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Abstract

Freshness of status update packets is essential for enabling services where a destination needs the most recent measurements of various sensors. In this paper, we study the information freshness of single-server multi-source queueing models under a first-come first-served (FCFS) serving policy. In the considered model, each source independently generates status update packets according to a Poisson process. The information freshness of the status updates of each source is evaluated by the average age of information (AoI). We derive an exact expression for the average AoI for the case with exponentially distributed service time, i.e., for a multi-source M/M/1 queueing model. Moreover, we derive an approximate expression for the average AoI for a multi-source M/G/1 queueing model having a general service time distribution. Simulation results are provided to validate the derived exact average AoI expression, to assess the tightness of the proposed approximation, and to demonstrate the AoI behavior for different system parameters.

Index Terms—Information freshness, age of information (AoI), multi-source M/G/1 queueing model.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, various services in wireless sensor networks (WSNs) such as Internet of Things and cyber-physical control applications have attracted both academic and industrial attention. In these networks, low power sensors may be assigned to send status updates about a random process to intended destinations [1]–[6]. Such a status update system can monitor, e.g., temperature of a specific environment (room, greenhouse, etc.) [1], and a vehicular status (position, acceleration,
One key enabler for these services is high freshness of the sensors’ information at a destination. For instance, real-time control and decision making in the system requires that the destination has very recent measurements of the various sensors.

The traditional metrics such as throughput and delay can not fully characterize the information freshness. Recently, the age of information (AoI) was proposed as a destination-centric metric to measure the information freshness in status update systems. A status update packet contains the measured value of a monitored process and a time stamp representing the time when the sample was generated. Due to wireless channel access, channel errors, and fading etc., communicating a status update packet through the network experiences a random delay. If at a time instant \( t \), the most recently received status update packet contains the time stamp \( U(t) \), AoI is defined as the random process \( \Delta(t) = t - U(t) \). Thus, the AoI measures for each sensor the time elapsed since the last received status update packet was generated at the sensor. The most common metrics of the AoI are average AoI, peak AoI, and effective AoI. In this work, we focus on the average AoI.

### A. Related Works

The first queueing theoretic work on AoI is [7] where the authors derived the average AoI for a single-source M/M/1 first-come first-served (FCFS) queueing model. The average AoI for an M/M/1 last-come first-served (LCFS) queueing model with preemption was analyzed in [8]. In [11], the authors proposed peak AoI as an alternative metric to evaluate the information freshness. The average AoI and average peak AoI for different packet management policies in an M/M/1 queueing model were derived in [12]. The authors of [13] derived a closed-form expression for the average AoI of a single-source M/G/1/1 preemptive queueing model (where the last entry in the Kendall notation shows the total capacity of the queueing system; 1 indicates that there is one packet under service whereas the queue holds zero packets). A closed-form expression for the average AoI in a single-source M/G/1 queueing model was derived in [14]. The work [15] considered a single-source LCFS queueing model where the packets arrive according to a Poisson process and the service time follows a gamma distribution. They derived the average AoI and average peak AoI for two packet management policies, LCFS with and without preemption.

Besides single-source setups, the work [16] was the first to investigate the average AoI in a multi-source setup. The authors of [16] derived the average AoI for a multi-source M/M/1
FCFS queueing model. The authors of [17] considered a multi-source M/G/1 queueing system and optimized the arrival rates of each source to minimize the peak AoI. The closed-form expressions for the average AoI and average peak AoI in a multi-source M/G/1/1 preemptive queueing model were derived in [18]. In [6], the authors introduced a powerful technique based on stochastic hybrid systems to evaluate the AoI in finite-state continuous-time queueing systems.

The AoI has also been applied as a novel metric in various networking problems. The AoI in a carrier sense multiple access (CSMA) based vehicular network was studied via simulations in [9]. The authors of [19] studied AoI and throughput in a shared access network having one primary and several secondary transmitter-receiver pairs. The authors of [20] investigated the AoI for ALOHA and time-scheduled based access techniques in WSNs. They concluded that ALOHA access, while simple, leads to AoI that is inferior to a scheduled access case. The authors of [21] considered a WSN, derived the average AoI and peak AoI for the system, and minimized the average AoI and peak AoI by optimizing the probability of transmission of each node. The authors of [22] analyzed the AoI in a CSMA based system using the stochastic hybrid systems technique. They optimized the system’s average AoI by adjusting the back-off time of each link. The authors of [23] analyzed the worst case average AoI for each sensor in a CSMA based WSN.

B. Contributions

In this paper, we analyze the average AoI of the different sources in single-server multi-source queueing models under an FCFS service policy with Poisson packet arrivals. We derive an exact expression for the average AoI for a multi-source M/M/1 queueing model. The setup was earlier addressed in [6], [16], where the authors derived an approximate expression for the average AoI by neglecting the statistical dependency between certain random variables (see Section IV). Moreover, we point out the difficulties in an M/G/1 case and derive an approximate expression for the average AoI in a multi-source M/G/1 queueing model. We present simulation results to 1) validate the derived exact average AoI in a multi-source M/M/1 queueing model, 2) to show that the proposed approximation is relatively tight in both the M/M/1 case and the M/G/1 case where the service time follows a gamma distribution, and 3) exemplify the AoI behavior under different system parameters.
C. Organization

This paper is organized as follows. The system model and AoI definitions are presented in Section II. The average AoI and average peak AoI for a multi-source M/G/1 queueing model are derived in Section III. The exact expression for the average AoI in a multi-source M/M/1 queueing model is derived in Section IV. An approximate expression for the average AoI in a multi-source M/G/1 queueing model is derived in Section V. Numerical validation and results are presented in Section VI. Finally, concluding remarks are expressed in Section VII.

II. System Model and Definitions

We consider a system consisting of a set of independent sources denoted by $\mathcal{C} = \{1, \ldots, C\}$ and one server, as depicted in Fig. 1. Each source observes a random process, representing, e.g., temperature, vehicular speed or location at random time instants. A remote destination is interested in timely information about the status of these random processes. Status updates are transmitted as packets, containing the measured value of the monitored process and a time stamp representing the time when the sample was generated. We assume that the packets of source $c$ are generated according to the Poisson process with rate $\lambda_c$, $c \in \mathcal{C}$.

For each source, the AoI at the destination is defined as the time elapsed since the last successfully received packet was generated. Formal definition of the AoI is given next.

**Definition 1 (AoI).** Let $t_{c,i}$ denote the time instant at which the $i$th status update packet of source $c$ was generated, and $t'_{c,i}$ denote the time instant at which this packet arrives at the destination. At a time instant $\tau$, the index of the most recently received packet of source $c$ is
given by
\[ N_c(\tau) = \max \{ i' | t_{c,i'} \leq \tau \}, \]  
(1)
and the time stamp of the most recently received packet of source \( c \) is
\[ U_c(\tau) = t_{N_c(\tau)}. \]  
(2)
The AoI of source \( c \) at the destination is defined as the random process
\[ \Delta_c(t) = t - U_c(t). \]  
(3)
An example of evolution of the AoI is shown in Fig. 2. As it can be seen, \( \Delta_c(t) \) at the destination increases linearly with time, until the reception of a new status update, when the AoI is reset to the age of the newly received status update, i.e., the difference of the current time instant and the time stamp of the newly received update.

The two most commonly used metrics for evaluating the AoI of a source at the destination are the average AoI and average peak AoI \([5], [10], [11]\). Next, we introduce these two metrics for the considered system model.

A. Average AoI

Let \( (0, \tau) \) denote an observation interval. Accordingly, the time average AoI of the source \( c \) at the destination, denoted as \( \Delta_{\tau,c} \), is defined as
\[ \Delta_{\tau,c} = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \Delta_c(t) dt. \]  
(4)
The integral in (4) is equal to the area under \( \Delta_c(t) \) which can be expressed as a sum of disjoint areas determined by a polygon \( Q_{c,1} \), \( N_c(\tau) - 1 \) trapezoids \( Q_{c,i}, i = 2, \ldots, N_c(\tau) \), and a triangle \( \bar{Q}_c \), as illustrated in Fig. 2. Following the definition of \( N_c(\tau) \) in (1), \( \Delta_{\tau,c} \) can be calculated as
\[ \Delta_{\tau,c} = \frac{1}{\tau} \left( Q_{c,1} + \sum_{i=2}^{N_c(\tau)} Q_{c,i} + \bar{Q}_c \right) = \frac{Q_{c,1} + \bar{Q}_c}{\tau} + \frac{N_c(\tau) - 1}{\tau} \frac{1}{N_c(\tau) - 1} \sum_{i=2}^{N_c(\tau)} Q_{c,i}. \]  
(5)
The average AoI of source \( c \), denoted by \( \Delta_c \), is defined as
\[ \Delta_c = \lim_{\tau \to \infty} \Delta_{\tau,c}. \]
The term \( \frac{Q_{c,1} + \bar{Q}_c}{\tau} \) in (5) goes to zero as \( \tau \to \infty \), and the term \( \frac{N_c(\tau) - 1}{\tau} \) in (5)
converges to the rate of generating the status update packets of source $c$ as $\tau \to \infty$, i.e.,
\[
\lambda_c = \lim_{\tau \to \infty} \frac{N_c(\tau) - 1}{\tau}.
\]
Moreover, as $\tau \to \infty$, the number of transmitted packets grows to infinity, i.e., $N_c(\tau) \to \infty$. Thus, assuming that the random process $\{Q_{c,i}\}_{i>1}$ is (mean) ergodic \[5\]–\[7\], the sample average term $\frac{1}{N_c(\tau) - 1} \sum_{i=2}^{N_c(\tau)} Q_{c,i}$ in (5) converges to the stochastic average $\mathbb{E}[Q_{c,i}]$. Consequently, $\Delta_c$ is given by
\[
\Delta_c = \lambda_c \mathbb{E}[Q_{c,i}].
\]

As shown in Fig. 2, $Q_{c,i}$ can be calculated by subtracting the area of the isosceles triangle with sides $(t'_{c,i} - t_{c,i})$ from the area of the isosceles triangle with sides $(t'_{c,i} - t_{c,i} - 1)$. Let the random variable
\[
X_{c,i} = t_{c,i} - t_{c,i-1}
\]
represent the $i$th interarrival time of source $c$, i.e., the time elapsed between the generation of $i - 1$th packet and $i$th packet from source $c$. From here onwards, we refer to the $i$th packet from source $c$ simply as packet $c, i$. Moreover, let the random variable
\[
T_{c,i} = t'_{c,i} - t_{c,i}
\]
represent the system time of packet $c, i$, i.e., the time interval the packet spends in the system which consists of the sum of the waiting time and the service time. By using (6) and (7), $Q_{c,i}$ can be calculated by subtracting the area of the isosceles triangle with sides $X_{c,i}$ from the area

\[\text{Fig. 2: Age of information of source } c \text{ as a function of time.}\]
of the isosceles triangle with sides $X_{c,i} + T_{c,i}$ (see Fig. 2), and thus, the average AoI of source $c$ is given as

$$\Delta_c = \lambda_c E[Q_{c,i}] = \lambda_c \left( \frac{1}{2} E[(X_{c,i} + T_{c,i})^2] - \frac{1}{2} E[X_{c,i}^2] \right) = \lambda_c \left( \frac{E[X_{c,i}^2]}{2} + E[X_{c,i}T_{c,i}] \right).$$

(8)

B. Average Peak AoI

The peak AoI provides a more tractable metric than the average AoI for the analysis of freshness. This metric can be used in the applications where we need a threshold restriction on the AoI. Moreover, it can be exploited when we are interested in the worst case AoI in the sense that the average peak AoI provides an upper bound to the average AoI [5], [17].

The peak AoI of source $c$ at the destination is defined as the value of the AoI immediately before receiving an update packet. Accordingly, the peak AoI with respect to the $i$th successfully received packet of source $c$, denoted by $A_{c,i}$ (see Fig. 2), is given by

$$A_{c,i} = X_{c,i} + T_{c,i}.$$  

Let $W_{c,i}$ be the random variable representing the waiting time of packet $c, i$, and $S_{c,i}$ the random variable representing the service time of packet $c, i$. Consequently, the system time $T_{c,i}$ is given as the sum $T_{c,i} = W_{c,i} + S_{c,i}$, and the peak AoI in (9) can be written as

$$A_{c,i} = X_{c,i} + W_{c,i} + S_{c,i}.$$  

For the observation interval $(0, \tau)$, the time average peak AoI of source $c$, denoted by $A_{\tau,c}$, is defined as

$$A_{\tau,c} = \frac{1}{N_c(\tau)} \sum_{i=1}^{N_c(\tau)} A_{c,i}.$$  

The average peak AoI of source $c$, denoted by $A_c$, is given by

$$A_c = \lim_{\tau \to \infty} A_{\tau,c}.$$  

Consequently, assuming that the process $\{W_{c,i}\}_{i>1}$ is (mean) ergodic, the average peak AoI for source $c$ is given by

$$A_c = E[A_{c,i}] = E[X_{c,i}] + E[W_{c,i}] + E[S_{c,i}].$$

(10)
III. AOI IN A MULTI-SOURCE M/G/1 QUEUEING MODEL

To evaluate the AoI of one source in a queueing model with multiple sources of Poisson arrivals, we can consider two sources without loss of generality. Thus, we proceed to evaluate the AoI of source 1 by aggregating the other \( C - 1 \) sources into source 2 having the Poisson arrival rate \( \lambda_2 = \sum_{c' \in C \backslash \{c\}} \lambda_{c'} \). The mean service time for each packet in the system is equal, given as \( \mathbb{E}[S_{1,i}] = \mathbb{E}[S_{2,i}] = 1/\mu, \forall i \). Let \( \rho_1 = \lambda_1/\mu \) and \( \rho_2 = \lambda_2/\mu \) be the load of source 1 and 2, respectively. Since packets of each source are generated according to the Poisson process and the sources are independent, the packet generation in the system follows the Poisson process with rate \( \lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \), and the overall load in the system is \( \rho = \rho_1 + \rho_2 = \lambda/\mu \). Since we do not assume any specific probability density function (PDF) for the service time, the considered model is referred to as a multi-source M/G/1 queueing model.

In the following, we derive the average AoI in (8) in the considered multi-source M/G/1 queueing model. For the completeness of presentation, we also address the average peak AoI in (10) which was earlier derived in [17].

A. The Average AoI

In this section we derive the average AoI (8) for source 1, denoted as \( \Delta_1 \). The first term in (8) is easy to compute. Namely, since the interarrival time of source 1 follows the exponential distribution with parameter \( \lambda_1 \), we have \( \mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}] = 2/\lambda_1^2 \). However, because the random variables \( X_{1,i} \) and \( T_{1,i} \) are dependent, the most challenging part in calculating (8) is \( \mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}T_{1,i}] \) which is derived in the following.

Since \( T_{1,i} = W_{1,i} + S_{1,i} \), we can rewrite term \( \mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}T_{1,i}] \) as follows:

\[
\mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}T_{1,i}] = \mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}(W_{1,i} + S_{1,i})] \overset{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}W_{1,i}] + \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}]}{\mu},
\]

where equality (a) follows because the interarrival time and service time of the packet 1, \( i \) are independent. Next, we derive \( \mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}W_{1,i}] \).

In order to calculate \( \mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}W_{1,i}] \), we follow the approach of [16] and characterize the waiting time \( W_{1,i} \) by means of two events \( E_{1,i}^B \) and \( E_{1,i}^L \) as

\[
E_{1,i}^B = \{ T_{1,i-1} \geq X_{1,i} \}, \quad E_{1,i}^L = \{ T_{1,i-1} < X_{1,i} \}.
\]
Here, brief event $E_{1,i}^B$ is the event where the interarrival time of packet $1, i$ is brief, i.e., the interarrival time of packet $1, i$ is shorter than the system time of packet $1, i - 1$. On the contrary, long event $E_{1,i}^L$ refers to the complementary event where the interarrival time of packet $1, i$ is long, i.e., the interarrival time of packet $1, i$ is longer than the system time of packet $1, i - 1$.

Under the event $E_{1,i}^B$, the waiting time of packet $1, i$ ($W_{1,i}$) contains two terms: 1) the residual system time to complete serving packet $1, i - 1$, and 2) the sum of service times of the source 2 packets that arrived during $X_{1,i}$ and must be served before packet $1, i$ according to the FCFS policy (see Fig. 3(a)). Under the event $E_{1,i}^L$, the waiting time of packet $1, i$ contains two terms: 1) the possible residual service time of a source 2 packet that is under service at the arrival instant of packet $1, i$, and 2) the sum of service times of source 2 packets in the queue that must be served before packet $1, i$ according to the FCFS policy (see Fig. 3(b)). Thus, by means of the two events in (12), the waiting time for packet $1, i$ can be expressed as

$$W_{1,i} = \begin{cases} T_{1,i-1} - X_{1,i} + \sum_{i' \in M_{2,i}^B} S_{2,i'}, & E_{1,i}^B \\ \sum_{i' \in M_{2,i}^L} S_{2,i'} + R_{2,i}, & E_{1,i}^L \end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

where $M_{2,i}^B$ is the set of indices of queued packets of source 2 that must be served before packet $1, i$ under the event $E_{1,i}^B$, where $|M_{2,i}^B| = M_{2,i}^B$; $M_{2,i}^L$ is the set of indices of packets of source 2 that are in the queue (but not under service) at the arrival instant of packet $1, i$ conditioned on the event $E_{1,i}^L$ and, thus, must be served before packet $1, i$, where $|M_{2,i}^L| = M_{2,i}^L$; and $R_{2,i}$ is a random variable that represents the possible residual service time of the packet of source 2 that is under service at the arrival instant of packet $1, i$ conditioned on the event $E_{1,i}^L$.

For the case $E_{1,i}^B$, let us further divide the waiting time $W_{1,i}$ in (13) into two terms $R_{1,i}^B$ and $S_{1,i}^B$ as follows. Let

$$R_{1,i}^B = T_{1,i-1} - X_{1,i}$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

represent the residual system time to complete serving packet $1, i - 1$ and let

$$S_{1,i}^B = \sum_{i' \in M_{2,i}^B} S_{2,i'}$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

represent the sum of service times of source 2 packets that arrived during $X_{1,i}$ and must be
served before packet \(1,i\). Similarly for the event \(E_{1,i}^L\), let

\[
S_{1,i}^L = \sum_{i' \in M_{2,i}} S_{2,i'}
\]

represent the sum of service times of source 2 packets that must be served before packet \(1,i\).

Based on (14), (15), and (16), \(\mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}W_{1,i}]\) in (11) can be expressed as

\[
\mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}W_{1,i}] = \left(\mathbb{E}[R_{B,1,i} X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B] + \mathbb{E}[S_{B,1,i} X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B]\right) P(E_{1,i}^B) + \mathbb{E}[(S_{1,i}^L + R_{L,2,i}) X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^L] P(E_{1,i}^L),
\]

where \(P(E_{1,i}^B)\) and \(P(E_{1,i}^L)\) denote the probabilities of the events \(E_{1,i}^B\) and \(E_{1,i}^L\), respectively.

Next, we derive the expressions for \(P(E_{1,i}^B)\) and \(P(E_{1,i}^L)\) in (17). Then, by referring to \(\mathbb{E}[R_{B,1,i} X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B]\), \(\mathbb{E}[S_{B,1,i} X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B]\), and \(\mathbb{E}[(S_{1,i}^L + R_{L,2,i}) X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^L]\) in (17) as the first, the second, and the third conditional expectation terms of (17), we present elaborate derivations of the first and second terms in Sections III-A1 and III-A2 respectively, and in Section III-A3 we point out the difficulties involved in computing the third term for a generic service time distribution.

The following lemma gives the expressions for \(P(E_{1,i}^B)\) and \(P(E_{1,i}^L)\) in (17).
Lemma 1. The probabilities of the events $E_{1,i}^B$ and $E_{1,i}^L$ in (12) are calculated as follows:

$$P(E_{1,i}^B) = \frac{L_S(\lambda_1)(\lambda + (\rho - 1)\lambda_1) - \lambda_2}{\lambda L_S(\lambda_1) - \lambda_2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

$$P(E_{1,i}^L) = \frac{(1 - \rho)\lambda_1 L_S(\lambda_1)}{\lambda L_S(\lambda_1) - \lambda_2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

where $L_S(\lambda_1) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda_1S}]$ is the Laplace transform of the PDF of the service time $S$ at $\lambda_1$; note that the service times of all packets are stochastically identical as $S_{1,i} = S_{2,i} = S$, $\forall i$.

Proof: Using the facts that $T_{1,i-1}$ and $X_{1,i}$ are independent and the PDF of $X_{1,i}$ is $f_{X_{1,i}}(x) = \lambda_1 e^{-\lambda_1 x}$, $P(E_{1,i}^B)$ can be written as

$$P(E_{1,i}^B) = \int_0^\infty P(T_{1,i-1} \geq X_{1,i} | T_{1,i-1} = t) f_{T_{1,i-1}}(t) dt$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

$$= \int_0^\infty F_{X_{1,i}}(t) f_{T_{1,i-1}}(t) dt$$

$$= 1 - \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 t} f_{T_{1,i-1}}(t) dt$$

$$\overset{(a)}{=} 1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda_1 T}]$$

$$= 1 - L_T(\lambda_1),$$

where equality (a) follows because the system times of different packets are stochastically identical, i.e., $T_{1,i} = T_{2,i} = T$, $\forall i$ [5], [16]; $F_{X_{1,i}}(x)$ is the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of $X_{1,i}$; and $L_T(\lambda_1)$ denotes the Laplace transform of the PDF of the system time $T$ at $\lambda_1$. Because $E_{1,i}^L$ is the complementary event of $E_{1,i}^B$, we have

$$P(E_{1,i}^L) = 1 - P(E_{1,i}^B) = L_T(\lambda_1).$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

The relation between the Laplace transforms of the PDFs of the system time $T$ and service time $S$ is given as [24, Sect. 5.1.2]

$$L_T(a) = \frac{(1 - \rho)a L_S(a)}{a - \lambda(1 - L_S(a))} \triangleq H_S(a).$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

Finally, substituting (22) in (20) and (21) results in the expressions (18) and (19), respectively.

$\blacksquare$
1) The First Conditional Expectation in (17): Let us now focus on the first conditional expectation term \( E[R_{1,i}^B X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B] \) in (17). According to (14), this term is expressed as follows:

\[
E[R_{1,i}^B X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B] = E[T_{1,i-1} X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B] - E[X_{1,i}^2 | E_{1,i}^B]
\]

where equality (a) follows because \( X_{1,i} \) and \( T_{1,i-1} \) are independent, i.e., \( f_{X_{1,i}, T_{1,i-1}}(x, t) = f_{X_{1,i}}(x) f_{T_{1,i-1}}(t) \); equality (b) follows from the definition of the derivative of an integral [25].

Lemma 2. The conditional PDF \( f_{X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B}(x) \) is given by

\[
f_{X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B}(x) = \frac{\lambda_i e^{-\lambda_i x} (1 - F_{T_{1,i-1}}(x))}{P(E_{1,i}^B)}.
\]

Proof: The conditional PDF \( f_{X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B}(x) \) can be obtained by taking the derivative of the CDF \( F_{X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B}(x) \), i.e.,

\[
f_{X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B}(x) = \frac{d(F_{X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B}(x))}{dx} = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{F_{X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B}(x+h) - F_{X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^B}(x)}{h}
\]

where equality (a) follows because \( X_{1,i} \) and \( T_{1,i-1} \) are independent, i.e., \( f_{X_{1,i}, T_{1,i-1}}(x, t) = f_{X_{1,i}}(x) f_{T_{1,i-1}}(t) \); equality (b) follows from the definition of the derivative of an integral [25].
Lemma 3. The conditional PDF \( f_{X_1,i,T_{1,i-1}|E_{1,i}^B}(x,t) \) is given by

\[
f_{X_1,i,T_{1,i-1}|E_{1,i}^B}(x,t) = \begin{cases} 
0 & x > t \\
\frac{\lambda_1 e^{-\lambda_1 x} f_{T_{1,i-1}}(t)}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} & x \leq t.
\end{cases}
\] (26)

**Proof:** To prove Lemma 3, we use the fact that for random variables \( Y_1 \) and \( Y_2 \) and a certain event \( A \), the conditional PDF \( f_{Y_1,Y_2|A}(y_1,y_2) \) is given by [26, Sect. 4.4]

\[
f_{Y_1,Y_2|A}(y_1,y_2) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{f_{Y_1,Y_2}(y_1,y_2)}{P(A)} & (y_1,y_2) \in A \\
0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\] (27)

In Lemma 3, \( Y_1 \) and \( Y_2 \) are \( X_{1,i} \) and \( T_{1,i-1} \), respectively, which are two independent random variables, and event \( A \) is \( E_{1,i}^B \).

Now, having introduced the conditional PDFs in Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, we can compute the conditional expectation \( \mathbb{E}[R_{1,i}^B|X_{1,i}] \) in (23). Using Lemma 3, the first term in (23) is calculated as

\[
\mathbb{E}[T_{1,i-1}X_{1,i}|E_{1,i}^B] = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty x t f_{X_1,i,T_{1,i-1}|E_{1,i}^B}(x,t) \, dx \, dt
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} \int_0^\infty \int_0^t t x \lambda_1 e^{-\lambda_1 x} f_{T_{1,i-1}}(t) \, dx \, dt
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} \int_0^\infty \left( -t^2 e^{-\lambda_1 t} - \frac{t}{\lambda_1} e^{-\lambda_1 t} + \frac{t^2}{\lambda_1} \right) f_{T_{1,i-1}}(t) \, dt
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} \left( -\mathbb{E}[T^2 e^{-\lambda_1 T}] - \frac{\mathbb{E}[T e^{-\lambda_1 T}]}{\lambda_1} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[T]}{\lambda_1} \right)
\]

\[
\overset{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} \left( -L''_T(\lambda_1) + \frac{L'_T(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[W]}{\lambda_1} + \frac{1}{\mu} \right),
\]

where in equality (a) the first and second derivative of the Laplace transform, \( L'_T \) and \( L''_T \) at \( \lambda_1 \), respectively, were obtained using the feature of the Laplace transform that for any function \( f(y), y \geq 0 \), we have [25, Sect. 13.5]

\[
L_{y^n f(y)}(a) = (-1)^n \frac{d^n(L_f(y))(a)}{da^n},
\] (29)
and consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}[T^n e^{-aT}] = (-1)^n \frac{d^n(L_T(a))}{da^n}. \quad (30)$$

Following the notation in (22) as $L_T^r(a) = H_S^r(a)$ and $L_T^w(a) = H_S^w(a)$, (28) can be written as

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{i-1} X_{1,i} \mid E_{1,i}^B] = \frac{1}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} \left( - H_S^w(\lambda_1) + \frac{H_S^r(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1} + \mathbb{E}[W] + 1/\mu \right). \quad (31)$$

Using Lemma 2, the second term $\mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}^2 \mid E_{1,i}^B]$ in (23) is calculated as

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}^2 \mid E_{1,i}^B] = \int_0^\infty x^2 f_{X_{1,i} \mid E_{1,i}^B}(x) \, dx \quad (32)$$

$$= \frac{1}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} \int_0^\infty x^2 \lambda_1 e^{-\lambda_1 x} (1 - F_{T_{i-1}}(x)) \, dx$$

$$= \frac{1}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} \left( \int_0^\infty x^2 \lambda_1 e^{-\lambda_1 x} \, dx - \lambda_1 \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda_1 x} (x^2 F_{T_{i-1}}(x)) \, dx \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} \left( \frac{2}{\lambda_1^2} - \lambda_1 L_{x^2 F_{T_1}}(\lambda_1) \right).$$

The Laplace transform $L_{x^2 F_{T_1}}(\lambda_1)$ in (32) is given by the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.** $L_{x^2 F_{T_1}}(\lambda_1)$ is given as follows:

$$L_{x^2 F_{T_1}}(\lambda_1) \bigg|_{a=\lambda_1} = \frac{\lambda_1 H_S^r(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1^2} - \frac{2H_S^r(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1^3} + \frac{2H_S^r(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1^3}. \quad (33)$$

**Proof:** According to the feature of the Laplace transform, for any function $f(y), y \geq 0$, we have [25] Sect. 13.5:

$$L_{f(y)}(a) = \frac{L_f(\lambda_1)}{a}. \quad (34)$$

Therefore, using (29) and (34), we have

$$L_{x^2 F_{T_1}}(\lambda_1) \bigg|_{a=\lambda_1} = L_{x^2 F_{T_1}}(\lambda_1) \bigg|_{a=\lambda_1} = \frac{d^2}{da^2} \left( \frac{L_{T}(a)}{a} \right) \bigg|_{a=\lambda_1} \quad (35)$$

$$= \frac{a L_T^w(a) - 2L_T^r(a) + 2L_T(a)}{a^3} \bigg|_{a=\lambda_1} = \frac{\lambda_1 H_S^r(\lambda_1) - 2H_S^r(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1^2} + \frac{2H_S(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1^3},$$

where equality (a) follows from the notations in (22).
Thus, applying Lemma 4 the conditional expectation in (32) is given as
\[
\mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}^2|E_{1,i}^B] = \frac{1}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} \left( \frac{2}{\lambda_1^2} - H_S''(\lambda_1) + \frac{2H_S'(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1} - \frac{2H_S(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1^2} \right). \tag{36}
\]

Finally, substituting (31) and (36) in (23), the first conditional expectation \(\mathbb{E}[R_{1,i}^BX_{1,i}|E_{1,i}^B]\) in (17) is given by
\[
\mathbb{E}[R_{1,i}^BX_{1,i}|E_{1,i}^B] = \frac{1}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} \left( \mathbb{E}[W] + 1/\mu - \frac{H_S'(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1} + \frac{2H_S(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1^2} - \frac{2}{\lambda_1^2} \right). \tag{37}
\]

2) The Second Conditional Expectation in (17): Next, we derive the second term \(\mathbb{E}[S_{1,i}^BX_{1,i}|E_{1,i}^B]\) in (17). First, let us elaborate the quantity \(M_{2,i}^B\) which is an integral part of calculating (17). Recall that \(M_{2,i}^B\) is defined as the number of queued packets of source 2 that must be served before packet 1, i according to the FCFS policy under the event \(E_{1,i}^B = \{T_{1,i-1} \geq X_{1,i}\}\). Thus, \(M_{2,i}^B\) is equal to the number of arrived (and thus, queued) packets of source 2 during the (brief) interarrival time \(X_{1,i}\). Consequently, we have a Markov chain \(T_{1,i-1} \leftrightarrow X_{1,i} \leftrightarrow M_{2,i}^B\) conditioned on the event \(E_{1,i}^B\), i.e., \(M_{2,i}^B\) is independent of \(T_{1,i-1}\) given \(X_{1,i}\) under the event \(E_{1,i}^B\).

Accordingly, the conditional expectation \(\mathbb{E}[S_{1,i}^BX_{1,i}|E_{1,i}^B]\) in (17) can be expressed as
\[
\mathbb{E}[S_{1,i}^BX_{1,i}|E_{1,i}^B] = \int_0^\infty x \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{s' \in M_{2,i}^B} S_{2,s'}|E_{1,i}^B, X_{1,i} = x \right] f_{X_{1,i}|E_{1,i}^B}(x)dx \tag{38}
\]
\[
= \left(a\right) \frac{1}{\mu} \int_0^\infty x \mathbb{E} \left[ M_{2,i}^B|X_{1,i} = x \right] f_{X_{1,i}|E_{1,i}^B}(x)dx
\]
\[
= \left(b\right) \frac{\rho_2}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} \int_0^\infty x^2 \lambda_1 e^{-\lambda_1 x}(1 - F_{T_{1,i-1}}(x))dx
\]
\[
= \left(c\right) \frac{\rho_2}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} \left( \int_0^\infty x^2 \lambda_1 e^{-\lambda_1 t} dt - \int_0^\infty x^2 \lambda_1 e^{-\lambda_1 t} F_{T_{1,i-1}}(x)dx \right)
\]
\[
= \frac{\rho_2}{P(E_{1,i}^B)} \left( \frac{2}{\lambda_1^2} - H_S''(\lambda_1) + \frac{2H_S'(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1} - \frac{2H_S(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1^2} \right),
\]
where equality (a) follows because (i) the service time \(S_{2,s'}\) is independent of all other random variables in the system and (ii) by the Markov chain property \(T_{1,i-1} \leftrightarrow X_{1,i} \leftrightarrow M_{2,i}^B\) conditioned on \(E_{1,i}^B\), \(M_{2,i}^B\) is independent of \(T_{1,i-1}\) given \(X_{1,i} = x\) under the event \(E_{1,i}^B\); equality (b) comes from Lemma 2 and the fact that \(\mathbb{E}[M_{2,i}^B|X_{1,i} = x] = \lambda_2 x\); equality (c) comes from Lemma 4.
3) The Third Conditional Expectation in $\text{(17)}$: The third term $E[(S_{1,i}^{L} + R_{2,i}^{L})X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^{L}]$ in $\text{(17)}$ can be calculated as

$$
E[(S_{1,i}^{L} + R_{2,i}^{L})X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^{L}] = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty x \mathbb{E}[\sum_{i' \in M_{2,i}^L} S_{2,i'} | X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^{L}] f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1}|E_{1,i}^{L}} (x, t) dx dt
$$

$$
+ \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty x \mathbb{E} [R_{2,i}^{L} | X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^{L}] f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1}|E_{1,i}^{L}} (x, t) dx dt,
$$

where the first term on the right hand side can be calculated as

$$
\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty x \mathbb{E}
\left[
\sum_{i' \in M_{2,i}^L} S_{2,i'} | X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^{L}
\right] f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1}|E_{1,i}^{L}} (x, t) dx dt
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{\mu} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty x \mathbb{E}
\left[
M_{2,i}^L | X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^{L}
\right] f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1}|E_{1,i}^{L}} (x, t) dx dt
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{\mu} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty x \sum_{m=0}^\infty \Pr[M_{2,i}^L = m | X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^{L}] f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1}|E_{1,i}^{L}} (x, t) dx dt,
$$

where equality (a) follows because (i) the service time $S_{2,i'}$ is independent of all other random variables in the system and (ii) the expectation of a sum of random number $N$ independent and identically distributed random variables $Y_n, n = 1, \ldots, N$, is equal to the expectation of the random number $\mathbb{E}[N]$ times the expectation of a random variable $\mathbb{E}[Y_n]$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{n=1}^N Y_n] = \mathbb{E}[N] \mathbb{E}[Y_n]$ [27] Sect. 11.2).

The second term on the right hand side of $\text{(39)}$ and the final expression in $\text{(40)}$ reveal two critical issues in deriving the third conditional expectation term of $\text{(17)}$. The second term on the right hand side of $\text{(39)}$ contains the possible residual service time of the packet of source 2 that is under service at the arrival instant of packet $1, i, R_{2,i}^{L}$, which cannot be further simplified. In the final expression in $\text{(39)}$, computing the probability $\Pr[M_{2,i}^L = m | X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^{L}]$ requires complicated transient analysis, which for an M/G/1 queueing model is intractable. Fortunately, these difficulties can be overcome when the service time is exponential, i.e., in an M/M/1 queueing model. Thus, we proceed as follows. We derive an exact expression of the average AoI in a multi-source M/M/1 queueing model in Section $\text{IV}$. In Section $\text{V}$ we propose an approximation for $\text{(39)}$ and derive an approximate expression for the average AoI in a multi-source M/G/1 queueing model.
B. Closed-Form Expression for the Average Peak AoI

Using (51), the average peak AoI (10) for source 1 is simply calculated as

\[ A_1 = \mathbb{E}[X_1] + \mathbb{E}[W] + \frac{1}{\mu} = \frac{1}{\lambda_1} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[S^2]}{2(1-\rho)} + \frac{1}{\mu}. \]  (41)

It is worth to note that (41) was earlier derived in [17].

IV. Exact Expression for the Average AoI in a Multi-Source M/M/1 Queueing Model

In this section, we derive an exact expression of the average AoI in (8) for a multi-source M/M/1 queueing model. Recall that in Section III, we already derived general expressions (for an M/G/1 case) for the key terms needed to describe the average AoI, i.e., the three conditional expectation terms of (17), which are given in (37), (38), and (39), respectively. Next, we specify these three terms to the case with exponentially distributed service time. We start by deriving an exact expression for the most challenging term, i.e., the third term (39), followed by the calculation of (37) and (38).

Due to the memoryless property of the exponentially distributed service time, the possible residual service time of the packet of source 2 that is under service at the arrival instant of packet 1, \( i \) for event \( E_{1,i}^{L} \) is also exponentially distributed; thus, the waiting time is the sum of \( \hat{M}_{2,i}^{L} \) exponentially distributed random variables, where \( \hat{M}_{2,i}^{L} \) is the total number of source 2 packets in the system (either in the queue or under service) at the arrival instant of packet 1, \( i \) conditioned on the event \( E_{1,i}^{L} \) [28, p. 168]. Therefore, the waiting time can be expressed as

\[ W_{1,i} = S_{1,i}^{L} + R_{2,i}^{L} = \sum_{i' \in \hat{M}_{2,i}^{L}} S_{2,i'}, \]  (42)

where \( \hat{M}_{2,i}^{L} \) is the set of indices of packets of source 2 that are in the system at the arrival instant of packet 1, \( i \) for event \( E_{1,i}^{L} \), with \( |\hat{M}_{2,i}^{L}| = \hat{M}_{2,i}^{L} \).

By (42), \( \mathbb{E}[W_{1,i}X_{1,i}|E_{1,i}^{L}] \) (cf. (39)) can be calculated as

\[
\mathbb{E}[W_{1,i}X_{1,i}|E_{1,i}^{L}] = \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} x \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i' \in \hat{M}_{2,i}^{L}} S_{2,i'} | X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^{L} \right] f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1}|E_{1,i}^{L}}(x,t)dxdt \\
= \frac{1}{\mu} \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} x \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{M}_{2,i}^{L} | X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^{L} \right] f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1}|E_{1,i}^{L}}(x,t)dxdt \\
= \frac{1}{\mu} \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} x \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} m \text{Pr}[\hat{M}_{2,i}^{L} = m | X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^{L}] f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1}|E_{1,i}^{L}}(x,t)dxdt. \]  (43)
Next, we calculate \( \text{Pr}[M_{2,i}^L = m|X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^L] \) in (43) by introducing an auxiliary random variable \( J_{2,i}^L \) that represents the number of source 2 packets in the system at the departure instant of packet 1, \( i - 1 \) for event \( E_{1,i}^L \) (see Fig. 3(b)). Using the law of total expectation, \( \text{Pr}[M_{2,i}^L = m|X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^L] \) in (43) is written as

\[
\text{Pr}[M_{2,i}^L = m|X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^L] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \text{Pr}[M_{2,i}^L = m|J_{2,i}^L = j, X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^L] \text{Pr}[J_{2,i}^L = j|X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^L],
\]

where

\[
\text{Pr}[J_{2,i}^L = j|X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^L] \overset{(a)}{=} \text{Pr}[J_{2,i}^L = j|T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^L] \overset{(b)}{=} e^{-\lambda_2 t} \frac{\left(\lambda_2 t\right)^j}{j!},
\]

where equality \((a)\) follows because \( J_{2,i}^L \) is conditionally independent of \( X_{1,i} \) given \( T_{1,i-1} \) and \( E_{1,i}^L \); equality \((b)\) follows because (i) under the long event \( E_{1,i}^L \), all \( J_{2,i}^L \) source 2 packets that are in the system at the departure instant of packet 1, \( i - 1 \) must have arrived during the system time \( T_{1,i-1} \) (see Fig. 3(b)), and (ii) the probability of having \( j \) Poisson arrivals of rate \( \lambda_2 \) during the time interval \( T_{1,i-1} = t \) is \( e^{-\lambda_2 t} \frac{\left(\lambda_2 t\right)^j}{j!} \) [28, Eq. (2.119)].

Note that during the time interval between the departure of packet 1, \( i - 1 \) and the arrival of packet 1, \( i \) (i.e., \( (t_{1,i-1}^1, t_{1,i}) \) in Fig. 2) the queue receives packets only from source 2 and, therefore, the system behaves as a single-source M/M/1 queue. Thus, \( \text{Pr}[M_{2,i}^L = m|J_{2,i}^L = j, X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^L] \) in (44) represents the probability that a single-source M/M/1 queueing system with arrival rate \( \lambda_2 \) and which initially holds \( j \) packets (either in the queue or under service) ends up holding \( m \) packets after \( \tau = x - t \) seconds. We denote this probability compactly by \( \bar{P}_{m|j}(\tau) \) and it is given by the transient analysis of an M/M/1 queueing system as [29 Eq. (6), [28 Eq. (2.163)]

\[
\bar{P}_{m|j}(\tau) = e^{-\left(\lambda_2 + \mu\right)\tau} \left[ \rho_2^{(m-1)/2} I_{m-1}(2\sqrt{\mu \lambda_2 \tau}) + \rho_2^{(m-j-1)/2} I_{m+j+1}(2\sqrt{\mu \lambda_2 \tau}) \right] + \rho_2^n (1 - \rho_2) \left( 1 - Q_{m+j+2}(\sqrt{2\lambda_2 \tau}, \sqrt{2\mu \tau}) \right),
\]

where \( I_k(\cdot) \) represents the modified Bessel function of the first kind of order \( k \), and \( Q_k(a, b) \) is the generalized Q-function.
Substituting (44), (45), and (46) into (43), we have

\[ \mathbb{E}[W_{1,i}X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^{L}] = \frac{1}{\mu} \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} x \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} m \bar{P}_{mij}(x-t)e^{-\lambda_{2}t} \frac{(\lambda_{2}t)^{j}}{j!} f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1} | E_{1,i}^{L}}(x,t) dx dt \]

where \( (a) \) follows from Lemma 5 below which derives the conditional PDF \( f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1} | E_{1,i}^{L}}(x,t) \), and using the substitution \( \tau = x - t \). Note that the double integral in \( \Psi(\mu, \rho_{1}, \lambda_{2}) \) needs to be in general numerically calculated.

**Lemma 5.** The conditional PDF \( f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1} | E_{1,i}^{L}}(x,t) \) is given by

\[ f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1} | E_{1,i}^{L}}(x,t) = \begin{cases} 
0 & x < t \\
\lambda_{1} e^{-\lambda_{2}x} f_{T_{1,i-1}}(t) \frac{P(E_{1,i}^{L})}{P(E_{1,i}^{B})} & x \geq t.
\end{cases} \]

**Proof:** The proof of Lemma 5 follows from the similar steps as we used for Lemma 3. ■

By substituting the probabilities \( P(E_{1,i}^{B}) \) and \( P(E_{1,i}^{L}) \) given by Lemma 1 and the three derived conditional expectation terms \( (37), (38), \) and \( (47) \) into (17), \( \mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}W_{1,i}] \) can be expressed as

\[ \mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}W_{1,i}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W]}{\lambda_{1}} + \lambda_{1}(1 - \rho)\Psi(\mu, \rho_{1}, \lambda_{2}) + \frac{2\lambda_{2}/\lambda_{1} + 1}{\lambda_{1} \mu} - \frac{2}{\lambda_{1}} + \frac{1 - \rho_{2}}{\lambda_{1}^{2}} H_{S}(\lambda_{1}) \]

\[ + \frac{2\rho_{2} - 1}{\lambda_{1}} H_{S}'(\lambda_{1}) - \rho_{2} H_{S}''(\lambda_{1}), \]

Finally, by substituting (49) and (11) into (8), the average AoI of source 1 for an M/M/1 queueing model can be expressed as:

\[ \Delta_{1} = \mathbb{E}[W] + \lambda_{1}^{2}(1 - \rho)\Psi(\mu, \rho_{1}, \lambda_{2}) + \frac{2}{\mu} (\lambda_{2} / \lambda_{1} + 1) - 1 / \lambda_{1} + 2 \frac{1 - \rho_{2}}{\lambda_{1}} H_{S}(\lambda_{1}) \]

\[ + (2\rho_{2} - 1) H_{S}'(\lambda_{1}) - \lambda_{1}\rho_{2} H_{S}''(\lambda_{1}), \]

where the average waiting time of each packet in the system, \( \mathbb{E}[W] \), is given as \[30\] Sect. 3

\[ \mathbb{E}[W] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[S^{2}]\lambda}{2(1 - \rho)}, \]

where \( \mathbb{E}[S^{2}] = 2/\mu^{2} \) is the second moment of the service time, \( H_{S}(\lambda_{1}) \) is a function of the
Laplace transform of the PDF of the service time given by (see (22))

\[
H_S(\lambda_1) = \frac{(1 - \rho)\lambda_1 L_S(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1 - \lambda(1 - L_S(\lambda_1))},
\]

and \( H'_S(\lambda_1) \) and \( H''_S(\lambda_1) \) are the first and second derivative of \( H_S(\cdot) \) at \( \lambda_1 \), respectively, as

\[
H'_S(\lambda_1) = \frac{d(H_S(a))}{da} \bigg|_{a=\lambda_1} = (1 - \rho)\frac{\lambda L'_S(\lambda_1) + (\lambda_1^2 - \lambda_1 \lambda)L'_S(\lambda_1) - \lambda L_S(\lambda_1)}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda(1 - L_S(\lambda_1)))^2},
\]

\[
H''_S(\lambda_1) = \frac{d^2(H_S(a))}{da^2} \bigg|_{a=\lambda_1} = (1 - \rho)\left(\frac{\lambda L''_S(\lambda_1)(\lambda_1^2 - \lambda_1 \lambda) + 2L'_S(\lambda_1)(\lambda_1 - \lambda + \lambda L_S(\lambda_1))}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda(1 - L_S(\lambda_1)))^2}
\right.
\]

\[
- \frac{2(\lambda L'_S(\lambda_1) + (\lambda_1^2 - \lambda_1 \lambda)L'_S(\lambda_1) - \lambda L_S(\lambda_1)(1 + \lambda L'_S(\lambda_1)))}{(\lambda_1 - \lambda(1 - L_S(\lambda_1)))^3},
\]

where \( L'_S(\lambda_1) \) and \( L''_S(\lambda_1) \) for the exponential service time are computed according to (29) as

\[
L_S(\lambda_1) = \int_0^\infty \mu e^{-(\mu + \lambda_1)s}ds = \frac{\mu}{\mu + \lambda_1}, \quad L'_S(\lambda_1) = -\int_0^\infty s\mu e^{-(\mu + \lambda_1)s}ds = -\frac{\mu}{(\mu + \lambda_1)^2},
\]

\[
L''_S(\lambda_1) = \int_0^\infty s^2\mu e^{-(\mu + \lambda_1)s}ds = \frac{2\mu}{(\mu + \lambda_1)^3}.
\]

By substituting \( \mathbb{E}[W], H_S(\lambda_1), H'_S(\lambda_1) \), and \( H''_S(\lambda_1) \) into (50), the average AoI of source 1 for a multi-source M/M/1 queueing model is given as

\[
\Delta_1 = \lambda_1^2(1 - \rho)\Psi(\mu, \rho_1, \lambda_2) + \frac{1}{\mu}\left(\frac{1}{\rho_1} + \frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} + \frac{(2\rho_2 - 1)(\rho - 1)}{(1 - \rho_2)^2} + \frac{2\rho_1\rho_2(\rho - 1)}{(1 - \rho_2)^3}\right).
\]

**Remark 1.** It is worth to note that (53) does not coincide with the prior result \([6, \text{Theorem. 1}]\) and \([16, \text{Eq. (16)}]\). The dissimilarity is explained in the following. The authors of \([6], [16]\) considered a similar two-source FCFS M/M/1 queueing model, with the aim of deriving a closed-form expression for the average AoI of source 1 (\( \Delta_1 \)). Let us focus on relation (33) of \([16]\) where the authors compute a conditional expectation equivalent to our \( \mathbb{E}[W_{1,i}X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^L] \) given by (47), which by (42) can be expressed as

\[
\mathbb{E}[W_{1,i}X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^L] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{2,i}} S_{2,\nu}X_{1,i} | E_{1,i}^L\right].
\]

The authors of \([16]\) tacitly assumed conditional independency between \( \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{2,i}} S_{2,\nu} \) and \( X_{1,i} \) under the event \( E_{1,i}^L = \{T_{1,i-1} < X_{1,i}\} \), and calculated (56) as a multiplication of two
expectations as
\[
E[W_{1,i}X_{1,i}|E_{1,i}^{\ell}] = E\left[\sum_{i'\in\tilde{M}_{2,i}} S_{2,i'}|T_{1,i-1} < X_{1,i}\right] E\left[X_{1,i}|T_{1,i-1} < X_{1,i}\right].
\] (57)

The critical point is that even if \(X_{1,i}\) is independent of \(T_{1,i-1}\), they become dependent when conditioned on the event \(E_{1,i} = \{T_{1,i-1} < X_{1,i}\}\), as in (56). This conditional dependency is violated by the separation of the expectations in (57) because the quantity \(\tilde{M}_{2,i}\) in general depends on both \(T_{1,i-1}\) and \(X_{1,i}\), and, thus, the multiplicative quantities \(\sum_{i'\in\tilde{M}_{2,i}} S_{2,i'}\) and \(X_{1,i}\) are dependent under the event \(E_{1,i}\). Note that we incorporate this conditional dependency in calculating \(E[W_{1,i}X_{1,i}|E_{1,i}^{\ell}]\) by using the conditional joint PDF \(f_{X_{c,i},T_{c,i-1}}(x,t)\).

**Remark 2.** It is worth to note that (55) neither coincides with our prior result [31, Eq. (25)]. The dissimilarity comes from the fact that in [31], we wrongly used steady-state properties of a queueing system in calculating \(E[M_{2,i}|X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^{\ell}]\) in (43).

V. AN APPROXIMATION FOR THE AVERAGE AOI IN A MULTI-SOURCE M/G/1 QUEUEING MODEL

In this section, we derive an approximate expression of the average AoI (8) for a multi-source M/G/1 queueing model. Recall that the exact expressions for the first and second conditional expectation terms of (17) are given by (37) and (38), respectively. Thus, we next propose an approximate calculation for the third conditional expectation term of (17) given by (39).

To approximate (39), we make the following two simplifications for the long event \(E_{1,i}^{\ell}\). First, we neglect the possible residual service time of source 2 packet that is under service at the arrival instant of packet 1, \(i\). Second, we assume that the average number of packets of source 2 that must be served before packet 1, \(i\) is equal to the average number of packets of source 2 that are queued during the system time of packet 1, \(i - 1\) (\(T_{1,i-1}\)). Thus, we assume \(E[M_{2,i}^{L}|X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^{L}] = E[J_{2,i}^{L}|X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E_{1,i}^{L}]\) in step (a) of (40), where, as defined previously, the random variable \(J_{2,i}^{L}\) represents the number of source 2 packets in the system at the departure instant of packet 1, \(i - 1\) for the long event \(E_{1,i}^{L}\). In other words, we assume that during the time interval \(x - t\), the arrivals and departures of source 2 packets cancel out. Note that the exact characterization of the number of source 2 packets during the time interval \(x - t\) relies on the transient analysis of an M/G/1 queue which is intractable.
With the simplifications above, (39) can be approximated as

\[
\mathbb{E}[(S^L_{1,i} + R^L_{2,i}) X_{1,i} | E^L_{1,i}] \approx \frac{1}{\mu} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty x \mathbb{E} [j^L_{2,i} | X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E^L_{1,i}] f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1}|E^L_{1,i}}(x,t) dx dt \\
= \rho_2 \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty t x f_{X_{1,i},T_{1,i-1}|E^L_{1,i}}(x,t) dx dt \\
= \rho_2 \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty t x \lambda_1 e^{-\lambda_1 x} f_{T_{1,i-1}}(t) dx dt \\
= \frac{\rho_2}{P(E^L_{1,i})} \int_0^\infty t^2 e^{-\lambda_1 t} f_{T_{1,i-1}}(t) + \frac{t e^{-\lambda_1 t}}{\lambda_1} f_{T_{1,i-1}}(t) dt \\
= \frac{\rho_2}{P(E^L_{1,i})} \left( H''_S(\lambda_1) - \frac{H'_S(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1} \right). 
\]

\[(58)\]

where (a) comes from the fact that \( \mathbb{E} [j^L_{2,i} | X_{1,i} = x, T_{1,i-1} = t, E^L_{1,i}] = \lambda_2 t \), (b) follows from Lemma 5, and (c) follows from (50).

By substituting the probabilities \( P(E^B_{1,i}) \) and \( P(E^L_{1,i}) \) given by Lemma 1 and the three derived conditional expectation terms (37), (38), and (58) into (17), an approximation for \( \mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}W_{1,i}] \) can be expressed as

\[
\mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}W_{1,i}] \approx \frac{\mathbb{E}[W]}{\lambda_1} + \frac{1}{\lambda_1 \mu} + \frac{2H_S(\lambda_1^2)}{\lambda_1} - \frac{H'_S(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1} - \frac{2}{\lambda_1^2} + \rho_2 \left( \frac{2}{\lambda_1} + H'_S(\lambda_1) - \frac{2H_S(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1} \right). 
\]

\[(59)\]

Finally, by substituting (59) and (17) into (8), an approximation for the average AoI of source 1 in a multi-source M/G/1 queueing model is given as

\[
\Delta_1 \approx \mathbb{E}[W] + \frac{2}{\mu} + \frac{2H_S(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1} - H'_S(\lambda_1) - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} + \rho_2 \left( \frac{2}{\lambda_1} + H'_S(\lambda_1) - \frac{2H_S(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1} \right), 
\]

\[(60)\]

where the quantities \( \mathbb{E}[W] \), \( H_S(\lambda_1) \), and \( H'_S(\lambda_1) \) are calculated by (51) - (54) for a specific service time distribution.

A. Single-Source M/G/1 Queueing Model

When \( \lambda_2 = 0 \), we have a single-source M/G/1 queueing model. In this case, the second and the third conditional expectation in (17) become zero. Since we only approximated the third term of (17), (60) provides an exact solution for the single-source M/G/1 queueing model as

\[
\Delta = \mathbb{E}[W] + \frac{2}{\mu} + \frac{2H_S(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_1} - H'_S(\lambda_1) - \frac{1}{\lambda_1}. 
\]

\[(61)\]
Using (51), (52), and (53), the quantities $E[W]$, $H_S(\lambda)$, and $H'_S(\lambda)$ are calculated as

$$E[W] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[S^2]\lambda}{2(1-\rho)}, \quad H_S(\lambda) = 1 - \rho, \quad H'_S(\lambda) = \frac{(1-\rho)(LS(\lambda) - 1)}{\lambda LS(\lambda)}.$$ 

By substituting $E[W]$, $H_S(\lambda)$, and $H'_S(\lambda)$ in (60), we have

$$\Delta = \frac{1}{\mu} + \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[S^2]}{2(1-\rho)} + \frac{1 - \rho}{\lambda LS(\lambda)},$$

which coincides with the result in [14, Eq. (22)].

VI. VALIDATION AND SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, we first evaluate the average AoI and average peak AoI in a multi-source M/M/1 queueing model and compare our exact expression in (55) with the results in existing works [16] and [31]. Then, we evaluate the accuracy of the proposed approximate expression in (60) in 1) a multi-source M/G/1 queueing model where the service time follows a gamma distribution, and 2) a multi-source M/M/1 queueing model.

A. Multi-Source M/M/1 Queueing Model

Fig. 4 depicts the average AoI of source 1 ($\Delta_1$) as a function of $\lambda_1$ with $\lambda_2 = 0.6$ and $\mu = 1$. As it can be seen, the simulation result and our proposed solution overlap perfectly. Due to the calculation errors in [16] and [31], both curves have a gap to the correct average AoI value.
The effect of $\lambda_2$ on the average AoI and average peak AoI ($A_1$) of source 1 are shown in Fig. 5(a) and 5(b), respectively. When $\lambda_2$ increases, the increased overall load in the system results in longer waiting time for packets of source 1 (and source 2), which increases $\Delta_1$. Note, however, that when $\lambda_2$ increases, the optimal value of $\lambda_1$ that minimizes $\Delta_1$ decreases. The figures illustrate that generating the status update packets too frequently or too rarely does not minimize the average AoI and average peak AoI. Moreover, Fig. 5(a) depicts the gap between the exact and approximate average AoI expressions. As it can be seen, our proposed approximation is relatively close to the exact one in the M/M/1 queueing model.

Fig. 6 depicts the average delay of source 1 as a function of $\lambda_1$ for different values of $\lambda_2$ with $\mu = 1$. The average delay is defined as the summation of the average waiting time and average service time i.e., $\mathbb{E}[W] + 1/\mu$. As the number of arrivals of source 2 packets increases, the queue becomes more congested and the average delay of source 1 increases. By comparing Figs. 5 and 6 one can see that the delay does not fully capture the information freshness, i.e., minimizing the average system delay does not necessarily lead to a good performance in terms of AoI and, reciprocally, minimizing the average AoI (or average peak AoI) does not minimize the average system delay.

### B. Multi-Source M/G/1 Queueing Model – Gamma Distribution

Next, we study the average AoI behavior in a multi-source M/G/1 queueing model where the service time follows a gamma distribution. A gamma distribution can be used to characterize the service time in a wireless system where a transmitter is not directly accessible to its intended receiver. Consider a relay network with multiple wireless hops between a transmitter and the receiver. If the service time of each hop follows an exponential distribution, the end-to-end service time in the system follows a gamma distribution [15].

**Definition 1** (Gamma distribution). The PDF of a gamma distributed random variable $S$ is defined as

$$f_S(s) = \text{Gamma}(s; \kappa, \beta) = \frac{\beta^\kappa s^{\kappa-1} \exp(-\beta s)}{\Gamma(\kappa)}, \quad \text{for } s > 0, \kappa > 0, \beta > 0,$$

with parameters $\kappa$ and $\beta$, where $\Gamma(\kappa)$ is the gamma function at $\kappa$. The first and the second moment of this random variable is $\mathbb{E}[S] = \kappa/\beta$ and $\mathbb{E}[S^2] = \kappa/\beta^2$, respectively. A gamma
Fig. 5: The average AoI (a) and the average peak AoI (b) of source 1 as a function of $\lambda_1$ for different values of $\lambda_2$ with $\mu = 1$.

Distribution with parameter $\kappa$ and $\beta$ can be interpreted as the summation of $\kappa$ independent exponential random variables with parameter $\beta$.

Fig. 7 shows the average AoI of source 1 as a function of $\lambda_1$ for different values of $\lambda_2$ with a fixed mean service time of the system $\mathbb{E}[S] = 1$, $\kappa = 2$ and $\beta = 2$. The figure shows that the
Fig. 6: The average delay of source 1 as a function of $\lambda_1$ for different values of $\lambda_2$ with $\mu = 1$.

Fig. 7: The average AoI of source 1 as a function of $\lambda_1$ for different values of $\lambda_2$ with a fixed mean service time of the system ($\mathbb{E}[S] = 1$) and $\kappa = 2$, $\beta_2 = 2$.

derived approximate expression in (60) provides an accurate estimate of the average AoI in the multi-source M/G/1 queueing model where the service time follows a gamma distribution.

Increasing $\kappa$ for a fixed $\beta$ models the increase of the number of wireless hops while keeping the mean service time of each hop fixed. In Fig. 8 we investigate the influence of number of wireless hops on the average AoI of source 1 as a function of $\lambda_1$ for different values of $\kappa$ when the mean service time of each hop is fixed to $\beta = 1$. As it can be seen, when $\kappa$ increases, the
average AoI increases for all values of $\lambda_1$. This is because when $\kappa$ increases, the mean service time of the system $\mathbb{E}[S] = \kappa/\beta$ increases, increasing the average AoI. Furthermore, the figure shows that as $\kappa$ increases, the average AoI becomes more sensitive to the optimization of status update rate, i.e., the range of $\lambda_1$ values for which the average AoI is close to the minimum narrows down.

Fig. 9 shows the effect of number of wireless hops on the average AoI of source 1 as a function of $\lambda_1$ for different values of $\kappa$ when the mean service time of the system is fixed to $\mathbb{E}[S] = 1$. We can see that when $\kappa$ increases, the average AoI decreases. Note that the second moment (i.e., the variance) of the service time following a gamma distribution is $\mathbb{E}[S^2] = \kappa/\beta^2$. Now, because we set $\mathbb{E}[S] = \kappa/\beta = 1$, we have $\kappa = \beta$. Therefore, when $\kappa$ increases, the variance of the system service time decreases with rate $1/\kappa$, and consequently, the waiting time decreases according to $\mathbb{E}[W] = \mathbb{E}[S^2] \lambda / 2(1 - \rho)$, reducing the average AoI. Fig. 9 demonstrates that in a wireless relay network for a fixed mean system service time, transmitting the status update packets using more hops with smaller average service time decreases the average AoI.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We considered a single-server multi-source FCFS queueing model with Poisson arrivals and analyzed the average AoI and average peak AoI of each source. We derived 1) an exact expression
Fig. 9: The average AoI of source 1 as a function of $\lambda_1$ for different values of parameter $\kappa$ and $\lambda_2$ with a fixed mean service time of the system $E[S] = 1$.

For the average AoI for a multi-source M/M/1 queueing model, and 2) an approximate expression for the average AoI for a multi-source M/G/1 queueing model. The simulation results showed that the approximate expression for the average AoI is sufficiently accurate for different service time distributions. The results also showed that in a wireless relay network for a fixed mean system service time, transmitting the status update packets using more hops with smaller average service time decreases the average AoI. Finally, the results pointed out the significance of the AoI as a metric in time-sensitive control applications: minimizing merely the average delay does not minimize the AoI.
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