Abstract—The design of caching algorithms to maximize hit probability has been extensively studied. In this paper, we associate each content with a utility, which is a function of either corresponding content hit rate or hit probability. We formulate a cache optimization problem to maximize the sum of utilities over all contents under stationary and ergodic request process, which is non-convex in general. We find that the problem can be reformulated as a convex optimization problem when the inter-request distribution has a non-increasing hazard rate function. We provide explicit optimal solutions for some inter-request distributions, and compare the solutions of the hit-rate based (HRB) and hit-probability based (HPB) problems. We also propose decentralized algorithms that can be implemented using limited information and are guaranteed to provide optimal solutions. We find that decentralized algorithms that solve HRB are more robust than decentralized HPB algorithms. Informed by these results, we further propose lightweight Poisson approximate decentralized and online algorithms that are accurate and efficient in achieving optimal hit rates and hit probabilities.

I. INTRODUCTION

Caches play a prominent role in networks and distributed systems for improving system performance. Since the number of contents in a system is typically significantly larger than cache capacity, the design of a caching algorithm typically focuses on maximizing the number of requests that can be served from the cache. Considerable research has focused on the analysis of caching algorithms using the metric of hit probability under the Independent Reference Model (IRM) [1], [8], [21], [7], [28], [25], [29]. However, hit rate [14] is a more generic performance metric in real systems. For example, pricing based on hit rate is preferable to that based on cache occupancy from the perspective of a service provider [26]. Furthermore, one goal of a service provider in designing hierarchical caches would be to minimize the internal bandwidth cost, which can be characterized with a utility function $U_i = -C_i(m_i)$, where $C_i(m_i)$ is the cost associated with miss rate $m_i$ for content $i$. Therefore, we focus on using the metric of hit rate in this paper.

Recently there has been a tremendous increase in the demand for different types of content with different quality of service requirements; consequently, user needs have become more heterogeneous. In order to meet such challenges, content delivery networks need to incorporate service differentiation among different classes of contents and applications. Though considerable literature has focused on the design of fair and efficient caching algorithms for content distribution, little work has focused on the provision of multiple levels of service in network and web caches.

Moreover, content performance is strongly coupled in conventional caching algorithms such as LRU [1], [25], [17], which make it difficult for cache service providers to provide differential services. In this paper, we focus on Time-to-Live (TTL) caches. When a content is inserted into the cache due to a cache miss, a timer is set. The timer value can differ for different contents. All requests to a content before the expiration of its timer results in a cache hit, and the first request after the expiration of its timer yields a cache miss. This ability to decouple the behaviors of different contents make the TTL policy an interesting alternative to more popular algorithms like LRU. Moreover, the TTL policy has been shown to mimic the behaviors of many caching algorithms.

In this paper, we consider a utility-driven caching framework, where each content is associated with a utility. Content is stored and managed in the cache so as to maximize the aggregate utility for all content. A related problem has been considered in [8], where the authors formulated a Hit-probability Based Cache Utility Maximization (HPB-CUM) framework under IRM. The objective is to maximize the sum of utilities under a cache capacity constraint when utilities are increasing, continuously differentiable, and strictly concave function of hit probability. [8], [13] and [29] characterized optimal TTL cache policies, and also proposed distributed cache management algorithms. Here, we focus on utility functions as functions of hit rates.

While characterization of hit rate under IRM is valuable, real-world request processes exhibit changes in popularity and temporal correlations in requests [35], [5]. To account for them, in this paper, we consider a very general traffic model where requests for distinct contents are described by mutually independent stationary and ergodic point processes [2].

A. Contributions

Our main contributions in this paper can be summarized as follows.

1) We formulate a Hit-rate Based Cache Utility Maximization (HRB-CUM) framework for maximizing aggregate content utilities subject to an expected cache size constraint at the service provider. In general, HRB-CUM with TTL caches under general stationary request process is a non-convex optimization problem. We develop a convex optimization problem
for the case that the marginal inter-request time distribution has a non-increasing hazard rate. This is an important case since inter-request times are often highly variable.

2) We compare hit rate based approaches to hit probability based approaches when utilities come from a family of $\beta$-fair utility functions. We find that HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM are identical under log utility function with $\beta = 1$. However, for $\beta < 1$, there exists a threshold such that HRB-CUM favors more popular contents over HPB-CUM, i.e., popular contents will be cached under HRB-CUM. Similar arguments hold for $\beta > 1$.

3) We propose decentralized algorithms that can adapt to different stationary requests using limited information. We prove that all our decentralized algorithms obtain the optimal solutions. We find that the corresponding decentralized algorithms for HRB-CUM are more robust and stable than those for HPB-CUM with respect to (w.r.t.) convergence rate.

4) Inspired by the analysis of decentralized algorithms, we further propose a lightweight Poisson approximate online algorithm where we apply the dual designed for the case of requests described by a Poisson process to a workload where requests are described by stationary request processes. Such a solution does not involve solving any non-linear equations and hence is computationally efficient. We also use estimation techniques to approximate the request rate, which make the algorithm be online.

In particular, we consider the 2-MMPP. We characterize its limiting behavior in terms of the state transition rates. We find that when the transition rates both go to infinity, 2-MMPP is equivalent to one Poisson process, i.e., our Poisson approximate is exact. Similarly, when the transition rates go to zero, 2-MMPP can be treated as a weighted sum of two Poisson processes. We numerically show that our approximation is accurate in achieving near optimal hit rates and hit probabilities. Furthermore, we also theoretically characterize the limiting behavior of the general $m$-state MMPP.

This analysis provides significant insights in modeling real traffic with Poisson process and also verify the robustness and wide applicability of Poisson process.

B. Related Work and Organization

Network Utility Maximization: Utility functions have been widely used in the performance analysis of computer networks, which define different fairness. Since Kelly’s seminal work \[23\], \[24\], a rich literature uses network utility maximization problem in the analysis of throughput maximization, dynamic allocation, network routing etc and we do not attempt to provide a detailed overview here.

Time-To-Live Caches: TTL caches have been employed in the Domain Name System (DNS) since the early days of Internet \[21\]. More recently, it has gained attention due to the case that it can easily be analyzed and can be used to model the behaviors of caching algorithms such as LRU. The TTL cache has been shown to provide accurate estimates of the performance of large caches, as first introduced for LRU under IRM \[9\], \[7\] through the notion of cache characteristic time.

It has been further generalized to other settings \[3\], \[14\], \[18\], \[17\]. The accuracy of the TTL cache is theoretically justified under IRM \[3\] and stationary processes \[19\], and numerically verified under renewal processes \[17\]. A recent paper \[11\] has tackled a similar problem close to ours, which focuses on maximizing hit probabilities under DHR demands. Instead, we focus on optimizing the total utilities of cache contents.

The paper is organized as follows. The next section contains some technical preliminaries. We formulate the HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM under general stationary requests in Section \[III\] and present some specific inter-request processes under which HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM become convex optimization problems in Section \[IV\] We compare their performance both theoretically and numerically in Section \[V\] We develop decentralized algorithms and give its performance evaluations in Section \[VI\] We present Poisson approximate online algorithms in Section \[VII\] We conclude the paper in Section \[VIII\].

II. Technical Preliminaries

We consider a cache of size $B$ serving $n$ distinct contents.

A. Content Request Process

In this paper, the request processes for distinct contents are described by mutually independent stationary and ergodic simple point process as \[2\], \[19\]. Our model generalizes the simplest and widely used stochastic Independence Reference Model (IRM) \[1\], where requests are described by Poisson processes.

Let \(\{t_{ik}, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}\) represent successive request times to content \(i = 1, \cdots, n\). Let \(X_{ik} = t_{ik} - t_{i(k-1)}\) denote the inter-request times for a particular content \(i\). We consider \(\{X_{ik}\}_{k \geq 1}\) to be a stationary point process with cumulative distribution function (c.d.f.) satisfying \[2\]

\[
F_i(t) = P(X_{ik} \leq t).
\]

For example, for the $l$-state MMPP, $F$ is a mixture of $l$ exponential distributions.

The mean request rate $\mu_i$ for content $i$ is then given by

\[
\mu_i = \frac{1}{E[X_{ik}]} = \frac{1}{\int_0^\infty (1 - F_i(t))dt}.
\]

Denote by $\hat{F}_i(t)$ the c.d.f. of the age associated with the inter-request time distribution for content $i$, satisfying \[2\]

\[
\hat{F}_i(t) = \mu_i \int_0^t (1 - F(x))dx.
\]

It is known that \[2\] the popularity (requested probability) of content $i$ satisfies

\[
p_i = \mu_i / \mu,
\]

with $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i$.

In our work, we consider various inter-request distributions, including exponential, Pareto, hyperexponential and MMPP.
B. Content Popularity

Whereas our analytical results hold for any popularity law, in our numerical studies we will use the Zipf distribution as this distribution is widely used in cache studies, and has been frequently observed in real traffic measurements [6]. Under the Zipf distribution, the probability of requesting the $i$-th most popular content is $A/i^\alpha$, where $\alpha$ is the Zipf parameter depending on the application [16], and $A$ is the normalization factor satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i = 1$.

C. TTL Caches

In a TTL cache, each content $i$ is associated with a timer $t_i$. When content $i$ is requested, there are two cases: (i) if the content is not in the cache (miss), then content $i$ is inserted into the cache and its timer is set to $t_i$; (ii) if the content is in the cache (hit), then the timer associated with content $i$ is reset. The timer decreases at a constant rate and the content is evicted once its timer expires. This is referred to as a Reset TTL Cache. We can control the hit probability of each content by adjusting its timer value.

Denote the hit rate and hit probability of content $i$ as $\lambda_i$ and $h_i$, respectively. From the analysis of previous work [13], the hit probability and hit rate for a reset TTL cache can be computed as

$$h_i = F_i(t_i), \quad \lambda_i = \mu_i F_i(t_i),$$

respectively, where requests for content $i$ follow a request process as described in Section II-A.

Let $h_i^\text{in}$ be the time-average probability that content $i$ is in the cache (i.e., occupancy probability), then we have [17, 11]

$$h_i^\text{in} = \hat{F}_i(t_i).$$

In particular, our model reduces to classical IRM when the inter-request time are exponentially distributed, i.e., Poisson arrival process [3], with $F_i(t) = 1 - e^{-\mu_i t}$, and $h_i = h_i^\text{in}$, based on PASTA property [27].

D. Utility Function and Fairness

Utility functions capture the satisfaction perceived by a content provider. Here, we focus on the widely used $\beta$-fair utility functions [33] given by

$$U_i(x) = \begin{cases} w_i x^{1-\beta}, & \beta \geq 0, \beta \neq 1; \\ w_i \log x, & \beta = 1, \end{cases}$$

where $w_i > 0$ denotes a weight associated with content $i$.

III. CACHE UTILITY MAXIMIZATION

In this section, we formulate a utility maximization problem for cache management (CUM). In particular, we consider a formulation based on hit rate (HRB-CUM). As mentioned in the introduction, one can also formulate a problem based on hit probability. A similar formulation for HPB-CUM is available in Appendix X-A.

We are interested in optimizing the sum of utilities over all contents,

$$\max_{\{t_1, \cdots, t_n\}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} U_i(\lambda_i^r(t_i))$$

s.t. $\sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i^\text{in}(t_i) \leq B$, \hspace{1cm} (8a)

$$0 \leq h_i^\text{in}(t_i) \leq 1,$$ \hspace{1cm} (8b)

$$0 \leq \lambda_i^r(t_i) = \lambda_i^r(t_i)/\mu_i \leq 1.$$ \hspace{1cm} (8c)

Constraint (8b) ensures that the expected number of contents does not exceed the cache size. (8c) and (8d) are the inherent constraints on occupancy probability $h_i^\text{in}(t_i) = F_i(t_i)$ and hit probability $\lambda_i^r(t_i) = \lambda_i^r(t_i)/\mu_i = F_i(t_i)$, respectively. Although the objective function is concave, (8) is not a convex optimization problem w.r.t. timer $t_i$, since the feasible set is not convex. See Appendix X-B for details. Hence, (8) is hard to solve in general.

In the following, we will show that (8) can be reformulated as a convex problem. From (5), we have $t_i = F_i^{-1}(\lambda_i^r/\mu_i)$, with $F_i^{-1}(\cdot)$ being the inverse function of $F_i(\cdot)$. Then by (6),

$$h_i^\text{in} = F_i(F_i^{-1}(\lambda_i^r/\mu_i)) \equiv g_i(\lambda_i^r/\mu_i).$$

From (3), we know there exists a one-to-one correspondence between $F_i$ and $F_i$, hence $g_i(\cdot)$ exists. Therefore, (8) can be reformulated as follows

$$\text{HRB-CUM:} \quad \max_{\{\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n\}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} U_i(\lambda_i^r)$$

s.t. $\sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(\lambda_i^r/\mu_i) \leq B$, \hspace{1cm} (10a)

$$0 \leq \lambda_i^r/\mu_i \leq 1.$$ \hspace{1cm} (10b)

Again (10b) is on average cache occupancy. Note that we can obtain HPB-CUM from (10) by replacing $\lambda_i^r$ by $h_i^\text{in}$ in (10a), and $\lambda_i^r/\mu_i$ by $h_i^\text{in}$ in (10b) and (10c), respectively.

Remark 1. It can be shown that if $n \to \infty$ and $B$ grows in a sub-linear manner, the probability of violating the target cache size $B$ becomes negligible [9].

A related problem has been formulated in [11], where the authors formulated the optimization problem as a function of $h_i^\text{in}$. However, such a formulation may not be suitable for designing decentralized algorithms since we need a closed form expression for $F_i^{-1}$. More details on the advantages of our formulation over [11] in decentralized algorithm design are given in Section VI. Furthermore, [11] only considers linear utilities while we aim to characterize the impact of different utility functions on optimal TTL policies.

Now we consider the convexity of (10).

Lemma 1. Let $F_i(t)$ and $\hat{F}_i(t)$ be the c.d.f. and age distribution for the request process of content $i$, given in (3) and (4), respectively. Denote the corresponding density function as
Let $\zeta_i(t)$ be the hazard rate function associated with $F_i(t)$, given as
\[
\zeta_i(t) = \frac{f_i(t)}{1 - F_i(t)}, \quad t \in [0, F_i^{-1}(1)]. \tag{11}
\]
Then we have
\[
\frac{\partial g_i(\lambda_i^r/\mu_i)}{\partial \lambda_i^r} = 1 - \frac{F_i(\lambda_i^r/\mu_i)}{f_i(\lambda_i^r/\mu_i)} = \frac{1}{\zeta_i(\lambda_i^r/\mu_i)}. \tag{12}
\]

The proof can be found in Appendix X-B.

From (12), it is clear that the behavior of the hazard rate function plays a prominent role in solving (10). In particular, if $\zeta_i(t)$ is a non-increasing hazard rate function (DHR), then by (12), $g_i(\lambda_i^r/\mu_i)$ is non-decreasing in $\lambda_i^r$. Therefore, the feasible set in (10) is convex. Since the objective function is strictly concave and continuous, (10) is a convex optimization problem. We write the

\[
\sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\lambda_i^r/\mu_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(y_i^{-1}(\eta^r)) = B. \tag{17}
\]

As discussed earlier, our optimization framework holds for TTL caches. Once we determine $\eta^r$ from (17), the timer can be computed as
\[
t_i = F_i^{-1}(y_i^{-1}(\eta^r)), \quad i = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{18}
\]
then by (5), the hit probability and hit rate for reset TTL cache under HRB-CUM is
\[
h^r_i = y_i^{-1}(\eta^r), \quad \lambda_i^r = \mu_i y_i^{-1}(\eta^r). \tag{19}
\]

IV. SPECIFIC TRAFFIC DISTRIBUTIONS

In this section, we investigate inter-request time distributions that are DHR such that (10) is a convex optimization problem. For the ease of exposition, we relegate detailed explanations of different parameters and derivations to Appendix X-C. The properties of these distributions are presented in Table II.

First, for both exponential and generalized Pareto distributions, we have explicit forms for $g_i(\cdot)$. Thus the optimization problem in (10) can be solved both centrally and in distributed manner with a distributed algorithm. However, we will see that the distributed dual algorithm for generalized Pareto distribution involves solving a fixed point equation, which has high computational complexity. This will be further discussed in Section VII.

Second, for hyperexponential distribution, we cannot obtain an explicit form for $F_i^{-1}(\cdot)$, and hence not for $g_i(\cdot)$ from (9). Therefore, it is difficult to obtain an exact solution of (10) through centralized solver besides a few special cases. However, we will see that the corresponding problems of (10) can be solved in a distributed fashion through solving fixed point equations without the explicit form of $g_i(\cdot)$. Again, this will be further discussed in Section VII.

Next, we consider a Markov modulated Poisson process (MMPP). MMPP is a doubly stochastic Poisson process with rate varying according to a Markov process. MMPPs have been widely used to model request processes with bursty arrivals, which occur in various application domains such as web caching [31] and Internet traffic modeling [30]. We consider arrivals following a two state MMPP. W.l.o.g., denote the states as 1 and 2. The transition rate for content $i$ from state 1 to 2 is $r_{1i}$, and $r_{2i}$ vice versa. The arrivals for content $i$ at states 1 and 2 are described by Poisson processes with rates $\theta_{1i}$ and $\theta_{2i}$, respectively. Then the steady state distribution satisfies $\pi = [\pi_{1i}, \pi_{2i}] = [r_{2i} / (r_{1i} + r_{2i}), r_{1i} / (r_{1i} + r_{2i})]$. Denote $\mathbf{p}_i = [p_{1i}, p_{2i}] = [\eta_{1i}(\mathbf{p}), \eta_{2i}(\mathbf{p}) / \eta_{2i}(\mathbf{p})]$. We assume that the initial probability vector for this 2-MMPP is chosen according to $\mathbf{p}$, i.e., interval stationary [12]. Under this assumption, the inter-request times of this 2-MMPP is
equivalent to a second order hyperexponential distribution with parameters satisfying \[ u_{1i} = \left( \theta_{1i} + \theta_{2i} + r_{1i} + r_{2i} - \delta_i \right) / 2, \]
\[ u_{2i} = \left( \theta_{1i} + \theta_{2i} + r_{1i} + r_{2i} + \delta_i \right) / 2, \]
\[ q_{1i} = \frac{\theta_{2i}^2 r_{1i} + \theta_{1i}^2 r_{2i}}{\theta_{1i} + \theta_{2i}} - \frac{u_{2i}}{u_{1i} - u_{2i}}, \]
\[ q_{2i} = 1 - q_{1i}, \]
\[ \delta_i = \sqrt{\theta_{1i} - \theta_{2i} + r_{1i} - r_{2i}^2 + 4r_{1i}r_{2i}}. \]  
(20)

Again, it is difficult to obtain exact solution of (10) through centralized solver for a two state MMPP.

**Remark 2.** Note that obtaining optimal solution for inter-request times with hyperexponential distribution has significant advantages since many heavy-tailed distributions can be well approximated by a hyperexponential distribution \[ (10). \] Similarly for an m-state MMPP, \( F_i(\cdot) \) is a mixture of m exponential distributions. In particular, we will discuss the algorithm for obtaining optimal solution for a two-state MMPP in Section VI. Furthermore, we also consider Weibull distribution. Due to space limits, we relegate its property to Appendix X-C.

V. PERFORMANCE COMPARISON

Different utility functions define different fairness properties. In this section, we analytically compare the performance of HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM under different utility functions and request arrival processes considered in Section IV. We omit proofs in this section and relegate them to Appendix X-D.

A. Identical Distributions

Assume that all contents have the same request arrival process, i.e., \( F_i(\cdot) = F(\cdot) \) for all \( i \), then we have \( \tilde{F}_i(\cdot) = \tilde{F}(\cdot) \), \( g_i(\cdot) = g(\cdot) \) and \( \mu_i = \mu \) for all \( i \).

**Theorem 1.** Under identical stationary request processes, HRB-CUM \[ (8) \] and HPB-CUM \[ (33) \] in Appendix X-A are equivalent.

Further assume that all contents have the same utility function, i.e., \( U_i(\cdot) = U(\cdot) \), for all \( i \). From (15), we know \( y_i^{-1} = y^{-1} \) for all \( i \). Hence \( \lambda_i^* = \lambda^r \) for all \( i \). Therefore, from (17),
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(\lambda_i^*/\mu_i) = ng(\lambda^r/\mu) = B, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \lambda^r = mg^{-1}(B/n). \]  
(21)

B. \( \beta \)-fair Utility Functions

Consider the case that \( \beta = 1 \) in (7), i.e., \( U_i(x) = w_i \log x \), then \( U_i^*(x) = w_i/x \).

**Theorem 2.** HRB-CUM \[ (8) \] and HPB-CUM \[ (33) \] in Appendix X-A are identical under \( \beta \)-utility function with \( \beta = 1 \).

In the remainder of this section, we consider \( \beta \)-fair utility function with \( \beta > 0 \) and \( \beta \neq 1 \). We compare the optimal hit probabilities \( h_i^r, h_i^\beta \) and hit rates \( \lambda_i^r, \lambda_i^\beta \), under HRB-CUM \[ (8) \] and HPB-CUM \[ (33) \] in Appendix X-A for different weights \( w_i \). Without loss of generality (w.l.o.g.), we assume arrival rates satisfy \( \mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_n \), such that content popularities satisfy \( p_1 \geq \cdots \geq p_n \), where \( p_i = \mu_i/\mu \) and \( \mu = \sum_i \mu_i \).

1) Poisson Request Processes: With the Lagrangian method, we easily obtain the optimal hit rate \( \lambda_i^r \) and hit probability \( h_i^r \) under HRB-CUM for \( \beta > 0 \) and \( \beta \neq 1 \),
\[ \lambda_i^r = \frac{w_i^{1/\beta} H_i^{1/\beta}}{\sum_j w_j^{1/\beta} H_j^{1/\beta}}, \quad h_i^r = \frac{w_i^{1/\beta} H_i^{1/\beta}}{w_i^{1/\beta} H_i^{1/\beta} - \sum_j w_j^{1/\beta} H_j^{1/\beta} - B}. \]  
(22)

From (8), the corresponding optimal hit rate and hit probability under HPB-CUM are \( \lambda_i^\beta = \frac{w_i^{1/\beta} \mu_i}{\sum_j w_j^{1/\beta} \mu_j} B \) and \( h_i^\beta = \frac{w_i^{1/\beta} \mu_i B}{\sum_j w_j^{1/\beta} \mu_j B} \), respectively. Consider the Zipf popularity distribution with parameter \( \alpha = 0.8 \), \( n = 10^3 \) and \( B = 100 \) in our numerical studies.

**Monotone non-increasing weights:** We consider monotone non-increasing weights, i.e., \( w_1 \geq \cdots \geq w_n \), given \( \mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_n \).

**Theorem 3.** When \( \{w_i, i = 1, \cdots, n\} \) are monotone decreasing, (i) for \( \beta < 1 \), \( \exists \tilde{j} \in (1, n) \) s.t. \( \lambda_i^r > \lambda_j^r \), \( \forall i < \tilde{j} \); and (ii) for \( \beta > 1 \), \( \exists \tilde{l} \in (1, n) \) s.t. \( \lambda_i^\beta > \lambda_j^\beta \), \( \forall i > \tilde{l} \). In particular, if \( \tilde{j}, \tilde{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \), then \( \lambda_i^r = \lambda_j^p \), and \( \lambda_i^\beta = \lambda_j^\beta \).
Fig. 1: HRB-CUM vs. HPB-CUM under exponential distribution: (Left) $\beta = 0.8$ and (Right) $\beta = 2$.

Theorem 3 states that compared to HPB-CUM, HRB-CUM favors more popular contents for $\beta < 1$, and less popular contents for $\beta > 1$.

The following corollary applies to the Zipf popularity distribution.

**Corollary 1.** If the popularity distribution is Zipfian: (a) When $\beta < 1$, $\lambda_i^r > \lambda_i^p$ for $i = 1, \ldots, i_0$, and $\lambda_i^r < \lambda_i^p$ for $i = i_0 + 1, \ldots, n$; (b) When $\beta > 1$, $\lambda_i^r < \lambda_i^p$ for $i = 1, \ldots, i_0$, and $\lambda_i^r > \lambda_i^p$ for $i = i_0 + 1, \ldots, n$, where

$$i_0 = \left\lfloor \frac{\sum w_j^r j^{(\omega - 1)/\gamma}}{\sum w_j^p j^{(\omega - 1)/\gamma}} \right\rfloor.$$

Figures 1 (Left) and (Right) illustrate the case that $w_i = \mu_i$, $\beta = 0.8$ and $\beta = 2$, respectively.

We make a similar comparison of the hit probabilities under HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM.

**Theorem 4.** When $w_1 \geq \cdots \geq w_n$, (i) for $\beta < 1$, $\exists j \in (1, n)$ s.t. $h_l^r > h_l^p$, $\forall i < j$, and $h_l^r < h_l^p$, $\forall i > j$; and (ii) for $\beta > 1$, $\exists l \in (1, n)$ s.t. $h_l^r < h_l^p$, $\forall i < l$, and $h_l^r > h_l^p$, $\forall i > l$. In particular, if $j, l \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, then $h_j^r = h_l^p$, and $h_l^r = h_l^p$.

The following corollary applies to the Zipf popularity distribution.

**Corollary 2.** Assume the Zipf popularity distribution: (a) When $\beta < 1$, $h_l^r > h_l^p$, for $i = 1, \ldots, i_0$, and $h_l^r < h_l^p$, for $i = i_0 + 1, \ldots, n$; (b) When $\beta > 1$, $h_l^r < h_l^p$, for $i = 1, \ldots, i_0$, and $h_l^r > h_l^p$, for $i = i_0 + 1, \ldots, n$, where

$$i_0 = \left\lfloor \frac{\sum w_j^r j^{(\omega - 1)/\gamma}}{\sum w_j^p j^{(\omega - 1)/\gamma}} \right\rfloor.$$

We numerically verify our results, and observe that they exhibit similar trends as in Figures 1 (Left) and (Right), hence we omit them here due to space constraints.

We are unable to achieve explicit expressions for $h_l^r, h_l^p, \lambda_i^r$, and $\lambda_i^p$ for HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM when inter-request times follow either a generalized Pareto or hyperexponential distribution, or 2-MMP distribution. However, from Section IV, we know (10) and (33) in Appendix X-A are convex optimization problems. We numerically compare the performance of HRB-CUM (8) and HPB-CUM (33) in Appendix X-A under a Zipf-like distribution with parameter $\alpha = 0.8$. Similar results hold for these distributions, and we omit the results due to space limitation.

VI. DECENTRALIZED ALGORITHMS

In Section III, we formulated the optimization problem with a fixed cache size, however, system parameters (e.g. request processes) can change over time, and as discussed in Section V the optimization problem under some inter-request distributions cannot be solved centrally. Moreover, it is infeasible to solve the optimization problem offline and then implement the optimal strategy. Hence decentralized algorithms are needed to implement the optimal strategy to adapt to these changes in the presence of limited information.

In the following, we develop such algorithms for HRB-CUM and compare its performance to that of HPB-CUM under stationary request processes discussed in Section V. We only present explicit algorithms for HRB-CUM, similar algorithms for HPB-CUM are available in Appendix X-E. We drop the superscript $r$ in this section for brevity.

**A. Dual Algorithm**

For a request arrival process with a DHR inter-request distribution, (10) becomes a convex optimization problem as discussed in Section IV and hence solving the dual problem produces the optimal solution. Since $0 < t_i < \infty$, then $0 < \lambda_i/\mu_i < 1$ and $0 < g_i(\lambda_i/\mu_i) < 1$. Therefore, the Lagrange dual function is

$$D(\eta) = \max_{\lambda_i} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n U_i(\lambda_i) - \eta \left( \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\lambda_i/\mu_i) - B \right) \right\},$$

and the dual problem is

$$\min_{\eta \geq 0} D(\eta).$$

Following the standard gradient descent algorithm by taking the derivative of $D(\eta)$ w.r.t. $\eta$, the dual variable $\eta$ should be updated as

$$\eta^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \max \left\{ 0, \eta^{(k)} + \gamma \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\lambda_i^{(k)}/\mu_i) - B \right] \right\},$$

where $k$ is the iteration number, $\gamma > 0$ is the step size at each iteration and $\eta \geq 0$ due to KKT conditions.

Based on the results in Section III in order to achieve optimality, we must have

$$\eta^{(k)} = \frac{\mu_i U_i'((\lambda_i^{(k)})/\mu_i)}{g_i((\lambda_i^{(k)})/\mu_i)),} \triangleq y_i(\lambda_i^{(k)}/\mu_i),$$

i.e., $\lambda_i^{(k)} = \mu_i y_i^{-1}(\eta^{(k)}).

(26)

Since $g_i(\lambda_i^{(k)}/\mu_i)$ indicates the probability that content $i$ is in the cache, $\sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\lambda_i^{(k)}/\mu_i)$ represents the number of contents currently in the cache, denoted as $B_{curr}$. Therefore, the dual algorithm for reset TTL caches is

$$t_i^{(k)} = F_i^{-1}(y_i^{-1}(\eta^{(k)})),$$

$$\eta^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \max \left\{ 0, \eta^{(k)} + \gamma(B_{curr} - B) \right\},$$

(27a, 27b)
where the iteration index $k$ is incremented upon each request.

**Remark 3.** From (26) and (27), it is clear that if the explicit form of $g_i(\cdot)$ or $\hat{g}_i(\cdot)$ is available, then the dual algorithm can be directly implemented. This is the case for Poisson and generalized Pareto inter-request distributions, see Section IV and the following for details. However, neither is available for the hyperexponential distribution and the 2-MMPP. In the following, we will show that the dual algorithm can still be implemented without this information.

**Poisson Process:** We have $g_i(\lambda_i^k(\mu)) = 1$, and $\lambda_i^k = U_1^k - (\eta^{(k)})^{\gamma_i} / (\mu)$.  

**Generalized Pareto Distribution:** When inter-request times are described by a generalized Pareto distribution and utilities are $\beta$-fair, $\lambda_i^k$ can be obtained through  

$$\mu_i^{1-\beta} \cdot u_i(1 - (\lambda_i^k(\mu))^{k_i} / [\eta^{(k)}(1 - k_i)]) - (\lambda_i^k(\mu))^{\beta} = 0.$$  

(28)

We can show that there exists a finite value solution in $[0, \mu_i]$ for any $\eta^{(k)} > 0$; details given in Appendix X-E1

**Hyperexponential Distribution:** Under a hyperexponential distribution, we have $g_i(x) = \mu_i (1 - x) / f_i(F_i^{-1}(x))$. Since we do not have a closed form expression for $F_i^{-1}(x)$, no explicit form exists for $g_i(x)$. Given (26) and a $\beta$-fair utility, timer $t_i^k$ at iteration $k$ can be solved from the following fixed point equation  

$$(F_i(t_i^k))^{\beta + 1} - (F_i(t_i^k))^{\beta} + f_i(t_i^k) / (\eta^{(k)})^{\beta - 1} = 0,$$  

(29)

where $F_i(t) = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} p_{ji} e^{-\theta_i j t}$ and $f_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} p_{ji} \theta_i j e^{-\theta_i j t}$.

**2-MMPP:** From Section IV 2-MMPP is equivalent to a second order hyperexponential distribution. Hence timer $t_i^k$ can be updated from (29) with $F_i(t) = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{2} q_{ji} u_j^{\gamma_i}$ and $f_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{2} q_{ji} u_j^{\gamma_i} e^{-\theta_i j t}$.

**Remark 4.** We can similarly design primal and primal-dual algorithms by introducing a cost function $C(\cdot)$ to the sum of utilities, which is a convex and non-decreasing penalty function denoting the cost for extra cache storage. For ease of exposition, we relegate their description to Appendix X-E2. In the remainder of the paper, we refer to these distributed algorithms as Dual, Primal and Primal-Dual, respectively. Furthermore, it can be easily shown that all the above distributed algorithms converge to the optimal solutions, respectively, using Lyapunov techniques. Again, the corresponding algorithms for Weibull distribution are available in Appendix X-E3.

**B. Performance Evaluation**

In this Section, we evaluate the performance of the decentralized algorithms for both HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM when inter-request times are described by a stationary request process and utility functions are $\beta$-fair. Due to space restrictions, we limit our study to minimum potential delay fairness, i.e., $\beta = 2$.

1) **Experiment Setup:** In our studies, we consider a Zipf popularity distribution with $\alpha = 0.8$, $n = 1000$ and $B = 100$. We consider the inter-request time distributions described in Section IV with an aggregate request rate $\mu = 1$ such that $\mu_i = p_i$ from (2). In particular, (i) for exponential distribution, the rate parameter is set to $\mu_i = p_i$; (ii) for generalized Pareto distribution, let $k_i = 0.48$, $\sigma_i = (1 - k_i) / p_i$ and $\theta_i = 0$. We relegate the discussions of hyperexponential and 2-MMPP to Section VII since no centralized solution is available for them.

2) **Exactness:** We first consider the dual algorithm described in Section VI-A. Note that the dual algorithm for generalized Pareto involves solving singular equation (28). We solve it efficiently with Matlab routine fsolve using a step size $\gamma = 10^{-7}$. The performance of dual under exponential is shown in Figure 2 (Left), where “Centralized” means solutions from solving (10).

From Figure 2 (Left-Top), we observe that the decentralized algorithms yield the exact hit rates under both HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM. Similarly results hold for the hit probabilities, which is omitted here due to space limits. Figure 2 (Left-Bottom) shows the probability density for the number of contents in the cache across these distributions. As expected the density is highly concentrated around the cache size $B$. Similar results hold for generalized Pareto distribution and we omit the results due to space limits.

We also use primal and primal-dual distributed algorithms to implement minimum potential delay fairness. In particular, as discussed in Section VI primal is associated with a penalty function $C(\cdot)$. Choosing an appropriate penalty function plays an important role in the performance of primal, since we need to evaluate the gradient at each iteration through $C'()$. Here, we use $C(x) = \max \{0, x - B \log(B + x)\}$ Another reasonable choice can be $C(x) = \max \{0, x^m\}$, $m \geq 1$. We observe that both primal and primal-dual yield exact hit probabilities and hit rates under HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM for minimum potential delay fairness. We omit the plots due to space constraints.

3) **Convergence Rate and Robustness:** Although the decentralized algorithms converge to the optimal solution as shown in Section VI-B2 the rate of convergence is also important from a service provider’s perspective. Due to space limits, we only focus on the dual here. From (27), it is clear that the step size $\gamma$ (or $\gamma^p$) plays a significant role in the convergence rate. We choose different values of $\gamma_p$ and $\gamma^r$ and compare the performance of HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM under Poisson request processes, shown in Figure 2 (Middle) and (Right). On one hand, we find that when a larger value of $\gamma^p = \gamma^r = 10^{-5}$ is chosen, the dual for HRB-CUM easily converges after a few iterations, i.e., the simulated hit rates exactly match numerically computed values, while those of HPB-CUM do not converge. On the other hand, when a smaller value $\gamma^p = \gamma^r = 10^{-5}$ is chosen, both

\[\text{Note that the step size has an impact on the convergence and its rate, more details are discussed in Section VII-B.}\]

\[\text{Here we use superscript p and r to distinguish the step size of corresponding dual algorithms under HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM, respectively.}\]
In this section, we apply the Dual designed for the case of requests described by a Poisson process to a workload where requests are described by a non-Poisson stationary request processes. Such an algorithm does not require solving non-linear equations and hence is computationally efficient. Moreover, we also use estimation techniques introduced in [8] to approximate request rates which makes these distributed algorithms work in an online fashion. W.l.o.g., we consider content \( i \).

4) Comparison of Decentralized Algorithms: From the above analysis, we know that at each iteration, the dual algorithm needs to solve a non-linear equation to obtain the timer value, which might be computationally intensive compared to primal and primal-dual. However, for primal, some choices of penalty function \( C(\cdot) \) and arrival process \( g^i(\cdot) \) may result in large gradients and abrupt function change [32]. Similarly for primal-dual, two scaling parameters \( \delta_i \) and \( \gamma \) need to be carefully chosen, otherwise the algorithm might diverge. These demonstrate the pro-and-cons of these distributed algorithms, and one algorithm may be favorable than others in specific situations.

VII. POISSON ONLINE APPROXIMATION

From Section VI, it is clear that the implementation of Dual under generalized Pareto, hyperexponential distributions and 2-MMPP involves solving non-linear fixed point equations, which are computationally intensive. However, the Dual for the case of requests governed by Poisson processes is simple. Furthermore, knowledge of the inter-request distribution (e.g., request arrival rates) are also required. However, this is not always available at the service provider.

In this section, we apply the Dual designed for the case of requests described by a Poisson process to a workload where requests are described by a non-Poisson stationary request processes. Such an algorithm does not require solving non-linear equations and hence is computationally efficient. Moreover, we also use estimation techniques introduced in [8] to approximate request rates which makes these distributed algorithms work in an online fashion. W.l.o.g., we consider content \( i \).

A. Online Algorithm

We consider the problem of estimating the arrival rate \( \mu_i \) for content \( i \) adopting techniques used in [8] described as follows. Denote the remaining TTL time for content \( i \) as \( \tau_i \). This can be computed given \( t_i \) and a time-stamp for the last request time for content \( i \). Let \( X_{ik} \) be the mean. Then we approximate the mean inter-request time as \( \hat{X}_{ik} = t_i - \tau_i \). Clearly \( \hat{X}_{ik} \) is an unbiased estimator of \( X_{ik} \), and hence an unbiased estimator of \( 1/\mu_i \). In this section, we will use this estimator to implement the distributed algorithms, which now becomes an online algorithm.

Given this estimator and Dual (27), we propose the follow-
Optimal Hit Rate

Poisson approximate online algorithm

\[ t_i^{(k)} = -\frac{1}{\mu_i P} \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\mu_i P} U_i^{\eta^{(k+1)}} \right) \]  

\[ \eta^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \max \{ 0, \eta^{(k)} + \gamma(B_{\text{cur}} - B) \}. \]  

Note that there are two differences between our proposed algorithm \(30\) and Dual \(27\). First, the explicit form of \(27\) is different for different inter-request distributions as discussed in Section VI-A, while we always adopt the explicit form of Poisson process in \(30\). Second, \(\mu_i\) in \(26\) is the exact value of the mean arrival rate of the corresponding inter-request distribution, while we estimate its value as discussed above and denote it as \(\hat{\mu}_i\). The value of \(B_{\text{cur}}\) denotes the number of contents currently in the cache under the real inter-request distribution under both \(30\) and \(27\). In the following, we consider the performance of \(30\) under different inter-request distributions.

B. Generalized Pareto Distribution

In this section, we apply the online algorithm \(30\) to a workload where requests are described by stationary request process under generalized Pareto distribution with shape parameter \(k_i = 0.48\). The performance is shown in Figure 3. It is clear that the approximation is accurate. Furthermore, it has been theoretically characterized in [34] that for any given generalized Pareto model with finite variance, an optimal exponential approximation exists which minimizes the K-L divergence between these two distributions. The optimal exponential approximation has the same mean as that of the generalized Pareto distribution, i.e., \(\mu_i = (1 - k_i)/\sigma_i\). The estimator we use in our online algorithm \(30\), i.e., \(1/\hat{\mu}_i\), is an unbiased estimator of mean inter-request rate of the generalized Pareto arrival process, thus explaining the better performance of our Poisson approximation in accordance with the theoretical results provided in [34]. Moreover, we notice that when \(k_i\) becomes smaller, the accuracy has been improved. However, this approximation has poor performance when \(k_i > 0.5\) since the generalized Pareto distribution has an infinite variance for \(k_i > 0.5\).

C. 2-MMPP Distribution

The optimal hit rates under 2-MMPP can be obtained through solving Dual for a second order hyperexponential distribution with parameters \(q, u_1\) and \(u_2\) defined in \(20\). However, from Section VI-D Dual requires solving a non-linear equation \(29\). Instead, we consider Poisson approximation \(30\) under 2-MMPP. W.l.o.g., we assume the phase rates \(\theta_{1i}\) and \(\theta_{2i}\) for \(i = 1, \cdots, n\) to be Zipf distributed with parameters \(0.4\) and \(0.8\), respectively.

1) Limiting Behavior: We first evaluate the performance of Poisson online approximation algorithm \(30\) for different transition rates \(r_{1i}\) and \(r_{2i}\). W.l.o.g., we represent \(r_{1i} = a_{1i} x_i\) and \(r_{2i} = a_{2i} x_i\), where \(a_{1i}, a_{2i}\) are constants, and \(0 \leq x_i \leq \infty\).

Theorem 5. We represent \(r_{1i} = a_{1i} x_i\) and \(r_{2i} = a_{2i} x_i\), where \(a_{1i}, a_{2i}\) are constants, and \(0 \leq x_i \leq \infty\). Then we have the following results

(1) When \(r_{1i}, r_{2i} \to \infty\), i.e., \(x_i \to \infty\), by applying L’Hospital’s rule to \(20\), we have

\[ u_{1i} = \frac{\theta_{1i} a_{2i} + \theta_{2i} a_{1i}}{a_{1i} + a_{2i}}, \quad u_{2i} = \frac{\theta_{1i} a_{2i}}{\theta_{1i} a_{2i} + \theta_{2i} a_{1i}}, \quad q_{1i} = 1, \quad q_{2i} = 0, \]  

i.e., 2-MMPP is equivalent to a Poisson process with rate \(u_{1i}\), i.e., our approximation is exact.

(2) When \(r_{1i}, r_{2i} \to 0\), i.e., \(x_i \to 0\), by applying L’Hospital’s rule to \(20\), we have

\[ u_{1i} = \frac{\theta_{1i} a_{2i}}{\theta_{1i} a_{2i} + \theta_{2i} a_{1i}}, \quad u_{2i} = \frac{\theta_{1i} a_{2i}}{\theta_{1i} a_{2i} + \theta_{2i} a_{1i}}, \quad q_{1i} = \frac{\theta_{1i}}{\theta_{1i} + \theta_{2i}}, \quad q_{2i} = \frac{\theta_{2i}}{\theta_{1i} + \theta_{2i}}. \]  

i.e., 2-MMPP can be treated as a weighted sum of two Poisson processes with rates \(\theta_{1i}, \theta_{2i}\) and weights \(q_{1i}, q_{2i}\), respectively.

(3) When \(0 < r_{1i}, r_{2i} < \infty\), i.e., \(0 < x_i < \infty\): As discussed in Section IV 2-MMPP is equivalent to a second order hyperexponential distribution with parameters given in \(20\).

The proof is relegated to Appendix X-G

2) Numerical Validation: We numerically verify the results in Theorem 5 by taking different values of transition rates. The performance comparison between \(31\) and \(32\) are shown in Figures 4 and 5, respectively, where “Dual-MMPP” is obtained.
TABLE II: Optimal aggregate hit rates for large \((x = 10^{-3})\) and small \((x = 10^{-7})\) state transition rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(x)</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>Dual-MMPP</th>
<th>Dual-Poisson</th>
<th>Online-Poisson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10^{-3})</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.1691</td>
<td>0.1612</td>
<td>0.1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10^{-7})</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.1474</td>
<td>0.1427</td>
<td>0.1540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from Dual \((27)\) in Section VII “Dual-Poisson” is obtained from \((30)\) with the exact mean \(\mu_i = (\theta_{1i} r_{2i} + \theta_{2i} r_{1i})/(r_{1i} + r_{2i})\) is known and “Online-Poisson” is obtained from \((30)\) with estimated arrival rates as discussed in Section VII-A. We can see that with large transition rates, the poisson approximation performs better as compared to small transition rates. This is due to the fact that our approximation becomes exact when transition rates go to infinite. However, our approximation yields similar optimal aggregate hit rate as compared to “Dual-MMPP” even for small transition rates. We present these results in Table II. We also numerically verify the third case in Theorem 5 by taking \(r_{1i} = 5 \times 10^{-5}\) and \(r_{2i} = 2 \times 10^{-5}\). Again, we can see that the optimal hit rates obtained through \((30)\) match those obtained from Dual under 2-MMPP. We omit the plot due to space limits.

D. \(m\)-state MMPP

Under the general \(m\)-state MMPP, we can theoretically characterize the limit behaviors of the inter-request times, however, since there is no explicit form of the inter-request distribution, we cannot give an explicit form of the parameters as for the 2-MMPP in \((31)\) and \((32)\). We summarize the results in the following theorems and relegate the proofs to Appendix X-H.

**Theorem 6.** Consider an \(m\)-state MMPP. When the state transition rates go to 0, the inter-request times are a mixture of exponentials.

**Theorem 7.** Consider an \(m\)-state MMPP. When the state transition rate go to infinity, the inter-request times are exponentially distributed.

**Remark 5.** We also consider the case when arrivals follow hyperexponential and weibull distributions. From Section IV \((19)\) can be solved with Dual for hyperexponential and weibull distributions. We make comparisons between these results with those obtained by \((20)\). We find that the optimal hit rates obtained through \((30)\) match those obtained solving Dual for hyperexponential and weibull distributions. For ease of exposition, we relegate it to Appendix X-L.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we associated each content with a utility that is a function of the corresponding content hit rate or hit probability, and formulated a cache utility maximization problem under stationary requests. We showed that this optimization problem is convex when the request process has a DHR. We presented explicitly optimal solutions for HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM, and made a comparison between them both theoretically and numerically. We also developed decentralized algorithms to implement the optimal policies. We found that HRB-CUM is more robust and stable than HPB-CUM w.r.t. convergence rate. Finally, we proposed Poisson approximate online algorithms to different inter-request distributions, which is accurate and lightweight. Going further, we aim at extending our results to consider Non-reset TTL Cache where the timer is set only on a cache miss. Non-reset TTL Caches might have different implications on the design and performance analysis of distributed and online algorithms. Establishing these results will be our future goal.
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X. APPENDIX

A. HPB-CUM

Following a similar argument in Section III, we can formulate the following hit probability based optimization problem

\[
\text{HPB-CUM: } \max_{0 \leq h_i^p \leq 1} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} U_i(h_i^p) s.t. \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(h_i^p) \leq B \right\}, \tag{33}
\]

The Lagrangian function can be written as

\[
\mathcal{L}^p(h^p, \eta^p) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} U_i(h_i^p) - \eta^p \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(h_i^p) - B \right], \tag{34}
\]

where \(\eta^p\) is the Lagrangian multiplier and \(h^p = (h_1^p, \cdots, h_n^p)\). Similarly, the derivative of \(\mathcal{L}^p(h^p, \eta^p)\) w.r.t. \(h_i^p\) for \(i = 1, \cdots, n\), should satisfy the following condition so as to achieve its maximum

\[
\eta^p_i = U'_i(h_i^p)/g'_i(h_i^p) \triangleq v_i(h_i^p), \tag{35}
\]

where \(v_i(\cdot)\) is a continuous and differentiable function on \([0,1]\), i.e., there exists a one-to-one mapping between \(\eta^p\) and \(h_i^p\) if \(0 \leq v_i^{-1}(\eta^p) \leq 1\). Again, by the cache capacity constraint, we can compute \(\eta^p\) through the following fixed-point equation

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(h_i^p) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(v_i^{-1}(\eta^p)) = B. \tag{36}
\]

Finally, given \(\eta^p\), the timer, hit probability, and hit rate are

\[
t_i = F_i^{-1}(v_i^{-1}(\eta^p)), \quad h_i^p = v_i^{-1}(\eta^p), \quad \lambda_i^p = \mu_i v_i^{-1}(\eta^p), \tag{37}
i = 1, \cdots, n.
\]
B. Proofs in Section III

1) Convexity of HRB-CUM (8) and HPB-CUM (33): In this section, we show that HRB-CUM (8) and HPB-CUM (33) in terms of timers are non-convex.

**Theorem. HRB-CUM (8) and HPB-CUM (33) in terms of timers are non-convex.**

**Proof.** Recall that

\[ \hat{F}_i(t_i) = \mu_i \int_0^{t_i} (1 - F(x))dx. \]

Take the derivative w.r.t. \( t_i \), we have

\[ \frac{\partial \hat{F}_i(t_i)}{\partial t_i} = \mu_i(1 - F(t_i)), \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial^2 \hat{F}_i(t_i)}{\partial t_i^2} = -\mu_i f_i(t_i). \]  

(38)

Since \( f_i(\cdot) \) is the p.d.f. for the inter-request arrival time with \( \mu_i \geq 0 \), we have \( f_i(t_i) \geq 0 \). Thus \( \frac{\partial^2 \hat{F}_i(t_i)}{\partial t_i^2} \leq 0 \).

Therefore, \( \hat{F}_i(t_i) \) is concave in \( t_i \) and then (8) is a non-convex optimization problem. Similarly, we can show that (33) is non-convex.

2) Proof for Lemma 1: Given (1) and (3), we have

\[ \frac{\partial \hat{F}_i(t_i)}{\partial t_i} = \mu_i(1 - F(t_i)). \]  

(39)

Then

\[ \frac{\partial g_i(h^P_i)}{\partial h^P_i} = \frac{\partial \hat{F}_i(F_i^{-1}(h^P_i))}{\partial h^P_i} \]

\[ = \left[ \right] \frac{\partial \hat{F}_i(F_i^{-1}(h^P_i))}{\partial h^P_i} \cdot \frac{\partial F_i^{-1}(h^P_i)}{\partial h^P_i} \]

\[ \geq (a) \mu_i(1 - F_i(F_i^{-1}(h^P_i))) \cdot \frac{\partial F_i^{-1}(h^P_i)}{\partial h^P_i} \]

\[ \geq (b) \mu_i^2(1 - F_i(F_i^{-1}(h^P_i))) \]

\[ = \frac{\mu_i \hat{F}_i(t_i)}{\zeta(F_i^{-1}(h^P_i))}. \]

(40)

where (a) and (b) hold true based on the chain-rule and the inverse function theorem over continuously differentiable function \( F_i \), respectively.

C. Proofs in Section IV

In this section, we derive expressions for the age distribution of different inter-request distributions, which are summarized in Table I

**Exponential Distribution:** The c.d.f. for exponential distribution is

\[ F_i(t) = 1 - e^{-\mu_i t}, \quad t \geq 0, \]  

(41)

where \( \mu_i \) is the rate parameter. Then the age distribution \( \hat{F}_i(t) \) for \( t \geq 0 \) is

\[ \hat{F}_i(t) = \mu_i \int_0^t (1 - F_i(\tau))d\tau = \mu_i \int_0^t e^{-\mu_i \tau}d\tau \]

\[ = \frac{\mu_i(1 - e^{-\mu_i t})}{\mu_i} = 1 - e^{-\mu_i t} = F_i(t). \]  

(42)

**Generalized Pareto Distribution:** The c.d.f. of generalized Pareto distribution is

\[ F_i(t) = 1 - \left[ 1 + k_i(t - \theta_i) / \sigma_i \right]^{-1/k_i}, \quad t \geq \theta_i, \]  

(43)

where \( k_i, \sigma_i \) and \( \theta_i \) are shape, scale and location parameters, respectively. We consider the case that \( 0 \leq k_i < 1, \sigma_i \geq 0, \) and \( \theta_i = 0 \) such that (43) has a DHR. It is well known that the mean satisfies \( \mu_i = (1 - k_i) / \sigma_i \) and the age distribution \( \hat{F}_i(t) \) is

\[ \hat{F}_i(t) = \mu_i \int_0^t (1 - F_i(\tau))d\tau \]

\[ = \mu_i \int_0^t (1 + k_i t / \sigma_i)^{-1/k_i} \]

\[ = \mu_i \frac{(1 + k_i t / \sigma_i)^{-1/k_i + 1} - 1}{(k_i / \sigma_i)(-1/k_i + 1)} \]

\[ = 1 - (1 + k_i t / \sigma_i)^{1/k_i - 1}. \]  

(44)

**Hyperexponential Distribution:** The c.d.f. of hyperexponential distribution is

\[ F_i(t) = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^l p_{ji} e^{-\theta_{ji} t}, \]

(45)

where \( p_{ji} \) are phase probabilities and \( \theta_{ji} \) are phase rates. The age distribution \( \hat{F}_i(t) \) is

\[ \hat{F}_i(t) = \mu_i \int_0^t (1 - F_i(\tau))d\tau \]

\[ = \mu_i \int_0^t \sum_{j=1}^l p_{ji} e^{-\theta_{ji} \tau}d\tau \]

\[ = \mu_i \sum_{j=1}^l p_{ji} (1 - e^{-\theta_{ji} t}). \]  

(46)

**Weibull Distribution:** The c.d.f. for Weibull distribution is

\[ F_i(t) = 1 - e^{-(t/\theta_i)^{k_i}}, \]

(47)

where \( \theta_i \) and \( k_i \) are scale and shape parameters, respectively. Then the age distribution \( \hat{F}_i(t) \) is

\[ \hat{F}_i(t) = \mu_i t \int_0^t e^{-x^{k_i}} dx. \]

(48)

It is difficult to get a closed form of \( \hat{F}_i(t) \) in general. However, for a special case, \( k_i = 0.5 \), we have

\[ \hat{F}_i(t) = \mu_i \theta_i \int_0^t e^{-\sqrt{x}} dx = 2 \mu_i \theta_i \left[ 1 - e^{-\sqrt{\tau}} \left( \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{\theta_i}} + 1 \right) \right]. \]  

(49)

**Uniform Distribution:** The c.d.f. for uniform distribution is

\[ F_i(t) = \frac{t}{b_i}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq b_i, \]  

(50)

where \( b_i \) is the uniform parameter and \( \mu_i = 2 / b_i \). Then we have

\[ \hat{F}_i(t) = \mu_i \int_0^t \left( 1 - \frac{t}{b_i} \right) d\tau \]
D. Proofs in Section

In this section, we compare the performance of HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM under different utility functions and inter-request processes.

1) Identical Distributions: Here, we consider the performance comparison of HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM under identical inter-request process.

Proof of Theorem 1 Under identical inter-request process, we have \( F_i(\cdot) = F(\cdot) \) \( \forall i \). Hence \( F_i(\cdot) = F(\cdot) \), i.e., \( g_i(\cdot) = g(\cdot) \) \( \forall i \). Also \( \mu_i = \mu \neq i \). In HRB-CUM \( \text{(8)} \), we aim to maximize the objective \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} U_i(x_i^r) \). We can scale the objective as \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} U_i(\lambda_i^r) \), while the solution of problem \( \text{(8)} \) remains the same. By substituting \( \lambda_i^r / \mu_i = h_i^p \), \( \text{(8)} \) and \( \text{(33)} \), i.e. HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM are identical.

2) \( \beta \)-fair Utility Functions: Here, we consider \( \beta \)-fair utilities. First, we consider log utilities, i.e., \( \beta = 1 \).

Proof for Theorem 2 Consider \( U_i(x) = w_i \log x \), i.e., \( U_i'(x) = w_i / x \). Under HRB-CUM, from \( \text{(15)} \), it is clear that

\[
y_i(\lambda_i^r / \mu_i) = \frac{\mu_i w_i}{\lambda_i^r g_i(\lambda_i^r / \mu_i)} = \frac{U_i(\lambda_i^r / \mu_i)}{g_i(\lambda_i^r / \mu_i)} = v_i(\lambda_i^r / \mu_i).
\]

Again by substituting \( \lambda_i^r / \mu_i = h_i^p \), HRB-CUM and HPB-CUM are identical.

Exponential Distribution: We compare HPB-CUM and HRB-CUM under exponential inter-request process.

Uniform weights: First we consider uniform weights, i.e., \( w_i \equiv w \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). Then we have

\[
\begin{align*}
h_i^p &= \frac{B}{n}, \\
h_i^r &= \frac{\mu_i \mu_j^{\frac{1}{r} - 1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j^{\frac{1}{r} - 1}} B.
\end{align*}
\]

Proof. We first consider \( \beta < 1 \), i.e., \( h_i^r \) is decreasing in \( i \). We have

\[
\begin{align*}
h_i^r &= \frac{\mu_i^{\frac{1}{r} - 1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j^{\frac{1}{r} - 1}} B > \frac{\mu_i^{\frac{1}{p} - 1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j^{\frac{1}{p} - 1}} B = \frac{B}{n} = h_i^p, \\
h_i^r &= \frac{\mu_i^{\frac{1}{r} - 1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j^{\frac{1}{r} - 1}} B < \frac{\mu_i^{\frac{1}{p} - 1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j^{\frac{1}{p} - 1}} B = \frac{B}{n} = h_i^p.
\end{align*}
\]

Since \( h_i^r \) is decreasing in \( i \) and \( h_i^p = \frac{B}{n} \) for any \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), thus, there must exist an intersection point \( 1 < j < n \) such that \( h_i^r = h_j^p \), satisfying that \( h_k^r > h_j^p \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, j - 1 \) and \( h_k^r < h_j^p \) for \( k = j + 1, \ldots, n \).

Therefore, when \( \beta < 1 \), we know that HRB-CUM favors more popular item compared to HPB-CUM.

Similarly, when \( \beta > 1 \), \( h_i^r \) is increasing in \( i \). We have

\[
\begin{align*}
h_i^r &= \frac{\mu_i^{\frac{1}{r} - 1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j^{\frac{1}{r} - 1}} B < \frac{\mu_i^{\frac{1}{p} - 1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j^{\frac{1}{p} - 1}} B = \frac{B}{n} = h_i^p, \\
h_i^r &= \frac{\mu_i^{\frac{1}{r} - 1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j^{\frac{1}{r} - 1}} B > \frac{\mu_i^{\frac{1}{p} - 1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mu_j^{\frac{1}{p} - 1}} B = \frac{B}{n} = h_i^p.
\end{align*}
\]

Again, as \( h_i^r \) is increasing in \( i \) and \( h_i^p = \frac{B}{n} \) for any \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), thus, there must exist an intersection point \( 1 < l < n \) such that \( h_i^r = h_l^p \), satisfying that \( h_k^r < h_l^p \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, l - 1 \) and \( h_k^r > h_l^p \) for \( k = l + 1, \ldots, n \).

Therefore, when \( \beta > 1 \), we know that HRB-CUM favors less popular item compared to HPB-CUM.

Now we make a comparison between the hit rate under these two approaches.

Theorem. Under the uniform weight distribution, (i) for \( \beta < 1 \), hit rate based utility maximization approach favors more popular item compared to hit probability based utility approach, i.e., \( \exists j \in (1, n) \) s.t. \( \lambda_j^r > \lambda_i^r \) for \( i < j \); and (i) for \( \beta > 1 \), hit rate based utility maximization approach favors less popular item compared to hit probability based utility approach, i.e., \( \exists l \in (1, n) \) s.t. \( \lambda_l^r > \lambda_i^r \) for \( i > l \). In particular, if \( j, i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \), then \( \lambda_j^r = \lambda_j^p \) and \( \lambda_i^r = \lambda_i^p \).

Proof. We know that

\[
\lambda_i^r = \mu_i h_i^p, \quad \lambda_i^r = \mu_i h_i^p.
\]

Based on the relation between \( h_i^p \) and \( h_i^r \) proved in previous theorem, similar results can be obtained for hit rates: \( \lambda_i^r \) and \( \lambda_i^r \).

Monotone non-increasing weights: Since we usually weight more on popular content, we consider monotone non-
increasing weights, i.e., \( w_1 \geq \cdots \geq w_n \), given \( \mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_n \). In such a case, we have
\[
\begin{align*}
    h_i^0 &= \frac{w_i^{1/\beta}}{\sum_j w_j^{1/\beta}} B, \\
    h_i^1 &= \frac{w_i^{1/\beta} \mu_i^{1/\beta - 1}}{\sum_j w_j^{1/\beta} \mu_j^{1/\beta - 1}} B. 
\end{align*}
\]
It is easy to check that \( h_i^0, h_i^1 \) are decreasing in \( \beta < 1 \), and increasing in \( i \) for \( \beta > 1 \).

Following the same arguments in proofs of Theorems X-D2 and X-D2 we can prove Theorems 3 and 4, hence are omitted here.

**Proof for Theorem 4**

Proof. Above theorem can be proved in a similar manner to that of uniform distribution.

**Proof for Theorem 3**

Proof. Above theorem can be proved in a similar manner to that of uniform distribution.

**E. Decentralized Algorithms in Section [V]**

1) **Non-linear Equations for Dual in HRB-CUM**: We show the existence of a solution of (28).

**Theorem.** For any \( \eta^{(k)}, w_i > 0 \) and \( 0 \leq k_i \leq 1 \), there always exists a unique solution in \([0, 1]\) for
\[
e(h_i^{(k)}) = \mu_i^{1-\beta} w_i (1 - h_i^{(k)} \eta^{(k)(1-k_i)}) - (h_i^{(k)})^{\beta} = 0. \tag{57}
\]

Proof. For \( h_i^{(k)} = 0 \) and \( h_i^{(k)} = 1 \), we have
\[
e(0) = \frac{\mu_i^{1-\beta} w_i}{\eta^{(k)(1-k_i)}}, \quad e(1) = -1.
\]
Furthermore,
\[
e'(h_i^{(k)}) = -\mu_i^{1-\beta} w_i k_i (1 - h_i^{(k)} \eta^{(k)k_i}) - \beta (h_i^{(k)})^{\beta - 1} < 0,
\forall h_i^{(k)} \in [0, 1]. \tag{58}
\]
Thus \( e(\cdot) \) is decreasing in \( h_i^{(k)} \). Since \( h_i^{(k)} \in [0, 1], e(0) > 0 \) and \( e(1) < 0 \), therefore, there always exists a unique solution to (57) in \([0, 1]\). \( \square \)

2) **Decentralized Algorithms for HRB-CUM**: In the following, we develop primal and primal-dual algorithms for HRB-CUM under stationary request processes.

**Primal Algorithm:** Under the primal approach, we append a cost to the sum of utilities as
\[
W(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} U_i(\lambda_i) - C \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(\lambda_i/\mu_i) - B \right),
\tag{59}
\]
where \( C(\cdot) \) is a convex and non-decreasing penalty function denoting the cost for extra cache storage. When \( g_i(\cdot) \) is convex, by the composition property, \( W(\cdot) \) is strictly concave in \( \lambda \). We use standard gradient ascent as follows.

The gradient is given as
\[
\frac{\partial W(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda_i} = U_i'(\lambda_i) - \frac{g_i'(\lambda_i/\mu_i)}{\mu_i} C' \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(\lambda_i/\mu_i) - B \right).
\tag{60}
\]
We also have \( \frac{\partial \lambda_i}{\partial t_i} = \frac{\partial \mu_i}{\partial t_i} / \partial t_i = \mu_i f_i(t_i) > 0 \).
Hence we move \( t_i \) in the direction of gradient and the primal algorithm is given by
\[
\lambda_i^{(k+1)} = \mu_i f_i \left( t_i^{(k)} \right),
\tag{61}
\]
where \( t_i = \rho_i (\partial \lambda_i^{(k)}/\partial t_i) = \rho_i \mu_i f_i (t_i^{(k)}) \), and \( \rho_i \geq 0 \) is the step size.

**Primal-Dual Algorithm:** The dual and primal algorithms can be combined to form the primal-dual algorithm. For HRB-CUM, we have
\[
t_i^{(k+1)} = T_i(0, t_i^{(k+1)} + \delta_i \left[ U_i'(\lambda_i^{(k)}) - \frac{g_i'(\lambda_i^{(k)}/\mu_i)}{\mu_i} C'(B_{t_i^{(k)}} - B) \right],
\tag{62}
\]
where \( \delta_i = \rho_i (\partial \lambda_i^{(k)}/\partial t_i) = \rho_i \mu_i f_i (t_i^{(k)}) \), and \( \rho_i \geq 0 \) is the step size.

**Dual Algorithm:** For a request arrival process with a DHR inter-request distribution, (33) becomes a convex optimization problem as discussed in Section [IV], and hence solving the dual problem produces the optimal solution. Since \( 0 < t_i < \infty \), then \( 0 < h_i < 1 \) and \( g_i(h_i) < 1 \). Therefore, the Lagrange dual function is
\[
D(\eta) = \max_{h_i} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} U_i(h_i) - \eta \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(h_i) - B \right) \right],
\tag{63}
\]
and the dual problem is
\[
\min_{\eta \geq 0} D(\eta). \tag{64}
\]
Following the standard gradient descent algorithm by taking the derivative of \( D(\eta) \) w.r.t. \( \eta \), the dual variable \( \eta \) should be updated as
\[
\eta^{(k+1)} = \max \left[ 0, \eta^{(k)} + \gamma \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(h_i^{(k)}) - B \right) \right],
\tag{65}
\]
where \( k \) is the iteration number, \( \gamma > 0 \) is the step size at each iteration and \( \eta \geq 0 \) due to KKT conditions.

Based on the results in Section [III], in order to achieve optimality, we must have
\[
\eta^{(k)} = \frac{U_i'(h_i^{(k)})}{g_i'(h_i^{(k)})} \triangleq v_i(h_i^{(k)}), \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad h_i^{(k)} = v_i^{-1}(\eta^{(k)}).
\]
**Poisson Process:** Under a Poisson request process, we have 
\[ g_i(h_i^{(k)}) = 1, \] and 
\[ h_i^{(k)} = U_{t_i}^{(l)}(\eta^{(k)}), \] consistent with the results in [8].

**Generalized Pareto Distribution:** When inter-request times are described by a generalized Pareto distribution and utilities are β-fair, 
\[ h_i^{(k)} \] can be obtained through
\[ \frac{w_i}{\eta^{(k)}(1 - k)} - \left( h_i^{(k)} \right)^\beta = 0. \] (66)

**Weibull Distribution:** When inter-request times are described by a Weibull distribution with shape parameter 
\[ k_i = 0.5 \] and utilities are β-fair, 
\[ h_i^{(k)} \] can be obtained through
\[ \frac{w_i}{2\theta_i k_i \eta^{(k)}} \left[ \frac{1}{\log \left( \frac{1}{1 - h_i^{(k)}} \right)} \right] - \left( h_i^{(k)} \right)^\beta = 0. \] (67)

Since 
\[ g_i(h_i^{(k)}) \] indicates the probability that content \( i \) is in the cache, \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(h_i^{(k)}) \) represents the number of contents currently in the cache, denoted as \( B_{\text{curr}} \). Therefore, the dual algorithm for reset TTL caches is
\[ t_i^{(k)} = F_i^{-1}(\nu_i^{-1}(\eta^{(k)})), \]
\[ \eta^{(k+1)} = \max \left\{ 0, \eta^{(k)} + B_{\text{curr}} - B \right\}, \] (68)

where the iteration number \( k \) is incremented upon each request arrival.

**Primal Algorithm:** Under the primal approach, we append a cost to the sum of utilities as
\[ W(h) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} U_i(h_i) - C \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(h_i) - B \right), \] (69)
where \( C(\cdot) \) is a convex and non-decreasing penalty function denoting the cost for extra cache storage. When \( g_i(\cdot) \) is convex, by the composition property [4], \( W(\cdot) \) is strictly concave in \( h \). We use standard gradient ascent as follows.

The gradient is given as
\[ \frac{\partial W(h)}{\partial h_i} = U'_i(h_i) - g'_i(h_i)C' \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i(h_i) - B \right). \] (70)

We also have \( \partial h_i / \partial t_i = \partial F_i(t_i) / \partial t_i = f_i(t_i) > 0 \). Hence we move \( t_i \) in the direction of gradient and the primal algorithm is given by
\[ h_i^{(k)} = F_i\left( t_i^{(k)} \right), \]
\[ t_i^{(k+1)} = \max \left\{ 0, t_i^{(k)} + \delta \left[ U'_i(h_i^{(k)}) - g'_i(h_i^{(k)})C'(B_{\text{curr}} - B) \right] \right\}, \] (71)

where \( \delta_i = \rho_i(\partial h_i / \partial t_i) = \rho_i f_i(t_i^{(k)}) \), \( \rho_i \geq 0 \) is the step size, and \( k \) is the iteration number incremented upon each request arrival.

**Primal-Dual Algorithm:** The dual and primal algorithms can be combined to form the primal-dual algorithm. For HPB-CUM
\[ t_i^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \max \left\{ 0, t_i^{(k)} + \delta \left[ U'_i(h_i^{(k)}) - g'_i(h_i^{(k)})\eta^{(k)} \right] \right\}, \]
\[ \eta^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \max \left\{ 0, \eta^{(k)} + \gamma \left( B_{\text{curr}} - B \right) \right\}. \] (72)

**F. Poisson Approximation for various distributions**

1) **Hyperexponential Distribution:** W.l.o.g., we consider the arrivals follow a hyperexponential distribution with phase probabilities \( p_{1i} = p_{2i} = 0.5 \), and phase rate parameters \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) Zipf distributed with rates 0.4 and 0.8, respectively. From Figure 4 (b), we can see that the optimal hit rates obtained through (40) exactly match those obtained from Dual under hyperexponential distribution by solving fixed point equation in (29). Similar performance was obtained for other parameters, especially for \( p_{1i} \ll p_{2i} \), hence are omitted here.

2) **Weibull Distribution:** Similarly, we consider a Weibull distribution with shape parameter \( k_i = 0.5 \). From Figure 4 (c), it is clear that this approximation is accurate. Note that when \( k_i \rightarrow 1 \), Weibull behaves more close to exponential distribution, hence the accuracy of this approximation can be further improved. For smaller value of \( k_i \), it has been shown that Weibull can be well approximated by hyperexponential distribution [20]. The performance of Poisson approximation to hyperexponential distribution has been discussed in Section X-F-

**G. Limiting Behavior of 2-MMPP**

**Case 1:** When \( r_{1i} \rightarrow \infty \) and \( r_{2i} \rightarrow \infty \), i.e., \( x_i \rightarrow \infty \) From Equation (20), we get
\[ u_{1i} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \theta_{1i} + \theta_{2i} + r_{1i} + r_{2i} - (\theta_{1i} - \theta_{2i} + r_{1i} - r_{2i})^2 + 4r_{1i}r_{2i} \right] \]
\[ = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \theta_{1i} + \theta_{2i} + r_{1i} + r_{2i} - (\theta_{1i} - \theta_{2i} + r_{1i} - r_{2i})^2 + 4r_{1i}r_{2i} \right] \]
\[ = \frac{2\theta_{1i}\theta_{2i} + 2r_{1i}r_{2i}}{2\theta_{1i} + 2\theta_{2i} + 2r_{1i} + 2r_{2i}}, \]
\[ = \frac{\theta_{1i} + \theta_{2i} + (a_{1i} + a_{2i})x_i}{\sqrt{\theta_{1i} + \theta_{2i} + (a_{1i} + a_{2i})x_i}}. \] (73)

When \( x_i \rightarrow \infty \), by applying L'Hospital’s rule, we have
\[ u_{1i} = \frac{2\theta_{1i}a_{1i} + 2\theta_{2i}a_{1i}}{a_{1i} + a_{2i} + \lim_{x_i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\theta_{1i} - \theta_{2i} + (a_{1i} - a_{2i})x_i}{a_{1i} + a_{2i} + 2\theta_{1i}a_{1i} + 2a_{2i}a_{1i}}} \]
\[ = \frac{a_{1i} + a_{2i} + \lim_{x_i \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\theta_{1i} - \theta_{2i} + (a_{1i} - a_{2i})x_i} + (a_{1i} + a_{2i})^2x_i}{a_{1i} + a_{2i} + \lim_{x_i \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\theta_{1i} - \theta_{2i} + (a_{1i} - a_{2i})x_i} + (a_{1i} + a_{2i})^2x_i}. \]
Similarly, we have $\theta_2 = \infty$. Again, from Equation (20),

$$q_{i1} = \frac{\theta_1^2 r_1 + \theta_2^2 r_2}{(\theta_1 r_1 + \theta_2 r_2)(u_1 - u_2)} - \frac{u_2}{u_1 - u_2}$$

$$= \frac{\theta_1^2 a_1 + \theta_2^2 a_2}{\theta_1 + \theta_2 + (a_1 + a_2)x_i + \frac{1}{2}}$$

$$= \frac{2(\theta_1 a_1 + \theta_2 a_2)(a_1 + a_2)x + \theta_2 \theta_1 a_1 (a_1 + a_2) - \theta_2^2 a_2 - \theta_1^2 a_1}{\theta_1 + \theta_2 + (a_1 + a_2)x_i + \frac{1}{2}}$$

$$+ \frac{\theta_1^2 a_2 + \theta_2^2 a_1}{\theta_1 a_2 + \theta_2 a_1} \sqrt{(\theta_1 \rightarrow \infty)}$$

when $x_i \rightarrow \infty$, by applying L’Hospital’s rule, we have $q_{i1}$

$$= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{(\theta_1 a_2 + \theta_2 a_1)(a_1 + a_2)}{2(\theta_1 a_1 + \theta_2 a_2)(a_1 + a_2)}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 1,$$

thus $q_{i2} = 0$.

**Case 2: When $r_1 \rightarrow 0$ and $r_2 \rightarrow 0$, i.e., $x_i \rightarrow 0$: W.l.o.g., we assume $\theta_1 \geq \theta_2$. From Equation (20),

$$\delta = \theta_1 - \theta_2,$$

then

$$u_{i1} = \frac{1}{2} \theta_1 + \theta_2 + (a_1 + a_2)x_i - \delta = \theta_2,$$

similarly, we have $u_{i2} = \theta_1$.

**Proposition 1.** Suppose $J(a) = i$, then we have

$$P[J(b) = i, M(a, b) = 0] J(a) = i] = e^{-r_i(b-a)} \rightarrow 1,$$

as $r \rightarrow 0$. (80)

Proof. From the property of $m$-state MMPP, we directly have

$$P[J(b) = i, M(a, b) = 0] J(a) = i] = e^{-r_i(b-a)},$$

then take the limit as $r \rightarrow 0$, which completes the proof. □

Then we immediately have

**Corollary 3.**

$$P[J(b) = i, M(a, b) > 0] J(a) = i] \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0. \quad (81)$$

Proof.

$$P[J(b) = i, M(a, b) > 0] J(a) = i] \leq P[M(a, b) > 0] J(a) = i]$$

$$= 1 - P[M(a, b) = 0] J(a) = i]$$

$$= 1 - e^{-r_i(b-a)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0. \quad (82)$$

Since $P[J(b) = i, M(a, b) > 0] J(a) = i] \geq 0$, we have

$$P[J(b) = i, M(a, b) > 0] J(a) = i] \rightarrow 0$$

as $r \rightarrow 0$. □

From Proposition 1 and Corollary 3, we also obtain

**Proposition 2.** As $r \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$P^r[J(b) = j] J(a) = i] \rightarrow \delta_{ij}, \quad \forall b > a, \quad (83)$$

where

$$\delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = j; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Suppose $j \neq i$, then

$$P^r[J(b) = j] J(a) = i] = 1 - P^r[J(b) = i] J(a) = i]$$
\[ P_i(a, b) = 1 - P_i[J(a) = i, M(a, b) = 0] \]
\[ - P_i[J(a) = i, M(a, b) > 0] \]
\[ \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } r \to 0, \quad (84) \]

where (a) holds from Proposition 1 and Corollary 3.

Hence, we have \( P_i[J(b) = j | J(a) = i] = 1 \) for \( j = i \), which completes the proof.

Then we immediately have

**Corollary 4.** As \( r \to 0 \), we have
\[ P_i[J(a) = i] \to P_0[J(a) = i] = 1 \{ J(0) = i \}. \quad (85) \]

Now we are ready to prove our main result. Our goal is to show that the interarrival times within one state is exponentially distributed as the transition rate approaches zero.

**Proof for Theorem 6**

Proof. Basically we need to show that
\[ P[A_1, \ldots, A_l] \triangleq P[A] \to P_0[A] \]
\[ = \sum_i P[J(0) = i] \prod_{j=1}^l P_0[A_j | J(0) = i], \quad \text{as } r \to 0. \quad (86) \]

First we consider the event \( A_1 = [a_1, b_1] \). Denote \( N(a_1, b_1) \) as the number of arrivals during interval \([a_1, b_1]\). Then,
\[ P_i[N(a_1, b_1) = n_1] = \sum_i P_i[N(a_1, b_1) = n_1 | J(a_1) = i] \cdot P_i[J(a_1) = i]. \quad (87) \]

In the following, we characterize the two terms in the sum of (87), respectively.

On one hand, we have
\[ P_i[N(a_1, b_1) = n_1 | J(a_1) = i] \]
\[ = P_i[N(a_1, b_1) = n_1, M_i(a_1, b_1) = 0 | J(a_1) = i] \]
\[ + P_i[N(a_1, b_1) = n_1, M_i(a_1, b_1) > 0 | J(a_1) = i] \]
\[ \triangleq P_i[N_i(a_1, b_1) = n_1] \cdot e^{-r \cdot (b_1 - a_1)} + o(1) \]
\[ = P_i[N_i(a_1, b_1) = n_1], \quad \text{as } r \to 0, \quad (88) \]

where (a) holds from Proposition 1 and Corollary 3.

On the other hand, from Proposition 2 we have
\[ P_i[J(a_1) = i] \to 1 \{ J(0) = i \}, \quad \text{as } r \to 0. \quad (89) \]

Combining (88) and (89) into (87), we have
\[ P_i[N(a_1, b_1) = n_1 | J(0) = i] \to \sum_i P_i[N_i(a_1, b_1) = n_1], \quad \text{as } r \to 0. \quad (90) \]

Given the arrivals of interval \([a_1, b_1]\), we consider the second interval \([a_2, b_2]\). From Proposition 2 as \( r \to 0 \), we have
\[ P[J(a_2) = i] | J(a_1) = i] = 1. \quad (91) \]

Therefore, following a similar argument, we have
\[ P_i[N(a_2, b_2) = n_2 | N(a_1, b_1) = n_1, J(0) = i] \]
\[ = \sum_i P_i[N_i(a_2, b_2) = n_2] \cdot 1 \{ J(0) = i \}, \quad (92) \]

and
\[ P_i[N(a_2, b_2) = n_2, N(a_1, b_1) = n_1, J(0) = i] \]
\[ = \sum_i P_i[N_i(a_2, b_2) = n_2] \cdot \sum_i P_i[N_i(a_1, b_1) = n_1] \quad (93) \]

By induction, we have
\[ P_i[N(a_1, b_1) = n_1, \ldots, N(a_1, b_1) = n_1 | J(0) = i] \]
\[ = \sum_i P_i[N_0(a_2, b_2) = n_2] \cdot \sum_i P_i[N_i(a_1, b_1) = n_1] \quad (95) \]

which completes the proof.

2) The transition rate approaches infinity: Now we consider the case that the transition rate approaches infinity, i.e., \( r \to \infty \) \( (r_i \to \infty \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, m) \).

**Proof for Theorem 7**

Proof. W.l.o.g., consider a time interval \([a, b]\). Suppose that there are \( k \) state transition occurs during \([a, b]\). As \( r \to \infty \), we have \( k \to \infty \) a.s.

For simplicity, we denote the length of each time interval within one state as \( L_j \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, k \) and \( \sum_j L_j = b - a \). Then we have
\[ N(a, b) = \sum_j N_j(L_j), \quad (96) \]

where \( N(a, b) \) is the number of arrivals in \((a, b)\) and \( N_j(L_j) \) is the number of arrivals during a time interval of length \( L_j \) in \((a, b)\).

W.l.o.g., suppose during the \( j \)-th interval, the MC is in state \( i \) which has Poisson arrivals with rate \( \theta_i \), for \( i = 1, \ldots, m \). Let \( L_j(i) \) be the length of the corresponding interval.

Consider any two time \( t_i \) and \( t_i' \) with \( t_i' > t_i \) during which the MC is in state \( i \) and \( M_i(t_i, t_i') = 0 \). As \( r \to \infty \), we have \( |t_i' - t_i| \to 0 \) a.s.

Given the \( m \)-state MMPP with \( r \to \infty \) we have
\[ P_i(t_i') = P_i(t_i) e^{Q(t_i' - t_i)} = P_i(t_i) e^{r' Q(t_i' - t_i)}, \quad (97) \]

where \( r' \to \infty \) is a scalar and \( Q = r' Q_0 \).
The stochastic process described by \((97)\) (call it Process 1) is equivalent to a stochastic process with a finite-valued \(Q_0\) (call it Process 2) at stationary state (i.e., \(t \to \infty\)), since
\[
P^r(t_i^-) = \mathbb{P}^r(t_i^-) e^{-rQ_0(t_i^- - t_i)} = \mathbb{P}^r(t_i^-) e^{-rQ_0(t_i^- - t_i)},
\]
where (a) is from \((97)\) and (b) is through reordered the elements. We have \(e^{-rQ_0(t_i^- - t_i)} \to \infty\).

In other words,
- **Process 1**: we consider a finite time interval \((a, b)\) with an infinite state transition rate \(r \to \infty\);
- **Process 2**: we consider an infinite time interval \((ra, rb)\) with a finite state transition rate.

From \((98)\), it is clear that Process 1 and Process 2 are equivalent.

Denote \(\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_m)\) as the stationary distribution for the \(m\)-state MMPP. Then we have
\[
L_2(t) = \pi_i(b - a).
\]

Since the stochastic process is in stationary at each interval for a particular state, and the arrivals in each state follows a Poisson process. Therefore, the interarrival times of the \(m\)-state MMPP are exponentially distributed since the mix of Poisson process is still Poisson. From \((99)\), the equivalent arrival rate satisfies
\[
\hat{\theta} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \theta_i \pi_i.
\]
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