arXiv:1712.03853v1 [math.PR] 11 Dec 2017

Heavy-Traffic Analysis of Sojourn Time under the Foreground-Background Scheduling Policy

Bart Kamphorst[a] Bert Zwart[a,b]
b.kamphorst@cwi.nl b.zwart@cwi.nl
[a] Centrum Wiskunde & Informatica, P.O. Box 94079, 1090 GB Amsterdam, the Netherlands
[b] Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, P.O. Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, the Netherlands

8th March 2024

Abstract

We consider the steady-state distribution of the sojourn time of a job entering an M/GI/1 queue with the foreground-background scheduling policy in heavy traffic. The growth rate of its mean, as well as the limiting distribution, are derived under broad conditions. Assumptions commonly used in extreme value theory play a key role in both the analysis and the results.

Keywords: M/GI/1 *queue, sojourn time, heavy traffic, Foreground-Background, extreme value theory*

1 Introduction

One of the main insights from queueing theory is that the queue length and sojourn time are of the order $1/(1-\rho)$, as the traffic intensity of the system ρ approaches 100 percent utilization. This insight dates back to Kingman [13] and Prokhorov [19] and, appropriately reformulated, remains valid for queueing networks and multiple server queues [7, 11, 25]. This picture can change dramatically when the scheduling policy is no longer First-In-First-Out (FIFO). Bansal [1] was the first to point out that the mean sojourn time (a.k.a. response time, flow time) of a user is of $o(1/(1-\rho))$ in the M/M/1 queue when the scheduling policy is Shortest Remaining Processing Time (SRPT). This result was later generalized to several non-exponential service time distributions in Lin et al. [16]. More recently, Puha et al. [20] derived a process limit theorem for the SRPT queue length, under an assumption that implies that all moments of the service time are finite.

As SRPT requires information on service times in advance, the question was raised if the same growth rate in heavy traffic can be reached with a blind scheduling policy, a question that was answered negatively in Bansal et al. [3]. Specifically, the authors showed that for every blind scheduling policy, there exists a service time distribution under which the growth rate in heavy traffic of the mean sojourn time is at least a factor $\log(1/(1-\rho))$ larger than the growth rate of SRPT. Bansal et al. also construct a scheduling policy that achieves this growth rate, but this policy rather complicated as it involves randomization. All of the results mentioned thus far only concern the mean sojourn time, and it is of interest to obtain information about the distribution of the sojourn time as well.

Motivated by these developments, we consider the Foreground-Background (FB) scheduling policy in this paper. More precisely, we investigate the invariant distribution of the sojourn time of a customer in an M/GI/1/FB queue. The FB policy operates as follows: priority is given to the customer with the least-attained service, and when multiple customers satisfy this

property, they are served at an equal rate. The only heavy-traffic results for FB we are aware of are of "big-O" type and are known in case of deterministic, exponential, Pareto and specific finite-support service times [2, 17]. For deterministic service times, it is easy to see that all customers under FB depart in one batch at the end of every busy period, and as a result the growth rate in heavy traffic is very poor in this case $O((1-\rho)^{-2})$. The behaviour of FB is much better for service-time distributions with a decreasing failure rate, as FB then optimizes the mean sojourn time among all blind policies [22]. For more background on the FB policy we refer to the survey by Nuyens and Wierman [17].

The main results of this paper are of three types:

1. We characterize the exact growth rate (up to a constant independent of ρ) of the sojourn time in heavy traffic under very general assumptions on the service time distribution. As in Bansal and Gamarnik [2] and Lin et al. [16], we find a dichotomy: when the service time distribution has finite variance, the mean sojourn time $\mathbb{E}[T^{\rho}_{\mathrm{FB}}] = \Theta\left(\frac{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}{(1-\rho)^2}\right)$. Here $\overline{F}(x) = 1 - F(x)$ is the tail of the service time distribution and $G^{\leftarrow}$ is the right-inverse of the distribution function of a residual service time; a detailed overview of notation can be found in Section 2. In the infinite variance case, we find that $\mathbb{E}[T^{\rho}_{\mathrm{FB}}] = \Theta\left(\log \frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)$. This result is formally stated in Theorem 3.1. The precise conditions for these results to hold involve Matuszewska indices, a concept that will be reviewed in Section 2. The behaviour of $\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$ is quite rich, as will be illustrated by several examples.

2. Contrary to the results in Bansal and Gamarnik [2] and Lin et al. [16], we have been able to obtain a more precise estimate of the growth rate of $\mathbb{E}[T^{\rho}_{\mathrm{FB}}]$. It turns out that extreme value theory plays an essential role in our analysis, and the limiting constant factor in front of the growth rate $\frac{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}{(1-\rho)^2}$ crucially depends on in which domain of attraction the service-time distribution is. This result is summarized in Theorem 3.2 and appended in Theorem 3.4. When the service-time distribution tail is regularly varying, it is shown that the growth rate of the sojourn time under FB is equal to that of SRPT up to a finite constant. A comparison of the sojourn times under FB and SRPT is given in Corollary 3.5.

3. When analysing the distribution, we first show that $T^{\rho}_{\mathrm{FB}}/\mathbb{E}[T^{\rho}_{\mathrm{FB}}]$ converges to zero in probability as $\rho \uparrow 1$. To still get a heavy traffic approximation for $\mathbb{P}(T^{\rho}_{\mathrm{FB}} > y)$, we state a sample path representation for the sojourn time distribution for a job that requires a known amount of service. We then use fluctuation theory for spectrally negative Lévy processes to rewrite this representation into an expression that is amenable to analysis; in particular, we obtain a representation for the Laplace transform of the *residual* sojourn time distribution is of independent interest, from which a heavy-traffic limit theorem follows. Finally, the Laplace transform implies an estimate for the tail of T_{FB}.

   More specifically, our results show that $\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}} > y)/\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$ converges to a non-trivial function $g^*(y)$, for which we give an integral expression in terms of error functions. Along the way, we derive a heavy traffic limit for the total workload in an M/GI/1 queue, with truncated service times that also seems to be of independent interest (see Proposition 7.1). As in the analysis for the mean sojourn time, ideas from extreme value theory play an important role in the analysis, and the limit function g^* depends on which domain of attraction the service-time distribution falls into. A precise description of this result can be found in Theorem 3.7.

Despite the fact that extreme theory appears both in our analysis and our end results, the precise role of extreme value theory is not entirely clear from the analysis in this paper. A challenging topic for future research is to get a completely probabilistic proof of our result; e.g. a proof that does not use explicit integral expressions for the mean sojourn time. To this end,

it makes sense to consider a more general class of scheduling policies, for example the class of SMART scheduling policies considered in Wierman et al. [26] and Nuyens et al. [18]. This is beyond the scope of the present paper.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 formally introduces the model that is considered. Section 3 presents all our main results on the asymptotic behaviour of the mean and the tail of the sojourn time distribution under FB. The results on the mean are then proven in Sections 4 and 5, whereas the results on the tail distribution are supported in Sections 6 and 7.

2 Preliminaries

In this paper we consider a sequence of M/GI/1 queues, indexed by n, where the i-th job requires B_i units of service for all n. For convenience, we say that a job that requires x units of service is a *job of size* x. All B_i are independently and identically distributed (i.i.d) random variables with cumulative distribution function (c.d.f.) $F(x) = \mathbb{P}(B_i \leq x)$ and finite mean $\mathbb{E}[B]$. We assume that $F(0) = 0$, and denote $x_R := \sup\{x \geq 0 : F(x) < 1\} \leq \infty$. Jobs in the n-th queue arrive with rate $\lambda^{(n)}$, where $\lambda^{(n)} < 1/\mathbb{E}[B_1]$ to ensure that the n-th system experiences work intensity $\rho^{(n)} := \lambda^{(n)}\mathbb{E}[B_1] < 1$. For notational convenience, we let B denote a random variable with c.d.f. F.

Let $\overline{F}(x) := 1 - F(x)$ and $F^{\leftarrow}(y) := \inf\{x \geq 0 : F(x) \geq y\}$ denote the complementary c.d.f. (c.c.d.f.) and the right-inverse of F respectively. The random variable B^* is defined by its c.d.f. $G(x) := \mathbb{P}(B^* \leq x) = \int_0^x \overline{F}(t)/\mathbb{E}[B]\,\mathrm{d}t$ and has k-th moment $\mathbb{E}[(B^*)^k] = \mathbb{E}[B^k]/(k\mathbb{E}[B])$. Since $G^{\leftarrow}(y)$ is continuous and strictly increasing, its (right-)inverse $G^{\leftarrow}(y)$ satisfies $G^{\leftarrow}(G(x)) = x$. Also, we recognize $h^*(x) := \frac{\overline{F}(x)}{\mathbb{E}[B]\overline{G}(x)}$ as the failure rate of B^*. One may deduce that $h^*(x)$ equals the reciprocal of the mean residual time; $h^*(x) = 1/\mathbb{E}[B - x \mid B > x]$.

Foreground-Background scheduling policy

Jobs are served according to the Foreground-Background (FB) policy, meaning that at any moment in time, the server equally shares its capacity over all available jobs that have received the least amount of service thus far. First, we are interested in characteristics of the sojourn time $T_{\mathrm{FB}}^{(n)}$, defined as the duration of time that a generic job spends in the system. In order to analyse this, we consider an expression for the mean sojourn time of a generic job *of size* x, $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}^{(n)}(x)]$, for which Schrage [23] states that

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}^{(n)}(x)] = \frac{x}{1-\rho_x^{(n)}} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[W^{(n)}(x)]}{1-\rho_x^{(n)}} = \frac{x}{1-\rho_x^{(n)}} + \frac{\lambda^{(n)} m_2(x)}{2(1-\rho_x^{(n)})^2}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\rho_x^{(n)} := \lambda^{(n)}\mathbb{E}[B \wedge x] = \rho\mathbb{P}(B^* \leq x)$ and $m_2(x) := \mathbb{E}[(B \wedge x)^2] = 2\int_0^x t\overline{F}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t$ are functions of the first and second moments of $B \wedge x := \min\{B, x\}$, and $W^{(n)}(x)$ is the steady-state waiting time in a M/GI/1/FIFO queue with arrival rate $\lambda^{(n)}$ and jobs of size $B_i \wedge x$. The intuition behind this result, is that a job J_1 of size x experiences a system where all job sizes are truncated. Indeed, if another job J_2 of size $x + y, y > 0$, has received at least x service then FB will never dedicate its resources to job J_2 while job J_1 is incomplete. The mean sojourn time of job J_1 can now be salvaged from its own service requirement x, the truncated work already in the system upon arrival $W^{(n)}(x)$, and the rate $1 - \rho_x^{(n)}$ at which it is expected to be served, yielding (2.1). As a consequence, the mean sojourn time $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}^{(n)}]$ of a generic job is given by

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}^{(n)}] = \int_0^\infty \frac{x}{1-\rho_x^{(n)}}\,\mathrm{d}F(x) + \int_0^\infty \frac{\lambda^{(n)} m_2(x)}{2(1-\rho_x^{(n)})^2}\,\mathrm{d}F(x). \tag{2.2}$$

Second, we focus attention on the tail behaviour of $T_{\mathrm{FB}}^{(n)}$. Write $A \stackrel{d}{=} B$ if $\mathbb{P}(A \leq x) = \mathbb{P}(B \leq x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $\mathcal{L}_x(y)$ denote the time required by the server to empty the system given that job sizes are truncated to $B_i \wedge x$ and the current amount of work is y. The analysis of the tail behaviour is then facilitated by relation (4.28) in Kleinrock [14], stating

$$T_{\mathrm{FB}}^{(n)}(x) \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{L}_x(W_x^{(n)} + x). \tag{2.3}$$

For both the mean and tail behaviour of $T_{\mathrm{FB}}^{(n)}$, we take specific interest in systems that experience *heavy traffic*, that is, systems where $\rho^{(n)} \uparrow 1$ as $n \to \infty$. In the current setting, this is equivalent to sequences $\lambda^{(n)}$ that converge to $1/\mathbb{E}[B]$. Most results in this paper make no assumptions on sequence $\lambda^{(n)}$, in which case we drop the superscript n for notational convenience and just state $\rho \uparrow 1$.

The remainder of this section introduces some notation related to Matuszewska indices and extreme value theory.

Matuszewska indices

Definition 2.1. *Suppose that $f(\cdot)$ is positive.*

- *The upper Matuszewska index $\alpha(f)$ is the infimum of those α for which there exists a constant $C = C(\alpha)$ such that for each $\mu^* > 1$,*

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} f(\mu x)/f(x) \leq C\mu^{\alpha} \tag{2.4}$$

  uniformly in $\mu \in [1, \mu^*]$ as $x \to \infty$.

- *The lower Matuszewska index $\beta(f)$ is the supremum of those β for which there exists a constant $D = D(\beta) > 0$ such that for each $\mu^* > 1$,*

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} f(\mu x)/f(x) \geq D\lambda^{\beta} \tag{2.5}$$

  uniformly in $\mu \in [1, \mu^*]$ as $x \to \infty$.

One may note from the above definitions that $\beta(f) = -\alpha(1/f)$ holds for any positive f. Intuitively, a function f with upper and lower Matuszewska indices $\alpha(f)$ and $\beta(f)$ is bounded between functions $Dx^{\beta(f)}$ and $Cx^{\alpha(f)}$ for appropriate constants $C, D > 0$. More accurately, however, C and D could be unbounded or vanishing functions of x. Of special interest is the class of functions that satisfy $\beta(f) = \alpha(f)$.

Definition 2.2. *A measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is regularly varying at infinity with index $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ (written $f \in \mathrm{RV}_\alpha$) if for all $\mu > 0$*

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} f(\mu x)/f(x) = \mu^{\alpha}. \tag{2.6}$$

If (2.6) holds with $\alpha = 0$, then L is called slowly varying. If (2.6) holds with $\alpha = -\infty$, then L is called rapidly varying.

Extreme value theory

The following paragraphs introduce some notions and results from extreme value theory. The field of extreme value theory generally aims to assess the probability of an extreme event; however, for our purposes we restrict attention to the limiting distribution of $\max\{B_1, \ldots, B_n\}$. A key result on this functional is the Fisher-Tippett theorem:

Theorem 2.3 (Resnick [21], Proposition 0.3)**.** *Let $(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables and define $M_n := \max\{B_1, \ldots, B_n\}$. If there exist norming sequences $c_n > 0, d_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and some non-degenerate c.d.f H such that*

$$c_n^{-1}(M_n - d_n) \xrightarrow{d} H, \tag{2.7}$$

then H belongs to the type of one of the following three c.d.f.s:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textit{Fréchet:} && \Phi_\alpha(x) && = && \begin{cases} 0, & x \le 0 \\ \exp\{-x^{-\alpha}\}, & x > 0 \end{cases} && \alpha > 0. \\
&\textit{Weibull:} && \Psi_\alpha(x) && = && \begin{cases} \exp\{-(-x)^{\alpha}\}, & x \le 0 \\ 1, & x > 0 \end{cases} && \alpha > 0. \\
&\textit{Gumbel:} && \Lambda(x) && = && \exp\{-e^{-x}\} && x \in \mathbb{R}.
\end{aligned}$$

The three distributions above are referred to as the extreme value distributions.

A c.d.f. F is said to be in the *maximum domain of attraction of H* if there exist norming sequences c_n and d_n such that (2.7) holds. In this case, we write $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(H)$. A large body of literature has identified conditions on F such that $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(H)$. Excellent collections of such and related results can be found in Embrechts et al. [9] and Resnick [21]. For reasons of convenience, we only mention a characterisation theorem for $\mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$:

Theorem 2.4 (Embrechts et al. [9], Theorem 3.3.26)**.** *The c.d.f. F with right endpoint $x_R \le \infty$ belongs to the maximum domain of attraction of Λ if and only if there exists some $z < x_R$ such that F has representation*

$$\overline{F}(x) = c(x) \exp\left\{ -\int_z^x \frac{g(t)}{f(t)}\,\mathrm{d}t \right\}, \quad z < x < x_R, \tag{2.8}$$

where c and g are measurable functions satisfying $c(x) \to c > 0, g(t) \to 1$ as $x \uparrow x_R$, and $f(\cdot)$ is a positive, absolutely continuous function (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) with density $f'(x)$ having $\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} f'(x) = 0$.

If $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$, then the norming constants can be chosen as $c_n = f(d_n)$ and $d_n = F^{\leftarrow}(1 - n^{-1})$. A possible choice for the function $f(\cdot)$ is $f(\cdot) = 1/h^*(\cdot)$.

The function $f(\cdot)$ in the above definition is unique up to asymptotic equivalence. We refer to f as the *auxiliary function* of $\overline{F}$. Also, we note the following property of $f(\cdot)$:

Lemma 2.5 (Resnick [21], Lemma 1.2)**.** *Suppose that $f(\cdot)$ is an absolutely continuous auxiliary function with $f'(x) \to 0$ as $x \uparrow x_R$.*

- *If $x_R = \infty$, then $\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{f(x)}{x} = 0$.*
- *If $x_R < \infty$, then $\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{f(x)}{x_R - x} = 0$.*

This section's final lemma shows that $G \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$ whenever $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$:

Lemma 2.6. *If $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$, then $G \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$ and any auxiliary function for F is also an auxiliary function for G.*

Proof. According to Theorem 3.3.27 in Embrechts et al. [9], $G \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$ with auxiliary function $f(\cdot)$ if and only if $\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \overline{G}(x + tf(x))/\overline{G}(x) = e^{-t}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. It is straightforward to check that the above relation holds for any auxiliary function $f(\cdot)$ of F by using l'Hôpital and $\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} f'(x) = 0$. □

Asymptotic relations

Let $f(\cdot)$ and $g(\cdot)$ denote two positive functions and A and B two random variables. We write $f \sim g$ if $\lim_{z\uparrow z^*} f(z)/g(z) = 1$, where the appropriate limit $z \uparrow z^*$ depends on and should be clear from the context; it usually equals $x \uparrow x_R$ or $\rho \uparrow 1$. Similarly, we adopt the conventions $f = o(g)$ if $\limsup_{z\uparrow z^*} f(z)/g(z) = 0$, $f = O(g)$ if $\limsup_{z\uparrow z^*} f(z)/g(z) < \infty$ and $f = \Theta(g)$ if $0 < \liminf_{z\uparrow z^*} f(z)/g(z) \leq \limsup_{z\uparrow z^*} f(z)/g(z) < \infty$. We write $A \leq_{st} B$ if the relation $P(A > x) \leq \mathbb{P}(B > x)$ is satisfied for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Finally, the complementary error function is defined as $\mathrm{Erfc}(x) := 2\pi^{-1/2} \int_x^\infty e^{-u^2}\, \mathrm{d}u$.

3 Main results and discussion

This section presents and discusses our main results. Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 consider the asymptotic behaviour of the mean sojourn time $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]$ for various classes of distributions. Theorem 3.4 connects the asymptotic behaviour of $\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$ to the literature on extreme value theory. As a consequence, the expressions obtained in Theorem 3.2 can be specified for many distributions in $\mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$. Theorem 3.6 shifts focus to the distribution of T_{FB} and states that the scaled sojourn time $T_{\mathrm{FB}}/\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]$ tends to zero in probability. Instead, Theorem 3.7 shows that a certain fraction of jobs experiences a sojourn time of order $(1-\rho)^{-2}$. This result is achieved through the Laplace transform of the remaining sojourn time T^*_{FB}, for which we give an integral presentation. The proofs of the theorems are postponed to later sections.

Recall that $\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho)) = \mathbb{E}[B](1-\rho)h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$. Our first theorem presents the growth rate of $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]$.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that either $x_R = \infty$ and $-\infty < \beta(\overline{F}) \leq \alpha(\overline{F}) < -2$, or that $x_R < \infty$ and $-\infty < \beta(\overline{F}(x_R - (\cdot)^{-1})) \leq \alpha(\overline{F}(x_R - (\cdot)^{-1})) < 0$. Then the relations*

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] = \Theta\left(\frac{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}{(1-\rho)^2}\right) = \Theta\left(\frac{h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}{1-\rho}\right) \tag{3.1}$$

hold as $\rho \uparrow 1$, where $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho)) = 0$ if $x_R = \infty$ and $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho)) = \infty$ if $x_R < \infty$. Alternatively, assume $x_R = \infty$ and $\beta(\overline{F}(x)) > -2$. Then the relation

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] = \Theta\left(\log\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right) \tag{3.2}$$

holds as $\rho \uparrow 1$.

Theorem 3.1 shows that the behaviour of $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]$ is fundamentally different for $\alpha(\overline{F}) < -2$ and $\beta(\overline{F}(x)) > -2$. In the first case, the variance of F is bounded and therefore the expected remaining busy period duration is of order $\Theta((1-\rho)^{-2})$. Our analysis roughly shows that all jobs of size $G^{\leftarrow}(\rho)$ and larger will remain in the system until the end of the busy period, and hence experience a sojourn time of order $\Theta((1-\rho)^{-2})$. The theorem shows that, as the work intensity increases to unity, the contribution of these jobs to the average sojourn time determines the overall average sojourn time.

The above argumentation does not apply in case $\beta(\overline{F}(x)) > -2$, since then the expected remaining busy period duration is infinite. It turns out that in this case the mean sojourn time of a large job of size x is of the same order as the time that the job is in service, which has expectation $x/(1-\rho_x)$. The result follows after integrating over the job size distribution.

Additionally, it can be shown that the statements in Theorem 3.1 also hold if $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$, which is a special case of $\alpha(\overline{F}) = \beta(\overline{F}) = -\infty$ or $\alpha(\overline{F}(x_R - (\cdot)^{-1})) = \beta(\overline{F}(x_R - (\cdot)^{-1}) = -\infty$. In this case, as well as in case $\overline{F}(\cdot)$ or $\overline{F}(x_R - (\cdot)^{-1})$ is regularly varying, one can show that $(1-\rho)^2\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]/\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$ converges. Theorem 3.2 specifies Theorem 3.1 for the aforementioned cases, as well as for distributions with an atom in their endpoint.

Theorem 3.2. *The following relations hold as* $\rho \uparrow 1$*:*

(i) If $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Phi_\alpha), \alpha \in (1,2)$*, then* $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] \sim \frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}\mathbb{E}[B]\log\frac{1}{1-\rho}$.

(ii) If $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(H)$*, then* $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] \sim \frac{r(H)\mathbb{E}[B^*]\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}{(1-\rho)^2} = \frac{r(H)\mathbb{E}[B^2]h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}{2(1-\rho)}$ *where*

$$r(H) = \begin{cases} \frac{\pi/(\alpha-1)}{\sin(\pi/(\alpha-1))}\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} & \text{if } H = \Phi_\alpha, \alpha > 2, \\ 1 & \text{if } H = \Lambda, \text{ and} \\ \frac{\pi/(\alpha+1)}{\sin(\pi/(\alpha+1))}\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1} & \text{if } H = \Psi_\alpha, \alpha > 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

Additionally, if $H = \Phi_\alpha, \alpha > 2$*, then* $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho)) = 0$*, whereas if either* $H = \Lambda$ *and* $x_R < \infty$ *or if* $H = \Psi_\alpha, \alpha > 0$*, then* $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho)) = \infty$.

(iii) If F *has an atom in* $x_R < \infty$*, say* $\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\overline{F}(x_R - \delta) = p > 0$*, then* $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] \sim \frac{p\mathbb{E}[B^*]}{(1-\rho)^2}$.

The expressions in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 give insight into the asymptotic behaviour of $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]$. The following corollary shows that the asymptotic expressions above may be specified further if the job sizes are Pareto distributed. This extends the result by Bansal and Gamarnik [2], who derived the growth factor of $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]$ but not the exact asymptotics.

Corollary 3.3. *Assume* $\overline{F}(x) = (x/x_L)^{-\alpha}, x \geq x_L$*. Then the relations*

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] \sim \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}\mathbb{E}[B]\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} & \text{if } \alpha \in (1,2), \\ \frac{\pi/(\alpha-1)}{2\sin(\pi/(\alpha-1))}\frac{\mathbb{E}[B^2]\alpha^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}}{x_L(1-\rho)^{\frac{\alpha-2}{\alpha-1}}} & \text{if } \alpha \in (2,\infty), \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

hold as $\rho \uparrow 1$.

Proof. One may derive that $\overline{G}(x) = \frac{1}{\alpha}\left(\frac{x}{x_L}\right)^{1-\alpha}$ for $x \geq x_L$ and sequentially that $h^*(x) = \frac{\alpha-1}{x}$ for $x \geq x_L$ and $G^{\leftarrow}(\rho) = x_L(\alpha(1-\rho))^{\frac{-1}{\alpha-1}}$ for $\rho \geq 1 - 1/\alpha$. The result then follows from Theorem 3.2. □

Corollary 3.3 exemplifies that the asymptotic growth of $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]$ may be specified in some cases. However, it is often non-trivial to analyse the behaviour of $\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$ or equivalently $h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$. Theorem 3.4 aims to overcome this problem if $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$ by presenting a relation between $h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$ and norming constants c_n of F, which can often be found in the large body of literature on extreme value theory.

Theorem 3.4. *Assume* $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$ *and* $x_R = \infty$*, and let* c_n*,* d_n *be such that* $c_n^{-1}(\overline{F}^n - d_n) \xrightarrow{d} \Lambda$*. Define* $\lambda^{(n)} = (1-n^{-1})/\mathbb{E}[B]$ *so that* $\rho^{(n)} = 1 - n^{-1}$.

(i) If there exists $\alpha > 0$ *and a slowly varying function* $l(x)$ *such that* $-\log\overline{F}(x) \sim l(x)x^\alpha$ *as* $x \to \infty$*, then* $h^*(x) \sim \alpha l(x)x^{\alpha-1}$ *if and only if*

$$\inf_{\lambda\downarrow 1}\liminf_{x\to\infty}\inf_{t\in[1,\lambda]}\{\log h^*(tx) - \log h^*(x)\} \geq 0. \tag{3.5}$$

If (3.5) *holds, then* $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}^{(n)}] \sim \frac{\mathbb{E}[B^2]}{2(1-\rho^{(n)})c_n}$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

(ii) If there exists a function $l(x) : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}, \liminf_{x\to\infty} l(x) > 1$ *such that for all* $\lambda > 0$

$$\lim_{x\to\infty}\frac{-\log\overline{F}(\lambda x) + \log\overline{F}(x)}{l(x)} = \log(\lambda) \tag{3.6}$$

and $L = \lim_{x\to\infty}\frac{\log(x)}{l(x)}$ *exists in* $[0,\infty]$*, then* $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{2(1-\rho^{(n)})c_n}{\mathbb{E}[B^2]}\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}^{(n)}] = e^{-L}$.

The same results hold if $x_R < \infty$, provided that the $\overline{F}(\cdot)$ and $h^*(\cdot)$ in (i) and (ii) are replaced by $\overline{F}(x_R - \frac{1}{\cdot})$ and $h^*(x_R - \frac{1}{\cdot})/(\cdot)^2$, respectively.

Remark 1. Condition (3.5) in part (i) of Theorem 3.4 is a *Tauberian condition*, and origins from Theorem 1.7.5 in Bingham et al. [6]. A Tauberian theorem makes assumptions on a transformed function (here h^*), and uses these assumptions to deduce the asymptotic behaviour of that transform. It is non-restrictive in the sense the result in the theorem holds, i.e. if $h^*(x) \sim \alpha l(x) x^{\alpha-1}$, then obviously condition (3.5) is met and therefore the Tauberian condition does not restrict the class of functions F to which the theorem applies. However, condition (3.5) is necessary for the result to hold. The interested reader is referred to Section XIII.5 in Feller [10] and Section 1.7 in Bingham et al. [6].

Theorem 2.4 implies that $c_n \sim 1/h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(1-n^{-1}))$ for many distributions in MDA(Λ). As c_n may be chosen as $1/h^*(F^{\leftarrow}(1-n^{-1}))$, Theorem 3.4 implicitly states conditions under which $\lim_{n\to\infty} h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(1-n^{-1}))/h^*(F^{\leftarrow}(1-n^{-1})) = \lim_{y\uparrow 1}(1-y)^{-2}\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(y))\overline{G}(F^{\leftarrow}(y))$ exists, and exploits this limit to write $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}^{(n)}]$ as function of c_n rather than of $h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(1-n^{-1}))$. As to illustrate the implications of Theorem 3.4, the exact asymptotic behaviour of several well-known distributions is presented in Table 1.

We take a brief moment to compare the asymptotic mean sojourn time under FB to that under SRPT in M/GI/1 models. Clearly, FB can perform no better than SRPT due to SRPT's optimality [24]. The ratio of their respective mean sojourn time is shown to be unbounded if the job sizes are Exponentially distributed or if the job size distribution has finite support [1, 14, 16, 17], but bounded if the job sizes are Pareto distributed [2, 16]. To the best of the authors' knowledge, no results of this nature are known if job sizes are Weibull distributed.

The following corollary specifies the asymptotic advantage of SRPT over FB if the job sizes are Pareto distributed, and presents the first such results for Weibull distributed job sizes. Its statements follow directly from Corollaries 1 and 2 in Lin et al. [16] and the earlier results in this section.

Corollary 3.5. *The following relations hold as $\rho \uparrow 1$:*

(i) If $\overline{F}(x) = (x/x_L)^{-\alpha}, x \geq x_L > 0$ and $\alpha \in (1,2)$, then $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]/\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{SRPT}}] \sim \alpha^2$.

(ii) If $\overline{F}(x) = (x/x_L)^{-\alpha}, x \geq x_L > 0$ and $\alpha > 2$, then $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]/\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{SRPT}}] \sim \alpha^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}$.

(iii) If $\overline{F}(x) = e^{-\mu x^{\beta}}, x \geq 0$ and $\beta > 0$, then $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]/\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{SRPT}}] \sim \beta \log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)$.

Now that the asymptotic behaviour of the mean sojourn time under FB has been quantified, it is natural to investigate more complex characteristics. One such characteristic is the behaviour of the tail of the sojourn time distribution, where one usually starts by analysing the distribution of the sojourn time normalized by its mean, $T_{\mathrm{FB}}/\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]$. The following theorem indicates that this random variable converges to zero in probability, meaning that almost every job experiences a sojourn time that is significantly shorter than the mean sojourn time as $\rho \uparrow 1$:

Theorem 3.6. *If either*

- *$x_R = \infty$ and either $\beta(\overline{F}) > -2$ or $-\infty < \beta(\overline{F}) \leq \alpha(\overline{F}) < -2$, or*
- *$x_R < \infty$ and $-\infty < \beta(\overline{F}(x_R - (\cdot)^{-1})) \leq \alpha(\overline{F}(x_R - (\cdot)^{-1})) < 0$, or*
- *$F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$,*

then $\frac{T_{\mathrm{FB}}}{\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ as $\rho \uparrow 1$.

Distribution	c.c.d.f. $\overline{F}$ or p.d.f. F'		L	$\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] \sim$
Exponential-like	$\overline{F}(x) \sim Ke^{-\mu x}$	$K, \mu > 0$	$-$	$\frac{\mathbb{E}[B^2]\mu}{2(1-\rho)}$
Weibull-like	$\overline{F}(x) \sim Kx^{\alpha}e^{-\mu x^{\beta}}$	$K, \mu, \beta > 0, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$	$-$	$\frac{\beta\mu^{1/\beta}\mathbb{E}[B^2]}{2(1-\rho)\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)^{1/\beta-1}}$
Gamma	$F'(x) = \frac{\beta^{\alpha}}{\Gamma(\alpha)}x^{\alpha-1}e^{-\beta x}$	$\alpha, \beta > 0$	$-$	$\frac{\mathbb{E}[B^2]\beta}{2(1-\rho)}$
Normal	$F'(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-x^2/2}$		$-$	$\frac{\mathbb{E}[B^2]\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{2}(1-\rho)}$
Lognormal	$F'(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma x}e^{-(\log(x)-\mu)^2/(2\sigma^2)}$	$\sigma > 0, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$	σ^2	$\frac{e^{-\sigma^2}\mathbb{E}[B^2]\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)^{1/2}}{\sigma\sqrt{2}(1-\rho)\exp\left[\mu+\sigma\left(\sqrt{2\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)}-\frac{\log(4\pi)+\log\log(1/(1-\rho))}{2\sqrt{2\log(1/(1-\rho))}}\right)\right]}$
Finite Exponential	$\overline{F}(x) = Ke^{-\frac{\mu}{x_R-x}}$	$K, \mu > 0, x < x_R$	$-$	$\frac{\mathbb{E}[B^2]\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)^2}{2\mu(1-\rho)}$
Benktander-I	$\overline{F}(x) = \left(1+2\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\log(x)\right)$ $\times e^{-(\beta\log(x)^2+(\alpha+1)\log(x))}$	$\alpha, \beta > 0, x > 1$	$\frac{1}{2\beta}$	$\frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2\beta}}\mathbb{E}[B^2]\sqrt{\beta\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)}}{(1-\rho)\exp\left[-\frac{\alpha+1}{\beta}+\sqrt{\frac{\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)}{\beta}}\right]}$
Benktander-II	$\overline{F}(x) = x^{-(1-\beta)}e^{-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}(x^{\beta}-1)}$	$\alpha > 0, 0 < \beta < 1, x > 1$	$-$	$\frac{\alpha^{1/\beta}\mathbb{E}[B^2]}{2\beta^{1/\beta-1}(1-\rho)\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)^{1/\beta-1}}$

Table 1: Asymptotic expressions for the mean sojourn time for several well-known distributions in MDA(Λ), characterized by either their tail distribution or their probability density function (p.d.f.). These expressions follow from Table 3.4.4 in Embrechts et al. [9] through Theorem 3.4, where it is assumed that relation (3.5) holds.

Theorem 3.6 indicates that a decreasing fraction of jobs experiences a sojourn time of at least duration $\mathbb{E}[T_{\rm FB}]$. Our final main result aims to specify both the size of this fraction, and the growth factor of the associated jobs' sojourn time.

The intuition from the proof of Theorem 3.1 suggests that $T_{\rm FB}$ scales as $(1-\rho)^{-2}$, but only for jobs of size at least $G^{\leftarrow}(\rho)$. This makes it conceivable that the scaled probability $\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\rm FB} > y)/\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$ may be of $\Theta(1)$ as $\rho \uparrow 1$. Theorem 3.7 confirms this hypothesis, and additionally shows that the residual sojourn time $T^*_{\rm FB}$ with density $\mathbb{P}(T_{\rm FB} > x)/\mathbb{E}[T_{\rm FB}]$ scales as $(1-\rho)^{-2}$.

Theorem 3.7. *Assume $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(H)$, where H is an extreme value distributions with finite $(2+\varepsilon)$-th moment for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $r(H)$ be as in relation (3.3). Then $(1-\rho)^2 T^*_{\rm FB}$ converges to a non-degenerate random variable with monotone density g^* as $\rho \uparrow 1$, and*

$$\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} \frac{\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\rm FB} > y)}{r(H)\mathbb{E}[B^*]\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} = g^*(y) \tag{3.7}$$

almost everywhere. Here,

$$g^*(t) = \int_0^1 r(H)^{-1} 8\nu g(t,\nu) \left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)} \mathrm{d}\nu, \tag{3.8}$$

$$g(t,\nu) = \frac{e^{-\frac{t}{4\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu^2}}}{4\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu^2} \left(\frac{\sqrt{t}}{\nu\sqrt{\pi\mathbb{E}[B^*]}} - \frac{t}{2\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu^2} e^{\frac{t}{4\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu^2}} \operatorname{Erfc}\left(\frac{1}{2\nu}\sqrt{\frac{t}{\mathbb{E}[B^*]}}\right)\right), \tag{3.9}$$

and $p(H) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}$ if $H = \Phi_\alpha, \alpha > 2$; $p(H) = 1$ if $H = \Lambda$ and $p(H) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}$ if $H = \Psi_\alpha, \alpha > 0$.

All theorems presented in this section are now proven in order. First, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 are proven in Section 4. Then, Theorem 3.4 is justified in Section 5. Finally, Sections 6 and 7 respectively validate Theorems 3.6 and 3.7.

4 Asymptotic behaviour of the mean sojourn time

In this section, we prove Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 in order. The intuition behind the theorems is that jobs of size x can only be completed once the server has finished processing of all jobs of size at most x. Additionally, jobs of size x experience a system with job sizes $B_i \wedge x$ since no job will receive more than x units of processing as long as there are size x jobs in the system. One thus expects all jobs of size x to stay in the system for the duration of a remaining busy period in the truncated system, which is expected to last for $\Theta(\mathbb{E}[(B\wedge x)^2]/(1-\rho_x)^2)$ time.

Now, if $\mathbb{E}[B^2] < \infty$ and x^ν_ρ is such that $(1-\rho)/(1-\rho_{x^\nu_\rho}) = \nu \in (1-\rho, 1)$, then one can see from (2.1) that

$$(1-\rho)^2 \mathbb{E}[T_{\rm FB}(x^\nu_\rho)] = \nu(1-\rho)x^\nu_\rho + \nu^2 \frac{\lambda m_2(x^\nu_\rho)}{2}. \tag{4.1}$$

It turns out that the asymptotic behaviour of $(1-\rho)^2\mathbb{E}[T_{\rm FB}]$ is now determined by the fraction of jobs for which ν takes values away from zero.

If instead $\mathbb{E}[B^2] = \infty$, then it will be shown that the growth rate of the second term in (2.1) is bounded by the growth rate of $x\overline{G}(x)$. It turns out that the sojourn time is of the same order as the time that a job receives service, which is of order $\Theta(x/(1-\rho_x))$.

Both theorems follow after integrating $\mathbb{E}[T_{\rm FB}(x)]$ over all possible values of x, as shown in (2.2). By integrating by parts, we find that the first integral in (2.2) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty \frac{x}{1-\rho_x}\,\mathrm{d}F(x) &= \int_0^\infty \frac{\overline{F}(x)}{1-\rho_x}\,\mathrm{d}x + \lambda\int_0^\infty \frac{x\overline{F}(x)^2}{(1-\rho_x)^2}\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda}\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} + \lambda\int_0^\infty \frac{x\overline{F}(x)^2}{(1-\rho_x)^2}\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the second integral can be rewritten as

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{\lambda m_2(x)}{2(1-\rho_x)^2}\,\mathrm{d}F(x) = \lambda\int_0^\infty \frac{x\overline{F}(x)^2}{(1-\rho_x)^2}\,\mathrm{d}x + \lambda^2\int_0^\infty \frac{m_2(x)\overline{F}(x)^2}{(1-\rho_x)^3}\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] &= \frac{1}{\lambda}\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} + 2\lambda\int_0^\infty \frac{x\overline{F}(x)^2}{(1-\rho_x)^2}\,\mathrm{d}x + \lambda^2\int_0^\infty \frac{m_2(x)\overline{F}(x)^2}{(1-\rho_x)^3}\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[B]}{\rho}\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} + 2\rho\int_0^\infty \frac{x\overline{F}(x)}{(1-\rho_x)^2}\,\mathrm{d}G(x) + \frac{\rho^2}{\mathbb{E}[B]}\int_0^\infty \frac{m_2(x)\overline{F}(x)}{(1-\rho_x)^3}\,\mathrm{d}G(x). \qquad (4.2)\end{aligned}$$

We will now derive Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 from this relation.

4.1 General Matuszewska indices

This section proves Theorem 3.1. Relation (4.2) will be analysed separately for the cases $-\infty < \beta(\overline{F}) \le \alpha(\overline{F}) < -2$ and $-2 < \beta(\overline{F}) \le \alpha(\overline{F}) < 1$, which will be referred to as the finite and the infinite variance case, respectively. The finite variance case also considers $-\infty < \beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1})$. Note that we always have $\beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1})) \le \alpha(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1})) \le 0$ since $\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1})$ is non-increasing. Prior to further analysis, however, we introduce several results that will facilitate the analysis.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $f_1(\cdot), f_2(\cdot)$ be positive functions.*

(i) If $\alpha(f_1), \alpha(f_2) < \infty$, then $\alpha(f_1\cdot f_2) \le \alpha(f_1)+\alpha(f_2)$ and, assuming that f_1 is non-decreasing, $\alpha(f_1\circ f_2) \le \alpha(f_1)\cdot\alpha(f_2)$.

(ii) If $\beta(f_1), \beta(f_2) > -\infty$, then $\beta(f_1\cdot f_2) \ge \beta(f_1)+\beta(f_2)$ and, assuming that f_1 is non-increasing, $\beta(f_1\circ f_2) \ge \beta(f_1)\cdot\beta(f_2)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let f be positive. If $\alpha(f) < 0$, then $\lim_{x\to\infty} f(x) = 0$.*

Lemma 4.3 (Bingham et al. [6], Theorem 2.6.1)**.** *Let f be positive and locally integrable on $[X,\infty)$. Let $g(x) := \int_X^x f(t)/t\,\mathrm{d}t$. If $\beta(f) > 0$, then $\liminf_{x\to\infty} f(x)/g(x) > 0$.*

Lemma 4.4 (Bingham et al. [6], Theorem 2.6.3)**.** *Let f be positive and measurable. Let $g(x) := \int_x^\infty f(t)/t\,\mathrm{d}t$.*

(i) If $\alpha(f) < 0$, then $g(x) < \infty$ for all large x.

(ii) If $\beta(f) > -\infty$, then $\limsup_{x\to\infty} f(x)/g(x) < \infty$.

Lemma 4.5. *If $x_R = \infty$, then $\alpha(\overline{G}) \le \alpha(\overline{F})+1$ and $\beta(\overline{G}) \ge \beta(\overline{F})+1$. Alternatively, if $x_R < \infty$, then $\alpha(\overline{G}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1})) \le \alpha(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1})) - 1$ and $\beta(\overline{G}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1})) \ge \beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1})) - 1$.*

Lemma 4.6. *If $x_R = \infty$ and $\beta(\overline{F}) > -\infty$, then $\beta(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1})) \ge -1/(\beta(\overline{F})+1)$ and $\alpha(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1})) \le -1/(\alpha(\overline{F})+1)$. Alternatively, if $x_R < \infty$ and $\beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1})) > -\infty$, then $\beta(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1})) \ge -1/(\beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))-1)$ and $\alpha(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1})) \le -1/(\alpha(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))-1)$.*

Corollary 4.7. *If $x_R = \infty$ and $\beta(\overline{F}) > -\infty$, then $\beta(\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))) \ge \frac{-\beta(\overline{F})}{\beta(\overline{F})+1}$ and $\alpha(\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))) \le \frac{-\alpha(\overline{F})}{\alpha(\overline{F})+1}$. Alternatively, if $x_R < \infty$ and $\beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1})) > -\infty$, then $\beta(\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))) \ge \frac{-\beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))}{\beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))-1}$ and $\alpha(\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))) \le \frac{-\alpha(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))}{\alpha(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))-1}$.*

Lemma 4.1 states some closure properties of Matuszewska indices. Lemma 4.2 gives a sufficient condition for f to vanish. Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 state helpful results on the asymptotic behaviour of the ratio between a function and certain integrals over this function, depending on its Matuszewska indices. Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 and Corollary 4.7 specify and append the earlier lemmas by giving bounds on the Matuszewska indices of $G^{\leftarrow}$ and the composition of $\overline{F}$ and $G^{\leftarrow}$. The proofs of Lemmas 4.1, 4.2, 4.5 and 4.6, along with several additional results, are postponed to Appendix A. Corollary 4.7 follows immediately from Lemmas 4.1 and 4.6.

4.1.1 Finite variance

In this section, we assume either $x_R = \infty$ and $-\infty < \beta(\overline{F}) \leq \alpha(\overline{F}) < -2$, or $x_R < \infty$ and $\beta(\overline{F}(x_R - (\cdot)^{-1})) > -\infty$. If $x_R = \infty$, then $\alpha((\cdot)^2\overline{F}(\cdot)) < 0$ and thus $\mathbb{E}[B^2] = 2\int_0^\infty t\overline{F}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t < \infty$ by Lemma 4.4(i); if $x_R < \infty$ then clearly $\mathbb{E}[B^2] < \infty$.

Noting that $G^{\leftarrow}$ is a continuous, strictly increasing function, it follows that the function $x_\rho^\nu := G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)$ is well-defined for all $\nu \in (1-\rho, 1)$. For this choice of x_ρ^ν, we have $\frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho_{x_\rho^\nu}} = \nu$ and $\frac{\mathrm{d}G(x_\rho^\nu)}{\mathrm{d}\nu} = \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1}{\nu^2}$, and therefore relation (4.2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
(1-\rho)^2\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[B](1-\rho)^2}{\rho}\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} + 2\rho\int_0^\infty \left(\frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho_x}\right)^2 x\overline{F}(x)\,\mathrm{d}G(x) \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho^2}{\mathbb{E}[B]}\int_0^\infty \left(\frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho_x}\right)^3 \frac{m_2(x)\overline{F}(x)}{1-\rho}\,\mathrm{d}G(x) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{E}[B](1-\rho)^2}{\rho}\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} \\
&\quad + 2(1-\rho)\int_{1-\rho}^1 G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)\mathrm{d}\nu \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho}{\mathbb{E}[B]}\int_{1-\rho}^1 \nu\, m_2\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)\mathrm{d}\nu.
\end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by $\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{(1-\rho)^2\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[B](1-\rho)^2}{\rho\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} \\
&\quad + \frac{2(1-\rho)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\int_{1-\rho}^1 G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)\mathrm{d}\nu \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho}{\mathbb{E}[B]}\int_{1-\rho}^1 \nu\, m_2\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)\frac{\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\mathrm{d}\nu \\
&= \mathrm{I}(\rho) + \mathrm{II}(\rho) + \mathrm{III}(\rho) \qquad (4.3)
\end{aligned}$$

We will show that $\mathrm{I}(\rho) + \mathrm{II}(\rho) = o(1)$ and $\mathrm{III}(\rho) = \Theta(1)$. Assume $x_R = \infty$. Then, by Lemma 4.1 and Corollary 4.7 we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(\mathrm{I}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}) &\leq \alpha((\cdot)^{-2}) + \alpha(1/\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))) + \alpha(\log(\cdot)) \\
&= -2 - \beta(\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))) + 0 \leq -2 + \frac{\beta(\overline{F})}{\beta(\overline{F})+1} < 0, \qquad (4.4)
\end{aligned}$$

and consequently $\mathrm{I}(\rho) = o(1)$ as $\rho \uparrow 1$ by Lemma 4.2.

Next, fix $0 \le \varepsilon < 2 - \frac{\beta(\overline{F})}{\beta(\overline{F})+1}$. Substitution of $w = \frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\frac{\nu}{1-\nu}$ in $\mathrm{II}(\rho)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{II}(\rho) &= \frac{2(1-\rho)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\int_1^\infty \frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}+w\right)^{-2} G^{\leftarrow}(1-w^{-1})\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-w^{-1}))\,\mathrm{d}w \\ &\le \frac{2(1-\rho)^{2-\varepsilon}}{\rho^{1-\varepsilon}\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\int_1^\infty w^{-\varepsilon} G^{\leftarrow}(1-w^{-1})\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-w^{-1}))\,\mathrm{d}w.\end{aligned}$$

Let $q(w)$ denote the integrand in the last line. A similar analysis to (4.4) indicates that the term in front of the integral vanishes as $\rho \uparrow 1$, so we only need to show that the integral is bounded. This is implied by Lemma 4.4(i) after noting that

$$\alpha(q) \le -\varepsilon + \alpha(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1})) + \alpha(\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))) \le -1-\varepsilon < 0,$$

where the inequalities follow from Lemmas 4.1 and 4.6 and Corollary 4.7.

Lastly, we wish to show that $\mathrm{III}(\rho) = \Theta(1)$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{III}(\rho) &\le \lambda\mathbb{E}[B^2]\int_{1-\rho}^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} \nu\,\frac{\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1-\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\,\mathrm{d}\nu + \lambda\mathbb{E}[B^2]\int_{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}^1 \frac{\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1-\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\,\mathrm{d}\nu \\ &\le 2\rho\mathbb{E}[B^*]\int_1^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \frac{\rho w}{1-\rho}\left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}+w\right)^{-3}\frac{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-w^{-1}))}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\,\mathrm{d}w + \mathbb{E}[B^*] \\ &\le \frac{2\mathbb{E}[B^*]}{\rho}\int_1^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \frac{w\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-w^{-1}))}{\frac{1}{(1-\rho)^2}\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\,\mathrm{d}w + \mathbb{E}[B^*] = \frac{2\mathbb{E}[B^*]}{\rho}\int_1^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \frac{f(w)/w}{f(1/(1-\rho))}\,\mathrm{d}w + \mathbb{E}[B^*],\end{aligned}$$

where $f(w) = w^2\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-w^{-1}))$. Lemma 4.1 and Corollary 4.7 then state that $\beta(f) \ge 2 - \frac{\beta(\overline{F})}{\beta(\overline{F})+1} > 0$, and therefore Lemma 4.3 implies

$$\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1}\int_1^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \frac{f(w)/w}{f(1/(1-\rho))}\,\mathrm{d}v = \left[\liminf_{y\to\infty}\frac{f(y)}{\int_1^y f(w)/w\,\mathrm{d}w}\right]^{-1} < \infty.$$

As such, $\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1}\mathrm{III}(\rho) < \infty$.

In order to show $\liminf_{\rho\uparrow 1}\mathrm{III}(\rho) > 0$, fix $c \in (0,1)$ and let $\delta_\rho := (1-\rho)/(c\rho+1-\rho)$. One may then readily verify that $\mathrm{III}(\rho) \ge \lambda m_2(G^{\leftarrow}(1-c))\int_{\delta_\rho}^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} \nu\,\mathrm{d}\nu \to \frac{m_2(G^{\leftarrow}(1-c))}{8\mathbb{E}[B]} > 0$.

The $x_R = \infty$ case is concluded once we prove $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho)) = 0$. To this end, write $h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$ as $x\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-x^{-1}))/\mathbb{E}[B]$, where $x = (1-\rho)^{-1}$. The claim then follows from Lemma 4.2 after noting that

$$\alpha(h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))) \le \alpha(\cdot) + \alpha(\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))) \le 1 - \frac{\alpha(\overline{F})}{\alpha(\overline{F})+1} = \frac{1}{\alpha(\overline{F})+1} < 0,$$

where the inequalities follow from Lemma 4.1 and Corollary 4.7.

The $x_R < \infty$ case can be proven similarly. In that case, one fixes $1 < \varepsilon < 2 - \frac{\beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))}{\beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))-1}$ and obtains $\alpha(\mathrm{I}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}) \le -2 + \frac{\beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))}{\beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))-1} < 0$, $\alpha(q) \le -\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))+1}{\alpha(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))-1} \le 1-\varepsilon < 0$ and $\beta(f) \ge 2 - \frac{\beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))}{\beta(\overline{F}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1}))-1} > 0$. The claim $h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho)) \to \infty$ follows from Lemma 2.5.

4.1.2 Infinite variance

Assume $\beta(\overline{F}) > -2$ and recall that $m_2(x) = 2\mathbb{E}[B]\int_0^x t\,\mathrm{d}G(t) = 2\mathbb{E}[B]\left(\int_0^x \overline{G}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t - x\overline{G}(x)\right)$. By Lemmas 4.1 and 4.5, one sees that $\beta((\cdot)\overline{G}(\cdot)) > 0$ and therefore it follows from Lemma 4.3 that

$$\limsup_{x\to\infty}\frac{m_2(x)}{2\mathbb{E}[B]x\overline{G}(x)} = \limsup_{x\to\infty}\frac{\int_0^x \overline{G}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t}{x\overline{G}(x)} - 1 < \infty. \tag{4.5}$$

Also, since $\beta((\cdot)\overline{F}(\cdot)) > -\infty$, Lemma 4.4(ii) indicates that

$$\limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{x\overline{F}(x)}{\overline{G}(x)} = \limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[B]x\overline{F}(x)}{\int_x^\infty \overline{F}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t} < \infty.$$

Consequently, it follows from relation (4.2) that, for some $C, D > 0$ and all ρ sufficiently close to one, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] &\le \frac{\mathbb{E}[B]}{\rho}\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} + 2\int_0^\infty \frac{x\overline{F}(x)}{(1-\rho G(x))^2}\,\mathrm{d}G(x) + \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[B]}\int_0^\infty \frac{m_2(x)}{x\overline{G}(x)}\frac{x\overline{F}(x)}{(1-\rho G(x))^2}\,\mathrm{d}G(x)\\ &\le \frac{\mathbb{E}[B]}{\rho}\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} + C\int_0^\infty \frac{x\overline{F}(x)}{\overline{G}(x)}\frac{1}{1-\rho G(x)}\,\mathrm{d}G(x) \le D\log\frac{1}{1-\rho},\end{aligned}$$

and therefore $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] = \Theta\left(\log\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)$.

4.2 Special cases

This section proves Theorem 3.2. The maximum domain of attraction of each of the extreme value distributions are considered in order, followed by a distribution with an atom in its right endpoint. The Fréchet and Weibull cases follow rapidly from Theorem 3.1 and the Dominated Convergence Theorem. The same approach works for the Gumbel case, although Theorem 3.1 is not directly applicable. Finally, the atom case follows readily by analysing the sojourn time of maximum-sized jobs.

4.2.1 Fréchet(α) and Weibull(α)

Theorem 3.3.7 in Embrechts et al. [9] states that $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Phi_\alpha)$ if and only if $\overline{F}(x) = L(x)x^{-\alpha}$ is regularly varying with index $-\alpha$. Karamata's theorem [6, Theorem 1.5.11] then states that $\mathbb{E}[B]\overline{G}(x) \sim x\overline{F}(x)/(\alpha-1)$ is regularly varying with index $-(\alpha-1)$. Consequently, Theorem 1.5.12 in Bingham et al. [6] states that $G^{\leftarrow}(1-1/x)$ is regularly varying with index $1/(\alpha-1)$ and therefore $\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-1/x))$ is regularly varying with index $-\alpha/(\alpha-1)$ [6, Proposition 1.5.7].

First assume $\alpha > 2$. We saw in Section 4.1.1 that the asymptotic behaviour of $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]$ is identical to the asymptotic behaviour of term $\mathrm{III}(\rho)$ (cf. relation (4.3)). Now, the Uniform Convergence Theorem [6, Theorem 1.5.2] states that $\frac{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-1/x))}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-1/y))} \to \left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)}$ uniformly for all $0 < c < x, y < \infty$. Therefore, we substitute $w = \frac{\nu-(1-\rho)}{\rho}$ and exploit the Dominated Convergence Theorem to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\mathrm{III}(\rho)\\ &\quad= \lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\frac{\rho^2}{\mathbb{E}[B]}\int_0^1 (\rho w + 1 - \rho)\, m_2\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{(1-\rho)(1-w)}{1-\rho+\rho w}\right)\right)\frac{\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1-\frac{(1-\rho)(1-w)}{1-\rho+\rho w}\right)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\,\mathrm{d}w\\ &\quad= \frac{\mathbb{E}[B^2]}{\mathbb{E}[B]}\int_0^1 w\left(\frac{1-w}{w}\right)^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)}\,\mathrm{d}w = \mathbb{E}[B^*]\frac{\pi/(\alpha-1)}{\sin(\pi/(\alpha-1))}\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, Theorem 3.3.12 in Embrechts et al. [9] states that $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Psi_\alpha), \alpha > 0$, if and only if $x_R < \infty$ and $\overline{F}(x_R - x^{-1}) = L(x)x^{-\alpha}$ is regularly varying with index $-\alpha$. The corresponding result then follows after noting that $\mathbb{E}[B]\overline{G}(x_R - x^{-1}) \sim L(x)x^{-\alpha-1}/(\alpha+1)$ is regularly varying with index $-(\alpha+1)$ and $\frac{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-1/x))}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-1/y))} \to \left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)}$ uniformly for all $0 < c < x, y < \infty$.

Finally, assume $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Phi_\alpha), \alpha \in (1,2)$. Then, Karamata's Theorem implies $m_2(x) = 2\int_0^x y\overline{F}(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \sim 2x^2\overline{F}(x)/(2-\alpha)$ as $x \to \infty$. We analyse relation 4.2 and again exploit the Dominated Convergence Theorem to find

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[B]}{\rho}\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} + 2\rho\int_0^\infty \frac{x\overline{F}(x)}{\overline{G}(x)}\frac{1-G(x)}{(1-\rho G(x))^2}\,\mathrm{d}G(x) \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho^2}{\mathbb{E}[B]}\int_0^\infty \frac{m_2(x)\overline{F}(x)}{\overline{G}(x)^2}\frac{(1-G(x))^2}{(1-\rho G(x))^3}\,\mathrm{d}G(x) \\
&\sim \mathbb{E}[B]\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} + 2(\alpha-1)\mathbb{E}[B]\int_0^1 \frac{1-y}{(1-\rho y)^2}\,\mathrm{d}y + \frac{2}{\mathbb{E}[B]}\frac{(\alpha-1)^2\mathbb{E}[B]^2}{2-\alpha}\int_0^1 \frac{(1-y)^2}{(1-\rho y)^3}\,\mathrm{d}y \\
&\sim \mathbb{E}[B]\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} + 2(\alpha-1)\mathbb{E}[B]\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} + \frac{2(\alpha-1)^2\mathbb{E}[B]}{2-\alpha}\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} = \frac{\alpha}{2+\alpha}\mathbb{E}[B]\log\frac{1}{1-\rho}
\end{aligned}$$

as $\rho \uparrow 1$.

4.2.2 Gumbel

If $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$, then so is G by Lemma 2.6 and we may choose h^* as the auxiliary function of G. Propositions 0.9(a), 0.10 and 0.12 in Resnick [21] together state that

$$a_G(x) := \frac{1}{h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(1-1/x))} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[B]}{x\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-1/x))}$$

is 0-varying[1], implying that $\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-1/x))$ is (-1)-varying.

Following the analysis in Section 4.1.1, we obtain $\alpha(\mathrm{I}) = -1 < 0$ as before. Consider term $\mathrm{II}(\rho)$. By Markov's inequality, we have $\overline{G}(x) \le \mathbb{E}[B^*]/x$. Substituting $x = G^{\leftarrow}(1-w^{-1})$ then yields $G^{\leftarrow}(1-w^{-1}) \le \mathbb{E}[B^*]w$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{II}(\rho) &= \frac{2(1-\rho)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\int_1^\infty \frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}+w\right)^{-2} G^{\leftarrow}(1-w^{-1})\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-w^{-1}))\,\mathrm{d}w \\
&\le \frac{2\mathbb{E}[B^*](1-\rho)^{3/2}}{\rho^{1/2}\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\int_1^\infty w^{1/2}\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-w^{-1}))\,\mathrm{d}w.
\end{aligned}$$

The term in front of the integral and the integrand both have upper Matuszewska index $-1/2$, and therefore $\mathrm{II}(\rho) \to 0$.

Lastly, consider term $\mathrm{III}(\rho)$. The relation $\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1}\mathrm{III}(\rho) < \infty$ follows analogously to the analysis in Section 4.1.1. Then, along the lines of Section 4.2.1, one may apply the Uniform Convergence Theorem and the Dominated Convergence Theorem to derive the theorem statement.

4.2.3 Atom in right endpoint

First, we show that $\mathrm{I}(\rho)+\mathrm{II}(\rho) = o(1)$. Lemma 2.5 states that $\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} h^*(x) = \infty$, and therefore $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\mathrm{I}(\rho) = \lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\frac{(1-\rho)\log\frac{1}{1-\rho}}{\rho h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} = 0$. Also, $G^{\leftarrow}$ is bounded from above by x_R and consequently $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\mathrm{II}(\rho) \le \lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\frac{2(1-\rho)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\cdot x_R = \lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\frac{2x_R}{\mathbb{E}[B]h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} = 0$.

It remains to show that $\mathrm{III}(\rho) \to \mathbb{E}[B^*]$ and $\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho)) \to p$ as $\rho \uparrow 1$. The following lemma facilitates the analysis of this term. The proof the lemma is postponed until the end of this section.

[1]The propositions regard Π- and Γ-varying functions; we consider these classes in Section 5.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $f : D \to \mathbb{R}$ be any function that maps $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ onto $\mathbb{R}$, and assume that $\lim_{y\uparrow x} f(y) = p$ for some x in the closure $\overline{D}$ of D. Then, there exist $z > 0$ and $q > 0$ such that*

$$f(x-y) \le p + qy \tag{4.6}$$

for all $y \in (0, z]$ that satisfy $x - y \in D$.

Let $q > 0$ and $\delta^* > 0$ be such that $\overline{F}(x_R - \delta) \le p + q\delta$ for all $\delta \in (0, \delta^*]$. It follows that $\mathbb{E}[B]\overline{G}(x) = \int_x^{x_R} \overline{F}(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \sim p(x_R - x)$ as $x \uparrow x_R$, and hence $x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(u) \sim \mathbb{E}[B](1-u)/p$ as $u \uparrow 1$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $u^* \in (0,1)$ be such that $x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(u) \le (1+\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}[B](1-u)/p$ for all $u \in (u^*, 1)$. Now, for all $u > \rho_0 := \max\{u^*, 1 - p\delta^*/((1+\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}[B])\}$ we have

$$p \le \overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(u)) \le p + \frac{q}{p}(1+\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}[B](1-u) =: p + p\widetilde{q}(1-u) \tag{4.7}$$

and hence, for $\widetilde{q} = q(1+\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}[B]/p^2$, the relations

$$\frac{1}{1+\widetilde{q}(1-\rho)} \le \frac{\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} \le 1 + \widetilde{q}\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu} \le 1 + \widetilde{q}\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1}{\nu}$$

hold for all $\nu > \frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho\cdot\rho_0}, \rho > \rho_0$.

Consider term $\mathrm{III}(\rho)$. On the one hand, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1} \mathrm{III}(\rho) &\le \limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1} \frac{\mathbb{E}[B^2]}{\mathbb{E}[B]} \int_{1-\rho}^{1} \nu \frac{\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\,\mathrm{d}\nu \\
&\le \limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1} \frac{\mathbb{E}[B^2]}{\mathbb{E}[B]} \int_{1-\rho}^{\frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho\cdot\rho_0}} \frac{1}{p}\,\mathrm{d}\nu + \frac{\mathbb{E}[B^2]}{\mathbb{E}[B]} \int_{\frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho\cdot\rho_0}}^{1} \left\{\nu + \widetilde{q}\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\right\}\mathrm{d}\nu \\
&\le \limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1} \frac{\mathbb{E}[B^2]}{p\mathbb{E}[B]}\frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho\cdot\rho_0} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[B^2]}{2\mathbb{E}[B]} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[B^2]}{\mathbb{E}[B]}\widetilde{q}\frac{1-\rho}{\rho} = \mathbb{E}[B^*].
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{\rho\uparrow 1} \mathrm{III}(\rho) &\ge \liminf_{\rho\uparrow 1} \frac{\rho m_2(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho_0))}{\mathbb{E}[B]} \int_{\frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho\cdot\rho_0}}^{1} \frac{\nu}{1+\widetilde{q}(1-\rho)}\,\mathrm{d}\nu \\
&= \liminf_{\rho\uparrow 1} \frac{\rho m_2(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho_0))}{2\mathbb{E}[B]}\frac{1}{1+\widetilde{q}(1-\rho)}\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho\cdot\rho_0}\right)^2\right) = \frac{m_2(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho_0))}{\mathbb{E}[B^2]}\cdot\mathbb{E}[B^*].
\end{aligned}$$

Since ρ_0 may be chosen arbitrarily close to unity, we find $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] \sim \frac{\mathbb{E}[B^*]\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}{(1-\rho)^2} \sim \frac{p\mathbb{E}[B^*]}{(1-\rho)^2}$ as $\rho \uparrow 1$. Here, the last equivalence follows from (4.7). The section is concluded with the proof of Lemma 4.8.

Proof of Lemma 4.8. Without loss of generality, we assume that $(x-1, x) \subset D$. For sake of finding a contradiction, assume that the above statement is not true, i.e. for all $z > 0$ and all $q > 0$ there exists $\xi \in (0, z]$ such that

$$f(x-\xi) > p + q\xi. \tag{4.8}$$

Define $z_1 := 1, q_1 := 1$ and let $\xi_1 \in (0, 1]$ be such that (4.8) holds with $q = q_1$ and $\xi = \xi_1$. By definition of the left limit, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\eta^* > 0$ such that $f(x-\eta) \le p + \varepsilon$ for all $\eta \in (0, \eta^*]$. In particular, by choosing $\varepsilon = q_1\xi_1$ we obtain $\eta^* =: \eta_2^* < \xi_1 \le z_1$ such that $f(x-\eta) \le p + q_1\xi_1$ for all $\eta \in (0, \eta_2^*]$.

Define $z_2 := \min\{\eta_2^*, 1/2\}$ and set $q_2 := 1/z_2$. Again, there exists $\xi_2 \in (0, z_2]$ such that (4.8) holds for $q = q_2$ and $\xi = \xi_2$. By repeating the above procedure we obtain three sequences $(q_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, (z_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\xi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $q_n = 1/z_n$, $0 < z_{n+1} < \xi_n < z_n \leq 1/n$ and

$$f(x - \xi_n) > p + q_n\xi_n \tag{4.9}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. From these properties, one may additionally deduce that $\xi_n > 1/q_{n+1}, \xi_n \downarrow 0$ and $q_n \to \infty$.

We will obtain a contradiction by showing that $(q_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ also converges as $n \to \infty$. Assume that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} q_n\xi_n > 0$. Then, relation (4.9) implies $\limsup_{n\to\infty} f(x - \xi_n) \geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} p + q_n\xi_n > p$ which contradicts the lemma assumptions. Therefore, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} q_n\xi_n$ must equal zero. It then follows that $0 \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} q_n/q_{n+1} \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} q_n\xi_n = 0$ and as such the ratio test states that the sequence $(q_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges. □

Note that Lemma 4.8 can be applied generally to yield lower and upper bounds for $f(y)$ around any point $x \in \overline{D}$ for which either $\lim_{y\uparrow x} f(y)$ or $\lim_{y\downarrow x} f(y)$ exists.

5 Asymptotic behaviour of $h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$ if $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$

This section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 3.4. Theorem 2.4 states that c_n may be chosen as $1/h^*(F^{\leftarrow}(1-n^{-1}))$, so that the theorem follows from Theorem 3.2 after analysing the limit $\lim_{n\to\infty} h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(1-n^{-1}))/h^*(F^{\leftarrow}(1-n^{-1})) = \lim_{y\uparrow 1}(1-y)^{-2}\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(y))\overline{G}(F^{\leftarrow}(y))$. The proof heavily relies upon the work by De Haan [12] and Resnick [21], who both consider Γ- and Π-varying functions:

Definition 5.1. *A function $U : (x_L, x_R) \to \mathbb{R}, \lim_{x\uparrow x_R} U(x) = \infty$ is in the class of Γ-varying functions if it is non-decreasing, and there exists a function $f : (x_L, x_R) \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfying*

$$\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{U(x + tf(x))}{U(x)} = e^t \tag{5.1}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The function $f(\cdot)$ is called an auxiliary function and is unique up to asymptotic equivalence.

Definition 5.2. *A function $V : (x_L, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is in the class of Π-varying functions if it is non-decreasing, and there exist functions $a(x) > 0, b(x) \in \mathbb{R}$, such that*

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{V(tx) - b(x)}{a(x)} = \log t \tag{5.2}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The function $a(\cdot)$ is called an auxiliary function and is unique up to asymptotic equivalence.

It turns out that Γ- and Π-varying functions are closely related to MDA(Λ). In particular, if $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda)$ with auxiliary function $1/h^*$, then Proposition 1.9 in Resnick [21] states that $U_F := 1/\overline{F} \in \Gamma$ with auxiliary function $f_F := 1/h^*$. Proposition 0.9(a) then states that $V_F(\cdot) := U_F^{\leftarrow}(\cdot) = \left(\frac{1}{\overline{F}}\right)^{\leftarrow}(\cdot) = F^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - (\cdot)^{-1}\right) \in \Pi$ with auxiliary function $a_F(\cdot) := f_F(U_F^{\leftarrow}(\cdot)) = 1/h^*(F^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))$. Similarly, using Lemma 2.6, we find that $U_G := 1/\overline{G} \in \Gamma$ and $V_G(\cdot) := U_G^{\leftarrow}(\cdot) = G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - (\cdot)^{-1}\right) \in \Pi$ with auxiliary function $a_G(\cdot) := 1/h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(1 - (\cdot)^{-1}))$.

Now, since Theorem 2.4 states that the norming constants c_n may be chosen as $1/h^*(F^{\leftarrow}(1-1/n))$, we are done once we show that $\lim_{n\to\infty} c_n h^*(G^{\leftarrow}(1-1/n)) = \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{a_F(x)}{a_G(x)}$ tends to the right quantity for all cases in the theorem.

Corollary 3.4 in De Haan [12] states that[2] $\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{a_F(x)}{a_G(x)} = \xi^{-1} \in [0, \infty]$ if and only if there exist a positive function $b(x)$ with $\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} b(x) = \xi$ and constants $b_2 > 0$ and $b_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that[3]

[2]Here, we denote $0^{-1} = +\infty$.

[3]Their paper only considers the $x_R = \infty$ case; however, the proof also holds for finite x_R.

$P(x) = b_3 + \int_0^x b(t)\,\mathrm{d}t$ and ${V_F}^{\leftarrow}(x) \sim b_2 {V_G}^{\leftarrow}(P(x))$ as $x \uparrow x_R$. As ${V_\bullet}^{\leftarrow}(x) = ({U_\bullet}^{\leftarrow})^{\leftarrow}(x) \sim U_\bullet(x)$ [21, p.44], this is equivalent to finding a function $P(x)$, of the given form, that satisfies

$$\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{\overline{G}(P(x))}{b_2\overline{F}(x)} = \lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{U_F(x)}{b_2 U_G(P(x))} = \lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{V_F^{\leftarrow}(x)}{b_2 V_G^{\leftarrow}(P(x))} = 1. \tag{5.3}$$

We use the following lemma, proven at the end of this section, to construct a suitable $P(x)$:

Lemma 5.3. *Let F be a c.d.f. Then, there exists a strictly increasing, continuous c.d.f. $F_\uparrow(x)$ satisfying both $\overline{F}_\uparrow(x) \sim \overline{F}(x)$ and $\overline{G}(F_\uparrow(x)) \sim \overline{G}(F(x))$ as $x \uparrow x_R$.*

As $G^{\leftarrow}(F_\uparrow(x))$ is strictly increasing, there exists a positive function $b(\cdot)$ such that $\int_0^x b(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = G^{\leftarrow}(F_\uparrow(x))$. Therefore, we see that (5.3) is satisfied with $b_2 = 1$ and $b_3 = 0$. The result follows once we show that

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} b(x) = \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(x)}{x} = \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))}{x} = \xi \tag{5.4}$$

if $x_R = \infty$, and once we show that

$$\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} b(x) = \lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{P(x_R) - P(x)}{x_R - x} = \lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))}{x_R - x} = \xi. \tag{5.5}$$

if $x_R < \infty$.

The right-hand sides of both (5.4) and (5.5) depend on the function $G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))$. The advantage of this representation is apparent from the following key relation, which connects $G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))$ to $h^*(x)$:

$$\mathbb{E}[B]h^*(x) = \exp\left[\int_{G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))}^{x} h^*(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right]. \tag{5.6}$$

Relation (5.6) follows readily from $h^*(x) = -\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}\log\overline{G}(x)$. In the upcoming analysis, we first focus on (5.4) and then consider (5.5).

5.1 Infinite support

First assume $x_R = \infty$. The following theorem relates the assumptions on $\overline{F}(x)$ to properties of $h^*(x)$:

Theorem 5.4 (Beirlant et al. [5], Theorem 2.1)**.**

(i) If there exists $\alpha > 0$ and a slowly varying function $l(x)$ such that $-\log\overline{F}(x) \sim l(x)x^\alpha$ as $x \to \infty$, then $h^*(x) \sim \alpha l(x)x^{\alpha-1}$ as $x \to \infty$ if and only if

$$\lim_{\lambda\downarrow 1} \liminf_{x\to\infty} \inf_{t\in[1,\lambda]} \{\log h^*(tx) - \log h^*(x)\} \geq 0. \tag{5.7}$$

(ii) If there exists a function $l(x) : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}, \liminf_{x\to\infty} l(x) > 1$ such that for all $\lambda > 0$

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{-\log\overline{F}(\lambda x) + \log\overline{F}(x)}{l(x)} = \log(\lambda), \tag{5.8}$$

then $l(x)$ is slowly varying and $h^*(x) \sim (l(x) - 1)/x$ as $x \to \infty$.

The cases in Theorem 3.4 correspond to the cases in Theorem 5.4. We will consider the implications of Theorem 5.4 as to derive the results presented in Theorem 3.4.

(i) Assume $h^*(x) \sim \alpha l(x) x^{\alpha-1}, \alpha > 0$, and note that

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{-\log(\mathbb{E}[B]h^*(x))}{xh^*(x)} = \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{-\log(\mathbb{E}[B]\alpha l(x)) - (\alpha-1)\log(x)}{\alpha l(x) x^\alpha} = 0.$$

We will prove the relation $\lim_{x\to\infty} G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))/x = 1$ by contradiction. Specifically, if $\limsup_{x\to\infty} G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))/x > 1$ then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, x_n \to \infty$, such that $G^{\leftarrow}(F(x_n))/x_n \geq 1+\varepsilon$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The Uniform Convergence Theorem [6, Theorems 1.2.1 and 1.5.2] then implies

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{-\log(\mathbb{E}[B]h^*(x_n))}{x_n h^*(x_n)} &= \int_{x_n}^{G^{\leftarrow}(F(x_n))} \frac{h^*(t)}{x_n h^*(x_n)}\,\mathrm{d}t = \int_1^{G^{\leftarrow}(F(x_n))/x_n} \frac{h^*(\tau x_n)}{h^*(x_n)}\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\geq \int_1^{1+\varepsilon} \frac{h^*(\tau x_n)}{h^*(x_n)}\,\mathrm{d}\tau \sim \int_1^{1+\varepsilon} \tau^{\alpha-1}\,\mathrm{d}\tau = \alpha^{-1}((1+\varepsilon)^\alpha - 1)\end{aligned}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. However, this contradicts with $\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{\log(\mathbb{E}[B]h^*(x))}{xh^*(x)} = 0$ and it follows that $\liminf_{x\to\infty} G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))/x \leq 1$. Similarly, one may show that $\liminf_{x\to\infty} G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))/x \geq 1$ and therefore $\lim_{x\to\infty} G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))/x = 1$ as claimed.

(ii) Alternatively, assume $h^*(x) \sim (l(x)-1)/x$ and denote $L = \lim_{x\to\infty} \log(x)/l(x) \in [0,\infty]$. Then Lemma 2.5 states that $l(x) \to \infty$ and as such

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{-\log(\mathbb{E}[B]h^*(x))}{xh^*(x)} = \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{-\log(\mathbb{E}[B]) - \log(l(x)-1) + \log(x)}{l(x)-1} = L. \tag{5.9}$$

Now, if $L = 0$ then the analysis in (i) yields $\lim_{x\to\infty} G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))/x = 1 = e^0$. If $L \in (0,\infty)$ then (5.6) and (5.9) imply

$$\begin{aligned}L &= \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{-\log(\mathbb{E}[B]h^*(x))}{xh^*(x)} = \lim_{x\to\infty} \int_x^{G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))} \frac{h^*(t)}{xh^*(x)}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &= \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{1}{\log(x)} \int_x^{G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))} \frac{l(t)-1}{\log t} \cdot \frac{\log(x)}{l(x)-1} \cdot \frac{\log(t)}{t}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &= \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{1}{\log(x)} \int_x^{G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))} \frac{\log(t)}{t}\,\mathrm{d}t = \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{\log^2(G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))) - \log^2(x)}{2\log(x)}.\end{aligned}$$

Writing $G^{\leftarrow}(F(x)) = u(x)x, u(x)x \to \infty$, now yields

$$L = \lim_{x\to\infty} \log(u(x)) \left(1 + \frac{\log(u(x))}{2\log(x)}\right),$$

from which we conclude $u(x) \to e^L$ and consequently $\lim_{x\to\infty} G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))/x = e^L$.

Finally, if $L = \infty$ then $h^*(x) \downarrow 0$ and therefore $G^{\leftarrow}(F(x)) \geq x$ by (5.6). For sake of contradiction, assume $\liminf_{x\to\infty} G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))/x < \infty$. Then there exists $M_0 \geq 1$ such that for all $M \geq M_0$ there exists a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, x_n \to \infty$, such that $G^{\leftarrow}(F(x_n))/x_n \leq M$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A similar analysis as in (i) then shows that this contradicts relation (5.9), and therefore $\lim_{x\to\infty} G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))/x = \infty$.

5.2 Finite support

Now assume $x_R < \infty$. Theorem 2.4 states that $\overline{F}(x)$ can be represented as

$$\overline{F}(x) = c(x) \exp\left\{-\int_z^x g(t)h^*(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right\}, \quad z < x < x_R,$$

where c and g are measurable functions satisfying $c(x) \to c > 0, g(t) \to 1$ as $x \uparrow x_R$, and the auxiliary function $f_F(\cdot) = 1/h^*(\cdot)$ is positive, absolutely continuous and has density $f_F'(x)$ satisfying $\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} f_F'(x) = 0$. It is easily verified that the function $\overline{F}_\infty(x) := \overline{F}(x_R - x^{-1}), x \geq (x_R - z)^{-1}$, is also in MDA($\Lambda$) with auxiliary function $f_\infty(x) := x^2/h^*(x_R - x^{-1})$. From this representation it is easy to obtain a finite-support equivalent of Theorem 5.4:

Corollary 5.5. *Assume $x_R < \infty$.*

(i) If there exists $\alpha > 0$ and a slowly varying function $l(x)$ such that $-\log \overline{F}(x_R - x^{-1}) \sim l(x)x^\alpha$ as $x \to \infty$, then $h^*(x_R - x^{-1}) \sim \alpha l(x) x^{\alpha+1}$ as $x \to \infty$ if and only if

$$\lim_{\lambda\downarrow 1} \liminf_{x\to\infty} \inf_{t\in[1,\lambda]} \{\log h^*(x_R - (tx)^{-1}) - \log h^*(x_R - x^{-1}) - 2\log(t)\} \geq 0. \tag{5.10}$$

(ii) If there exists a function $l(x) : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}, \liminf_{x\to\infty} l(x) > 1$ such that for all $\lambda > 0$

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{-\log \overline{F}(x_R - (\lambda x)^{-1}) + \log \overline{F}(x_R - x^{-1})}{l(x)} = \log(\lambda), \tag{5.11}$$

then $l(x)$ is slowly varying and $h^*(x_R - x^{-1}) \sim (l(x) - 1)x$ as $x \to \infty$.

Again, the cases in Theorem 3.4 correspond to the cases in Corollary 5.5. The proof for the finite support case is similar to the infinite support case, yet we state it for completeness. Note that $h^*(x) \to \infty$ as $x \uparrow x_R$ in both cases, and therefore $\frac{x_R - G^\leftarrow(F(x))}{x_R - x} \geq 1$ for all x sufficiently close to x_R by (5.6).

(i) Assume $h^*(x_R - x^{-1}) \sim \alpha l(x) x^{\alpha+1}, \alpha > 0$, and note that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{-\log(\mathbb{E}[B]h^*(x))}{(x_R - x)h^*(x)} &= \lim_{y\to\infty} \frac{-\log(\mathbb{E}[B]h^*(x_R - y^{-1}))}{h^*(x_R - y^{-1})/y} \\ &= \lim_{y\to\infty} \frac{-\log(\mathbb{E}[B]\alpha l(y)) - (\alpha+1)\log(y)}{\alpha l(y) y^\alpha} = 0.\end{aligned}$$

We will show that $\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{x_R - G^\leftarrow(F(x))}{x_R - x} = 1$ by contradiction. By our previous remark, we only need show $\limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{x_R - G^\leftarrow(F(x))}{x_R - x} \leq 1$. If this is false, then there exists $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, x_n \uparrow x_R$, such that $\frac{x_R - x_n}{x_R - G^\leftarrow(F(x_n))} \leq 1 - \varepsilon$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As before, the Uniform Convergence Theorem [6, Theorems 1.2.1 and 1.5.2] then implies

$$\begin{aligned}-\frac{\log(\mathbb{E}[B]h^*(x_n))}{(x_R - x_n)h^*(x_n)} &= \int_{x_n}^{G^\leftarrow(F(x_n))} \frac{h^*(t)}{(x_R - x_n)h^*(x_n)}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &= \int_{\frac{x_R - x_n}{x_R - G^\leftarrow(F(x_n))}}^{1} \frac{h^*(x_R - (x_R - x_n)\tau^{-1})}{\tau^2 h^*(x_R - (x_R - x_n))}\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\geq \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} \frac{h^*(x_R - (x_R - x_n)\tau^{-1})}{\tau^2 h^*(x_R - (x_R - x_n))}\,\mathrm{d}\tau \sim \int_{1-\varepsilon}^{1} \tau^{\alpha-1}\,\mathrm{d}\tau = \alpha^{-1}(1 - (1-\varepsilon)^\alpha)\end{aligned}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which contradicts with $\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{\log(\mathbb{E}[B]h^*(x))}{(x_R - x)h^*(x)} = 0$.

(ii) Now, assume $h^*(x_R - x^{-1}) \sim (l(x) - 1)x$ and let $L = \lim_{x\to\infty} \log(x)/l(x) \in [0,\infty]$. Lemma 2.5 implies $l(x) \to \infty$, so that

$$\lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{-\log(\mathbb{E}[B]h^*(x))}{(x_R - x)h^*(x)} = \lim_{y\to\infty} \frac{-\log(\mathbb{E}[B](l(y) - 1)) - \log(y)}{l(y) - 1} = -L. \tag{5.12}$$

If $L = 0$, then $\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))}{x_R - x} = 1 = e^0$ by the analysis in (i). Alternatively, if $L \in (0,\infty)$ then (5.6) and (5.12) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
L &= \lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{\log(\mathbb{E}[B]h^*(x))}{(x_R - x)h^*(x)} = \lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \int_{G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))}^{x} \frac{h^*(t)}{(x_R - x)h^*(x)}\,\mathrm{d}t \\
&= \lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \int_{\frac{1}{x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))}}^{\frac{1}{x_R - x}} \frac{h^*(x_R - \tau^{-1})}{(x_R - x)\tau^2 h^*(x_R - (x_R - x))}\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\
&= \lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{1}{\log((x_R - x)^{-1})} \int_{\frac{1}{x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))}}^{\frac{1}{x_R - x}} \frac{l(\tau) - 1}{\log(\tau)} \cdot \frac{\log((x_R - x)^{-1})}{l((x_R - x)^{-1}) - 1} \cdot \frac{\log(\tau)}{\tau}\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\
&= \lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{1}{\log(x_R - x)} \int_{\frac{1}{x_R - x}}^{\frac{1}{x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))}} \frac{\log(\tau)}{\tau}\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\
&= \lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{\log^2(x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))) - \log^2(x_R - x)}{2\log(x_R - x)}
\end{aligned}$$

Write $G^{\leftarrow}(F(x)) = x_R - (x_R - x)u(x)$ where $(x_R - x)u(x) \to 0$ for all x sufficiently close to x_R. One then obtains

$$L = \lim_{x\uparrow x_R} \log(u(x)) \left(1 + \frac{\log(u(x))}{2\log(x_R - x)}\right),$$

implying $u(x) \to e^L$ and subsequently $\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))}{x_R - x} = e^L$.

Lastly, consider $L = \infty$ and assume $\limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))}{x_R - x} < \infty$ for sake of contradiction. Then there exists $M_0 \geq 1$ such that for all $M \geq M_0$ there exists a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, x_n \uparrow x_R$, such that $\frac{x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(F(x_n))}{x_R - x_n} \leq M$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A similar analysis as in (i) then shows that this contradicts relation (5.12), and therefore $\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))}{x_R - x} = \infty$.

5.3 Proof of Lemma 5.3

For any positive, non-increasing $\phi : [0,1) \to (0,1)$ that vanishes as the argument tends to unity, we may define

$$F_\phi(x) := \begin{cases} F(x) & \text{if } x < s_1, \text{ and} \\ F(x) + \frac{x - s_n}{s_{n+1} - s_n}(F(s_{n+1}) - F(x)) & \text{if } s_n \leq x < s_{n+1}, n \geq 1 \end{cases} \tag{5.13}$$

where $s_1 := 0$ and $s_{n+1} := \inf\left\{x \geq 0 : F(x) \geq \frac{F(s_n) + \phi(F(s_n))}{1 + \phi(F(s_n))}\right\}$ forms a strictly increasing sequence. Now, if $s_n \uparrow s^* < x_R$ then $F(s_n) \uparrow p$ for some $p \in (0,1)$ and therefore, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and all n sufficiently large, we have $(1-\varepsilon)p \leq F(s_n) \leq p$. Consequently, s_{n+1} must satisfy $p \geq F(s_{n+1}) \geq \frac{(1-\varepsilon)p + \phi(p)}{1 + \phi(p)}$, which yields a contradiction if $\varepsilon < \phi(p)\frac{1-p}{p}$. We conclude that F_ϕ is a strictly increasing, continuous c.d.f. that satisfies $\overline{F}_\phi(x) \leq \overline{F}(x)$ for all x.

Define $n(x) := \sup\{n \in \mathbb{N} : s_{n-1} \leq x\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\overline{F}_\phi(x)}{\overline{F}(x)} &= 1 - \frac{x - s_{n(x)}}{s_{n(x)+1} - s_{n(x)}} \frac{F(s_{n(x)+1}) - F(x)}{\overline{F}(x)} \geq 1 - \frac{F(s_{n(x)+1}) - F(s_{n(x)})}{1 - F(s_{n(x)+1})} \\
&\geq 1 - \frac{\frac{F(s_{n(x)}) + \phi(F(s_{n(x)}))}{1 + \phi(F(s_{n(x)}))} - F(s_{n(x)})}{1 - \frac{F(s_{n(x)}) + \phi(F(s_{n(x)}))}{1 + \phi(F(s_{n(x)}))}} = 1 - \phi(F(s_{n(x)})) \to 1
\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

as $x \uparrow x_R$, so that $\overline{F}_\uparrow(x) \sim \overline{F}(x)$ by our earlier remark.

Let $(s_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\widetilde{s}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the sequences associated with F_ϕ and $F_{\widetilde{\phi}}$ and assume $\widetilde{\phi}(y) \le \phi(y)$ for all $y \in [0,1)$. We prove $\widetilde{s}_n \le s_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by induction. The inequality $\widetilde{s}_1 \le s_1$ is immediate from the definition. Now, assume that $\widetilde{s}_n \le s_n$ and observe that $(F(s)+q)/(1+q)$ is non-decreasing in s for every $q \ge 0$, and in q for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, any x that satisfies $F(x) \ge (F(s_n)+\phi(F(s_n)))/(1+\phi(F(s_n)))$ evidently satisfies $F(x) \ge (F(\widetilde{s}_n)+\widetilde{\phi}(F(\widetilde{s}_n)))/(1+\widetilde{\phi}(F(\widetilde{s}_n)))$ and hence $\widetilde{s}_{n+1} \le s_{n+1}$.

As $F_\phi(x) \ge F(x)$ implies $G^{\leftarrow}(F_\phi(x)) \ge G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))$, the proof is complete once we show that there is a version of ϕ such that $\limsup_{x\uparrow x_R} \frac{G^{\leftarrow}(F(x))}{G^{\leftarrow}(F_\phi(x))} \ge 1$. To this end, we construct a suitable ϕ inductively.

Fix $\phi_1 := 1/2$. Then, for $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, let $r_{n+1} := \inf\left\{x \ge 0 : F(x) \ge \frac{F(s_n)+\phi_n}{1+\phi_n}\right\}$, denote $\phi_{n+1} := \min\{\phi_n, 2^{-2}\mathbb{E}[B]^{-2}\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(r_{n+1}))^2\}$ and define $\phi(y) := \phi_{n+1}$ for $y \in [F(s_n), F(s_{n+1}))$.

Since $\phi(F(s_n)) \le \phi_n$, it must be that $s_n \le r_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As a consequence, $\phi(F(s_n)) \le 2^{-2}\mathbb{E}[B]^{-2}\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(s_{n+1}))^2$. Writing $\eta(x) := \phi(F(s_{n(x)}))$ for notational convenience, one may now use (5.14) to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
G^{\leftarrow}(F(x)) &= \inf\{z \in \mathbb{R} : G(z) \ge F(x)\} = \inf\{z \in \mathbb{R} : \overline{G}(z) \le \overline{F}(x)\} \\
&\ge \inf\left\{z \in \mathbb{R} : \overline{G}(z) \le \frac{\overline{F}_\phi(x)}{1-\eta(x)}\right\} \\
&= \inf\left\{z - \sqrt{\eta(x)} \in \mathbb{R} : \overline{G}(z) + \mathbb{E}[B]^{-1}\int_{z-\sqrt{\eta(x)}}^{z} \overline{F}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \le \overline{F}_\phi(x) + \frac{\eta(x)}{1-\eta(x)}\overline{F}_\phi(x)\right\} \\
&\ge \inf\left\{z \in \mathbb{R} : \overline{G}(z) + \mathbb{E}[B]^{-1}\sqrt{\eta(x)}\overline{F}(z) \le \overline{F}_\phi(x) + \frac{\eta(x)}{1-\eta(x)}\right\} - \sqrt{\eta(x)} \\
&\ge G^{\leftarrow}(F_\phi(x)) - \sqrt{\eta(x)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the relation

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\eta(x)}{1-\eta(x)} - \mathbb{E}[B]^{-1}\sqrt{\eta(x)}\overline{F}(z) &\le \frac{\phi(F(s_{n(x)}))}{1-\phi(F(s_{n(x)}))} - \mathbb{E}[B]^{-1}\sqrt{\phi(F(s_{n(x)}))}\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(F(s_{n(x)+1}))) \\
&\le \sqrt{\phi(F(s_{n(x)}))}\left[2\sqrt{\phi(F(s_{n(x)}))} - \mathbb{E}[B]^{-1}\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(F(s_{n(x)+1})))\right] \le 0
\end{aligned}$$

for all $z \le G^{\leftarrow}(F_\phi(x)) \le G^{\leftarrow}(F(s_{n(x)+1}))$. We conclude that $\overline{G}(F_\uparrow(x)) \sim \overline{G}(F(x))$ as $x \uparrow x_R$.

6 Scaled sojourn time tends to zero in probability

The current section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 3.6. The intuition behind the proof is that the sojourn time of all jobs of size at most $\widetilde{x}_\rho$ grows slower than $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]$, where $\widetilde{x}_\rho$ is a function that depends on F. Alternatively, the fraction of jobs of size at least $\widetilde{x}_\rho$ tends to zero, since $\widetilde{x}_\rho \to x_R$ as $\rho \uparrow 1$. Section 7 discusses the sojourn time of these jobs in more detail.

For any $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{T_{\mathrm{FB}}}{\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]} > \varepsilon\right) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x) > \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}])\,\mathrm{d}F(x) \le \mathbb{P}(T_{\mathrm{FB}}(\widetilde{x}_\rho) > \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]) + \overline{F}(\widetilde{x}_\rho), \quad (6.1)$$

where the final term vanishes as $\rho \uparrow 1$ by choice of $\widetilde{x}_\rho$. The proof is completed if the first probability at the right-hand side also vanishes as $\rho \uparrow 1$.

In preparation of the analysis of $\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathrm{FB}}(\widetilde{x}_\rho) > \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}])$, reconsider the busy period representation $T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x) \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{L}_x(W_x + x)$. The relation states that the sojourn time of a job of size x is equal in distribution to a busy period with job sizes $B_i \wedge x$, initiated by the job of size x itself

and the time W_x required to serve all jobs already in the system up to level x. Here, the random variable W_x is equal in distribution to the steady state waiting time in an M/GI/1/FIFO queue with job sizes $B \wedge x$.

Let $N_x(t)$ denote a Poisson process with rate $\rho_x/\mathbb{E}[B \wedge x]$. Then, it follows from the busy period representation of T_{FB} that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x) > y) &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}_x(W_x + x) > (1-\rho)^{-2} y) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\inf\left\{ t \geq 0 : \sum_{i=1}^{N(t)} (B_i \wedge x) - t \leq -(W_x + x) \right\} > (1-\rho)^{-2} y \right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{t \in [0,(1-\rho)^{-2} y]} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N(t)} (B_i \wedge x) - t \right\} \geq -(W_x + x) \right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0,y]} \left\{ \frac{t}{(1-\rho)^2} - \sum_{i=1}^{N((1-\rho)^{-2} t)} (B_i \wedge x) \right\} \leq W_x + x \right). \qquad (6.2)
\end{aligned}$$

Additionally, application of Chebychev's inequality to the above relation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x) > y) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{y}{(1-\rho)^2} - \sum_{i=1}^{N((1-\rho)^{-2} y)} (B_i \wedge x) \leq W_x + x \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\Bigg(\left| W_x + \sum_{i=1}^{N((1-\rho)^{-2} y)} (B_i \wedge x) - \frac{\rho_x}{1-\rho_x} \mathbb{E}[(B \wedge x)^*] - \frac{\rho_x}{(1-\rho)^2} y \right| \geq \\
&\qquad\qquad \frac{1-\rho_x}{(1-\rho)^2} y - x - \frac{\rho_x}{1-\rho_x} \mathbb{E}[(B \wedge x)^*] \Bigg) \\
&\leq \frac{\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}[W_x] + \mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N((1-\rho)^{-2} y)} (B_i \wedge x) \right]}{\left(\frac{1-\rho_x}{(1-\rho)^2} y - x - \frac{\rho_x}{1-\rho_x} \mathbb{E}[(B \wedge x)^*] \right)^2} \\
&= \frac{\frac{\rho_x^2}{(1-\rho_x)^2} \mathbb{E}[(B \wedge x)^*]^2 + \frac{\rho_x}{1-\rho_x} \mathbb{E}[((B \wedge x)^*)^2] + \frac{2\rho_x \mathbb{E}[(B \wedge x)^*]}{(1-\rho)^2} y}{\left(\frac{1-\rho_x}{(1-\rho)^2} y - x - \frac{\rho_x}{1-\rho_x} \mathbb{E}[(B \wedge x)^*] \right)^2}. \qquad (6.3)
\end{aligned}$$

At this point, similar to the approach in Section 4, we differentiate between the finite and infinite variance cases.

6.1 Finite variance

This section considers all functions F that satisfy one of the conditions in the theorem statement and have finite variance. Specifically, this excludes the case $x_R = \infty$, $\beta(\overline{F}) > -2$. Fix

$$\widetilde{p}(F) := \begin{cases} \frac{\beta(\overline{F})}{\beta(\overline{F})+1} & \text{if } F \notin \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda) \text{ and } x_R = \infty, \\ \frac{\beta(\overline{F}(x_R - (\cdot)^{-1})}{\beta(\overline{F}(x_R - (\cdot)^{-1}))-1} & \text{if } F \notin \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda) \text{ and } x_R < \infty, \text{ and} \\ 1 & \text{if } F \in \mathrm{MDA}(\Lambda), \end{cases} \qquad (6.4)$$

and $\widetilde{\gamma} \in (\widetilde{p}(F)/2, 1)$, and define $\nu(\rho) := (1-\rho)^{\widetilde{\gamma}}$ and $\widetilde{x}_\rho := x_\rho^{\nu(\rho)} = G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho} \frac{1-\nu(\rho)}{\nu(\rho)}\right)$. Indeed $\widetilde{x}_\rho \to x_R$, and we proceed with the analysis in (6.3). Noting that $\mathbb{E}[((B \wedge x)^*)^2] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[(B \wedge x)^3]}{3\mathbb{E}[B]} \leq$

$\frac{x\mathbb{E}[B^2]}{3\mathbb{E}[B]} = \frac{2}{3}\mathbb{E}[B^*]x$ and substituting $x = \widetilde{x}_\rho$, gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}(\widetilde{x}_\rho) > y) &\leq \frac{\left(\frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho_{\widetilde{x}_\rho}}\right)^2 \mathbb{E}[B^*]^2 + \frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho_{\widetilde{x}_\rho}}\frac{2}{3}\mathbb{E}[B^*](1-\rho)\widetilde{x}_\rho + 2\mathbb{E}[B^*]y}{\left(\frac{1-\rho_{\widetilde{x}_\rho}}{1-\rho}y - (1-\rho)\widetilde{x}_\rho - \frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho_{\widetilde{x}_\rho}}\rho_{\widetilde{x}_\rho}\mathbb{E}[B^*]\right)^2} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[B^*]^2\nu(\rho)^2 + \frac{2}{3}\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu(\rho)(1-\rho)x_\rho^{\nu(\rho)} + 2\mathbb{E}[B^*]y}{\left(\nu(\rho)^{-1}y - (1-\rho)x_\rho^{\nu(\rho)} - \rho_{x_\rho^{\nu(\rho)}}\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu\right)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

We now return to the probability $\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathrm{FB}}(\widetilde{x}_\rho) > \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}])$ in relation (6.1). By Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, there exists $C > 0$ such that the inequality $(1-\rho)^2\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] \geq C\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$ holds true for all ρ sufficiently close to one. Denoting $\widetilde{\varepsilon} := \varepsilon C$, this gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathrm{FB}}(\widetilde{x}_\rho) > \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]) &\leq \mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}(\widetilde{x}_\rho) > \widetilde{\varepsilon}\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))) \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[B^*]^2\nu(\rho)^2 + \frac{2}{3}\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu(\rho)(1-\rho)x_\rho^{\nu(\rho)} + 2\widetilde{\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}[B^*]\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}{\left(\widetilde{\varepsilon}\nu(\rho)^{-1}\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho)) - (1-\rho)x_\rho^{\nu(\rho)} - \rho_{x_\rho^{\nu(\rho)}}\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu(\rho)\right)^2} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[B^*]^2\frac{\nu(\rho)^4}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))^2} + \frac{2\mathbb{E}[B^*]}{3}\frac{\nu(\rho)^3(1-\rho)x_\rho^{\nu(\rho)}}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))^2} + 2\widetilde{\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}[B^*]\frac{\nu(\rho)^2}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}}{\left(\widetilde{\varepsilon} - \frac{\nu(\rho)(1-\rho)x_\rho^{\nu(\rho)}}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} - \rho_{x_\rho^{\nu(\rho)}}\mathbb{E}[B^*]\frac{\nu(\rho)^2}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\right)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Subsequently, we observe for any $\nu \in (0,1)$ that

$$\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}(1-\rho)x_\rho^\nu = \lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}(1-\rho)G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\right) = \lim_{z\to x_R}\frac{\frac{\nu}{1-\nu}\overline{G}(z)\cdot z}{1+\frac{\nu}{1-\nu}\overline{G}(z)} \leq \lim_{z\to x_R}\frac{\nu\cdot z\overline{G}(z)}{1-\nu}. \quad (6.5)$$

where $z\overline{G}(z) \to 0$ as $z \to x_R$ since $\mathbb{E}[B^2] < \infty$ (cf. Section 4.1.1). It follows that $(1-\rho)x_\rho^{\nu(\rho)} = o(\nu(\rho))$ as $\rho \uparrow 1$, so that $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathrm{FB}} > \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]) = 0$ provided that $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\frac{\nu(\rho)^2}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} = 0$.

Write $x = (1-\rho)^{-1}$. By Lemma 4.2, it suffices to show $\alpha\left((\cdot)^{-2\widetilde{\gamma}}\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))\right) < 0$. This relation follows from Lemma 4.1, Corollary 4.7 and our choice of $\widetilde{\gamma}$:

$$\alpha\left(\frac{(\cdot)^{-2\widetilde{\gamma}}}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))}\right) \leq -2\widetilde{\gamma} - \beta\left(\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))\right) \leq -2\widetilde{\gamma} + \widetilde{p}(F) < 0.$$

6.2 Infinite variance

This section regards all functions F that satisfy $x_R = \infty, \beta(\overline{F}) > -2$. In this case, $\widetilde{x}_\rho$ can be any function that satisfies both $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\widetilde{x}_\rho = \infty$ and $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\frac{\widetilde{x}_\rho}{\overline{G}(\widetilde{x}_\rho)\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)} = 0$.

Theorem 3.1 implies that there exists $C > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}] \geq C\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)$ for all ρ sufficiently close to one. Again, denote $\widetilde{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon C$. The analysis resumes with relation (6.3), where we substitute y by $\widetilde{\varepsilon}(1-\rho)^2\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x) > \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x) > \widetilde{\varepsilon}(1-\rho)^2\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)\right) \\ &\leq \frac{\frac{1}{(1-\rho_x)^2}\mathbb{E}[(B\wedge x)^*]^2 + \frac{1}{1-\rho_x}\mathbb{E}[((B\wedge x)^*)^2] + 2\widetilde{\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}[(B\wedge x)^*]\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)}{\left(\widetilde{\varepsilon}(1-\rho_x)\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right) - x - \frac{\rho_x}{1-\rho_x}\mathbb{E}[(B\wedge x)^*]\right)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

By relation (4.5), there exists a function $b(x)$ that is bounded for all x sufficiently large and satisfies $m_2(x) = \mathbb{E}[B]b(x)x\overline{G}(x)$. As such, $\mathbb{E}[((B \wedge x)^*)^2] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[(B\wedge x)^3]}{3\mathbb{E}[B]} \leq \frac{xm_2(x)}{3\mathbb{E}[B]} = b(x)x^2\overline{G}(x)/3$ and similarly $\mathbb{E}[(B \wedge x)^*] = \frac{m_2(x)}{2\mathbb{E}[B]} = b(x)x\overline{G}(x)/2$. Substituting this into the above relation yields

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x) > \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]) \leq \frac{\frac{b(x)^2}{4}\frac{x^2\overline{G}(x)^2}{(1-\rho_x)^2} + \frac{b(x)}{3}\frac{x^2\overline{G}(x)}{1-\rho_x} + \widetilde{\varepsilon}b(x)x\overline{G}(x)\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)}{\left(\widetilde{\varepsilon}(1-\rho_x)\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right) - x - \frac{\rho_x b(x)}{2}\frac{x\overline{G}(x)}{1-\rho_x}\right)^2},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x) > \varepsilon\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]) \\ &\quad\leq \frac{\frac{b(x)^2}{4}\frac{\overline{G}(x)^2}{(1-\rho_x)^2}\frac{x^2}{(1-\rho_x)^2\log^2\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)} + \frac{b(x)}{3}\frac{\overline{G}(x)}{1-\rho_x}\frac{x^2}{(1-\rho_x)^2\log^2\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)} + \widetilde{\varepsilon}b(x)\frac{\overline{G}(x)}{1-\rho_x}\frac{x}{(1-\rho_x)\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)}}{\left(\widetilde{\varepsilon} - \frac{x}{(1-\rho_x)\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)} - \frac{\rho_x b(x)}{2}\frac{\overline{G}(x)}{1-\rho_x}\frac{x}{(1-\rho_x)\log\left(\frac{1}{1-\rho}\right)}\right)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

The result follows after noting that $1 - \rho_x = 1 - \rho G(x) \geq \overline{G}(x)$ and substituting $\widetilde{x}_\rho$ for x.

7 Asymptotic behaviour of the sojourn time tail

In this section, we prove Theorem 3.7 after presenting two facilitating propositions. The proofs of the propositions are postponed to Sections 7.1 and 7.2. Throughout this section, $\mathbf{e}(q)$ will denote an Exponentially distributed random variable with rate $q > 0$. We abuse notation by writing $\mathbf{e}(0) = +\infty$.

Reconsider the relation $T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x) \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{L}_x(W_x + x)$ to gain some intuition. A rough approximation of the duration of a busy period, given $W_x + x$ units of work at time $t = 0$, is $(W_x + x)/(1 - \rho_x)$. The scaled sojourn time $(1 - \rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x)$ is then approximated by $\frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho_x}(1 - \rho)(W_x + x)$. As in Section 4, define $x_\rho^\nu = G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right), \nu \in (1-\rho, 1)$, so that $\frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho_x} = \nu$. Then for all $\nu \in (0, 1)$, we have $(1 - \rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x_\rho^\nu) \stackrel{d}{\approx} \nu(1 - \rho)(W_{x_\rho^\nu} + x_\rho^\nu)$. We will show that $(1 - \rho)x_\rho^\nu \to 0$ for all fixed $\nu \in (0, 1)$. Instead, the following proposition shows that $(1-\rho)W_{x_\rho^\nu}$ behaves as an exponentially distributed random variable as $\rho \uparrow 1$:

Proposition 7.1. *Let $x_\rho^\nu = G^{\leftarrow}\left(1 - \frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right), \nu \in (1 - \rho, 1)$, and let W_x^ρ denote the steady state waiting time in an* M/GI/1/FIFO *queue with job sizes $B_i \wedge x$ and arrival rate $\rho_x/\mathbb{E}[B \wedge x]$. Then, for any fixed $\nu \in (0, 1)$, $(1 - \rho)W_{x_\rho^\nu} \stackrel{d}{\to} \mathrm{Exp}((\nu\mathbb{E}[B^*])^{-1})$ as $\rho \uparrow 1$.*

If $W^\rho = W_\infty^\rho$ denotes the steady state waiting time in the non-truncated system, then Kingman [13] proved that $(1 - \rho)W^\rho \stackrel{d}{\to} \mathrm{Exp}(\mathbb{E}[B^*]^{-1})$. Proposition 7.1 shows how jobs can be truncated such that the exponential behaviour is preserved, and quantifies how the truncation affects the parameter of the exponential distribution.

Substituting the result in Proposition 7.1 into our approximation yields $(1 - \rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x_\rho^\nu) \stackrel{d}{\approx} \mathrm{Exp}((\nu^2\mathbb{E}[B^*])^{-1})$ for every fixed $\nu \in (0, 1)$. We will show that the fraction of jobs for which ν is in $(\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)$ scales as $\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))$, and that the contribution of other jobs to the tail of $(1 - \rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}$ is negligible. The result is presented in Proposition 7.2, where we focus on the probability $\mathbb{P}((1 - \rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}} > \mathbf{e}(q))$ for its connection to the Laplace transform of T_{FB}^*.

Proposition 7.2. *Assume $F \in \mathrm{MDA}(H)$, where H is an extreme value distribution. Let $p(H) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}$ if $H = \Phi_\alpha, \alpha > 2$; $p(H) = 1$ if $H = \Lambda$ and $p(H) = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}$ if $H = \Psi_\alpha, \alpha > 0$. Then*

$$\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} \frac{\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}} > \mathbf{e}(q))}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} = \int_0^1 \frac{8\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu}{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}\left(\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}+1\right)^2}\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)} \mathrm{d}\nu \tag{7.1}$$

for all $q \geq 0$. Here, the integral is finite for all $q \geq 0$.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.7. Using the relation $\mathbb{E}[e^{-qY}] = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}(q) > Y)$, one sees that $\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T^{\rho}_{\mathrm{FB}} > \mathbf{e}(q)) = 1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-q(1-\rho)^2 T^{\rho}_{\mathrm{FB}}}]$ and consequently

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}} > \mathbf{e}(q))}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} &= \frac{(1-\rho)^2\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} \cdot \frac{1-\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-q(1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}}\right]}{(1-\rho)^2\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]} \\ &= \frac{(1-\rho)^2\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} \cdot q \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-q(1-\rho)^2 T^*_{\mathrm{FB}}}\right],\end{aligned}$$

where T^*_{FB} is the residual sojourn time and has density $\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathrm{FB}} > t)/\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-q(1-\rho)^2 T^*_{\mathrm{FB}}}\right] \\ &\quad= \lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} \frac{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}{(1-\rho)^2\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]} \int_0^1 \frac{8\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu}{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}\left(\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}+1\right)^2}\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)} \mathrm{d}\nu \\ &\quad= r(H)^{-1} \int_0^1 \frac{8\nu}{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}\left(\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}+1\right)^2}\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)} \mathrm{d}\nu \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

for all $q \geq 0$, where $r(H)$ was introduced in Theorem 3.2. It follows from Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 that $\lim_{q\downarrow 0}\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-q(1-\rho)^2 T^*_{\mathrm{FB}}}\right] = 1$. Additionally, the right-hand side is continuous in q, so that $(1-\rho)^2 T^*_{\mathrm{FB}}$ converges to some non-degenerate random variable by the Continuity Theorem.

The Laplace transform inversion formula (12) in Bateman [4, p.234] states that $f(t) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}\sqrt{t} - 2te^t \operatorname{Erfc}(\sqrt{t})$ is the Laplace inverse of $s^{-1/2}(s^{1/2}+1)^{-2}$, i.e., $\int_0^\infty e^{-qt} f(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}(\sqrt{q}+1)^2}$. Consequently, we have

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-qt} g(t,\nu)\,\mathrm{d}t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}\left(\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}+1\right)^2} \tag{7.3}$$

for $g(t,\nu) = \frac{e^{-\frac{t}{4\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu^2}}}{4\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu^2} f\left(\frac{t}{4\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu^2}\right)$, and hence relation (7.2) may be rewritten as

$$\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-q(1-\rho)^2 T^*_{\mathrm{FB}}}\right] = \int_0^\infty e^{-qt}\left[\int_0^1 8r(H)^{-1}\nu g(t,\nu)\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)} \mathrm{d}\nu\right] \mathrm{d}t =: \int_0^\infty e^{-qt} g^*(t)\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

We conclude that the limiting random variable $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}(1-\rho)^2 T^*_{\mathrm{FB}}$ has density g^*. Furthermore, as

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-q(1-\rho)^2 T^*_{\mathrm{FB}}}\right] &= \lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} \int_0^\infty e^{-q\tau} \frac{\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}} > \tau)}{(1-\rho)^2\mathbb{E}[T_{\mathrm{FB}}]}\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &= \lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} \int_0^\infty e^{-q\tau} \frac{\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}} > \tau)}{r(H)\mathbb{E}[B^*]\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\,\mathrm{d}\tau,\end{aligned}$$

for all $q \geq 0$, we also see that $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} \frac{\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}} > y)}{r(H)\mathbb{E}[B^*]\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} = g^*(y)$ almost everywhere.

To see that g^* is monotone, it suffices to show that $f(t)$ is monotone. To this end, we exploit the continued fraction representation (13.2.20a) in Cuyt et al. [8] and find

$$\mathrm{Erfc}(x) = \frac{x}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-x^2} \cfrac{1}{x^2 + \cfrac{1/2}{1 + \cfrac{1}{x^2 + \cfrac{3/2}{1+\ldots}}}} \geq \frac{e^{-x^2}}{x\sqrt{\pi}} \left(1 - \frac{x^2 + 3/2}{2x^4 + 6x^2 + 3/2}\right). \tag{7.4}$$

As a consequence, one sees that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} f(t) = \frac{1+2t}{\sqrt{\pi}\sqrt{t}} - 2(1+t)e^t \,\mathrm{Erfc}(\sqrt{t}) \leq \frac{1 + 2t - 2(1+t)\left(1 - \frac{t+3/2}{2t^2+6t+3/2}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi}\sqrt{t}} = \frac{-1 + \frac{2t^2+5t+3}{2t^2+6t+3/2}}{\sqrt{\pi}\sqrt{t}},$$

which is negative for all $t \geq 0$. We conclude the section with the postponed proofs of Propositions 7.1 and 7.2.

7.1 Proof of Proposition 7.1

The Pollaczek-Khintchine formula states that $\mathbb{E}[e^{-s(1-\rho)W_x}] = \frac{1-\rho_x}{1-\rho_x \mathbb{E}[e^{-s(1-\rho)(B\wedge x)^*}]}$. In this representation, we expand the Laplace-Stieltjes transform $\mathbb{E}[e^{-s(1-\rho)(B\wedge x)^*}]$ around $\rho = 1$ to find

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-s(1-\rho)W_x}] = \frac{1-\rho_x}{1 - \rho_x\left(1 - \mathbb{E}[(B\wedge x)^*](1-\rho)s + o(1-\rho)\right)}$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-s(1-\rho)W_{x_\rho^\nu}}] = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho_{x_\rho^\nu}}\rho_{x_\rho^\nu}\mathbb{E}[(B\wedge x_\rho^\nu)^*]s + o\left(\frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho_{x_\rho^\nu}}\right)} = \frac{1}{1 + \nu\rho_{x_\rho^\nu}\mathbb{E}[(B\wedge x_\rho^\nu)^*]s + o(1)},$$

where $o(1)$ vanishes as $\rho \uparrow 1$. By definition of x_ρ^ν, $x_\rho^\nu \to \infty$ and $\rho_{x_\rho^\nu} \uparrow 1$ as $\rho \uparrow 1$ for any fixed $\nu \in (0,1)$. In particular, $\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1} \mathbb{E}[e^{-s(1-\rho)W_{x_\rho^\nu}}] = \frac{1}{1+\nu\mathbb{E}[B^*]s}$. The proof is completed by applying the Continuity Theorem.

7.2 Proof of Proposition 7.2

We require functions $\nu_l(\rho) \downarrow 0$ and $\nu_u(\rho) \uparrow 1$ that distinguish the jobs that significantly contribute to the tail of $(1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}$, and those that don't. For the former function, fix $\gamma \in (p(H)/2, 1)$ and let $\nu_l(\rho) = (1-\rho)^\gamma$ as in Section 6.1. This is possible as $p(H) < 2$ for all H to which the theorem applies. For the latter function, we refer to relation (6.5) to verify that there exists a function $\nu(\rho) \uparrow 1$ such that $(1-\rho)x_\rho^{\nu(\rho)} \to 0$. Let $\nu_u(\rho)$ be a function with this property, and write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}} > \mathbf{e}(q))}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} \\
&= \int_{\nu=0}^{\nu_l(\rho)} \mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x_\rho^\nu) > \mathbf{e}(q)) \frac{\mathrm{d}F(x_\rho^\nu)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} + \int_{\nu=\nu_l(\rho)}^{\nu_u(\rho)} \mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x_\rho^\nu) > \mathbf{e}(q)) \frac{\mathrm{d}F(x_\rho^\nu)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} \\
&\quad + \int_{\nu=\nu_u(\rho)}^{1} \mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x_\rho^\nu) > \mathbf{e}(q)) \frac{\mathrm{d}F(x_\rho^\nu)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} =: \widehat{\mathrm{I}}(\rho) + \widehat{\mathrm{II}}(\rho) + \widehat{\mathrm{III}}(\rho).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

The next paragraphs study the behaviour of $\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x) > \mathbf{e}(q))$, which will then facilitate the analysis of the above three regions. Specifically, we will derive the asymptotic behaviour of $\widehat{\mathrm{II}}(\rho)$ in terms of q, and show that $\widehat{\mathrm{I}}(\rho) + \widehat{\mathrm{III}}(\rho) = o(1)$ for any $q \geq 0$.

From relation (6.2), we know that

$$\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}(x) > \mathbf{e}(q)) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, \mathbf{e}(q)]} X_x^\rho(t) \leq (1-\rho) W_x + (1-\rho) x \right), \tag{7.6}$$

where $X_x^\rho(t) := \frac{t}{1-\rho} - \sum_{i=1}^{N((1-\rho)^{-2}t)} (1-\rho)(B_i \wedge x)$. Then $X_x^\rho(t)$ is a spectrally negative Lévy process, and therefore relation (8.4) in Kyprianou [15] implies

$$\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}^\rho(x) > \mathbf{e}(q)) = \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{e}(\Phi(x,\rho,q)) \leq (1-\rho) W_x + (1-\rho) x \right), \tag{7.7}$$

where $\Phi(x,\rho,q) := \sup\{s \geq 0 : \psi(x,\rho,s) = q\}$ is the right inverse of the Laplace exponent $\psi(s) := t^{-1} \log \mathbb{E}[e^{s X_x^\rho(t)}]$ of $X_x^\rho(t)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x,\rho,s) &= t^{-1} \log \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\frac{st}{1-\rho} - \sum_{i=1}^{N((1-\rho)^{-2}t)} (1-\rho) s (B_i \wedge x)} \right] \\ &= \frac{s}{1-\rho} + t^{-1} \log \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\sum_{i=1}^{N((1-\rho)^{-2}t)} (1-\rho) s (B_i \wedge x)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\sum_{i=1}^{N((1-\rho)^{-2}t)} (1-\rho) s (B_i \wedge x)}] &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-(1-\rho)s(B \wedge x)}]^n \frac{\left(\frac{\lambda t}{(1-\rho)^2}\right)^n}{n!} e^{-\frac{\lambda t}{(1-\rho)^2}} \\ &= e^{-\frac{\lambda t}{(1-\rho)^2}\left(1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-(1-\rho)s(B \wedge x)}]\right)}, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain $\psi(x,\rho,s) = \frac{s}{1-\rho} - \frac{\lambda}{(1-\rho)^2}\left(1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-(1-\rho)s(B\wedge x)}]\right)$. A Taylor expansion around $\rho = 1$ now yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\psi(x,\rho,s) \\ &\quad = \frac{s}{1-\rho} - \frac{\lambda}{(1-\rho)^2}\left(1 - \left(1 - (1-\rho)s\mathbb{E}[B \wedge x] + \frac{(1-\rho)^2 s^2}{2}\mathbb{E}[(B\wedge x)^2] + o((1-\rho)^2 s^2)\right)\right) \\ &\quad = \frac{s}{1-\rho} - \left(\frac{\rho_x s}{1-\rho} - \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[(B\wedge x)^2]}{2} s^2 + o(s^2)\right) = \frac{1-\rho_x}{1-\rho} s + \frac{\rho \mathbb{E}[(B\wedge x)^2]}{2\mathbb{E}[B]} s^2 + o(s^2), \end{aligned}$$

so that $\lim_{\rho \uparrow 1} \psi(x_\rho^\nu, \rho, s) = \nu^{-1} s + \mathbb{E}[B^*] s^2$ for all $\nu > 0$, and consequently

$$\lim_{\rho \uparrow 1} \Phi(x_\rho^\nu, \rho, q) = \frac{\sqrt{\nu^{-2} + 4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q} - \nu^{-1}}{2\mathbb{E}[B^*]} = \frac{\sqrt{1 + 4\mathbb{E}[B^*] q \nu^2} - 1}{2\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu} =: \Phi(\nu, q). \tag{7.8}$$

Similarly, one deduces that $\lim_{\rho \uparrow 1} \nu_l(\rho) \psi(x_\rho^{\nu_l(\rho)}, \rho, s) = s$ and

$$\lim_{\rho \uparrow 1} \nu_l(\rho)^{-1} \Phi(x_\rho^{\nu_l(\rho)}, \rho, q) = q. \tag{7.9}$$

We now gathered sufficient tools to analyse the asymptotic behaviour of $\widehat{\mathrm{II}}(\rho)$.

Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/3)$. We have already shown that $(1-\rho) W_{x_\rho^\nu}^\rho \to \mathbf{e}((\nu \mathbb{E}[B^*])^{-1})$ and $(1-\rho) x_\rho^\nu \to 0$ as $\rho \uparrow 1$ for all $\nu \in (0,1)$. Since $\mathbf{e}(q_1) \leq_{st} \mathbf{e}(q_2)$ whenever $q_1 \geq q_2$, relations (7.7) and (7.8) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}((1-\rho)^2 T_{\mathrm{FB}}^\rho(x_\rho^\nu) > \mathbf{e}(q)) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{e}((1+\varepsilon)\Phi(\nu,q)) \leq \mathbf{e}((1-\varepsilon)(\nu\mathbb{E}[B^*])^{-1}) + \varepsilon\right) \\ &= e^{-(1+\varepsilon)\varepsilon\Phi(\nu,q)} \frac{(1+\varepsilon)\Phi(\nu,q)}{(1+\varepsilon)\Phi(\nu,q) + (1-\varepsilon)(\nu\mathbb{E}[B^*])^{-1}} + 1 - e^{-\varepsilon(1+\varepsilon)\Phi(\nu,q)} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{1 + 4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2} - 1}{\sqrt{1 + 4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2} + 1 - \frac{4\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}} + 1 - e^{-\varepsilon \cdot \frac{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}-1}{\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu}} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\rho \geq \rho_\varepsilon$, ρ_ε sufficiently close to one. Consequently, for all $\rho \geq \rho_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\Pi}(\rho) &\leq \int_{\nu_l(\rho)}^{\nu_u(\rho)} \frac{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}-1}{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}+1-\frac{4\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}} \frac{\mathrm{d}F\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1-\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} \\
&\quad + \int_{\nu_l(\rho)}^{\nu_u(\rho)} \left(1-e^{-\varepsilon\cdot\frac{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}-1}{\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu}}\right) \frac{\mathrm{d}F\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1-\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))} \\
&\leq -\left[\frac{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}-1}{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}+1-\frac{4\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}} \frac{\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1-\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\right]_{\nu=\nu_l(\rho)}^{\nu_u(\rho)} \\
&\quad + \int_{\nu_l(\rho)}^{\nu_u(\rho)} \frac{8\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu}{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}\left(\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}+1-\frac{4\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\right)^2} \frac{\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1-\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\,\mathrm{d}\nu \\
&\quad - \left[\left(1-e^{-\varepsilon\cdot\frac{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}-1}{\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu}}\right) \frac{\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1-\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\right]_{\nu=\nu_l(\rho)}^{\nu_u(\rho)} \\
&\quad + 4q\int_{\nu_l(\rho)}^{\nu_u(\rho)} \varepsilon\cdot e^{-\varepsilon\cdot\frac{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}-1}{\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu}} \frac{\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1-\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\,\mathrm{d}\nu.
\end{aligned}$$

In Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, we deduced that $\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1}))$ is regularly varying with index $-p(H)$. The Uniform Convergence Theorem then implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1}\widehat{\Pi}(\rho) &\leq -\left[\frac{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}-1}{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}+1-\frac{4\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}}\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)}\right]_{\nu=0}^{1} \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 \frac{8\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu}{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}\left(\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}+1-\frac{4\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\right)^2}\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)}\mathrm{d}\nu \\
&\quad - \left[\left(1-e^{-\varepsilon\cdot\frac{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}-1}{\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu}}\right)\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)}\right]_{\nu=0}^{1} \\
&\quad + 4q\int_0^1 \varepsilon\cdot e^{-\varepsilon\cdot\frac{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}-1}{\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu}}\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)}\mathrm{d}\nu \\
&= \int_0^1 \frac{8\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu}{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}\left(\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}+1-\frac{4\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\right)^2}\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)}\mathrm{d}\nu \\
&\quad + 4q\int_0^1 \varepsilon\cdot e^{-\varepsilon\cdot\frac{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}-1}{\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu}}\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)}\mathrm{d}\nu.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, both integrals are bounded for all $\varepsilon \in (0,1/3)$ and all $q \geq 0$. Additionally, both integrands are increasing in ε for all ε sufficiently small. One may thus take the limit $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ and apply the Dominated Convergence Theorem to find

$$\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1}\widehat{\Pi}(\rho) \leq \int_0^1 \frac{8\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu}{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}\left(\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}+1\right)^2}\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)}\mathrm{d}\nu. \tag{7.10}$$

Similarly, one may show that

$$\liminf_{\rho\uparrow 1}\widehat{\mathrm{II}}(\rho)\geq\int_0^1\frac{8\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu}{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}\left(\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}+1+\frac{4\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\right)^2}\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)}\,\mathrm{d}\nu,$$

and we conclude

$$\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\widehat{\mathrm{II}}(\rho)=\int_0^1\frac{8\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu}{\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}\left(\sqrt{1+4\mathbb{E}[B^*]q\nu^2}+1\right)^2}\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\right)^{p(H)}\,\mathrm{d}\nu. \tag{7.11}$$

Second, consider $\widehat{\mathrm{I}}(\rho)$. Define $M(\rho):=(1-\rho)^{-\widehat{\gamma}}$ for some $\widehat{\gamma}\in(p(H)/2,\gamma)$ and recall that $(1-\rho)x\to 0$ and $(1-\rho)W_x^\rho\overset{d}{\to}0$ (and hence in probability) for all $x\leq x_\rho^{\nu_l(\rho)}$. Thus, for all $x\leq x_\rho^{\nu_l}$ and all ρ sufficiently large, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathrm{I}}(\rho)&=\int_{\nu=0}^{\nu_l(\rho)}\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{e}(\Phi(x_\rho^\nu,\rho,q))\leq(1-\rho)W_{x_\rho^\nu}+(1-\rho)x_\rho^\nu\right)\frac{\mathrm{d}F(x_\rho^\nu)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\\&\leq\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{e}(\Phi(x_\rho^{\nu_l(\rho)},\rho,q))\leq 2M(\rho)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}+\frac{\mathbb{P}((1-\rho)W_x^\rho\geq M(\rho))}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}=:\widehat{\mathrm{Ia}}(\rho)+\widehat{\mathrm{Ib}}(\rho)\end{aligned}$$

Fix $\delta\in(0,p(H)-\gamma-\widehat{\gamma})$. Potter's Theorem [6, Theorem 1.5.6] states that $\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))\geq C(1-\rho)^{p(H)+\delta}$ for some constant $C>0$ and all ρ sufficiently close to one. Also, one may readily deduce from relation (7.9) that $\mathbf{e}(\Phi(x_\rho^{\nu_l(\rho)},\rho,q))\geq_{st}\mathbf{e}(2q\nu_l(\rho))$ for all $x\leq x_\rho^{\nu_l(\rho)}$ and ρ sufficiently large. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1}\widehat{\mathrm{Ia}}(\rho)&\leq\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1}\frac{1-e^{-4q\nu_l(\rho)M(\rho)}}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\leq\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\frac{1-e^{-4q(1-\rho)^{\gamma-\widehat{\gamma}}}}{C(1-\rho)^{p(H)+\delta}}\\&=\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\frac{4q(\gamma-\widehat{\gamma})(1-\rho)^{\gamma-\widehat{\gamma}-1}e^{-4q(1-\rho)^{\gamma-\widehat{\gamma}}}}{C\left(p(H)+\delta\right)(1-\rho)^{p(H)-1+\delta}}\\&=\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}\frac{4q(\gamma-\widehat{\gamma})}{C\left(p(H)+\delta\right)}\cdot\exp\left[-4q(1-\rho)^{\gamma-\widehat{\gamma}}+(\gamma-\widehat{\gamma}-p(H)-\delta)\log(1-\rho)\right]=0.\end{aligned}$$

For term $\widehat{\mathrm{Ib}}(\rho)$, we apply Markov's inequality and Potter's Theorem to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1}\widehat{\mathrm{Ib}}(\rho)&\leq\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1}\frac{\frac{1-\rho}{1-\rho_x}\rho_x\mathbb{E}[(B\wedge x)^*]}{M(\rho)\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\leq\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}C_1\frac{\mathbb{E}[B^*]\nu_l(\rho)}{M(\rho)(1-\rho)^{p(H)+\delta}}\\&=\lim_{\rho\uparrow 1}C_1\mathbb{E}[B^*](1-\rho)^{\gamma+\widehat{\gamma}-p(H)-\delta}=0.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, consider term $\widehat{\mathrm{III}}(\rho)$. For this term, the claim follows rapidly from the Uniform Convergence Theorem and the property $\nu_u(\rho)\uparrow 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1}\widehat{\mathrm{III}}(\rho)&\leq\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1}\frac{\overline{F}(x_\rho^{\nu_u})}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}=\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1}\frac{\overline{F}\left(G^{\leftarrow}\left(1-\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}\frac{1-\nu_u(\rho)}{\nu_u(\rho)}\right)\right)}{\overline{F}(G^{\leftarrow}(\rho))}\\&=\limsup_{\rho\uparrow 1}\left(\frac{1-\nu_u(\rho)}{\rho\nu_u(\rho)}\right)^{p(H)}=0.\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof.

Acknowledgements

The work of Bart Kamphorst is part of the free competition research programme with project number 613.001.219, which is financed by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). The research of Bert Zwart is partly supported by the NWO VICI grant 639.033.413.

A Additional Matuszewska theory

This appendix gathers some results on Matuszewska indices. Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 are proven directly from the definition of the lower and upper Matuszewska indices. Then, a generalized version of Potter's Theorem allows us to prove Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Let $\alpha_1 > \alpha(f_1)$ and $\alpha_2 > \alpha(f_2)$. Then, by definition of the upper Matuszewska index, there exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for all $\mu \in [1, \mu^*], \mu^* > 1$, we have $f_1(\mu x) \leq C_1 \mu^{\alpha_1} f_1(x)$ and $f_2(\mu x) \leq C_2 \mu^{\alpha_2} f_2(x)$ for all x sufficiently large. Consequently, we have $\limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{f_1(\mu x) f_2(\mu x)}{f_1(x) f_2(x)} \leq C_1 C_2 \mu^{\alpha_1+\alpha_2}$ and thus $\alpha(f_1 \cdot f_2) \leq \alpha(f_1) + \alpha(f_2)$.

Similarly, if f_1 is non-decreasing, we have $f_1(f_2(\mu x)) \leq f_1(C_2 \mu^{\alpha_2} f_2(x)) \leq C_1 C_2^{\alpha_1} \mu^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2} f_1(f_2(x))$. and thus $\alpha(f_1 \circ f_2) \leq \alpha(f_2) \cdot \alpha(f_2)$. The results on the lower Matuszewska indices are proven analogously. □

Proof of Lemma 4.2. As f is positive, it suffices to show that $\limsup_{x\to\infty} f(x) = 0$. For sake of contradiction, assume that this is false. Then there exists a constant $m > 0$ and a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, x_n \to \infty$, such that $f(x_n) \geq m$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, by definition of the upper Matuszewska index, there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\mu \in [1, \mu^*], \mu^* > 1$, we have $f(x) \geq C\mu^{-\alpha(f)/2} f(\mu x)$ for all x sufficiently large. As a consequence, for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $f(x_N) \geq C(x_n/x_N)^{-\alpha(f)/2} f(x_n) \geq Cm(x_n/x_N)^{-\alpha(f)/2}$ for any fixed $n \geq N$. This is a contradiction for any x_n that satisfies $x_n > x_N(Cm/f(x_N))^{2/\alpha(f)}$. □

The following result is a generalized version of Potter's theorem and gives bounds on the ratio $f(y)/f(x)$:

Theorem A.1 (Bingham et al. [6], Proposition 2.2.1)**.** *Let f be positive.*

(1) If $\alpha(f) < \infty$, then for every $\alpha > \alpha(f)$ there exist positive constants C and X such that $f(y)/f(x) \leq C(y/x)^\alpha$ for all $y \geq x \geq X$.

(2) If $\beta(f) > -\infty$, then for every $\beta < \beta(f)$ there exist positive constants D and X such that $f(y)/f(x) \geq D(y/x)^\beta$ for all $y \geq x \geq X'$.

Theorem A.1 allows us to derive a relation between the Matuszewska indices of f to those of $f^{\leftarrow}$, which is presented as Lemma A.2:

Lemma A.2. *Let f be positive and locally integrable on $[X, \infty)$. If f is strictly increasing, unbounded above and $\alpha(f) < \infty$, then $\beta(f^{\leftarrow}) = 1/\alpha(f)$. If $\beta(f) > 0$, then $\alpha(f^{\leftarrow}) = 1/\beta(f)$.*

Proof. By definition of the upper Matuszewska index, for all $\alpha > \alpha(f)$ there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $\mu^* > 1$, $f(\mu x)/f(x) \leq C\mu^\alpha$ uniformly in $\mu \in [1, \mu^*]$ as $x \to \infty$. In particular, for all x sufficiently large we have $f((\mu/C)^{1/\alpha} x) \leq \mu f(x)$. As f is strictly increasing and unbounded above, one can hence see that

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{f^{\leftarrow}(\mu x)}{f^{\leftarrow}(x)} = \lim_{y\to\infty} \frac{f^{\leftarrow}(\mu f(y))}{f^{\leftarrow}(f(y))} \geq \lim_{y\to\infty} \frac{f^{\leftarrow}(f((\mu/C)^{1/\alpha} y))}{y} \geq (C)^{-1/\alpha} \mu^{1/\alpha} \tag{A.1}$$

uniformly for $\mu \in [1, \mu^*]$. As a consequence, $\beta(f^{\leftarrow}) \geq 1/\alpha(f)$.

On the other hand, if $\beta(f^{\leftarrow}) > 1/\alpha(f), \alpha(f) > 0$, then Theorem A.1(2) claims that for some $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small there exists a constant $C' > 0$ such that $f^{\leftarrow}(y)/f^{\leftarrow}(z) \geq C'(y/z)^{1/\alpha(f)+\varepsilon}$ for all $y \geq z$ sufficiently large. Consequently, one may substitute $y = f(\mu x), z = f(x)$ to obtain

$$C' \left(\frac{f(\mu x)}{f(x)} \right)^{1/\alpha(f)+\varepsilon} \leq \frac{f^{\leftarrow}(f(\mu x))}{f^{\leftarrow}(f(x))} = \mu$$

and hence $\lim_{x\to\infty} f(\mu x)/f(x) \leq ((C')^{-1}\mu)^{\frac{\alpha(f)}{1+\varepsilon\alpha(f))}}$. This inequality, however, indicates that $\alpha(f)$ was not the infimum over all α satisfying (2.4), which is a contradiction.

The relation $\alpha(f^{\leftarrow}) = 1/\beta(f)$ is proven similarly. □

A more general version of this lemma has been stated in several other works [e.g. 6, 16]; however, these works refer to an unpublished manuscript by De Haan and Resnick for the corresponding proof.

Our final results relate the Matuszewska indices of $\overline{F}$ to those of related functions. First, Lemma 4.5 relates the Matuszewska indices of $\overline{F}$ to those of $\overline{G}$. Its proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 6 in Lin et al. [16].

Proof of Lemma 4.5. First assume $x_R = \infty$. Then by definition of $\alpha(\overline{F})$, we have for all $\alpha > \alpha(\overline{F})$ that $\overline{F}(\mu t)/\overline{F}(t) \leq C(1 + o(1))\mu^{\alpha}$ uniformly in $\mu \in [1, \mu^*]$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[B]\overline{G}(\mu x) &= \mu \int_x^{\infty} \overline{F}(\mu\tau)\,\mathrm{d}\tau \leq C(1 + o(1))\mu^{\alpha+1} \int_x^{\infty} \overline{F}(\tau)\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &= C(1 + o(1))\mu^{\alpha+1}\mathbb{E}[B]\overline{G}(x)\end{aligned}$$

as $x \to \infty$. On the other hand, if $x_R < \infty$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[B]\overline{G}(x_R - (\mu x)^{-1}) &= \int_{x_R-(\mu x)^{-1}}^{x_R} \overline{F}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = \int_x^{\infty} \mu^{-1}\tau^{-2}\overline{F}(x_R - (\mu\tau)^{-1})\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\leq C(1 + o(1))\mu^{\alpha-1} \int_x^{\infty} \tau^{-2}\overline{F}(x_R - \tau^{-1})\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &= C(1 + o(1))\mu^{\alpha-1}\mathbb{E}[B]\overline{G}(x_R - x^{-1})\end{aligned}$$

as $x \to \infty$. The claims on the lower Matuszewska index can be proven analogously. □

Second, Lemma 4.6 relates the Matuszewska indices of $\overline{F}$ to those of $G^{\leftarrow}$. It does so by combining Lemmas 4.1, A.2 and 4.5.

Proof of Lemma 4.6. We only prove the relation between the lower Matuszewska indices, as the relation between the upper Matuszewska indices can be proven similarly.

First, assume $x_R = \infty$. Since $\beta(\overline{F}) > -\infty$, it follows from Lemma 4.5 that $\beta(\overline{G}) > -\infty$ and hence, by Lemma 4.1, that $\alpha(1/\overline{G}) = -\alpha(\overline{G}) \leq -\beta(\overline{G}) < \infty$. The result follows readily from Lemma A.2 through $\beta(G^{\leftarrow}(1 - (\cdot)^{-1})) = \beta((1/\overline{G})^{\leftarrow}) = 1/\alpha(1/\overline{G}) = -1/\beta(\overline{G})$ and subsequent application of Lemma 4.5.

Similarly, if $x_R < \infty$ then $\alpha(1/\overline{G}(x_R - (\cdot)^{-1})) < \infty$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(1 - x^{-1})} &= \frac{1}{x_R - \inf\{z : G(z) > 1 - x^{-1}\}} = \inf\left\{ \frac{1}{x_R - z} : G(z) > 1 - x^{-1} \right\} \\ &= \inf\{y : G(x_R - y^{-1}) > 1 - x^{-1}\} = \inf\{y : 1/\overline{G}(x_R - y^{-1}) > x\} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\overline{G}\left(x_R - \frac{1}{\cdot}\right)} \right)^{\leftarrow}(x).\end{aligned}$$

The result then follows from $\beta\left(\frac{1}{x_R - G^{\leftarrow}(1-(\cdot)^{-1})}\right) = \beta\left(\left(\frac{1}{\overline{G}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1})}(\cdot)\right)^{\leftarrow}\right) = 1/\alpha\left(\frac{1}{\overline{G}(x_R-(\cdot)^{-1})}\right) = -1/\beta(\overline{G}(x_R - (\cdot)^{-1}))$ and application of Lemma 4.5. □

References

[1] Bansal, N. (2005). On the average sojourn time under M/M/1/SRPT. *Operations Research Letters*, 33(2):195–200.

[2] Bansal, N. and Gamarnik, D. (2006). Handling load with less stress. *Queueing Systems*, 54(1):45–54.

[3] Bansal, N., Kamphorst, B., and Zwart, B. (to appear). Achievable performance of blind policies in heavy traffic. *Mathematics of Operations Research*.

[4] Bateman, H. (1954). Tables of integral transforms [volumes I & II].

[5] Beirlant, J., Broniatowski, M., Teugels, J. L., and Vynckier, P. (1995). The mean residual life function at great age: Applications to tail estimation. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 45(1):21–48.

[6] Bingham, N. H., Goldie, C. M., and Teugels, J. L. (1989). *Regular variation*, volume 27. Cambridge university press.

[7] Braverman, A., Dai, J. G., and Miyazawa, M. (2017). Heavy traffic approximation for the stationary distribution of a generalized jackson network: The bar approach. *Stoch. Syst.*, 7(1):143–196.

[8] Cuyt, A., Petersen, V. B., Verdonk, B., Waadeland, H., and Jones, W. B. (2008). *Handbook of Continued Fractions for Special Functions*. Springer.

[9] Embrechts, P., Klüppelberg, C., and Mikosch, T. (1997). *Modelling extremal events: for insurance and finance*, volume 33. Springer.

[10] Feller, W. (1971). *An introduction to probability theory and its applications: volume II*, volume 2. John Wiley & Sons New York, 1 edition.

[11] Gamarnik, D. and Zeevi, A. (2006). Validity of heavy traffic steady-state approximation in generalized Jackson networks. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 16(1):56–90.

[12] de Haan, L. (1974). Equivalence classes of regularly varying functions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 2(3):243–259.

[13] Kingman, J. F. C. (1961). The single server queue in heavy traffic. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 57:902–904.

[14] Kleinrock, L. (1976). *Queueing Systems II: Computer Theory*. John Wiley & Sons.

[15] Kyprianou, A. E. (2014). *Introductory lectures on fluctuations of Lévy processes with applications*. Springer, 2nd edition.

[16] Lin, M., Wierman, A., and Zwart, B. (2011). Heavy-traffic analysis of mean response time under shortest remaining processing time. *Performance Evaluation*, 68(10):955–966.

[17] Nuyens, M. and Wierman, A. (2008). The foreground–background queue: a survey. *Performance evaluation*, 65(3):286–307.

[18] Nuyens, M., Wierman, A., and Zwart, B. (2008). Preventing large sojourn times using SMART scheduling. *Operations Research*, 56(1):88–101.

[19] Prokhorov, Yu. V. (1963). Transition phenomena in queueing processes. I. *Litovsk. Mat. Sb.*, 3(1):199–205.

[20] Puha, A. L. et al. (2015). Diffusion limits for shortest remaining processing time queues under nonstandard spatial scaling. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 25(6):3381–3404.

[21] Resnick, S. I. (1987). *Extreme values, regular variation and point processes*. Springer.

[22] Righter, R. and Shanthikumar, J. G. (1989). Scheduling multiclass single server queueing systems to stochastically maximize the number of successful departures. *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences*, 3(3):323–333.

[23] Schrage, L. (1967). The queue m/g/1 with feedback to lower priority queues. *Management Science*, 13(7):466–474.

[24] Schrage, L. (1968). Letter to the editor — a proof of the optimality of the shortest remaining processing time discipline. *Operations Research*, 16(3):687–690.

[25] Whitt, W. (2002). *Stochastic-process limits*. Springer Series in Operations Research. Springer-Verlag, New York. An introduction to stochastic-process limits and their application to queues.

[26] Wierman, A., Harchol-Balter, M., and Osogami, T. (2005). Nearly insensitive bounds on SMART scheduling. In *Proceedings of the 2005 ACM SIGMETRICS International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems*, SIGMETRICS '05, pages 205–216, New York, NY, USA. ACM.