

# Stabilizing a Queue Subject to Activity-Dependent Server Performance

Michael Lin Richard J. La Nuno C. Martins

**Abstract**—We consider a discrete-time system comprising a first-come-first-served queue, a non-preemptive server, and a scheduler that governs the assignment of tasks in the queue to the server. The server has an *availability* state that indicates, at each instant, whether the server is busy working on a task or is available. In the latter case, if the queue is nonempty, then a task-assignment control policy implemented by the scheduler either assigns a new task to the server or allows it to rest. The server also has an integer-valued *activity state* that is non-increasing during rest periods, and is non-decreasing otherwise. An instantaneous service rate function ascribes to each possible value of the activity state a probability that the server can complete a task in one time step. For a typical instantaneous service rate function, the completion probability decreases (server performance worsens) as the activity state increases. The scheduler policy has access to the queue size and the entire state of the server.

In this article, we study the problem of designing scheduler policies that stabilize the queue. We show that stability, whenever viable, can be achieved by a simple policy that bases its decisions on the availability state, a threshold applied to the activity state, and a flag that indicates when the queue is empty. The supremum of the service rates achievable by stabilizing policies can be determined by a finite search. Our results remain valid even when the instantaneous service rate function is not monotonic.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Recent advances in information and communication networks, and sensor technologies, fostered a new wide range of applications. These include networked systems in which sensors are equipped with communication modules powered by renewable energy, such as solar and geothermal energy. Invariably, operation of these systems requires the management of queued tasks. Consequently, a queueing paradigm is needed that goes beyond the classical case in which the performance of the server is time-invariant. Notably, in these new applications, server performance often depends on its activity, understood as a proxy for the cumulative effect on resources of the history of task assignments. Typically, the performance of the server degrades when resources get depleted as a result of higher activity, and may recover when its activity is lowered to allow for the renewal of resources.

This article starts by proposing a queueing system in which the performance of the server depends on its activity. Subse-

quently, we study two (soon to be stated) problems associated with the design of task-assignment control policies for the scheduler. These policies will govern the assignment of tasks from the queue to the server with the goal of keeping the queue stable. A major challenge in the design of these policies is that they will have to manage the trade-off between assigning tasks immediately, which may decrease server performance due to the decrease of resource levels associated with increased activity, or wait until resource levels are renewed at the expense of allowing the queue length to increase as new tasks arrive at a fixed rate.

**Convention:** Throughout this article, we will refer to the task-assignment control policy at the scheduler as scheduler policy or, simply, as policy for short when appropriate.

To be more specific, we consider a queueing system comprising the following three components:

- A first-in first-out unbounded **queue** registers a new task when it arrives and removes it as soon as work on it is completed. It has an internal state, its queue size, which indicates the number of uncompleted tasks in the queue.
- The **server** performs the work required by each task assigned to it. It has an internal state with two components. The first is the *availability* state, which indicates whether the server is currently working on a task or is available to start a new one. We assume that the server is non-preemptive, which in our context means that the server gets busy when it starts work on a new task, and it becomes available again only after the task is completed. The second component of the state is finite-valued and is termed *activity*. It accounts for the cumulative effect of the history of task assignments on resources that influence the performance of the server. Such an activity state could, for instance, account for the battery charge level of an energy harvesting module that powers the server (see Section I-B) or the status of arousal or fatigue of a human operator that assists the server or supervises the work. In our framework, the activity state plays a central role in that it determines the server performance understood as the probability that, within a given time-period, the server can complete a task. Namely, a decrease in performance causes an increase in the expected time needed to service a task.
- The **scheduler** has access to the queue size and the entire state of the server. When the server is available and the queue is not empty, the scheduler policy decides whether to assign a new task or to allow for a rest period. Our formulation admits non-work-conserving policies that may choose to assign rest periods even when the queue is not empty. This would allow the server to rest as a way to steer the activity state towards

The authors are with the Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering and the Institute for Systems Research, the University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742. Email: {mlin1025, hyongla, nmartins}@umd.edu.

This work is supported in part by AFOSR Grant FA95501510367 and NSF Grant ECCS 1446785.

a range that can deliver better long-term performance.

We adopt a stochastic discrete-time framework in which time is uniformly partitioned into epochs, within which new tasks arrive according to a Bernoulli process. The probability of arrival per epoch is termed arrival rate<sup>1</sup>. We constrain our analysis to *stationary scheduler policies* that are invariant under epoch shifts. We discuss our assumptions and provide a detailed description of our framework in Section II.

### A. Main Problems

The following are the main challenges studied in this article:

---

#### Main Problems:

- P-i) An arrival rate is qualified as stabilizable when there is a stationary scheduler policy that stabilizes the queue. Given a server, we seek to compute the supremum of the set of stabilizable arrival rates.
  - P-ii) We seek to propose scheduler policies that have a simple structure and are guaranteed to stabilize the queue for any stabilizable arrival rate.
- 

Notice that, as alluded to above in the scheduler description, we allow non-work-conserving scheduler policies. This means that, in addressing Problem P-i), we must allow policies that are a function of not only the queue size, but also the activity and availability states of the server. The fact that this functional dependence complicates the design of the policies justifies the importance of addressing Problem P-ii).

### B. Motivating Example

The need to analyze a class of remote wireless monitoring systems – each comprising a sensor that measures and broadcasts to a base station variations on a bridge joint’s strain or temperature – was a motivation for the work reported in this article. We proceed to describe in detail the components of one such system in the context of our framework:

**Arrival process:** A new packet recording a strain or temperature measurement is created and logged into a queue when the absolute value of the difference between the current measurement and the last recorded measurement exceeds a predefined threshold. Hence, decreasing (increasing) the threshold increases (decreases) the rate at which new packets are created and entered into the queue.

**Tasks:** The transmission from the sensor to the base station (or gateway) of the packet at the head of the queue is a task.

**Server:** According to our framework, the server for this example is the communication link consisting of a wireless transmitter at the sensor and a receiver at the base station (or gateway). When requested by the scheduler, the server will repeatedly attempt to complete the task (transmit the measurement or packet at the head of the queue) until it succeeds<sup>2</sup>. The transmitter at a sensor operates on batteries

<sup>1</sup>Notice that, unlike the nomenclature we adopt here, *arrival rate* is commonly used in the context of Poisson arrival processes. This distinction is explained in detail in Section II-B.1.

<sup>2</sup>We assume that, every time it successfully receives a packet, the base station can use enough power to guarantee that an acknowledgement is provided to the sensor.

that are recharged by a solar panel. Discharge curve characteristics [1], [2], as well as power management firmware on the sensor, reduces (resp. increases) the transmit power when the state of charge of the battery decreases (resp. increases). This is consequential because the probability of a fading event causing a failed transmission diminishes (resp. grows) when the transmit power increases (resp. decreases). The difference between the capacity of the battery and its current state of charge is the activity state. Hence, the probability that a transmission attempt will succeed (complete the task) is a function of the activity state, as envisaged in our framework.

**Scheduler:** A microcontroller at the sensor implements a policy that decides based on the activity state, the queue size and availability of the server whether to initiate the transmission of the packet at the head of the queue (new task).

### C. Preview of Results

The following are our main results (presented in Section III) and their correspondence with Problems P-i) and P-ii).

R-i) In Theorem 3.1, we show that the supremum mentioned in P-i) can be computed by maximizing a function whose domain is the *finite* set of activity states. The fact that such a quantity can be determined by a finite search is not evident because the queue size is unbounded.

R-ii) As we state in Theorem 3.2, given a server, there is a threshold policy that stabilizes the queue for any stabilizable arrival rate. The threshold policy assigns a new task only when the server is available, the queue is not empty, and the activity state is less than a threshold chosen to be the value (found by a *finite* search) at which the maximum referred to in R-i) is attained. This is our answer to Problem P-ii).

From this discussion we conclude that, to the extent that the stability of the system is concerned, we can focus solely on the threshold policies outlined in R-ii). It is also important to observe that, as we discuss in Remark 3 of Section III, Theorem 3.2 is valid even when the performance of the server is not monotonic with respect to the activity state.

### D. Related Literature

The stability of queueing systems has been studied extensively [3]–[6], and there exists a large volume of literature. Earlier studies of queueing systems with time-varying parameters date back to the studies by Conway and Maxwell [7], Jackson [8], Yadin an Naor [9], Gupta [10] and Harris [11]. A summary of earlier studies on queues with state-dependent parameters can be found in [12] and references therein. The manuscript [4] discusses *rate stability*, which is different from the usual definition of stability in stochastic literature, and proves that if the conditional output rate of the server when the queue size is sufficiently large exceeds the input rate, the system is rate stable.

In addition, with the rapid growth of wireless networks, there has been much interest in understanding and designing efficient scheduler policies with time-varying channel conditions that affect the probability of successful transmissions [13]–[15]. Many studies focus on designing throughput optimal scheduler policies that can stabilize the system for

any arrival rate (vector) that lies in the stability region (e.g., [14], [16], [17]). However, there is a major difference between these studies and our study. In wireless networks, channel conditions and probability of successful transmission/decoding vary independently of the scheduling decisions chosen by the scheduler. In our study, on the other hand, the probability of successfully completing a task within an epoch depends on the past history of scheduling decisions. Consequently, the current scheduling decision affects the future efficiency of the server.

In [18], [19], the authors study the problem of designing admission control policies to ensure quality-of-service in the form of call block probabilities. In particular, [20] considers queueing systems with workload-dependent service rates and studies the problem of devising an admission control policy that maximizes the long-run throughput. It shows that, under the assumption that the expected return time to given workload is unimodal, there exists an optimal admission control policy with a threshold on workload. Despite some similarity between this study and ours, there are major differences: first, the studied problems are different; unlike in [20], in our problem we do not control the workload arriving at the queue, and the service rate depends on the activity state of the server that summarizes its recent utilization level. We are interested in designing a non-work-conserving scheduling policy that permits a non-preemptive server to rest after completing a task, instead of forcing it to operate inefficiently. Second, perhaps more noteworthy, we demonstrate that there is an optimal threshold policy (on the activity state) without assuming that the service rate is unimodal in the activity state.

Another area that is closely related to our study is task scheduling for human operators/servers. The performance and management of human operators and servers (e.g., bank tellers, toll collectors, doctors, nurses, emergency dispatchers) has been the subject of many studies in the past, e.g., [21]–[24]. Recently, with rapid advances in information and sensor technologies, human supervisory control, which requires processing a large amount of information in a short period, potentially causing information overload, became an active research area [25], [26].

As human supervisors play a critical role in the systems (e.g., supervisory control and data acquisition), there is a resurging interest in understanding and modeling the performance of humans under varying settings. Although this is still an active research area, it is well documented that the performance of humans depends on many factors, including arousal and perceived workload [22], [23], [27], [28]. For example, the well-known Yerkes-Dodson law suggests that moderate levels of arousal are beneficial, leading to the inverted-U model [24].

In closely related studies, Savla and Frazzoli [29], [30] investigated the problem of designing a task release control policy. They assumed periodic task arrivals and modeled the dynamics of server utilization, which determines the service time of the server, using a differential equation; the server utilization increases when the server is busy and decreases when it is idle. They showed that, when all tasks bring identical workload, a policy that allows a new task to be released to the server only when its utilization is below a suitably chosen threshold, is maximally stabilizing [30, Theorems III.1 and




Fig. 1. Illustration of time uniformly divided into epochs and when updates and actions are taken. (Assuming  $k \geq 1$ )

III.2]. Moreover, they proved that when task workloads are modeled using independent and identically distributed random variables, the maximum achievable throughput increases compared to the homogeneous workload cases.

We note that existing results in the literature (e.g., [31]) may be used to prove Theorem 3.2. However, we elect to provide a more direct proof in the paper for two reasons: first, a self-contained proof eliminates the need to introduce additional setup and notation to make use of existing results and, in our opinion, improves readability. Second, we believe that our approach and reported auxiliary results in the proof can be used more readily in extending the results of this paper. Finally, to the best of our knowledge, the more notable result in Theorem 3.1 does not follow from any existing results in the literature.

**Paper Structure:** A stochastic discrete-time model is described in Section II. In it we also introduce notation, key concepts and propose a Markov Decision Process (MDP) framework that is amenable to performance analysis and optimization. Our main results are discussed in Section III, and Section IV describes an auxiliary MDP that is central to our analysis. The proofs of our results are presented in Section V, and Section VI provides concluding remarks.

## II. STOCHASTIC DISCRETE-TIME FRAMEWORK

In the following subsection, we describe a discrete-time framework that follows from assumptions on when the states of the queue and the server are updated and how actions are decided. In doing so, we will also introduce the notation used to represent these discrete-time processes. A probabilistic description that leads to a tractable MDP formulation is deferred to Section II-B.

### A. State Updates and Scheduler Operation: Timing and Notation

We consider an infinite horizon problem in which the *physical* (continuous) time set is  $\mathbb{R}_+ := [0, \infty)$ , which we partition uniformly into half-open intervals of positive duration  $\Delta$  as  $\mathbb{R}_+ = \cup_{k=0}^{\infty} [k\Delta, (k+1)\Delta)$ . Each interval is called an *epoch*, and epoch  $k$  refers to  $[k\Delta, (k+1)\Delta)$ . Our formulation and results are valid regardless of the epoch duration  $\Delta$ . We reserve  $t$  to denote continuous time, and  $k$  is the discrete-time index we use to represent epochs.

Each epoch is subdivided into three half-open subintervals denoted by stages  $S1$ ,  $S2$  and  $S3$  (see Fig. 1). As we explain

below, stages  $S1$  and  $S2$  are allocated for basic operations of record keeping, updates and scheduling decisions. Although, in practice, the duration of these stages is a negligible fraction of  $\Delta$ , we discuss them here in detail to clarify the causality relationships among states and actions. We also introduce notation used to describe certain key discrete-time processes that are indexed with respect to epoch number.

In addition, even though more general arrival processes can be handled, for simplicity of exposition, we assume that new task arrivals occur in accordance with a Bernoulli process, and the Bernoulli random variables are assumed independent. Thus, at most one new task arrives at queue during each epoch. We denote the number of tasks that arrive during epoch  $k$  by  $B_k$ , which takes values in  $\{0, 1\}$ .

Furthermore, during each epoch, the scheduler policy assigns at most one task to the server. Hence, the server either works on a single task or remains idle at any given time. We denote the number of tasks that the server completes during epoch  $k$  by  $D_k$ , which takes values in  $\{0, 1\}$ .

**1) Stage S1:** The following updates take place during stage  $S1$  of epoch  $k + 1$ :

The *queue size* at time  $t = k\Delta$  is denoted by  $Q_k$ , and it is updated according to a Lindley's equation [32]:

$$Q_{k+1} = \max\{0, Q_k + B_k - D_k\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, \dots\} \quad (1)$$

The *availability state of the server* at time  $t = k\Delta$  is denoted by  $W_k$  and takes values in  $\mathbb{W} := \{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}\}$ . We use  $W_k = \mathcal{B}$  to indicate that the server is busy working on a task at time  $t = k\Delta$ . If it is available at time  $t = k\Delta$ , then  $W_k = \mathcal{A}$ . The update mechanism for  $W_k$  is as follows:

- If  $W_k = \mathcal{A}$ , then  $W_{k+1} = \mathcal{A}$  when either no new task was assigned during epoch  $k$ , or a new task was assigned and completed during epoch  $k$ . If  $W_k = \mathcal{A}$  and a new task is assigned during epoch  $k$  which is not completed until  $t = (k + 1)\Delta$ , then  $W_{k+1} = \mathcal{B}$ .
- If  $W_k = \mathcal{B}$  and the server completes the task by time  $t = (k + 1)\Delta$ , then  $W_{k+1} = \mathcal{A}$ . Otherwise,  $W_{k+1} = \mathcal{B}$ .

We use  $S_k$  to denote the *activity state* at time  $t = k\Delta$ , and assume that it takes values in  $\mathbb{S} := \{1, \dots, n_s\}$ . The activity state is non-decreasing while the server is working and is non-increasing when it is idle. In Section II-B, we describe an MDP that specifies probabilistically how  $S_k$  transitions to  $S_{k+1}$ , conditioned on whether the server worked or rested during epoch  $k$ .

Without loss of generality, we assume that  $Q_k$ ,  $W_k$  and  $S_k$  are initialized as follows:  $Q_0 = 0$ ,  $W_0 = \mathcal{A}$ , and  $S_0 = 1$ . The overall state of the server is represented compactly by  $\mathbf{Y}_k$ , which takes values in  $\mathbb{Y}$ , defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{Y}_k := (S_k, W_k), \quad \mathbb{Y} := \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{W}$$

In a like manner, we define the overall state for the MDP taking values in  $\mathbb{X}$  as follows:

$$\mathbf{X}_k := (\mathbf{Y}_k, Q_k), \quad \mathbb{X} := \mathbb{S} \times \left( (\mathbb{W} \times \mathbb{N}) \setminus (\mathcal{B}, 0) \right)$$

From the definition of  $\mathbb{X}$ , it follows that when the queue is empty, there is no task for the server to work on and, hence, it cannot be busy.

**2) Stage S2:** It is during stage  $S2$  of epoch  $k$  that the scheduler issues a decision based on  $\mathbf{X}_k$ , in accordance with the employed scheduler policy: let  $\mathbb{A} := \{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{W}\}$  represent the set of possible actions that the scheduler can request from the server, where  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$  represent 'rest' and 'work', respectively. The assumption that the server is non-preemptive and the fact that no new tasks can be assigned when the queue is empty, lead to the following set of admissible actions for each possible state  $\mathbf{x} = (s, w, q)$  in  $\mathbb{X}$ :

$$\mathbb{A}_{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{cases} \{\mathcal{R}\} & \text{if } q = 0, \text{ (impose 'rest' when queue is empty)} \\ \{\mathcal{W}\} & \text{if } q > 0 \text{ and } w = \mathcal{B}, \text{ (non-preemptive server)} \\ \mathbb{A} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

We denote the action chosen by the adopted scheduler policy at epoch  $k$  by  $A_k$ , which takes values in  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbf{X}_k}$ .

Notice that, in light of the restrictions in (2), only when the queue is nonempty and the server is available at time  $k$  will the scheduler policy have the authority to decide whether  $A_k = \mathcal{W}$  (assign a new task for the server to work on) or  $A_k = \mathcal{R}$  (let the server rest).

As we discuss in Section II-C, we focus on the design of stationary policies that determine  $A_k$  as a function of  $\mathbf{X}_k$ .

**3) Stage S3:** A task can arrive at any time during each epoch, but we assume that work on a new task can be assigned to the server only at the beginning of stage  $S3$ . More specifically, the scheduler acts as follows:

- If  $W_k = \mathcal{A}$  and  $A_k = \mathcal{W}$ , then the server starts working on a new task at the head of the queue when stage  $S3$  of epoch  $k$  begins.
- When  $W_k = \mathcal{A}$ , the scheduler can also select  $A_k = \mathcal{R}$  to signal that no work will be performed by the server during the remainder of epoch. Once this 'rest' decision is made, a new task can be assigned no earlier than the beginning of stage  $S3$  of epoch  $k + 1$ . Since the scheduler is non-work-conserving, it may decide to assign such 'rest' periods as a way to possibly reduce  $S_{k+1}$  and to improve future performance.
- If  $W_k = \mathcal{B}$ , the server was still working on a task at time  $t = k\Delta$ . In this case, because the server is non-preemptive, the scheduler picks  $A_k = \mathcal{W}$  to indicate that work on the current task is ongoing and must continue until it is completed and no new task can be assigned during epoch  $k$ .

## B. State Updates and Scheduler Operation: Probabilistic Model

Based on the formulation outlined in Section II-A, we proceed to describe a discrete-time MDP that models how the states of the server and queue evolve over time for any given scheduler policy.

**1) Arrival Process:** We assume that tasks arrive during each epoch according to a Bernoulli process  $\{B_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . The probability of arrival for each epoch ( $P(B_k = 1)$ ) is called the *arrival rate* and is denoted by  $\lambda$ , which is assumed to belong to  $(0, 1)$ . Although we assume Bernoulli arrivals to simplify our analysis and discussion, more general arrival

distributions (e.g., Poisson distributions) can be handled only with minor changes as it will be clear.

Notice that, as we discuss in Remark 1 below, our nomenclature for  $\lambda$  should not be confused with the standard definition of arrival rate for Poisson arrivals. Since our results are valid irrespective of  $\Delta$ , including when it is arbitrarily small, the remark also gives a sound justification for our adoption of the Bernoulli arrival model by viewing it as a *discrete-time approximation* of the widely used Poisson arrival model.

*Remark 1:* It is a well-known fact that, as  $\Delta$  tends to zero, a Poisson process in continuous time  $t$ , with arrival rate  $\tilde{\lambda}$ , is arbitrarily well approximated by  $B_{\lfloor t/\Delta \rfloor}$  with  $\lambda = \Delta\tilde{\lambda}$ .

**2) Activity-Dependent Server Performance:** In our formulation, the efficiency or performance of the server during an epoch is modeled with the help of an *instantaneous service rate function*  $\mu : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ . More specifically, if the server works on a task during epoch  $k$ , the probability that it completes the task by the end of the epoch is  $\mu(S_k)$ . This holds irrespective of whether the task is newly assigned or inherited as ongoing work from a previous epoch.<sup>3</sup> Thus,  $\mu$  quantifies the effect of the activity state on the performance of the server. **The results presented throughout this article are valid for any choice of  $\mu$  with codomain  $(0, 1)$ .**

**3) Dynamics of the Activity State:** We assume that (i)  $S_{k+1}$  is equal to either  $S_k$  or  $S_k + 1$  when  $A_k$  is  $\mathcal{W}$  and (ii)  $S_{k+1}$  is either  $S_k$  or  $S_k - 1$  if  $A_k$  is  $\mathcal{R}$ . The state-transition probabilities for  $S_k$  are specified below for every  $s$  and  $s'$  in  $\mathbb{S}$ :

$$P_{S_{k+1}|S_k, A_k}(s' | s, \mathcal{W}) = \begin{cases} \rho_{s, s+1} & \text{if } s' = s + 1 \\ 1 - \rho_{s, s+1} & \text{if } s' = s \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3a)$$

$$P_{S_{k+1}|S_k, A_k}(s' | s, \mathcal{R}) = \begin{cases} \rho_{s, s-1} & \text{if } s' = s - 1 \\ 1 - \rho_{s, s-1} & \text{if } s' = s \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3b)$$

where the parameters  $\rho_{s, s'}$  quantify the likelihood that the activity state will transition to a greater or lesser value, depending on whether the action is  $\mathcal{W}$  or  $\mathcal{R}$ , respectively. Here, we assume that  $\{\rho_{s, s+1} : 1 \leq s < n_s\}$  and  $\{\rho_{s, s-1} : 1 < s \leq n_s\}$  take values in  $(0, 1)$ . We also adopt the convention that  $\rho_{1,0} = \rho_{n_s, n_s+1} = 0$ .

*Remark 2:* According to (3), the state of charge (activity state) of the battery for the example in Section I-B would be modeled as a controlled Markov chain, which can be viewed as an approximation of the models in [33], [34] and [35, Part IV]. This follows the approach of the work described in the surveys [36]–[38], in which controlled Markovian models are widely used to characterize the time-evolution of the state of charge of the batteries of energy harvesting devices. As is discussed in [38], there are other processes that could be viewed as the activity state of a system and whose dynamics could be approximated by a controlled Markovian model after appropriate discretization of the state-space. Examples of such

<sup>3</sup>This assumption is introduced to simplify the exposition. However, more general scenarios in which the probability of task completion within an epoch depends on the total service received by the task prior to epoch  $k$  can be handled by extending the state space and explicitly modeling the total service received by the task in service.




Fig. 2. Dynamics of the Activity State  $S_k \in \mathbb{S}$ .

processes include the temperature of the wireless transmission module in communication [39], [40] and distributed estimation systems [41], or, as is described in Section I-D, the state quantifying human operator fatigue in [30].

**4) Transition probabilities for  $\mathbf{X}_k$ :** We consider that  $S_{k+1}$  is independent of  $(W_{k+1}, Q_{k+1})$  when conditioned on  $(\mathbf{X}_k, A_k)$ . Under this assumption, the transition probabilities for  $\mathbf{X}_k$  can be written as follows: for every  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'$  in  $\mathbb{X}$  and  $a$  in  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbf{X}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathbf{X}_{k+1}|\mathbf{X}_k, A_k}(\mathbf{x}' | \mathbf{x}, a) &= P_{S_{k+1}|\mathbf{X}_k, A_k}(s' | \mathbf{x}, a) \\ &\quad \times P_{W_{k+1}, Q_{k+1}|\mathbf{X}_k, A_k}(w', q' | \mathbf{x}, a) \\ &= P_{S_{k+1}|S_k, A_k}(s' | s, a) \\ &\quad \times P_{W_{k+1}, Q_{k+1}|\mathbf{X}_k, A_k}(w', q' | \mathbf{x}, a). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We assume that, within each epoch  $k$ , the events that (a) there is a new task arrival during the epoch and (b) a task being serviced during the epoch is completed by the end of the epoch are independent when conditioned on  $\mathbf{X}_k$  and  $\{A_k = \mathcal{W}\}$ . Hence, the transition probability  $P_{W_{k+1}, Q_{k+1}|\mathbf{X}_k, A_k}$  in (4) is given by the following:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{W_{k+1}, Q_{k+1}|\mathbf{X}_k, A_k}(w', q' | \mathbf{x}, \mathcal{W}) &= \begin{cases} \mu(s_k) \lambda & \text{if } w' = \mathcal{A} \text{ and } q' = q, \\ \mu(s_k) (1 - \lambda) & \text{if } w' = \mathcal{A} \text{ and } q' = q - 1, \\ (1 - \mu(s_k)) \lambda & \text{if } w' = \mathcal{B} \text{ and } q' = q + 1, \\ (1 - \mu(s_k))(1 - \lambda) & \text{if } w' = \mathcal{B} \text{ and } q' = q, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (5a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} P_{W_{k+1}, Q_{k+1}|\mathbf{X}_k, A_k}(w', q' | \mathbf{x}, \mathcal{R}) &= \begin{cases} \lambda & \text{if } w' = \mathcal{A} \text{ and } q' = q + 1, \\ 1 - \lambda & \text{if } w' = \mathcal{A} \text{ and } q' = q, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (5b)$$

**Definition 1: (MDP  $\mathbf{X}$ )** The MDP with input  $A_k$  and state  $\mathbf{X}_k$ , which at this point is completely defined, is denoted by  $\mathbf{X}$ . Table I summarizes the notation for MDP  $\mathbf{X}$ .

### C. Evolution of the System State Under a Stationary Policy

We start by defining the class of policies that we consider throughout the paper.

**Definition 2:** A stationary randomized policy is specified by a mapping  $\theta : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  that determines the probability that the server is assigned to work on a task or rest, as a function of the system state, according to

$$\begin{aligned} P_{A_k|\mathbf{X}_k, \dots, \mathbf{X}_0}(\mathcal{W}|x_k, \dots, x_0) &= \theta(x_k) \quad \text{and} \\ P_{A_k|\mathbf{X}_k, \dots, \mathbf{X}_0}(\mathcal{R}|x_k, \dots, x_0) &= 1 - \theta(x_k). \end{aligned}$$

$\mathbb{S}$	set of activity states $\{1, \dots, n_s\}$
$\mathbb{W} := \{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}\}$	server availability ( $\mathcal{A}$ = available, $\mathcal{B}$ = busy)
$W_k$	server availability at epoch $k$ (takes values in $\mathbb{W}$ )
$\mathbb{Y}$	server state components $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{W}$
$\mathbf{Y}_k := (S_k, W_k)$	server state at epoch $k$ (takes values in $\mathbb{Y}$ )
$\mathbb{N}$	natural number system $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ .
$Q_k$	queue size at epoch $k$ (takes values in $\mathbb{N}$ )
$\mathbb{X}$	state space formed by $\mathbb{S} \times ((\mathbb{W} \times \mathbb{N}) \setminus (\mathcal{B}, 0))$
$\mathbf{X}_k := (\mathbf{Y}_k, Q_k)$	system state at epoch $k$ (takes values in $\mathbb{X}$ )
$\mathbf{X}$	MDP whose state is $\mathbf{X}_k$ at epoch $k \in \mathbb{N}$
$\mathbb{A} := \{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{W}\}$	possible actions ( $\mathcal{R}$ = rest, $\mathcal{W}$ = work)
$\mathbb{A}_{\mathbf{x}}$	set of actions admissible at a given state $\mathbf{x}$ in $\mathbb{X}$
$A_k$	action chosen at epoch $k$ .
PMF	probability mass function

TABLE I

A SUMMARY OF NOTATION DESCRIBING MDP  $\mathbf{X}$ .

Hence, for given a realization  $x_k$  of the state at epoch  $k$ , the stationary randomized policy specified by a map  $\theta : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  assigns the action  $A_k = \mathcal{W}$  with probability  $\theta(x_k)$ , and  $A_k = \mathcal{R}$  with probability  $1 - \theta(x_k)$ . According to [42], these policies would be further qualified as memoryless because, given  $x_k$ , they do not rely on previous realizations of the state.

*Definition 3:* The set of admissible stationary randomized policies satisfying (2) is denoted by  $\Theta_R$ .

**Convention:** We adopt the convention that, unless stated otherwise, a positive arrival rate  $\lambda$  is pre-selected and fixed throughout the paper. Although the statistical properties of  $\mathbf{X}$  and associated quantities subject to a given policy depend on  $\lambda$ , we simplify our notation by not labeling them with  $\lambda$ .

From (4) - (5b), we conclude that  $\mathbf{X}$  subject to a policy  $\theta$  in  $\Theta_R$  evolves according to a time-homogeneous Markov chain (MC), which we denote by  $\mathbf{X}^\theta = \{\mathbf{X}_k^\theta : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Also, when it is clear from the context, we refer to  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$  as *the system*.

There are several different but related definitions of stability for queueing systems (e.g., rate stability and asymptotic average stability), and we refer a reader to manuscripts [3]–[6] for more details. For our study, we adopt the definition of system stability stated below. As it will be clear, for our system, this definition is equivalent to a definition of stability that is common in the literature on stochastic systems, which requires the existence of a limiting probability distribution (Lemma 1).

*Definition 4 (System stability, stabilizability and  $\Theta_S(\lambda)$ ):*

For a given policy  $\theta$  in  $\Theta_R$ , the system  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$  is stable if it satisfies the following properties:

- (i) The number of transient states is finite and, hence, there is at least one recurrent communicating class (RCC).
- (ii) All RCCs are positive recurrent.

An arrival rate  $\lambda$  is said to be stabilizable when there is a policy  $\theta$  in  $\Theta_R$  for which  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$  is stable. We also define  $\Theta_S(\lambda)$  to be the set of randomized policies in  $\Theta_R$  that stabilize the system for a stabilizable arrival rate  $\lambda$ .

Before we proceed, let us point out a useful fact under any stabilizing policy  $\theta$  in  $\Theta_S(\lambda)$ .

*Lemma 1:* A stable system  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$  has a unique positive recurrent communicating class (PRCC), which is aperiodic. Hence, there is a unique stationary probability mass function (PMF) for  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$ .

*Proof:* Please see Appendix I for a proof. ■




Fig. 3. System Diagram.

*Definition 5:* Given a fixed arrival rate  $\lambda > 0$  and a stabilizing policy  $\theta$  in  $\Theta_S(\lambda)$ , we denote the unique stationary PMF and PRCC of  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$  by  $\pi^\theta = (\pi^\theta(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X})$  and  $\mathbb{C}_\theta$ , respectively.

### III. MAIN RESULTS

Our main results are Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, where we state that a soon-to-be defined quantity  $\bar{\nu}^*$ , which can be computed efficiently, is the least upper bound of all arrival rates for which there exists a stabilizing policy in  $\Theta_R$  (see Definition 4). The theorems also assert that, for any arrival rate  $\lambda$  less than  $\bar{\nu}^*$ , there is a stabilizing deterministic *threshold* policy in  $\Theta_R$  with the following structure:

$$\theta_\tau(s, w, q) := \begin{cases} \phi_\tau(s, w) & \text{if } q > 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $\tau$  lies in  $\mathbb{S} \cup \{n_s + 1\}$ , and  $\phi_\tau$  is a threshold policy that acts as follows:

$$\phi_\tau(s, w) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s \geq \tau \text{ and } w = \mathcal{A}, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Notice that, when the server is available and the queue is not empty,  $\theta_\tau$  assigns a new task only if  $s$  is less than the threshold  $\tau$  and lets the server rest otherwise.

In Section IV, we introduce an auxiliary MDP with *finite* state space  $\mathbb{Y}$ , which can be viewed as the server state in  $\mathbf{X}$  when the queue size  $Q_k$  is always positive. First, using the fact that  $\mathbb{Y}$  is finite, we demonstrate that, for every  $\tau$  in  $\mathbb{S} \cup \{n_s + 1\}$ , the auxiliary MDP subject to  $\phi_\tau$  has a unique stationary PMF, which we denote by  $\bar{\pi}^\tau$ . Then, we show that, for any stable system  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$  under some policy  $\theta$  in  $\Theta_R$ , we can find a threshold policy  $\phi_\tau$  for the auxiliary MDP, which achieves the same long-term departure rate of completed tasks as in  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$ . As a result, the maximum long-term departure rate of completed tasks in the auxiliary MDP among all threshold policies  $\phi_\tau$  with  $\tau$  in  $\mathbb{S} \cup \{n_s + 1\}$  serves as an upper bound on the arrival rate  $\lambda$  for which we can hope to find a stabilizing policy  $\theta$  in  $\Theta_R$ .

Making use of this observation, we define the following important quantity:

$$\bar{\nu}^* := \max_{\tau \in \mathbb{S} \cup \{n_s + 1\}} \left( \sum_{(\bar{s}, \bar{w}) \in \mathbb{Y}} \bar{\pi}^\tau(\bar{s}, \bar{w}) \phi_\tau(\bar{s}, \bar{w}) \mu(\bar{s}) \right) \quad (8)$$

From the definition of the stationary PMF  $\bar{\pi}^\tau$ ,  $\bar{\nu}^*$  can be interpreted as the maximum long-term departure rate of completed tasks under any threshold policy of the form in (6), *assuming that the queue is always non-empty*.

The following are the main results of this paper.

**Theorem 3.1:** (Necessity) If, for a given arrival rate  $\lambda$ , there exists a stabilizing policy in  $\Theta_R$ , then  $\lambda \leq \bar{\nu}^*$ .

A proof of Theorem 3.1 is provided in Section V-A.

**Theorem 3.2:** (Sufficiency) Let  $\tau^*$  be a maximizer of (8). If the arrival rate  $\lambda$  is strictly less than  $\bar{\nu}^*$ , then  $\theta_{\tau^*}$  stabilizes the system.

Theorem 3.2 is proved in Section V-B.

**Remark 3:** The following important observations are direct consequences of (8) and Theorems 3.1 and 3.2:

- The computation of  $\bar{\nu}^*$  in (8) along with a maximizing threshold  $\tau^*$  relies on a *finite* search that can be carried out efficiently.
- The theorems are valid for *any* choice of  $\mu : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ . In particular,  $\mu$  could be multi-modal, increasing or decreasing.
- The search that yields  $\bar{\nu}^*$  and an associated  $\tau^*$  does not require knowledge of  $\lambda$ .

We point out two key differences between our study and [29], [30]. The model employed by Savla and Frazzoli assumes that the service time function is convex, which is analogous to  $\mu$  being unimodal in our formulation. In addition, a threshold policy is proved to be maximally stabilizing only for identical task workload. In our study, however, we do not impose any assumption on  $\mu$ , and the workloads of tasks are modeled using independent and identically distributed random variables.<sup>4</sup>

#### IV. AN AUXILIARY MDP $\bar{\mathbb{Y}}$

In this section, we describe an *auxiliary* MDP whose state takes values in  $\mathbb{Y}$  and approximates the server state of  $\mathbf{X}$  under a subclass of policies in  $\Theta_R$ , subject to an assumption that the queue always has a task to service whenever the server becomes available. We denote this auxiliary MDP by  $\bar{\mathbb{Y}}$  and its state at epoch  $k$  by  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_k = (\bar{S}_k, \bar{W}_k)$  in order to emphasize that it takes values in  $\mathbb{Y}$ . The action chosen at epoch  $k$  is denoted by  $\bar{A}_k$ . We use the overline to denote the auxiliary MDP and any other variables associated with it, in order to distinguish them from those of the server state in  $\mathbf{X}$ .

We can view  $\bar{\mathbb{Y}}$  as the server state of the original MDP  $\mathbf{X}$  for which infinitely many tasks are waiting in the queue at the beginning, i.e.,  $Q_0 = \infty$ . As a result, there is always a task waiting for service when the server becomes available.

<sup>4</sup>To be more precise, our assumptions correspond to the case with exponentially distributed workloads. However, as mentioned earlier, this assumption can be relaxed to allow more general workload distributions.

The reason for introducing  $\bar{\mathbb{Y}}$  is the following: (i)  $\mathbb{Y}$  is finite and, hence,  $\bar{\mathbb{Y}}$  is easier to analyze than  $\mathbf{X}$ , and (ii) we can establish a relation between  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\bar{\mathbb{Y}}$ , which allows us to prove the main results in the previous section by studying  $\bar{\mathbb{Y}}$  instead of  $\mathbf{X}$ . This simplifies the proofs of the theorems in the previous section.

**Admissible action sets:** As the queue size is no longer a component of the state of  $\bar{\mathbb{Y}}$ , we eliminate the dependence of admissible action sets on  $q$ , which was explicitly specified in (2) for MDP  $\mathbf{X}$ , while still ensuring that the server is non-preemptive. More specifically, the set of admissible actions at each element  $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = (\bar{s}, \bar{w})$  of  $\mathbb{Y}$  is given by

$$\bar{\mathbb{A}}_{\bar{w}} := \begin{cases} \{\mathcal{W}\} & \text{if } \bar{w} = \mathcal{B}, \quad (\text{non-preemptive server}) \\ \mathbb{A} & \text{if } \bar{w} = \mathcal{A}. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Consequently, for any given realization of the current state  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k = (\bar{s}_k, \bar{w}_k)$ ,  $\bar{A}_k$  is required to take values in  $\bar{\mathbb{A}}_{\bar{w}_k}$ .

**Transition probabilities:** We define the transition probabilities that specify  $\bar{\mathbb{Y}}$ , as follows:

$$P_{\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_{k+1} | \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_k, \bar{A}_k}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}' | \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{a}) := P_{\bar{S}_{k+1} | \bar{S}_k, \bar{A}_k}(\bar{s}' | \bar{s}, \bar{a}) \times P_{\bar{W}_{k+1} | \bar{Y}_k, \bar{A}_k}(\bar{w}' | \bar{y}, \bar{a}), \quad (10)$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}'$  are in  $\mathbb{Y}$ , and  $\bar{a}$  is in  $\bar{\mathbb{A}}_{\bar{w}}$ . Subject to these action constraints, the right-hand terms of (10) are defined, in connection with  $\mathbf{X}$ , as follows:

$$P_{\bar{S}_{k+1} | \bar{S}_k, \bar{A}_k}(\bar{s}' | \bar{s}, \bar{a}) := P_{S_{k+1} | S_k, A_k}(s' | \bar{s}, \bar{a}) \quad (11)$$

$$P_{\bar{W}_{k+1} | \bar{Y}_k, \bar{A}_k}(\bar{w}' | \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \mathcal{W}) := \begin{cases} \mu(\bar{s}) & \text{if } \bar{w}' = \mathcal{A} \\ 1 - \mu(\bar{s}) & \text{if } \bar{w}' = \mathcal{B} \end{cases} \quad (12a)$$

$$P_{\bar{W}_{k+1} | \bar{Y}_k, \bar{A}_k}(\bar{w}' | \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \mathcal{R}) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \bar{w}' = \mathcal{A} \\ 0 & \text{if } \bar{w}' = \mathcal{B} \end{cases} \quad (12b)$$

**Relating the transition probabilities of  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\bar{\mathbb{Y}}$ :** From the definition above and (5), we can show that, for all  $q \geq 1$ ,

$$P_{\bar{W}_{k+1} | \bar{Y}_k, \bar{A}_k}(\bar{w}' | \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \mathcal{W}) = \sum_{q'=0}^{\infty} P_{W_{k+1}, Q_{k+1} | \mathbf{X}_k, A_k}((\bar{w}', q') | (\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q), \mathcal{W}), \quad (13)$$

which holds for any  $\bar{w}'$  in  $\mathbb{W}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$  in  $\mathbb{Y}$ . Notice that the right-hand side (RHS) of (13) does not change when we vary  $q$  across the positive integers. From this, in conjunction with (4), (10) and (11), we have, for all  $q \geq 1$ ,

$$P_{\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_{k+1} | \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_k, \bar{A}_k}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}' | \bar{\mathbf{y}}, \mathcal{W}) = \sum_{q'=0}^{\infty} P_{\mathbf{X}_{k+1} | \mathbf{X}_k, A_k}((\bar{\mathbf{y}}', q') | (\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q), \mathcal{W}). \quad (14)$$

The equality in (14) indicates that  $P_{\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_{k+1} | \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_k, \bar{A}_k}$  also characterizes the transition probabilities of the server state  $\mathbf{Y}_k = (S_k, W_k)$  in  $\mathbf{X}$  when the current queue size is positive. This is consistent with our earlier viewpoint that  $\bar{\mathbb{Y}}$  can be considered the server state in  $\mathbf{X}$  initialized with infinite queue length at

the beginning. We will explore this relationship in Section V, where we use  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$  to prove Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.

#### A. Stationary Policies and Stationary PMFs of $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$

Analogously to the MDP  $\mathbf{X}$ , we only consider stationary randomized policies for  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$ , which are defined below.

*Definition 6 (Stationary randomized policies for  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$ ):* We restrict our attention to stationary randomized policies acting on  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$ , which are specified by a mapping  $\phi : \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , as follows: for all  $k$  in  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_0$  in  $\mathbb{Y}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{A_k | \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_k, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_0}(\mathcal{W} | \bar{\mathbf{y}}_k, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_0) &= \phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) \\ P_{A_k | \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_k, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_0}(\mathcal{R} | \bar{\mathbf{y}}_k, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_0) &= 1 - \phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k) \end{aligned}$$

The set of all stationary randomized policies for  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$  which honor (9) is defined to be  $\Phi_R$ .

The MDP  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$  subject to a policy  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_R$  is a *finite-state* time-homogeneous MC and is denoted by  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^\phi := \{\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_k^\phi : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .

*1) Recurrent Communicating Classes of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^\phi$ :* Because  $\mathbb{Y}$  is finite, for any policy  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_R$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^\phi$  has a PRCC and a stationary distribution [43]. In fact, there are at most two PRCCs as explained in Cases 1 and 2 below.

Define a mapping  $\mathcal{T} : \Phi_R \rightarrow \mathbb{S} \cup \{0\}$ , where

$$\mathcal{T}(\phi) := \max\{\bar{s} \in \mathbb{S} \mid \phi(\bar{s}, \mathcal{A}) = 1\}, \phi \in \Phi_R.$$

We assume that  $\mathcal{T}(\phi) = 0$  if the set on the RHS is empty.

*Case 1.  $\phi(1, \mathcal{A}) > 0$ :* First, from the definition of  $\mathcal{T}(\phi)$ , all states  $(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$  with  $\bar{s} \geq \mathcal{T}(\phi)$  communicate with each other, but none of these states communicates with any other state  $(\bar{s}', \bar{w}')$  with  $\bar{s}' < \mathcal{T}(\phi)$  because  $\phi(\mathcal{T}(\phi), \mathcal{A}) = \phi(\mathcal{T}(\phi), \mathcal{B}) = 1$ . Second, because  $\phi(1, \mathcal{A}) > 0$  by assumption, all states  $(\bar{s}', \bar{w}')$  with  $\bar{s}' < \mathcal{T}(\phi)$  communicate with states  $(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$  with  $\bar{s} \geq \mathcal{T}(\phi)$ . Together with the first observation, this implies that these states  $(\bar{s}', \bar{w}')$  with  $\bar{s}' < \mathcal{T}(\phi)$  are transient. Thus, there is only one PRCC given by

$$\mathbb{Y}^\phi := \{(\bar{s}, \bar{w}) \in \mathbb{Y} \mid \bar{s} \geq \mathcal{T}(\phi)\}. \quad (15)$$

*Case 2.  $\phi(1, \mathcal{A}) = 0$ :* In this case, it is clear that  $(1, \mathcal{A})$  is an absorbing state and forms a PRCC by itself. Hence, if  $\mathcal{T}(\phi) = 0$ , as all other states communicate with  $(1, \mathcal{A})$ , the only PRCC is  $\{(1, \mathcal{A})\}$  and all other states are transient. On the other hand, if  $\mathcal{T}(\phi) > 1$ , for the same reason explained in the first case,  $\mathbb{Y}^\phi$  gives rise to a second PRCC, and all other states  $(\bar{s}', \bar{w}')$  with  $\bar{s}' < \mathcal{T}(\phi)$ , except for  $(1, \mathcal{A})$ , are transient.

In our study, we often limit our discussion to randomized policies  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_R$  with  $\phi(1, \mathcal{A}) > 0$ . For this reason, for notational convenience, we define the set of randomized policies satisfying this condition by  $\Phi_R^+$ . The reason for this will be explained in the subsequent section.

The following proposition is an immediate consequence of the above observation.

*Corollary 1:* For any policy  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_R^+$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^\phi$  has a unique stationary PMF, which we denote by  $\bar{\pi}^\phi = (\bar{\pi}^\phi(\mathbf{y}) : \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Y})$ .

*2) Existence Of A Policy For  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$  With An Identical Steady-State Server State PMF In  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$ :* One of key facts which we will make use of in our analysis is that, for any stabilizing policy  $\theta$  in  $\Theta_S(\lambda)$ , we can find a policy  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_R^+$  which achieves the same steady-state distribution of server state. To this end, we first define, for each  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$  in  $\mathbb{Y}$ ,

$$\mathbb{Q}^{\bar{\mathbf{y}}} := \{q \in \mathbb{N} \mid (\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q) \in \mathbb{X}\}.$$

*Definition 7 (Policy projection map  $\mathcal{Y}$ ):* Given  $\lambda$  in  $(0, \bar{\nu}^*)$ , we define a mapping  $\mathcal{Y} : \Theta_S(\lambda) \mapsto \Phi_R$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{Y}(\theta) := \phi^\theta, \theta \in \Theta_S(\lambda),$$

where  $\phi^\theta : \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is specified as:

$$\phi^\theta(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) := \frac{\sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}^{\bar{\mathbf{y}}}} \theta(\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q) \pi^\theta(\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q)}{\sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}^{\bar{\mathbf{y}}}} \pi^\theta(\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q)}, \bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{Y}. \quad (16)$$

We first present a lemma that proves useful in our analysis.

*Lemma 2:* For every stabilizing policy  $\theta$  in  $\Theta_S(\lambda)$ , we have  $\phi^\theta(1, \mathcal{A}) > 0$ .

*Proof:* Please see Appendix II for a proof. ■

An obvious implication of the lemma is that  $\mathcal{Y}(\theta)$  belongs to  $\Phi_R^+$  for every  $\theta$  in  $\Theta_S(\lambda)$ , and there exists a unique stationary PMF for  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{\mathcal{Y}(\theta)}$ , namely  $\bar{\pi}^{\mathcal{Y}(\theta)}$ .

The following lemma shows that the steady-state PMF of the server state in  $\mathbf{X}$  under policy  $\theta$  in  $\Theta_S(\lambda)$  is identical to that of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$  under policy  $\mathcal{Y}(\theta)$ .

*Lemma 3:* Suppose that  $\theta \in \Theta_S(\lambda)$ . Then, we have

$$\bar{\pi}^{\mathcal{Y}(\theta)}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) = \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}^{\bar{\mathbf{y}}}} \pi^\theta(\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q), \bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{Y}. \quad (17)$$

*Proof:* A proof is provided in Appendix III. ■

## V. PROOFS OF THE MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we begin with a comment on the long-term average departure rate of completed tasks when the system is stable. Then, we provide the proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 in Sections V-A and V-B, respectively.

*Remark 4:* Recall from our discussion in Section II that, under a stabilizing policy  $\theta$  in  $\Theta_S(\lambda)$ , there exists a unique stationary PMF  $\pi^\theta$ . Consequently, the average number of completed tasks per epoch converges almost surely as  $k$  goes to infinity. In other words,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{\tau=0}^{k-1} D_\tau^\theta}{k} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}} \mu(s) \pi^\theta(\mathbf{x}) \theta(\mathbf{x}) := \nu^\theta \text{ almost surely,}$$

where  $s, w$  and  $q$  are the coordinates of  $\mathbf{x} = (s, w, q)$ , and  $D_\tau^\theta$  is the number of tasks that the server completes during epoch  $\tau$  under policy  $\theta$ . We call  $\nu^\theta$  the *service rate* of  $\theta$  (for the given arrival rate  $\lambda > 0$ ). Moreover, because  $\theta$  is assumed to be a stabilizing policy, we have  $\nu^\theta = \lambda$ .

### A. Proof of Theorem 3.1

In order to prove Theorem 3.1, we make use of a similar notion of *service rate* of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^\phi$ , which can be viewed in most cases as the average number of completed tasks per epoch. **(Step 1)** We first establish that, for every stabilizing policy  $\theta$ , we can find a *related* policy  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_R$  whose service rate equals that of  $\theta$  or, equivalently, the arrival rate  $\lambda$ . **(Step 2)** We prove that  $\bar{\nu}^*$  in (8) equals the maximum service rate achievable by any policy in  $\Phi_R$ . Together, they tell us  $\lambda \leq \bar{\nu}^*$ .

**Service rate of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^\phi$ :** The *service rate* associated with  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^\phi$  under policy  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_R$  is defined as follows: for each  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_R$ , let  $\bar{\Pi}(\phi)$  be the set of stationary PMFs of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^\phi$ . By Corollary 1, for any  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_R^+$ , there is a unique stationary PMF and  $\bar{\Pi}(\phi)$  is a singleton. The service rate of  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_R$  is defined to be

$$\bar{\nu}^\phi := \sup_{\bar{\pi} \in \bar{\Pi}(\phi)} \left( \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{Y}} \mu(\bar{s}) \bar{\pi}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \right). \quad (18)$$

Recall that  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$  is the pair  $(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$  taking values in  $\mathbb{Y}$ .

**Step 1:** The following lemma illustrates that the long-term service rate achieved by  $\mathcal{Y}(\theta)$  in  $\Phi_R^+$  equals that of  $\theta$ .

*Lemma 4:* Suppose that  $\theta$  is a stabilizing policy in  $\Theta_S(\lambda)$ . Then,  $\bar{\nu}^{\mathcal{Y}(\theta)} = \nu^\theta = \lambda$ .

*Proof:* First, note

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\nu}^{\mathcal{Y}(\theta)} &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{Y}} \mu(\bar{s}) \bar{\pi}^{\mathcal{Y}(\theta)}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{Y}} \mu(\bar{s}) \left( \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}^{\bar{\mathbf{y}}}} \pi^\theta(\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q) \right) \theta(\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}} \mu(s) \pi^\theta(\mathbf{x}) \theta(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{(d)}{=} \nu^\theta, \end{aligned}$$

where (b) follows from Lemma 3, and (c) results from rearranging the summations in terms of  $\mathbf{x} = (s, w, q)$ . Finally (a) and (d) hold by definition. The lemma follows from Remark 4 that  $\nu^\theta$  is equal to  $\lambda$ . ■

As  $\mathcal{Y}(\theta)$  belongs to  $\Phi_R^+$  as explained earlier, by Lemma 4,

$$\lambda = \bar{\nu}^{\mathcal{Y}(\theta)} \leq \max_{\phi \in \Phi_R} \bar{\nu}^\phi := \bar{\nu}^{**}. \quad (19)$$

**Step 2:** We shall prove that  $\bar{\nu}^* = \bar{\nu}^{**}$  in two steps. First, we establish that there is a stationary *deterministic* policy that achieves  $\bar{\nu}^{**}$ . Then, we show that, for any stationary deterministic policy, we can find a deterministic *threshold* policy that achieves the same service rate, thereby completing the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Let us define  $\Phi_D$  to be a subset of  $\Phi_R$ , which consists only of stationary *deterministic* policies for  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$ . In other words, if  $\phi \in \Phi_D$ , then  $\phi(\mathbf{y}) \in \{0, 1\}$  for all  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Y}$ . Theorem 9.1.8 in [42, p. 451] tells us that if (i) the state space is finite and (ii) the set of admissible actions is finite for every state, there exists a deterministic stationary optimal policy. Thus,

$$\bar{\nu}^{**} = \max_{\phi \in \Phi_R} \bar{\nu}^\phi = \max_{\phi \in \Phi_D} \bar{\nu}^\phi. \quad (20)$$

While the equality in (20) simplifies the computation of the maximum service rate achievable by some  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_R$ , it

requires a search over a set of  $2^{n_s}$  deterministic policies in the worst case. Thus, when  $n_s$  is large, it can be computationally expensive. As we show shortly, it turns out that the maximum service rate on the RHS of (20) can always be achieved by a deterministic *threshold* policy of the form in (7).

*Definition 8:* Recall from (7) that, for a given  $\tau$  in  $\mathbb{S} \cup \{n_s + 1\}$ ,  $\phi_\tau$  is the following deterministic threshold policy for  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$ :

$$\phi_\tau(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \bar{s} \geq \tau \text{ and } \bar{w} = \mathcal{A} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The following lemma shows that, for each deterministic policy  $\phi$  satisfying  $\phi(1, \mathcal{A}) = 1$ , there is a deterministic *threshold* policy with the same service rate.

*Lemma 5:* Suppose that  $\phi$  is a policy in  $\Phi_D$  with  $\phi(1, \mathcal{A}) = 1$ . Then,  $\bar{\nu}^\phi = \bar{\nu}^{\phi_{\tau'}}$ , where  $\tau' = \mathcal{T}(\phi) + 1$ .

*Proof:* We begin with the following facts that will be utilized in the proof.

- F1.** The postulation that the server is non-preemptive, which we formally impose in (9), means that after the server initiates work on a task, it will be allowed to rest only after the task is completed. This implies that any policy  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_D$  satisfies  $\phi(\bar{s}, \mathcal{B}) = 1$  for all  $\bar{s}$  in  $\mathbb{S}$ .
- F2.** From (3) and (11), we know that  $S_{k+1}$  is never smaller than  $S_k$  if the server works during epoch  $k$ .

From **F1** and **F2** stated above, we conclude that the following holds for any  $\sigma$  in  $\mathbb{S}$ :

$$\phi(\sigma, \mathcal{A}) = 1 \implies \Pr(\bar{S}_{k+1}^\phi \geq \sigma \mid \bar{S}_k^\phi = \sigma) = 1 \quad (21)$$

Here, we recall that  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_k^\phi = (\bar{S}_k^\phi, \bar{W}_k^\phi)$  represents the state of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^\phi$  at epoch  $k$ .

The implication in (21) leads us to the following important observation: suppose that a deterministic policy  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_D$  satisfies  $\phi(\sigma, \mathcal{A}) = 1$  for some  $\sigma$  greater than 1. Then, all states  $(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$  with  $\bar{s}$  less than  $\sigma$  are transient and, therefore,

$$\bar{\pi}^\phi(\bar{s}, \bar{w}) = 0 \text{ if } \bar{s} < \sigma. \quad (22)$$

The reason for this is that (i) because  $\phi(1, \mathcal{A}) = 1$ , all states  $(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$  with  $\bar{s} < \sigma$  communicate with every state  $(\bar{s}', \bar{w}')$  with  $\bar{s}' \geq \sigma$ , and (ii) none of the states  $(\bar{s}', \bar{w}')$  with  $\bar{s}' \geq \sigma$  communicates with any state  $(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$  with  $\bar{s} < \sigma$  since  $\phi(\sigma, \mathcal{A}) = \phi(\sigma, \mathcal{B}) = 1$ .

**F3.** The above observation means that, given a deterministic policy  $\phi$  in  $\Phi_D$ , every state  $(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$  with  $\bar{s} < \mathcal{T}(\phi)$  is transient and  $\bar{\pi}^\phi(\bar{s}, \bar{w}) = 0$ .

**F4.** Moreover, the remaining states  $(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$  in  $\mathbb{Y}^\phi$  with  $\bar{s} \geq \mathcal{T}(\phi)$  communicate with each other and their period is one (because it is possible to transition from  $(\mathcal{T}(\phi), \mathcal{A})$  to itself). Since  $\mathbb{Y}^\phi$  is finite, it forms an aperiodic PRCC of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^\phi$ .

We will complete the proof of Lemma 5 with the help of following lemma.

*Lemma 6:* Suppose that  $\phi$  and  $\tilde{\phi}$  are two deterministic policies in  $\Phi_D$  satisfying  $\phi(1, \mathcal{A}) = \tilde{\phi}(1, \mathcal{A}) = 1$ . Then,

$$\mathcal{T}(\tilde{\phi}) = \mathcal{T}(\phi) \implies \bar{\pi}^{\tilde{\phi}} = \bar{\pi}^\phi \quad (23)$$

*Proof:* If  $\mathcal{T}(\tilde{\phi}) = \mathcal{T}(\phi)$ , **F3** states that, for any state  $(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$  with  $\bar{s} < \mathcal{T}(\phi)$ , we have  $\bar{\pi}^{\tilde{\phi}}(\bar{s}, \bar{w}) = \bar{\pi}^\phi(\bar{s}, \bar{w}) = 0$ .

Furthermore, **F4** tells us that the PRCCs are identical, i.e.,  $\mathbb{Y}^\phi = \mathbb{Y}^{\tilde{\phi}}$ . From **F1** and the definition of mapping  $\mathcal{T}$ , we conclude that, for all states  $(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$  in  $\mathbb{Y}^\phi$ ,  $\tilde{\phi}(\bar{s}, \bar{w}) = \phi(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$ . This in turn means that, for all  $(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$  in  $\mathbb{Y}^\phi$ , we have  $\bar{\pi}^\phi(\bar{s}, \bar{w}) = \bar{\pi}^{\tilde{\phi}}(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$ . ■

Let us continue with the proof of Lemma 5. Select  $\tilde{\phi} = \phi_{\tau'}$  with  $\tau' = \mathcal{T}(\phi) + 1$ . Then, Lemma 6 tells us that  $\bar{\pi}^{\tilde{\phi}} = \bar{\pi}^\phi$ . From the definition of  $\bar{\nu}^\phi$  in (18), Lemma 5 is now a direct consequence of this observation and **F4**. ■

The proof of Theorem 3.1 will be completed with the help of the following intermediate result. It tells us that we can focus only on the deterministic policies  $\phi$  with  $\phi(1, \mathcal{A}) = 1$ .

*Lemma 7:* There exists a deterministic policy  $\phi^*$  with  $\phi^*(1, \mathcal{A}) = 1$ , whose service rate equals  $\bar{\nu}^{**}$ .

*Proof:* A proof can be found in Appendix IV. ■

Proceeding with the proof of the theorem, Lemma 7 tells us that some deterministic policy  $\phi^*$  with  $\phi^*(1, \mathcal{A}) = 1$  achieves the service rate equal to  $\bar{\nu}^{**}$ . This, together with Lemma 5, proves that there exists a deterministic *threshold* policy that achieves  $\bar{\nu}^{**}$  and, as a result, we must have  $\bar{\nu}^* = \bar{\nu}^{**}$ .

## B. Proof of Theorem 3.2

As mentioned in Section I-D, existing results, such as [31], can be used to construct a proof of the theorem. Here, we provide a more direct proof of the theorem by contradiction: suppose that the theorem is false and there exists an arrival rate  $\lambda_1 < \bar{\nu}^*$  for which the system is not stable under the policy  $\theta_{\tau^*}$ . We demonstrate that this leads to a contradiction.

For notational convenience, we denote the unique stationary distribution of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{\phi_{\tau^*}}$  by  $\bar{\pi}^{\tau^*}$ . In addition, for each  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{X}$ , we define two sequences of distributions  $\{\xi_k^{\mathbf{x}_0} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and  $\{\wp_k^{\mathbf{x}_0} : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , where  $\xi_k^{\mathbf{x}_0}$  and  $\wp_k^{\mathbf{x}_0}$  are the distribution of the server state  $\mathbf{Y}_k$  and the system  $\mathbf{X}_k$ , respectively, at epoch  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  under the policy  $\theta_{\tau^*}$ , conditional on  $\{\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0\}$ .

We make use of the following lemma to complete the proof of the theorem.

*Lemma 8:* Suppose that the system is not stable under the policy  $\theta_{\tau^*}$ . Then, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  and initial state  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{X}$ , there exists finite  $T(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}_0)$  such that, for all  $k \geq T(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}_0)$ , we have  $\|\xi_k^{\mathbf{x}_0} - \bar{\pi}^{\tau^*}\|_1 < \varepsilon$ .

*Proof:* A proof is provided in Appendix V. ■

Proceeding with the proof of the theorem, for every  $k$  in  $\mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left(D_k^{\theta_{\tau^*}} = 1 \mid \mathbf{X}_0^{\theta_{\tau^*}} = \mathbf{x}_0\right) &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}} \theta_{\tau^*}(\mathbf{x}) \mu(s) \wp_k^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Y}} \phi_{\tau^*}(\mathbf{y}) \mu(s) \left(\xi_k^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{y}) - \wp_k^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{y}, 0)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

First, since the system is assumed to be not stable, Lemma 8 tells us  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \xi_k^{\mathbf{x}_0} = \bar{\pi}^{\tau^*}$  for all  $\mathbf{x}_0$  in  $\mathbb{X}$ . Second, one can argue that the MDP  $\mathbf{X}^{\theta_{\tau^*}}$  is irreducible because the state  $(1, \mathcal{A}, 0)$  communicates with all other states, and vice versa. In addition,  $(1, \mathcal{A}, 0)$  is aperiodic because the probability of transitioning from  $(1, \mathcal{A}, 0)$  to itself is positive. Therefore, all states are either null recurrent or transient if the system is not stable. Since  $|\mathbb{Y}| = 2n_s$  is finite, this means

$\mathbb{P}_{\theta_{\tau^*}}[Q_k = 0 \mid \mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0] = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Y}} \wp_k^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{y}, 0)$  converges to zero as  $k$  goes to  $\infty$ . Thus, for all  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{X}$ , the probability in (24) converges to

$$\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Y}} \phi_{\tau^*}(\mathbf{y}) \mu(s) \bar{\pi}^{\tau^*}(\mathbf{y}) = \bar{\nu}^* \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (25)$$

Making use of the reverse Fatou's lemma [44, pp. 86-87] and the convergence in (25), given any initial distribution of  $\mathbf{X}_0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{\tau=0}^{k-1} D_k^{\theta_{\tau^*}}\right] &\geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{k} \sum_{\tau=0}^{k-1} D_k^{\theta_{\tau^*}}\right] \\ &= \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{\tau=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[D_k^{\theta_{\tau^*}}] = \bar{\nu}^*. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that, for  $\delta := 0.5(\bar{\nu}^* - \lambda_1) > 0$ , we must have

$$\Pr\left(\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{\tau=0}^{k-1} D_k^{\theta_{\tau^*}} > \lambda_1 + \delta\right) > 0. \quad (26)$$

On the other hand, for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the number of completed tasks up to epoch  $k$  cannot exceed the sum of the initial queue size  $Q_0$  and the number of arrivals up to epoch  $k$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{\tau=0}^{k-1} D_k^{\theta_{\tau^*}} &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{\tau=0}^{k-1} D_k^{\theta_{\tau^*}} + \frac{Q_0}{k}\right) \\ &\leq \lambda_1 \quad \text{with probability 1,} \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the strong law of large numbers. Clearly, this contradicts the earlier inequality in (26).

## VI. CONCLUSION

We investigated the problem of designing a task scheduler policy when the efficiency of the server is allowed to depend on the past utilization, which is modeled using an internal state of the server. First, we proposed a new framework for studying the stability of the queue length of the system. Second, making use of the new framework, we characterized the set of task arrival rates for which there exists a stabilizing stationary scheduler policy. Moreover, finding this set can be done by solving a simple optimization problem over a finite set. Finally, we identified an optimal threshold policy that stabilizes the system whenever the task arrival rate lies in the interior of the aforementioned set for which there is a stabilizing policy.

## APPENDIX I PROOF OF LEMMA 1

We will prove the claim by contradiction. The decomposition theorem of MCs tells us that  $\mathbb{X}$  can be partitioned into a set consisting of transient states and a collection of *irreducible, closed* RCCs  $\{\mathbb{C}^1, \mathbb{C}^2, \dots\}$  [43, p. 224]. Since  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$  is assumed stable, all RCCs  $\mathbb{C}^m$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , are positive recurrent. Suppose that the claim is false and there is more than one PRCC. We demonstrate that this leads to a contradiction.

First, we show that  $\mathbb{C}^m$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , include a state  $(s_m, \mathcal{B}, q_m)$  for some  $s_m \in \mathbb{S}$  and  $q_m > 0$ . If this is not true,

every state in  $\mathbb{C}^m$  is of the form  $(s, \mathcal{A}, q)$  and  $\theta(s, \mathcal{A}, q) = 0$  because  $\mathbb{C}^m$  is closed [43]. But, this implies that, starting with any state in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ , the scheduler will never assign a task to the server and, consequently, all states in  $\mathbb{C}^m$  must be transient, which contradicts that  $\mathbb{C}^m$  is positive recurrent. For the same reason, each  $\mathbb{C}_m$  must include a state  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_m = (\tilde{s}_m, \mathcal{A}, \tilde{q}_m)$  with  $\theta(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_m) > 0$ , which implies that  $\mathbb{C}_m$  is aperiodic.

Second, if some state  $(s, \mathcal{B}, q)$  is in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , then so are all the states  $(s', w, q')$  for all  $s' \geq s$ ,  $w$  in  $\mathbb{W}$ , and  $q' \geq q$ : the fact that  $(s, \mathcal{B}, q)$  communicates with  $(s', w, q)$ ,  $s' \geq s$  and  $w$  in  $\mathbb{W}$ , which means that these states belong to  $\mathbb{C}^m$  as well, is obvious. In addition, it is evident that  $(s', \mathcal{B}, q)$  communicates with  $(s', \mathcal{B}, q')$  for all  $q' \geq q$ . In order to see why  $(s', \mathcal{A}, q')$ ,  $s' \geq s$  and  $q' \geq q$ , also lie in  $\mathbb{C}^m$ , consider the following two cases: if  $\theta(s', \mathcal{A}, q) = 0$ , then clearly  $(s', \mathcal{A}, q)$  communicates with  $(s', \mathcal{A}, q + 1)$ . On the other hand, if  $\theta(s', \mathcal{A}, q) > 0$ ,  $(s', \mathcal{A}, q)$  communicates with  $(s', \mathcal{B}, q + 1)$ , which in turn communicates with  $(s', \mathcal{A}, q + 1)$ . The claim now follows by induction.

Note that, the above two observations together imply that there exists finite  $q^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{q_1, q_2\}$  such that all states  $(n_s, w, q)$ ,  $w$  in  $\mathbb{W}$  and  $q \geq q^*$ , belong to both  $\mathbb{C}^1$  and  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . This, however, contradicts the earlier assumption that  $\mathbb{C}^1$  and  $\mathbb{C}^2$  are *disjoint* PRCCs.

## APPENDIX II PROOF OF LEMMA 2

We start with two observations: first, recall from the decomposition theorem [43] that  $\mathbb{C}_\theta$  is closed. Thus, once  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$  reaches a state in  $\mathbb{C}_\theta$ , it never leaves  $\mathbb{C}_\theta$ . Second, if  $(1, \mathcal{A}, q') =: \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{C}_\theta$  for some  $q' \geq 1$ , then  $(1, \mathcal{A}, q) \in \mathbb{C}_\theta$  for all  $q \geq q'$ . This can be shown by considering two cases: (a)  $\theta(\mathbf{x}') > 0$  and (b)  $\theta(\mathbf{x}') = 0$ . In case (a), consider the following event with positive probability: suppose  $\mathbf{X}_k^\theta = \mathbf{x}'$  at epoch  $k$ . The server assigns a new task at epoch  $k$ , there is an arrival at each epoch  $k, k + 1, \dots, k + q - q'$ , and the server completes the service of the task assigned at epoch  $k$  during epoch  $k + q - q'$ . When this event occurs, we have  $\mathbf{X}_{k+q-q'+1}^\theta = (1, \mathcal{A}, q)$ . In case (b), define  $q^* = \min\{\tilde{q} > q' \mid \theta(1, \mathcal{A}, \tilde{q}) > 0\}$  with the convention  $q^* = \infty$  if the set is empty. If  $q^* \geq q$ ,  $\mathbf{x}'$  communicates with  $(1, \mathcal{A}, q)$ . If  $q^* < q$ ,  $\mathbf{x}'$  communicates with  $(1, \mathcal{A}, q^*)$ , which in turn communicates with  $(1, \mathcal{A}, q)$  by the same argument used in the first case. Since  $\mathbb{C}_\theta$  is closed, it follows  $(1, \mathcal{A}, q) \in \mathbb{C}_\theta$  and, hence,  $\pi^\theta(1, \mathcal{A}, q) > 0$  for all  $q \geq q'$  [43].

We now prove that there is some  $q^+ \geq 1$  such that  $(1, \mathcal{A}, q^+) \in \mathbb{C}_\theta$ . Suppose that this is false. Then,  $\mathbb{C}_\theta \subseteq \{(s, \mathcal{W}, q) \mid s \in \mathbb{S}, q \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{(1, \mathcal{A}, 0)\}$ . This implies that the server does not schedule new tasks for service at steady state with distribution  $\pi^\theta$  and obviously contradicts the assumption  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$  is stable. Finally,  $\sum_{q=q^+}^\infty \theta(1, \mathcal{A}, q)$  must be strictly positive when  $\theta$  is a stabilizing policy; otherwise, states  $(1, \mathcal{A}, q)$ ,  $q \geq q^+$ , would be transient instead. The lemma now follows from an earlier observation  $\pi^\theta(1, \mathcal{A}, q) > 0$  for all  $q \geq q^+$  and the definition of  $\phi^\theta(1, \mathcal{A})$  in (16).

## APPENDIX III PROOF OF LEMMA 3

For notational convenience, let  $\phi = \mathcal{Y}(\theta)$ . Taking advantage of the fact that there is a unique stationary PMF of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^\phi$ , it suffices to show that the distribution given in (17) satisfies the definition of stationary PMF:

$$\bar{\pi}^\phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) = \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}' \in \mathbb{Y}} \bar{\pi}^\phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}') \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}', \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^\phi \quad \text{for all } \bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{Y}, \quad (27)$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}^\phi$  denotes the one-step transition matrix of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^\phi$ .

• **Right-hand side of (27):** Using the policy  $\phi$  in place,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}' \in \mathbb{Y}} \bar{\pi}^\phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}') \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}', \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^\phi \\ &= \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}' \in \mathbb{Y}} \bar{\pi}^\phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}') (\phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}') \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}', \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^{\mathcal{W}} + (1 - \phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}')) \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}', \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^{\mathcal{R}}) \\ &= \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}' \in \mathbb{Y}} \bar{\pi}^\phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}') \left( \phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}') (\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}', \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^{\mathcal{W}} - \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}', \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^{\mathcal{R}}) + \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}', \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^{\mathcal{R}} \right), \quad (28) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathcal{R}}$  (resp.  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathcal{W}}$ ) denotes the one-step transition matrix of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$  under a policy that always rests (resp. works on a new task) when available.

Substituting (16) for  $\phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}')$  in (28) and using the given expression  $\bar{\pi}^\phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}') = \sum_{q \in \mathbb{L}^{\bar{\mathbf{y}}'}} \pi^\theta(\bar{\mathbf{y}}', q)$  in (17), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (28) &= \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}' \in \mathbb{Y}} \sum_{q' \in \mathbb{L}^{\bar{\mathbf{y}}'}} \theta(\bar{\mathbf{y}}', q') \pi^\theta(\bar{\mathbf{y}}', q') (\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}', \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^{\mathcal{W}} - \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}', \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^{\mathcal{R}}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}' \in \mathbb{Y}} \sum_{q \in \mathbb{L}^{\bar{\mathbf{y}}'}} \pi^\theta(\bar{\mathbf{y}}', q) \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}', \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^{\mathcal{R}} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{X}} \theta(\mathbf{x}') \pi^\theta(\mathbf{x}') (\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}', \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^{\mathcal{W}} - \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}', \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^{\mathcal{R}}) + \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{X}} \pi^\theta(\mathbf{x}') \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}', \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^{\mathcal{R}}. \quad (29) \end{aligned}$$

• **Left-hand side of (27):** Using (17), we get

$$\bar{\pi}^\phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) = \sum_{q \in \mathbb{L}^{\bar{\mathbf{y}}}} \pi^\theta(\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q). \quad (30)$$

For notational simplicity, we denote  $(\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q)$  on the RHS of (30) simply by  $\mathbf{x}$ . Since  $\pi^\theta$  is the unique stationary PMF of  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^\theta(\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q) &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{X}} \pi^\theta(\mathbf{x}') \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}}^\theta \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{X}} \pi^\theta(\mathbf{x}') \theta(\mathbf{x}') (\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{W}} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{R}}) + \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{X}} \pi^\theta(\mathbf{x}') \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{R}}, \quad (31) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{P}^\theta$  is the one-step transition matrix of  $\mathbf{X}^\theta$ , and  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{R}}$  (resp.  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{W}}$ ) is the one-step transition matrix under a policy that always rests (resp. assigns a new task) when the server is available and at least one task is waiting for service.

Substituting (31) in (30) and rearranging the summations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\pi}^\phi(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{X}} \pi^\theta(\mathbf{x}') \theta(\mathbf{x}') \sum_{q \in \mathbb{L}^{\bar{\mathbf{y}}}} (\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{W}} - \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{R}}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{X}} \pi^\theta(\mathbf{x}') \sum_{q \in \mathbb{L}^{\bar{\mathbf{y}}}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}}^{\mathcal{R}}. \quad (32) \end{aligned}$$

From (29) and (32), in order to prove (27), it suffices to show  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^a = \sum_{q \in \mathbb{L}^{\bar{\mathbf{y}}}} \mathbf{P}_{(\bar{\mathbf{y}}', q'), (\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q)}^a$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{A}$ . Note that

$$\sum_{q \in \mathbb{L}^{\bar{\mathbf{y}}}} \mathbf{P}_{(\bar{\mathbf{y}}', q'), (\bar{\mathbf{y}}, q)}^a = P_{\mathbf{Y}_{k+1} | (\mathbf{Y}_k, Q_k), A_k}(\bar{\mathbf{y}} | (\bar{\mathbf{y}}', q'), a). \quad (33)$$

Clearly, conditional on  $\{(\mathbf{Y}_k, A_k) = (\bar{\mathbf{y}}', a)\}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}_{k+1}$  does not depend on the queue size at epoch  $k$ . As a result, the RHS of (33) does not depend on  $q'$  and is equal to  $P_{\mathbf{Y}_{k+1} | \mathbf{Y}_k, A_k}(\bar{\mathbf{y}} | \bar{\mathbf{y}}', a) = \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}}^a$ .

#### APPENDIX IV PROOF OF LEMMA 7

In order to prove the lemma, it suffices to show the following: suppose that  $\phi'$  is a deterministic policy with  $\phi'(1, \mathcal{A}) = 0$  and achieves  $\bar{\nu}^{**}$ . Then, we can find another deterministic policy  $\phi^*$  with  $\phi^*(1, \mathcal{A}) = 1$  which achieves  $\bar{\nu}^{**}$ .

Suppose  $\phi'$  satisfies  $\phi'(1, \mathcal{A}) = 0$  and  $\bar{\nu}^{\phi'} = \bar{\nu}^{**}$ . First, we can show that  $\mathcal{T}(\phi') > 1$  by contradiction: assume  $\mathcal{T}(\phi') = 0$ . Then, from the discussion in Section IV-A, we know that  $\{(1, \mathcal{A})\}$  is the unique PRCC of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{\phi'}$  and, hence,  $\bar{\nu}^{\phi'} = 0$ , thereby contradicting the earlier assumption that  $\bar{\nu}^{\phi'} = \bar{\nu}^{**} > 0$ .

Since  $\mathcal{T}(\phi') > 1$ , we know that there are two PRCCs –  $\{(1, \mathcal{A})\}$  and  $\mathbb{Y}^{\phi'}$  – and all other states are transient. But, the first PRCC does not contribute to the long-term service rate and, as a result, the service rate  $\bar{\nu}^{\phi'} = \bar{\nu}^{**}$  is achieved by a stationary PMF only over  $\mathbb{Y}^{\phi'}$ , which we denote by  $\bar{\pi}^{\phi'}$ .

Consider a new deterministic policy  $\phi^+$  with

$$\phi^+(\bar{s}, \bar{w}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 1 \leq \bar{s} \leq \mathcal{T}(\phi'), \\ \phi'(\bar{s}, \bar{w}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By construction, clearly  $\mathcal{T}(\phi') = \mathcal{T}(\phi^+)$  and, hence,  $\mathbb{Y}^{\phi'} = \mathbb{Y}^{\phi^+}$ . Because  $\phi'(\bar{s}, \bar{w}) = \phi^+(\bar{s}, \bar{w})$  if  $\bar{s} \geq \mathcal{T}(\phi')$ , it follows that  $\bar{\pi}^{\phi^+} = \bar{\pi}^{\phi'}$  and, as a result,  $\bar{\nu}^{\phi^+} = \bar{\nu}^{\phi'} = \bar{\nu}^{**}$ .

#### APPENDIX V PROOF OF LEMMA 8

Denote the one-step transition matrix of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}^{\phi_{\tau^*}}$  by  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*$ . We prove Lemma 8 with the help of the following two lemmas.

*Lemma 9:* For every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists finite  $T_1(\varepsilon)$  such that, for all  $k \geq T_1(\varepsilon)$  and any distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  over  $\mathbb{Y}$ , we have  $\|\mathbf{p}(\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^k - \bar{\pi}^{\tau^*}\|_1 < 0.5\varepsilon$ .

*Proof:* Let  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}^* := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^k$ , whose rows are equal to  $\bar{\pi}^{\tau^*}$ . Then, given any distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  over  $\mathbb{Y}$ , we have  $\mathbf{p}\bar{\mathbf{P}}^* = \bar{\pi}^{\tau^*}$ . Using this equality, for all sufficiently large  $k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{p}(\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^k - \bar{\pi}^{\tau^*}\|_1 &= \|\mathbf{p}(\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^k - \mathbf{p}\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*\|_1 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{p}\|_1 \cdot \|(\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^k - \bar{\mathbf{P}}^*\|_\infty = \|(\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^k - \bar{\mathbf{P}}^*\|_\infty < 0.5\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the definition of  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*$ .  $\blacksquare$

*Lemma 10:* Suppose that the system is not stable. Then, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , positive integer  $N$ , and initial state  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{X}$ , there exists finite  $T_2(\varepsilon, N, \mathbf{x}_0)$  such that, for all  $k \geq N + T_2(\varepsilon, N, \mathbf{x}_0)$ , we have  $\|\xi_k^{\mathbf{x}_0} - \xi_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^N\|_1 < 0.5\varepsilon$ .

*Proof:* Let  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathcal{R}}$  be the one-step transition matrix of  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}$  under policy  $\phi_1$  that always chooses  $\mathcal{R}$  when the server is available. We denote the row of  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*$  (resp.  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}^{\mathcal{R}}$ ) corresponding to the server state  $\mathbf{y} = (s, w) \in \mathbb{Y}$  by  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\mathbf{y}}^*$  (resp.  $\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathcal{R}}$ ).

By conditioning on  $\mathbf{X}_{k-N}$  and using the equality  $\xi_k^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{q \in \mathbb{L}^{\mathbf{y}}} \wp_k^{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{y}, q)$ , we can rewrite  $\xi_{k-N+1}^{\mathbf{x}_0}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{k-N+1}^{\mathbf{x}_0} &= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} \left[ \wp_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0}(s, \mathcal{A}, 0) \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{(s, \mathcal{A})}^{\mathcal{R}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{w \in \mathbb{W}} \left( \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \wp_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0}(s, w, q) \right) \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{(s, w)}^* \right] \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} \left[ \wp_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0}(s, \mathcal{A}, 0) \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{(s, \mathcal{A})}^{\mathcal{R}} + \xi_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0}(s, \mathcal{B}) \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{(s, \mathcal{B})}^* \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \xi_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0}(s, \mathcal{A}) - \wp_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0}(s, \mathcal{A}, 0) \right) \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{(s, \mathcal{A})}^* \right] \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} \left[ \wp_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0}(s, \mathcal{A}, 0) (\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{(s, \mathcal{A})}^{\mathcal{R}} - \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{(s, \mathcal{A})}^*) \right] + \xi_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0} \bar{\mathbf{P}}^*. \quad (34) \end{aligned}$$

Define  $\gamma_\ell^{\mathbf{x}_0} := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} [\wp_\ell^{\mathbf{x}_0}(s, \mathcal{A}, 0) (\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{(s, \mathcal{A})}^{\mathcal{R}} - \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{(s, \mathcal{A})}^*)]$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . Applying (34) iteratively, we obtain

$$\xi_k^{\mathbf{x}_0} = \xi_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0} (\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^N + \sum_{\ell=1}^N \gamma_{k-\ell}^{\mathbf{x}_0} (\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^{\ell-1}. \quad (35)$$

Subtracting the first term on the RHS of (35) from both sides and taking the norm,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi_k^{\mathbf{x}_0} - \xi_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0} (\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^N\|_1 &= \left\| \sum_{\ell=1}^N \gamma_{k-\ell}^{\mathbf{x}_0} (\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^{\ell-1} \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|\gamma_{k-\ell}^{\mathbf{x}_0}\|_1 \cdot \|(\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^{\ell-1}\|_\infty = \sum_{\ell=1}^N \|\gamma_{k-\ell}^{\mathbf{x}_0}\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the expression for  $\gamma_{k-\ell}^{\mathbf{x}_0}$  and using the inequality

$\|\bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathcal{R}} - \bar{\mathbf{P}}_{\mathbf{y}}^*\|_1 \leq 2$  for all  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Y}$ , we get

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^N \|\gamma_{k-\ell}^{\mathbf{x}_0}\|_1 \leq 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^N \left( \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}} \wp_{k-\ell}^{\mathbf{x}_0}(s, \mathcal{A}, 0) \right). \quad (36)$$

Recall that if  $\mathbf{X}^{\theta_{\tau^*}}$  is not stable, all states are either null recurrent or transient. This implies that, for all  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{X}$ ,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \wp_k^{\mathbf{x}_0}(s, \mathcal{A}, 0) = 0$  for all  $s \in \mathbb{S}$ . Therefore, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , fixed  $N$ , and an initial state  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , there exists finite  $T_2(\varepsilon, N, \mathbf{x}_0)$  such that, for all  $k \geq T_2(\varepsilon, N, \mathbf{x}_0)$ , we have  $\wp_k^{\mathbf{x}_0}(s, \mathcal{A}, 0) < \frac{\varepsilon}{4N|\mathbb{S}|}$ . Consequently, the RHS of (36) is smaller than  $0.5\varepsilon$  for all  $k \geq T_2(\varepsilon, N, \mathbf{x}_0) + N$ .  $\blacksquare$

We now proceed with the proof of Lemma 8.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi_k^{\mathbf{x}_0} - \bar{\pi}^{\tau^*}\|_1 & \quad (37) \\ &\leq \|\xi_k^{\mathbf{x}_0} - \xi_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0} (\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^N\|_1 + \|\xi_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0} (\bar{\mathbf{P}}^*)^N - \bar{\pi}^{\tau^*}\|_1 \end{aligned}$$

Since Lemma 9 holds for any distribution  $\mathbf{p}$ , if we choose  $\mathbf{p} = \xi_{k-N}^{\mathbf{x}_0}$ , for all  $N \geq T_1(\varepsilon)$ , the second term in (37) is smaller than  $0.5\varepsilon$ . In addition, Lemma 10 tells us that we can find  $T_2(\varepsilon, N, \mathbf{x}_0)$  such that, for all  $k \geq N + T_2(\varepsilon, N, \mathbf{x}_0)$ , the first term in (37) is upper bounded by  $0.5\varepsilon$ . Thus, it is clear that Lemma 8 holds with  $T(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}_0) = T_1(\varepsilon) + T_2(\varepsilon, T_1(\varepsilon), \mathbf{x}_0)$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. M. Shepherd, "Design of primary and secondary cells ii. an equation describing battery discharge," *Journal of the Electrochemical Society*, vol. 112, no. 7, pp. 657–664, 1965.
- [2] M. Chen and G. A. Ricón-Mora, "Accurate electrical battery model capable of predicting runtime and i-v performance," *IEEE Transactions on Energy Conversion*, vol. 21, pp. 504–511, June 2006.
- [3] F. Baccelli and P. Bremaud, *Elements of Queueing Theory: Palm Martingale Calculus and Stochastic Recurrences*. Springer, 2nd ed., 2002.
- [4] M. El-Taha and S. J. Stidham, *Analysis of Queueing Systems*. Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 1999.
- [5] S. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie, *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed., 2009.
- [6] J. G. Dai and J. M. Harrison, *Processing Networks: Fluid Models and Stability*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [7] R. W. Conway and W. L. Maxwell, "A queueing model with state dependent service rates," *Journal of Industrial Engineering*, vol. 12, pp. 132–136, 1962.
- [8] J. R. Jackson, "Jobshop-like queueing systems," *Management Science*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 131–142, 1963.
- [9] M. Yadin and P. Naor, "Queueing systems with a removable service station," *Operational Research Society*, vol. 14, pp. 393–405, December 1963.
- [10] S. Gupta *Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan*, vol. 9, pp. 69–82, April 1967.
- [11] C. M. Harris, "Queues with state-dependent stochastic service rates," *Operations Research*, vol. 15, pp. 117–130, February 1967.
- [12] J. H. Dshalalow, "Queueing systems with state dependent parameters," in *Frontiers in Queueing: Models and Applications in Science and Engineering, Probability and Stochastics Series* (J. H. Dshalalow, ed.), ch. 4, pp. 132–136, CRC, 1997.
- [13] R. Agrawal and V. G. Subramanian, "Optimality of certain channel aware scheduling policies," in *Proceedings of Allerton Conference on Communication, Control and Computing*, October 2002.
- [14] M. Andrews, K. Kumaran, K. Ramanan, A. Stolyar, R. Vijayakumar, and P. Whiting, "Scheduling in a queueing system with asynchronously varying service rates," *Probability in the Engineering and Information Sciences*, vol. 18, pp. 191–217, 2004.
- [15] S. C. Borst, "User-level performance of channel-aware scheduling algorithms in wireless data networks," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 13, pp. 636–647, June 2005.
- [16] T. Ren, R. J. La, and L. Tassiulas, "Optimal transmission scheduling with base station antenna array in cellular networks," in *Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM*, March 2004.
- [17] L. Tassiulas and A. Ephremides, "Stability properties of constrained queueing systems and scheduling policies for maximum throughput in multihop radio networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 37, pp. 1936–1949, December 1992.
- [18] R. Ramjee, R. Nagarajan, and D. Towsley, "On optimal call admission control in cellular networks," in *Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM*, pp. 24–28, August 1996.
- [19] Y. Fang and Y. Zhang, "Call admission control schemes and performance analysis in wireless mobile networks," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 51, pp. 371–382, March 2002.
- [20] R. Bekker and S. C. Borst, "Optimal admission control in queues with workload-dependent service rates," *Probability in the Engineering and Information Sciences*, vol. 20, pp. 543–570, 2006.
- [21] G. Borghini, L. Astolfi, G. Vecchiato, D. Mattia, and F. Babiloni, "Measuring neurophysiological signals in aircraft pilots and car drivers for the assessment of mental workload, fatigue and drowsiness," *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, vol. 44, pp. 58–75, July 2014.
- [22] L. C. Edie, "Traffic delays at toll booths," *Journal of the Operations Research Society of America*, vol. 2, pp. 107–138, May 1954.
- [23] M. Shunko, J. Niederhoff, and Y. Rosokha, "Humans are not machines: the behavioral impact of queueing design on service time," *Management Science*, vol. 64, pp. 57–80, December 2017.
- [24] R. M. Yerkes and J. D. Dodson, "The relation of strength of stimulus to rapidity of habit-formation," *Journal of Comparative Neurology and Psychology*, vol. 18, pp. 459–482, November 1908.
- [25] J. R. Peters, V. Srivastava, G. S. Taylor, A. Surana, M. P. Eckstein, and F. Bullo, "Human supervisory control of robotic teams: Integrating cognitive modeling with engineering design," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 35, pp. 57–80, December 2015.
- [26] T. S. Sheridan, *Handbook of human factors and ergonomics, second edition*, edited by Gavriel Salvendy, ch. Supervisory Control, pp. 1295–1327. John Wiley & Sons, 1997.
- [27] P. V. Asaro, L. M. Lewis, and S. B. Boxerman, "The impact of input and output factors on emergency department throughput," *Academic Emergency Medicine*, vol. 14, pp. 235–242, April 2007.
- [28] D. S. Kc and C. Terwiesch, "Impact of workload on service time and patient safety: an economic analysis of hospital operations," *Management Science*, vol. 55, pp. 1486–1498, September 2009.
- [29] K. Savla and E. Frazzoli, "Maximally stabilizing task release control policy for a dynamical queue," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, pp. 2655–2660, November 2010.
- [30] K. Savla and E. Frazzoli, "A dynamical queue approach to intelligent task management for human operators," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 100, pp. 672–686, March 2012.
- [31] F. Baccelli and S. Foss, "Ergodicity of Jackson-type queueing networks," *Queueing Systems*, vol. 17, pp. 5–72, 1994.
- [32] D. V. Lindley, "The theory of queues with a single server," *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 277–289, 1952.
- [33] S. Sudevalayam and P. Kulkarni, "Energy harvesting sensor nodes: Survey and implications," *IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 443–461, 2011.
- [34] A. Kansal, J. Hsu, S. Zahedi, and M. B. Srivastava, "Power management in energy harvesting sensor networks," *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems*, vol. 6, September 2007.
- [35] S. Priya and D. J. Inman, eds., *Energy Harvesting Technologies*. Springer, 2009.
- [36] S. Ulukus, A. Yener, E. Erkip, O. Simeone, M. Zorzi, P. Grover, and K. Huang, "Energy harvesting wireless communications: a review of recent advances," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 33, pp. 360–381, March 2015.
- [37] A. S. Leong, D. E. Quevedo, and S. Dey, *Optimal control of energy resources for state estimation over wireless channels*. Briefs in electrical and computer engineering, Springer, 2018.
- [38] V. Jog, R. J. La, M. Lin, and N. C. Martins, "Channels, remote estimation and queueing systems with a utilization-dependent component: A unifying survey of recent results," *arXiv:1905.04362*, 2021.
- [39] T. Koch, A. Lapidoth, and P. P. Sotiriadis, "Channels that heat up," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, pp. 3594–3612, August 2009.
- [40] A. Baknina, O. Ozel, and S. Ulukus, "Energy harvesting communications under explicit and implicit temperature constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 17, pp. 6680–6692, October 2018.
- [41] D. Forte and A. Srivastava, "Thermal-aware sensor scheduling for distributed estimation," *ACM Transactions on Sensor Networks*, vol. 9, pp. 53:1–53:31, July 2013.
- [42] M. L. Puterman, *Markov decision processes: discrete stochastic dynamic programming*. Wiley, 2005.
- [43] G. Grimmett and D. Stirzaker, *Probability and Random Processes, third ed.* Oxford, 2001.
- [44] H. L. Royden, *Real analysis*. Krishna Prakashan Media, 1968.