. Grunwaldzki 2/4, 50-384 Wrocław, Poland
e-mail: Krzysztof.Debicki@math.uni.wroc.pl

K.M. Kosiński (✉) · M. Mandjes
Korteweg-de Vries Institute for Mathematics, University of Amsterdam, 94248 Amsterdam,
The Netherlands
e-mail: K.M.Kosinski@uva.nl

M. Mandjes
e-mail: M.R.H.Mandjes@uva.nl

K.M. Kosiński · M. Mandjes
Eurandom, Eindhoven University of Technology, 513 Eindhoven, The Netherlands

M. Mandjes
CWI, 94079 Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Keywords Gaussian processes · Heavy traffic · Light traffic · Functional limit theorems

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000) Primary 60G15 · 60F17 · Secondary 60K25

1 Introduction

A substantial research effort has been devoted to the analysis of queues with Gaussian input, often also called *Gaussian queues* [10–12]. The interest in this model can be explained from the fact that the Gaussian input model is highly flexible in terms of incorporating a broad set of correlation structures and, at the same time, adequately approximates various real-life systems. A key result in this area is [18], where it is shown that large aggregates of Internet sources converge to a fractional Brownian motion (being a specific Gaussian process).

The setting considered in this paper is that of a centered Gaussian process $X \equiv \{X(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ with stationary increments, $X(0) = 0$, continuous sample paths and variance function $\sigma^2(\cdot)$, equipped with a deterministic, linear drift with rate $c > 0$, reflected at 0:

$$Q_X^{(c)}(t) = \sup_{-\infty < s \leq t} (X(t) - X(s) - c(t - s)).$$

The resulting *stationary workload process* can be regarded as a *queue* [14]. The objective of the paper is to study $Q_X^{(c)} \equiv \{Q_X^{(c)}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ in the limiting regimes $c \rightarrow 0$ (heavy traffic) and $c \rightarrow \infty$ (light traffic).

Under mild conditions on the variance function $\sigma^2(\cdot)$, $Q_X^{(c)}$ is a properly defined, almost surely (a.s.) finite stochastic process. However, if $c \rightarrow 0$, then $Q_X^{(c)}(t)$ grows to infinity (in a distributional sense), for any $t \geq 0$. The branch of queueing theory investigating *how fast* $Q_X^{(c)}$ grows to infinity (as $c \rightarrow 0$) is commonly referred to as the domain of *heavy-traffic approximations*. In many situations this regime allows manageable expressions for performance metrics that are, under ‘normal’ load conditions, highly complex or even intractable, see for instance the seminal paper by [9] on the classical single-server queue. Since then, a similar approach has been followed in various other settings, e.g., [5, 13, 15, 17, 19] and many other papers.

Analogously, one can ask what happens in the *light-traffic* regime, i.e., $c \rightarrow \infty$; then evidently $Q_X^{(c)}$ decreases to zero. So far, hardly any attention has been paid to the light-traffic and heavy-traffic regimes for Gaussian queues. An exception is [8], where the focus is on a special family of Gaussian processes, in a specific heavy-traffic setting. The primary contribution of the present paper concerns the analysis of $Q_X^{(c)}$ under both limiting regimes, for quite a broad class of Gaussian input processes X .

We now give a somewhat more detailed introduction to the material presented in this paper. It is well known that under the assumption that $\sigma(\cdot)$ varies regularly at infinity with parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, for any function δ such that $\delta(c) \rightarrow \infty$ as $c \rightarrow 0$,

there is convergence to fractional Brownian motion in the heavy-traffic regime:

$$\frac{X(\delta(c)\cdot)}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \xrightarrow{d} B_\alpha(\cdot), \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow 0. \tag{1}$$

We shall show that an analogous statement holds in the light-traffic regime, that is, if $\sigma(\cdot)$ varies regularly at zero with parameter $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ (i.e., $x \mapsto \sigma(1/x)$ varies regularly at infinity with parameter $-\lambda$), then for any function δ such that $\delta(c) \rightarrow 0$ as $c \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{X(\delta(c)\cdot)}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \xrightarrow{d} B_\lambda(\cdot), \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow \infty. \tag{2}$$

Assuming that X satisfies some minor additional conditions, both (1) and (2) apply in $C(\mathbb{R})$, the space of all continuous functions on \mathbb{R} .

Our paper shows that the statements (1) and (2), which relate to the input processes, carry over to the corresponding stationary buffer content processes $Q_X^{(c)}$. That is, we identify, under specific conditions, a function $\delta(\cdot)$ such that

$$\frac{Q_X^{(c)}(\delta(c)\cdot)}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \xrightarrow{d} Q_{B_\alpha}^{(1)}(\cdot), \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\frac{Q_X^{(c)}(\delta(c)\cdot)}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \xrightarrow{d} Q_{B_\lambda}^{(1)}(\cdot), \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow \infty,$$

both in the space $C[0, \infty)$ of all continuous functions on $[0, \infty)$.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sect. 2 we introduce the notation and give some preliminaries. Section 3.1 presents the results for the heavy-traffic regime, whereas Sect. 3.2 covers the light-traffic regime. We give the proofs of the main theorems (i.e., Theorems 1 and 2) in Sect. 4.

2 Preliminaries

In this paper we use the following notation. By $\text{id} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we shall denote the identity operator on \mathbb{R} , that is, $\text{id}(t) = t$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We write $f(x) \sim g(x)$ as $x \rightarrow x_0 \in [0, \infty]$ when $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x)/g(x) = 1$. Let $\mathcal{R}\mathcal{V}_\infty(\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{R}\mathcal{V}_0(\lambda)$ denote the class of regularly varying functions at infinity with parameter α and at zero with parameter λ , respectively. That is, for a non-negative measurable functions f, g on $[0, \infty)$, $f \in \mathcal{R}\mathcal{V}_\infty(\alpha)$ if for all $t > 0$, $f(tx)/f(x) \rightarrow t^\alpha$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$; $g \in \mathcal{R}\mathcal{V}_0(\lambda)$ if for all $t > 0$, $g(tx)/g(x) \rightarrow t^\lambda$ as $x \rightarrow 0$.

2.1 Spaces of continuous functions

We refer to [3] for the details of this subsection. For any $T > 0$, let $C[-T, T]$ be the space of all continuous functions $f : [-T, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Equip $C[-T, T]$ with

the topology of uniform convergence, i.e., the topology generated by the norm $\|f\|_{[-T, T]} := \sup_{t \in [-T, T]} |f(t)|$ under which $C[-T, T]$ is a separable Banach space. Therefore, by Prokhorov’s theorem, weak convergence of random elements $\{X^{(c)}\}$ of $C[-T, T]$ as $c \rightarrow \infty$ is implied by convergence of finite-dimensional distributions and tightness. A family $\{X^{(c)}\}$ in $C[-T, T]$ is tight if and only if for each positive ε , there exists an a and c_0 such that

$$\mathbb{P}(|X^{(c)}(0)| \geq a) \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } c \geq c_0; \tag{3}$$

and, for any $\eta > 0$,

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{c \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\substack{|t-s| \leq \zeta \\ s, t \in [-T, T]}} |X^{(c)}(t) - X^{(c)}(s)| \geq \eta\right) = 0. \tag{4}$$

For notational convenience, we leave out the requirement $s, t \in [-T, T]$ explicitly in the remainder of this paper.

Finally, let $C(\mathbb{R})$ be the space of all functions $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f|_{[-T, T]} \in C[-T, T]$ for all $T > 0$. The above definitions extend in an obvious way to $C[0, T]$, $C[0, \infty)$ and convergence as $c \rightarrow 0$.

For $\gamma \geq 0$, let Ω^γ be the space of all continuous functions $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} f(t)/(1 + |t|^\gamma) = 0$. Equip Ω^γ with the topology generated by the norm $\|f\|_{\Omega^\gamma} := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |f(t)|/(1 + |t|^\gamma)$ under which Ω^γ is a separable Banach space, so that Prokhorov’s theorem applies. The following property can be found in [6, Lemma 3] or [7, Lemma 4].

Proposition 1 *Let a family of random elements $\{X^{(c)}\}$ on Ω^γ be given. Suppose that the image of $\{X^{(c)}\}$ under the projection mapping $p_T : \Omega^\gamma \rightarrow C[-T, T]$ is tight in $C[-T, T]$ for all $T > 0$. Then $\{X^{(c)}\}$ is tight in Ω^γ if and only if for any $\eta > 0$,*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{c \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|t| \geq T} \frac{|X^{(c)}(t)|}{1 + |t|^\gamma} \geq \eta\right) = 0. \tag{5}$$

2.2 Fluid queues

Let $Q_X^{(c)} \equiv \{Q_X^{(c)}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ denote a stationary buffer content process for a fluid queue fed by a centered Gaussian process $X \equiv \{X(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ with stationary increments, $X(0) = 0$, continuous sample paths and variance function $\sigma^2(\cdot)$. The system is drained at a constant rate $c > 0$, so that for any $t \geq 0$,

$$Q_X^{(c)}(t) = \sup_{-\infty < s \leq t} (X(t) - X(s) - c(t - s)).$$

Additionally, an equivalent representation for $Q_X^{(c)}(t)$ holds [16, p. 375]:

$$Q_X^{(c)}(t) = Q_X^{(c)}(0) + X(t) - ct + \max\left(0, \sup_{0 < s < t} (-Q_X^{(c)}(0) - (X(s) - cs))\right). \tag{6}$$

Throughout the paper we say that X satisfies:

- C**: if $\sigma^2(t)|\log|t|^{1+\varepsilon}$ has a finite limit as $t \rightarrow 0$, for some $\varepsilon > 0$;
- RV₀**: if $\sigma \in \mathcal{RV}_0(\lambda)$, for $\lambda \in (0, 1)$;
- RV_∞**: if $\sigma \in \mathcal{RV}_\infty(\alpha)$, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$;
- HT**: if both **C** and **RV_∞** are satisfied.
- LT**: if both **RV₀** and **RV_∞** are satisfied.

Remark 1 In our setting (X has stationary increments), the assumption that X is continuous is equivalent to the convergence of *Dudley’s integral*; see Sect. 2.3. This is immediately implied by condition **C**; see [1, Theorem 1.4]. However, the real importance of condition **C** lies in the fact that if in addition X satisfies **RV_∞**, then X also belongs to Ω^γ , for every $\gamma > \alpha$. This is pointed out in Sect. 3.1. Finally, note that **C** is met under **RV₀**. Indeed, since $\sigma \in \mathcal{RV}_0(\lambda)$, then $t \mapsto \sigma(1/t)$ belongs to $\mathcal{RV}_\infty(-\lambda)$, thus $\sigma^2(1/t)t^\lambda \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Equivalently, $\sigma^2(t)t^{-\lambda} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, implying $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sigma^2(t)|\log|t|^{1+\varepsilon} = 0$, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$. Furthermore, **RV_∞** implies that $X(t)/t \rightarrow 0$ a.s., for $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$, so that $Q_X^{(c)}$ is a properly defined stochastic process for any $c > 0$; see [7, Lemma 3]. Lastly, the assumption that X has continuous sample paths implies that σ is continuous.

Due to the stationarity of increments, all finite-dimensional distributions of X are specified by the variance function, since we have

$$\text{Cov}(X(t), X(s)) = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma^2(s) + \sigma^2(t) - \sigma^2(|t - s|)). \tag{7}$$

Recall that by $B_H \equiv \{B_H(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ we denote fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter $H \in (0, 1)$, that is, a centered Gaussian process with stationary increments, continuous sample paths, $B_H(0) = 0$ and covariance function

$$\text{Cov}(B_H(t), B_H(s)) = \frac{1}{2}(|s|^{2H} + |t|^{2H} - |t - s|^{2H}). \tag{8}$$

As mentioned in the introduction, if $c \rightarrow 0$, then, for any t , $Q_X^{(c)}(t) \rightarrow \infty$ a.s., which is called the *heavy-traffic regime*. On the other hand, if $c \rightarrow \infty$, then $Q_X^{(c)}(t) \rightarrow 0$ a.s., which is called the *light-traffic regime*.

2.3 Metric entropy

For any $\mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{R}$ define the *semimetric*

$$d(t, s) := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|X(t) - X(s)|^2} = \sigma(|t - s|), \quad t, s \in \mathbb{T}.$$

We say that $S \subset \mathbb{T}$ is a ϑ -net in \mathbb{T} with respect to the semimetric d , if for any $t \in \mathbb{T}$ there exists an $s \in S$ such that $d(t, s) \leq \vartheta$. The metric entropy $\mathbb{H}_d(\mathbb{T}, \vartheta)$ is defined as $\log \mathbb{N}_d(\mathbb{T}, \vartheta)$, where $\mathbb{N}_d(\mathbb{T}, \vartheta)$ denotes the minimal number of points in a ϑ -net in \mathbb{T} with respect to d . Later on we use the following proposition; see [2, Theorem 1.3.3] and [2, Corollary 1.3.4], respectively.

Proposition 2 *There exists a universal constant K such that for a d -compact set \mathbb{T}*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t \in \mathbb{T}} X(t)\right) \leq K \int_0^{\text{diam}(\mathbb{T})/2} \sqrt{\mathbb{H}_d(\mathbb{T}, \vartheta)} \, d\vartheta$$

and for all $\zeta > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{\substack{(s,t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \\ d(s,t) < \zeta}} |X(t) - X(s)|\right) \leq K \int_0^\zeta \sqrt{\mathbb{H}_d(\mathbb{T}, \vartheta)} \, d\vartheta.$$

The quantity $\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\mathbb{H}_d(\mathbb{T}, \vartheta)} \, d\vartheta$ is called the Dudley integral.

3 Main results

In this section we formulate the result for the heavy-traffic and light-traffic regime, respectively. It is emphasized that these results are highly symmetric. Let us first introduce a function δ , such that for every $c > 0$

$$\frac{c\delta(c)}{\sigma(\delta(c))} = 1. \tag{9}$$

By the continuity of σ , we can choose δ as $\delta(c) = \inf\{x > 0 : x/\sigma(x) = 1/c\}$. From the definition of δ it follows that $\delta \in \mathcal{RV}_0(1/(\alpha - 1))$ under \mathbf{RV}_∞ and $\delta \in \mathcal{RV}_\infty(1/(\lambda - 1))$ under \mathbf{RV}_0 .

3.1 Heavy-traffic regime

In the heavy-traffic regime we are interested in the analysis of $Q_X^{(c)}$ as $c \rightarrow 0$, under the assumption that X satisfies **HT**. The following statement follows from [7, Theorems 5 and 6].

Proposition 3 *If X satisfies **HT**, then*

$$\frac{X(\delta(c)\cdot)}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \xrightarrow{d} B_\alpha(\cdot), \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow 0,$$

in $C(\mathbb{R})$ and Ω^γ , for any $\gamma > \alpha$.

In fact, Theorem 3 holds for any function $\delta(c)$ such that $\delta(c) \rightarrow \infty$ as $c \rightarrow 0$. Condition **C** (which is one of the requirements of **HT**) plays a crucial role in proving tightness both in $C[-T, T]$, for some $T > 0$, and in Ω^γ .

Combining Theorem 3 with the definition of δ leads to the following statement.

Corollary 1 *If X satisfies **HT**, then*

$$\frac{X(\delta(c)\cdot) - c\delta(c) \text{id}(\cdot)}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \xrightarrow{d} B_\alpha(\cdot) - \text{id}(\cdot), \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow 0,$$

in $C(\mathbb{R})$.

Now we are in the position to present the main result of this subsection.

Theorem 1 *If X satisfies HT, then*

$$\frac{Q_X^{(c)}(\delta(c)\cdot)}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \xrightarrow{d} Q_{B_\alpha}^{(1)}(\cdot), \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow 0, \tag{10}$$

in $C[0, \infty)$.

We postpone the proof of Theorem 1 to Sect. 4.

Remark 2 Theorem 1 extends the findings of [8, Theorem 3.2] where, under the heavy-traffic regime, the weak convergence in $C[0, \infty)$ of $Q_X^{(c)}(\delta(c)\cdot)/\sigma(\delta(c))$ as $c \rightarrow 0$ was obtained for the class of input processes having differentiable sample paths a.s., i.e., of the form $X(t) = \int_0^t Z(s) ds$, where $\{Z(s) : s \geq 0\}$ is a stationary centered Gaussian process whose variance function satisfies specific regularity conditions.

3.2 Light-traffic regime

In the light-traffic regime we analyze the convergence of $Q_X^{(c)}$ as $c \rightarrow \infty$, under the assumption that X satisfies LT. We begin by stating the counterpart of Proposition 3.

Proposition 4 *If X satisfies RV_0 , then*

$$\frac{X(\delta(c)\cdot)}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \xrightarrow{d} B_\lambda(\cdot), \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow \infty,$$

in $C(\mathbb{R})$. If, moreover, X satisfies LT, then the convergence also holds in Ω^γ , for any $\gamma > \max\{\lambda, \alpha\}$.

Analogously to Proposition 3, Proposition 4 holds for any function $\delta(c)$ such that $\delta(c) \rightarrow 0$ as $c \rightarrow \infty$. As in the heavy-traffic case, combining Proposition 4 with the definition of δ leads to the counterpart of Corollary 1.

Corollary 2 *If X satisfies RV_0 , then*

$$\frac{X(\delta(c)\cdot) - c\delta(c) \text{id}(\cdot)}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \xrightarrow{d} B_\lambda(\cdot) - \text{id}(\cdot) \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow \infty,$$

in $C(\mathbb{R})$.

The main result of this subsection is now stated as follows.

Theorem 2 *If X satisfies LT, then*

$$\frac{Q_X^{(c)}(\delta(c)\cdot)}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \xrightarrow{d} Q_{B_\lambda}^{(1)}(\cdot) \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow \infty, \tag{11}$$

in $C[0, \infty)$.

We postpone the proof of Theorem 4 and Theorem 2 to Sect. 4.

Remark 3 The assumption **LT** excludes the class of input processes of the structure $X(t) = \int_0^t Z(s) ds$, with $\{Z(s) : s \geq 0\}$ being a centered stationary Gaussian process with continuous sample paths a.s. (since $\lambda = 1$ in this case). In [8, Theorem 4.1] it was shown that, for this class of Gaussian processes, $Q_X^{(c)}(0)/\sigma(\delta(c))$ does *not* converge weakly to $Q_{B_\lambda}^{(1)}(0)$ as $c \rightarrow \infty$.

4 Proofs

In this section we prove our results, but we start by presenting an auxiliary result.

Lemma 1 *If X satisfies **LT**, then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist constants $C, a > 0$, such that for all $x \leq a$ and $t > 0$,*

$$\frac{\sigma(tx)}{\sigma(x)} \leq C \times \begin{cases} t^\ell & t \leq 1, \\ t^u & t > 1, \end{cases}$$

where $\ell := \min\{\lambda - \epsilon, \alpha + \epsilon\}$ and $u := \max\{\alpha + \epsilon, \lambda + \epsilon\}$.

Proof Take any $\epsilon > 0$, then because $\sigma \in \mathcal{RV}_0(\lambda)$, there exists an $a \leq 1$ such that

$$\frac{\sigma(tx)}{\sigma(x)} \leq 2t^{\lambda-\epsilon}, \quad \text{for all } x \leq a \text{ and } tx \leq a. \tag{12}$$

Moreover, there exists a constant K_1 such that $\sigma(x) \geq K_1x^{\lambda+\epsilon}$ for all $x \leq a$.

Because $\sigma \in \mathcal{RV}_\infty(\alpha)$, there exist constants $A, K_2 > 0$ such that $\sigma(x) \leq K_2x^{\alpha+\epsilon}$ for all $x \geq A$. Because σ is continuous, we can in fact find a K_2 such that $\sigma(x) \leq K_2x^{\alpha+\epsilon}$ for all $x \geq a$. Therefore

$$\frac{\sigma(tx)}{\sigma(x)} \leq \frac{K_2(tx)^{\alpha+\epsilon}}{K_1x^{\lambda+\epsilon}} =: Kt^{\alpha+\epsilon}x^{\alpha-\lambda}, \quad \text{for all } x \leq a \text{ and } tx \geq a.$$

Note that, if $\alpha - \lambda \geq 0$, then we have

$$\frac{\sigma(tx)}{\sigma(x)} \leq Ka^{\alpha+\epsilon}t^{\alpha+\epsilon}, \quad \text{for all } x \leq a \text{ and } tx \geq a. \tag{13}$$

If $\alpha - \lambda < 0$, then

$$\frac{\sigma(tx)}{\sigma(x)} \leq Ka^{\alpha-\lambda}t^{\lambda+\epsilon}, \quad \text{for all } x \leq a \text{ and } tx \geq a. \tag{14}$$

Combining (12)–(14), we conclude that there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\frac{\sigma(tx)}{\sigma(x)} \leq C \max\{t^{\lambda-\epsilon}, t^{\alpha+\epsilon}, t^{\lambda+\epsilon}\}, \quad \text{for all } x \leq a \text{ and all } t > 0. \quad \square$$

In what follows, we will use the following notation. Let

$$X^{(c)}(t) := \frac{X(\delta(c)t)}{\sigma(\delta(c))}$$

and denote the variance of $X^{(c)}$ by $(\sigma^{(c)})^2$, that is,

$$\sigma^{(c)}(t) := \frac{\sigma(\delta(c)t)}{\sigma(\delta(c))}.$$

Proof of Theorem 4 We begin by showing the convergence in $C(\mathbb{R})$. To this end, we need to show the convergence in $C[-T, T]$ for any fixed $T > 0$.

Convergence in $C[-T, T]$: From the fact that $\sigma \in \mathcal{R}\mathcal{V}_0(\lambda)$, it is immediate that the finite-dimensional distributions of $X^{(c)}$ converge in distribution to B_λ as $c \rightarrow \infty$, cf. (7)–(8), which also implies (3). Therefore, the weak convergence of $X^{(c)}$ in $C[-T, T]$ follows after showing (4).

By the Uniform Convergence Theorem, see [4, Theorem 1.5.2], for any $t \in (0, \zeta]$, we have $\sigma^{(c)}(t) \leq 2\zeta^\lambda$. Thus, Proposition 2 yields, for some universal constant $K > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|s-t|\leq\zeta} |X^{(c)}(t) - X^{(c)}(s)| \geq \eta\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\sigma^{(c)}(|s-t|)\leq 2\zeta^\lambda} |X^{(c)}(t) - X^{(c)}(s)| \geq \eta\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\eta} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{\sigma^{(c)}(|s-t|)\leq 2\zeta^\lambda} |X^{(c)}(t) - X^{(c)}(s)|\right) \\ &\leq \frac{K}{\eta} \int_0^{2\zeta^\lambda} \sqrt{\mathbb{H}^{(c)}([-T, T], \vartheta)} \, d\vartheta, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{H}^{(c)}([-T, T], \cdot)$ is the metric entropy induced by $\sigma^{(c)}$.

By Potter’s bound [4, Theorem 1.5.6] for any $\epsilon, \zeta > 0$, $\epsilon < \lambda$ and $t \in (0, \zeta]$ and sufficiently large c (corresponding to small $\delta(c)$), we have $\sigma^{(c)}(t) \leq 2t^{\lambda-\epsilon}$. Hence

$$\mathbb{H}^{(c)}([-T, T], \vartheta) \leq \mathbb{H}_{\tilde{d}}\left([-T, T], \frac{\vartheta}{2}\right),$$

where \tilde{d} is a semimetric such that $\tilde{d}(s, t) = |t - s|^{\lambda-\epsilon}$. The inverse of $x \mapsto x^{\lambda-\epsilon}$ is given by $x \mapsto x^{1/(\lambda-\epsilon)}$, so that

$$\mathbb{H}_{\tilde{d}}([-T, T], \vartheta) \leq \log\left(\frac{T}{\vartheta^{1/(\lambda-\epsilon)}} + 1\right) \leq C \log\left(\frac{1}{\vartheta}\right),$$

for some constant $C > 0$ and $\vartheta > 0$ small. It follows that

$$\int_0^{2\zeta^\lambda} \sqrt{\mathbb{H}^{(c)}([-T, T], \vartheta)} \, d\vartheta \leq \sqrt{C} \int_0^{2\zeta^\lambda} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2}{\vartheta}\right)} \, d\vartheta = 2\sqrt{C} \int_{\zeta^{-\lambda}}^\infty \frac{\sqrt{\log \vartheta}}{\vartheta^2} \, d\vartheta.$$

Summarizing, we have

$$\limsup_{c \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|s-t|\leq\zeta} |X^{(c)}(t) - X^{(c)}(s)| \geq \eta\right) \leq \frac{2K\sqrt{C}}{\eta} \int_{\zeta^{-\lambda}}^\infty \frac{\sqrt{\log \vartheta}}{\vartheta^2} \, d\vartheta;$$

we obtain (4) by letting $\zeta \rightarrow 0$.

Convergence in Ω^γ : To show the convergence in Ω^γ , we need to verify (5). Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \geq e^k} \frac{|X^{(c)}(t)|}{1+t^\gamma} \geq \eta\right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{j=k}^\infty \frac{\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [e^j, e^{j+1}]} |X^{(c)}(t)|}{1+e^{j\gamma}} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{j=k}^\infty \frac{\mathbb{E}|X^{(c)}(e^j)|}{1+e^{j\gamma}} + \frac{2}{\eta} \sum_{j=k}^\infty \frac{\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [e^j, e^{j+1}]} X^{(c)}(t)}{1+e^{j\gamma}} \\ & =: I_1(k) + I_2(k). \end{aligned}$$

$I_1(k)$ and $I_2(k)$ are dealt with separately. According to Lemma 1, for large c (that is, small $\delta(c)$), we have

$$\sigma^{(c)}(t) \leq C \times \begin{cases} t^\ell & t \leq 1, \\ t^u & t > 1, \end{cases}$$

where ℓ and u can be chosen such that $\ell, u < \gamma$. Therefore,

$$I_1(k) \leq \frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{j=k}^\infty \frac{\sigma^{(c)}(e^j)}{1+e^{j\gamma}} \leq \frac{C}{\eta} \sum_{j=k}^\infty \frac{e^{ju}}{1+e^{j\gamma}},$$

and the resulting upper bound tends to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Now focus on $I_2(k)$. For some universal constant $K > 0$ and because of the stationarity of the increments of X , Proposition 2 yields that $I_2(k)$ is majorized by

$$\frac{2K}{\eta} \sum_{j=k}^\infty \frac{\int_0^\infty \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{H}^{(c)}([e^j, e^{j+1}], \vartheta)} d\vartheta}{1+e^{j\gamma}} = \frac{2K}{\eta} \sum_{j=k}^\infty \frac{\int_0^\infty \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{H}^{(c)}([0, e^j(e-1)], \vartheta)} d\vartheta}{1+e^{j\gamma}}.$$

We will estimate the integrals under the sum by splitting the integration area into $\vartheta \leq 1$ and $\vartheta \geq 1$.

Observe that, for some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ (that is, not depending on j),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\mathbb{H}^{(c)}([0, e^j(e-1)], \vartheta)} d\vartheta & \leq \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{e^j(e-1)}{2\vartheta^{1/\ell}} + 1\right)} d\vartheta \\ & \leq \int_0^1 \sqrt{C_1 + j + \frac{1}{\ell} \log\left(\frac{1}{\vartheta}\right)} d\vartheta \\ & = \ell e^{\ell(C_1+j)} \int_{C_1+j}^\infty \sqrt{\vartheta} e^{-\ell\vartheta} d\vartheta \\ & \leq \ell e^{\ell(C_1+j)} \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\vartheta} e^{-\ell\vartheta} d\vartheta = C_2 e^{\ell j}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\ell < \gamma$, so that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \frac{\int_0^1 \sqrt{\mathbb{H}^{(c)}([0, e^j(e-1)], \vartheta)} \, d\vartheta}{1 + e^{j\gamma}} \leq \frac{2K}{\eta} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \frac{C_2 e^{\ell j}}{1 + e^{j\gamma}} = 0.$$

So it remains to show the analogous statement for the integration interval $[1, \infty)$. Using a similar argumentation as the one above, one can show that

$$\int_1^{\infty} \sqrt{\mathbb{H}^{(c)}([0, e^j(e-1)], \vartheta)} \, d\vartheta \leq C_3 e^{uj},$$

for some constant $C_3 > 0$, from which the claim is readily obtained. □

Since the proof of Theorem 1 is analogous to the proof of Theorem 2, we choose to focus on the light-traffic case only.

Proof of Theorem 2 The proof consists of three steps: convergence of the one-dimensional distributions, the finite-dimensional distributions, and a tightness argument.

Step 1: Convergence of one-dimensional distributions. In this step we show that, for a fixed $t \geq 0$,

$$\frac{Q_X^{(c)}(t)}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \xrightarrow{d} Q_{B_\lambda}^{(1)}(t), \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since $Q_X^{(c)}$ is stationary, it is enough to show the above convergence for $t = 0$ only. Observe that, due to the time-reversibility property of Gaussian processes,

$$Q_X^{(c)}(0) \stackrel{d}{=} \sup_{t \geq 0} (X(t) - ct) = \sup_{t \geq 0} (X(\delta(c)t) - c\delta(c)t).$$

Upon combining Corollary 2 with the continuous mapping theorem, for each $T > 0$,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left(\frac{X(\delta(c)t) - c\delta(c)t}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \right) \xrightarrow{d} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} (B_\lambda(t) - t), \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{c \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \geq T} \left(\frac{X(\delta(c)t) - c\delta(c)t}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \right) \geq \eta \right) = 0, \tag{15}$$

for any $\eta > 0$. Recall the definition of $X^{(c)}$, so that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \geq T} \left(\frac{X(\delta(c)t) - c\delta(c)t}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \right) \geq \eta \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \geq T} \frac{|X^{(c)}(t)|}{\eta + t} \geq 1 \right),$$

where we used (9). Proposition 4 implies that the family $\{X^{(c)}\}$ is tight in Ω^γ , for some $\gamma \leq 1$. Now (15) follows from Proposition 1.

Step 2: Convergence of finite-dimensional distributions. The argumentation of this step is analogous to Step 1. First note that for any $t_i \geq 0, \eta_i > 0$ and $s_i < t_i$, where $i = 1, \dots, n$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{Q_X^{(c)}(\delta(c)t_i)}{\sigma(\delta(c))} > \eta_i, i = 1, \dots, n\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{s \leq \delta(c)t_i} \left(\frac{X(\delta(c)t_i) - X(s) - c\delta(c)(t_i - s)}{\sigma(\delta(c))}\right) > \eta_i, i = 1, \dots, n\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{s \in [s_i, t_i]} \left(\frac{X(\delta(c)t_i) - X(\delta(c)s) - c\delta(c)(t_i - s)}{\sigma(\delta(c))}\right) > \eta_i, i = 1, \dots, n\right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{s \leq s_i} \left(\frac{X(\delta(c)t_i) - X(\delta(c)s) - c\delta(c)(t_i - s)}{\sigma(\delta(c))}\right) > \eta_i\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now the same procedure can be followed as in Step 1.

Step 3: Tightness in $C[0, T]$. In this step, for any $T > 0$, we show the tightness of $\{Q_X^{(c)}(\delta(c)\cdot)/\sigma(\delta(c))\}$ in $C[0, T]$. Given that we have established Step 2 already, (3) holds so we are left with proving (4), with $s, t \in [0, T]$; the remainder of the proof is devoted to settling this claim.

Stationarity of $Q_X^{(c)}$ implies that $\{Q_X^{(c)}(\delta(c)t) - Q_X^{(c)}(\delta(c)s) : t \geq s\}$ is distributed as

$$\{Q_X^{(c)}(\delta(c)(t - s)) - Q_X^{(c)}(0) : t \geq s\},$$

so that it suffices to prove (4) for $s = 0$ only. Furthermore, cf. (6),

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq \zeta} |Q_X^{(c)}(\delta(c)t) - Q_X^{(c)}(0)| \leq 2 \sup_{0 < t \leq \zeta} |X(\delta(c)t) - c\delta(c)t|.$$

From Corollary 2 it follows that

$$\sup_{0 < t \leq \zeta} \frac{|X(\delta(c)t) - c\delta(c)t|}{\sigma(\delta(c))} \xrightarrow{d} \sup_{0 < t \leq \zeta} |B_\lambda(t) - t|, \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now notice that for $\zeta < \eta/4$, by the self-similarity of B_λ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 < t \leq \zeta} |B_\lambda(t) - t| \geq \frac{\eta}{2}\right) \leq 2\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 < t \leq 1} B_\lambda(t) \geq \frac{\eta}{4}\zeta^{-\lambda}\right).$$

Now it is straightforward to conclude that the last expression tends to zero as $\zeta \rightarrow 0$. □

Acknowledgements K. Dębicki was supported by MNiSW Grant N N201 394137 (2009–2011) and by a travel grant from NWO (Mathematics Cluster STAR). K.M. Kosiński was supported by NWO grant 613.000.701.

Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial License which permits any noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.

References

1. Adler, R.J.: An Introduction to Continuity, Extrema, and Related Topics for General Gaussian Processes. Lecture Notes-Monograph Series, vol. 12 (1990). IMS
2. Adler, R.J., Taylor, J.E.: Random Fields and Geometry. Springer, Berlin (2007)
3. Billingsley, P.: Convergence of Probability Measures, 2nd edn. Wiley, New York (1999)
4. Bingham, N.H., Goldie, C.M., Teugels, J.L.: Regular Variation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1987)
5. Boxma, O.J., Cohen, J.W.: Heavy-traffic analysis for the $GI/G/1$ queue with heavy-tailed distributions. Queueing Syst. **33**, 177–204 (1999)
6. Buldygin, V.V., Zaiats, V.V.: A global asymptotic normality of the sample correlogram of a stationary Gaussian process. Random Oper. Stoch. Equ. **7**, 109–132 (1999)
7. Dieker, A.B.: Conditional limit theorems for queues with Gaussian input, a weak convergence approach. Stoch. Process. Appl. **115**, 849–873 (2005)
8. Dębicki, K., Mandjes, M.: Traffic with an fBm limit: Convergence of the stationary workload process. Queueing Syst. **46**, 113–127 (2004)
9. Kingman, J.F.C.: The single server queue in heavy traffic. Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc. **57**, 902–904 (1961)
10. Mandjes, M.: Large Deviations for Gaussian Queues. Wiley, Chichester (2007)
11. Mannersalo, P., Norros, I.: A most probable path approach to queueing systems with general Gaussian input. Comput. Netw. **40**, 399–412 (2002)
12. Norros, I.: A storage model with self-similar input. Queueing Syst. **16**, 387–396 (2004)
13. Prokhorov, Ju.V.: Transition phenomena in queueing processes. I. Liet. Mat. Rink. **9**, 199–205 (1963)
14. Reich, E.: On the integrodifferential equation of Takács I. Ann. Math. Stat. **29**, 563–570 (1958)
15. Resnick, S., Samorodnitsky, G.: A heavy traffic limit theorem for workload processes with heavy tailed service requirements. Manag. Sci. **46**, 1236–1248 (2000)
16. Robert, P.: Stochastic Networks and Queues. Springer, Berlin (2003)
17. Szczotka, T., Woyczyński, W.A.: Heavy-tailed dependent queues in heavy traffic. Probab. Math. Stat. **24**, 67–96 (2004)
18. Taqqu, M.S., Willinger, W., Sherman, R.: Proof of a fundamental result in self-similar traffic modeling. Comput. Commun. Rev. **27**, 5–23 (1997)
19. Whitt, W.: Weak convergence theorems for priority queues. J. Appl. Probab. **8**, 74–94 (1971)