

ESTIMATING CUSTOMER IMPATIENCE IN A SERVICE SYSTEM WITH BALKING

YOSHIAKI INOUE, LIRON RAVNER, MICHEL MANDJES

ABSTRACT. This paper studies a service system in which arriving customers are provided with information about the delay they will experience. Based on this information they decide to wait for service or to leave the system. The main objective is to estimate the customers' patience-level distribution and the corresponding potential arrival rate, using knowledge of the actual workload process only. We cast the system as a queueing model, so as to evaluate the corresponding likelihood function. Estimating the unknown parameters relying on a maximum likelihood procedure, we prove strong consistency and derive the asymptotic distribution of the estimation error. Several applications and extensions of the method are discussed. In particular, we indicate how our method generalizes to a multi-server setting. The performance of our approach is assessed through a series of numerical experiments. By fitting parameters of hyperexponential and generalized-hyperexponential distributions our method provides a robust estimation framework for any continuous patience-level distribution.

KEYWORDS. Service systems \circ impatience \circ balking \circ incomplete information \circ estimation

AFFILIATIONS. Yoshiaki Inoue is with Department of Information and Communications Technology, Graduate School of Engineering, Osaka University, 2-1 Yamadaoka, Suita 565-0871, Japan (yoshiaki@comm.eng.osaka-u.ac.jp). Liron Ravner is with the Department of Statistics, University of Haifa, Israel (lravner@haifa.stat.ac.il), and Korteweg-de Vries Institute for Mathematics, University of Amsterdam. Michel Mandjes is with Korteweg-de Vries Institute for Mathematics, University of Amsterdam, Science Park 904, 1098 XH Amsterdam, the Netherlands (m.r.h.mandjes@uva.nl), EURANDOM, Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, the Netherlands, and Amsterdam Business School, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. The research of MM and LR is partly funded by NWO Gravitation project NETWORKS, grant number 024.002.003. The research of YI is supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP18K18007. Date: November 29, 2021.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. The authors wish to thank Onno Boxma (Eindhoven University of Technology) for providing useful feedback.

1. INTRODUCTION

In many service systems potential customers are provided with information on the performance they will experience [12, 22]. This information, typically in terms of a statement on the anticipated delay or current workload, is used by the potential customers to decide to either join the system or to refrain from service. Many examples of such mechanisms can be given. The congestible resource under consideration could be a road network, where drivers are given information on anticipated travel times (e.g. by relying on Google Maps), or, in the context of ride-hailing companies (such as Uber), an estimate of the pickup time. Customers of food delivery services (e.g. UberEats in the US, or Deliveroo in Europe) can observe the estimated delivery time. In call centers callers are provided with information on the expected waiting time. In computer communications systems estimates of download times are given, based on which clients can decide to start the download now or to postpone. When seeing the queue in a shop, customers can decide to wait or to refrain from purchasing a certain good. In an emergency department of a hospital wait-time estimates can be given.

In general terms, one could view balking as an implicit form of admission control: the load on the service system does not explode as a consequence of the fact that during busy times potential customers decide to leave, effectively making the system self-regulating. To make sound decisions on the design of the service system, it is crucial to have knowledge of the volume of the *potential* supply (i.e., the clients who buy the service increased by those who decide to balk) and the mechanism based on which potential customers decide to join or to leave. With this knowledge, the service provider can e.g. decide whether it is economically viable to increase the service capacity or the number of staff. In some service systems the volume of the missed supply is easy to estimate – think of a call center in which all renegeing clients are logged. In many other situations, however, there is the complication that the balking customer stream is not observed. This is often the case: think of the transportation and delivery examples mentioned above, potential clients deciding whether or not to buy a certain product in a shop when seeing the waiting line, Internet users who may refrain from downloading when provided a delay estimate, and car drivers who observe the congestion level of a shopping mall’s parking lot.

A commonly adopted modeling framework to describe balking decisions makes use of the concept of *customer impatience*; see e.g. [15, 16]. In this setup each customer is endowed with a patience level Y , such that she decides to join the system if the current workload w is below the patience level Y , whereas otherwise she decides to balk. We assume that the actual workload process is observed, i.e., the arrival epochs of the non-balking customers, their service requirements, and how the system workload drains in between consecutive arrivals. The main complication is that the balking customers are not observed. To do justice to the heterogeneity between the patience levels of individual customers, we sample these per-customer patience levels in an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) manner. We let potential customers arrive according to a Poisson process with rate $\lambda > 0$, bringing along i.i.d. service requirements that are distributed as the non-negative random variable X . The objective of this paper is to develop procedures for estimating the *total* arrival rate (corresponding to customers joining the system *and* balking customers, that is) and the patience-level distribution, observing the workload process only. The focus is on developing estimators with provable performance guarantees.

We proceed by detailing our paper's main contributions. These relate to (i) our estimator and its asymptotic properties, (ii) results and experiments for specific patience-level distributions, and (iii) extensions and ramifications.

- Framing the system described above as a queueing model with impatient customers, we can evaluate the corresponding likelihood function (in terms of the observed quantities). This means that, in a parametric context, we can estimate the unknown parameters — i.e., λ and the parameter(s) corresponding to the patience level Y — relying on a maximum likelihood procedure. In the case of a continuous patience-level distribution we prove, under appropriate regularity conditions, strong consistency and asymptotic normality of the resulting estimator, the proof of the asymptotic normality relying on an application of a suitable version of the martingale central limit theorem. The procedure that we have developed has several attractive features, the most prominent one being that it does not require that we simultaneously estimate the distribution of the service requirements X . In addition, our methodology uses the fundamental queueing dynamics and does not, as is common in the literature, rely on any fluid and/or diffusion approximations.
- In the case that the patience level Y is constant (say θ_0), more refined results can be obtained, most notably a distributional characterization of the difference between the estimator and θ_0 . A number of other special cases are dealt with, covering exponentially and (generalized) hyperexponentially distributed Y ; we present closed-form expressions for the asymptotic variance of the estimation error. The class of generalized hyperexponentially distributed distributions is highly relevant for various reasons, most importantly because these can be used to approximate any positive continuous distribution arbitrarily closely [5]. In addition, in the call center literature [33] it has been observed that such distributions yield a good fit for observed customer patience. We provide several numerical examples that illustrate the robustness of our methodology. Indeed, our experiments show that even if the patience-level distribution is misspecified (i.e., is not generalized hyperexponential itself), the distribution function of the estimated generalized hyperexponential distribution is still remarkably close to the true one.
- We also discuss several ramifications and model extensions that can be handled using our framework. These include extending the framework to multi-server M/G/s queues with delay messages of expected waiting times based on the queue length, noisy delay information, estimating the proportion of impatient customers in the population, and estimating specific utility parameters such as service value and waiting time sensitivity.

There is a substantial body of literature on queues with impatient customers. This line of research goes back to Naor's influential paper [29], which can be seen as a pioneering contribution to the field of behavioral queues. It presents a powerful stylized model for a queueing resource in which potential customers decide to join or to balk based on delay information. The effect of providing workload information to strategic customers was investigated in e.g. [15, 16]. For various specific types of queueing systems with impatient customers explicit performance results are known; see, for example, [6, 7, 25, 26, 27, 28]. Importantly, however, the estimation techniques presented in our paper do not require knowledge of e.g. the queue's

stationary distribution. It is also worth stressing that despite the fact that queues with impatient customers are well studied, to the best of our knowledge, hardly any workload-based estimation techniques have been developed (a notable exception being [14], featuring an asymptotic analysis of statistical inference of waiting times truncated by abandonments). More background on applied probability and queueing systems in a general context is provided in e.g. [2, 10], and on rational behavior of customers in queueing systems in [18, 19].

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the model featuring in this paper and introduce the notation used. In addition, we present a number of known results from the queueing literature that are relied on later. Then, in Section 3, we construct and analyze our maximum likelihood estimator. For continuous patience-level distributions, we prove strong consistency and asymptotic normality of the estimation error. The case of deterministic patience is treated separately, leading to a similar conclusion regarding strong consistency, but with the notable difference that in this case the limiting distribution of the estimation error is exponential. Section 4 covers applications, model extensions, results for specific patience-level distributions, and numerical experiments. In Section 5 we provide concluding remarks and directions for followup research, including a brief discussion of a non-parametric estimation procedure.

2. MODEL AND PRELIMINARIES

In this section we provide a detailed model description, introduce the notation used throughout this paper, state the objective of the paper, and present preliminaries.

Model description. Potential customers arrive at the service system according to a Poisson process with rate λ . Each customer has a service requirement with cumulative distribution function (cdf) $G(\cdot)$ and a patience level with cdf $H(\cdot)$. The interarrival times $(T_i)_{i=1,2,\dots}$, the service requirements $(B_i)_{i=1,2,\dots}$, and patience levels $(Y_i)_{i=1,2,\dots}$ are independent sequences of i.i.d. distributed random variables. Customer i joins the queue if Y_i is smaller than or equal to the workload seen upon arrival, not including its own service requirement. The resulting system can be considered as an M/G/1 queue with impatient customers.

As some customers will balk, there will be a difference between the interarrival times of the customers (covering both the balking and non-balking customers) on one hand, and the *effective* interarrival times (covering just the non-balking customers) on the other hand. Throughout this paper the sequence of effective interarrival times is denoted by $(A_i)_{i=1,2,\dots}$. Importantly, observe that the random variables A_i are generally neither identically distributed nor independent (noting that in a stationary system the sequence is identically distributed but still dependent). We can reconstruct them from the sequences $(T_i)_{i=1,2,\dots}$, $(B_i)_{i=1,2,\dots}$, and $(Y_i)_{i=1,2,\dots}$ in the following manner. For the following construction we let a non-balking customer arrive at time $t = 0$, as will be further motivated in Remark 1. Denoting the workload process at time t by $V(t)$, we have that $A_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{j_1} T_k$ where

$$j_1 := \inf \left\{ j \geq 1 : V \left(\sum_{k=1}^j T_k \right) \leq Y_j \right\}.$$

Similarly $A_i = \sum_{k=j_{i-1}+1}^{j_i} T_k$ where

$$j_i := \inf \left\{ j \geq j_{i-1} + 1 : V \left(\sum_{k=1}^j T_k \right) \leq Y_j \right\}.$$

Observe that j_i has the interpretation of being the index of the i -th non-balking customer; we denote her service requirement by $X_i := B_{j_i}$. In addition, let $\tilde{A}_i := \sum_{k=1}^i A_k$ denote the i -th effective arrival time. We define X and Y as the generic random variables corresponding to the service requirements and impatience levels, respectively.

We focus on the case that the patience-level distribution is determined by a parameter θ that is a vector in \mathbb{R}^p for some (known) $p \in \mathbb{N}$, entailing the estimation problem is parametric. In addition, the arrival rate λ is to be estimated, which is evidently of a parametric nature as well. Alternatively, θ could be a function from some more general space, rendering the estimation problem non-parametric; in Section 5 we briefly discuss an approach that can be used in this setting.

Throughout this paper, we assume that we observe the full workload process. This in particular means that we observe the arrival epochs of the non-balking customers and their service requirements. The objective is to use this information to somehow learn the true arrival rate and the parameters of the patience-level distribution. More concretely, we wish to devise statistical procedures for estimating the arrival rate λ and the distribution of the patience Y (both corresponding to non-observable quantities) with provable performance properties.

In Figure 1 the workload process during a single busy period is illustrated for the case of deterministic patience, i.e., $Y = \theta$ for some $\theta > 0$. The building blocks of our framework, viz. the interarrival and service requirements and their *effective* counterparts, are highlighted in the figure. It is stressed that the distribution of the effective interarrival times can significantly deviate from the (exponential) distribution of the interarrival times. Figure 2 illustrates this effect for two different patience-level distributions. In addition, as mentioned, the effective interarrival times are not independent, as opposed to the interarrival times.

We throughout assume that the mean service time $E[X]$ is finite, and that, with $\rho := \lambda E[X]$ denoting the traffic intensity,

$$\rho \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} (1 - H(x)) < 1.$$

Under these assumptions, we have that the queue is stable and that a stationary workload $V := V(\infty)$ exists [3]. Note that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} H(x) < 1$ holds only if there are customers with infinite patience, i.e., $P(Y = \infty) > 0$. If $P(Y < \infty) = 1$, on the other hand, then we have $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} H(x) = 1$, so that the system is stable irrespective of the value of the traffic intensity ρ .

We briefly recapitulate some known results for this model. The stationary workload distribution has probability mass $\pi_0 := P(V = 0)$ at zero and it is absolutely continuous on $(0, \infty)$. Its density function $v(x)$ is given by the unique solution of a Volterra integral equation of the second kind [24]:

$$v(x) = \lambda \pi_0 \bar{H}(0) \bar{G}(x) + \lambda \int_0^x v(y) \bar{H}(y) \bar{G}(x-y) dy, \quad x \geq 0, \quad (1)$$




FIGURE 1. The workload level $V(t)$ during a busy period for the case of deterministic patience levels. The dotted red lines mark arrival instants of new customers. Arrivals 3 and 5 observe a workload level above θ and immediately balk, and thus the workload continues to deplete as if there was no arrival. Although six customers have arrived during the busy period, only four effective interarrival times and service requirements are observed, namely $((A_1, X_1), (A_2, X_2), (A_3, X_3), (A_4, X_4))$, being equal to $((T_1, B_1), (T_2, B_2), (T_3 + T_4, B_4), (T_5 + T_6, B_6))$.

where $\overline{G}(x) := 1 - G(x)$ and $\overline{H}(x) := 1 - H(x)$ denote the complementary cdfs of the service-requirement and patience-level distributions, respectively. We note that (1) is readily verified with a level-crossing argument [6]. A solution of the integral equation (1) is, as can be found in [3, 23], given in terms of the pdf $g_e(x) := \overline{G}(x)/E[X]$ of the equilibrium distribution (i.e., the residual lifetime distribution) corresponding to the service requirements:

$$\begin{aligned}
 v(x) &= \pi_0 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n(x), \quad x \geq 0, \\
 \pi_0 &= \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} u_n(x) dx \right)^{-1}, \\
 u_1(x) &= \rho \overline{H}(0) g_e(x), \quad u_n(x) = \rho \int_0^x u_{n-1}(y) \overline{H}(y) g_e(x-y) dy, \quad n = 2, 3, \dots
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Owing to the PASTA property, the workload seen by an arriving customer has the same distribution as the stationary workload V . The stationary waiting time W of a non-balking customer is thus given by a conditional random variable $[V | V < Y]$. We can thus identify $P(W = 0)$ and the probability density function (pdf) $w(\cdot)$ of W in terms of the stationary workload distribution $v(\cdot)$:

$$P(W = 0) = \frac{\pi_0 \overline{H}(0)}{1 - P_\ell}, \quad w(x) = \frac{v(x) \overline{H}(x)}{1 - P_\ell}, \quad x \geq 0, \tag{3}$$




FIGURE 2. Tail distribution (smooth black) of the potential interarrival time T is exponential with rate $\lambda = 1$. Simulation of the tail distributions of the stationary effective interarrival times is illustrated for two cases: A^d corresponds to deterministic patience levels with $\theta = 3$ (dotted red), while A^e corresponds to exponentially distributed patience levels with mean 3 (dashed blue). The service requirements in the example are Erlang distributed with parameters $(5, 1.5)$.

where P_ℓ denotes the loss probability given by

$$P_\ell = \pi_0 H(0) + \int_0^\infty v(y) H(y) dy = 1 - \frac{1 - \pi_0}{\rho}. \quad (4)$$

In some special cases, the expression (2) for the workload density $v(\cdot)$ can be further simplified, as shown in the examples below.

Example 1 (Constant patience levels). We consider the case that the patience levels take a constant value θ_0 (for some $\theta_0 > 0$). Let $g_e^{(n)}(\cdot)$ (for $x \geq 0$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$) denote the n -fold convolution of the pdf $g_e(\cdot)$ of the equilibrium distribution of the service times, and $G_e^{(n)}(x)$ the corresponding cdf. Also, define $g_{e,\theta_0}^{(n)}(\cdot)$ by

$$g_{e,\theta_0}^{(n)}(x) := \begin{cases} g_e^{(n)}(x)/G_e^{(n)}(\theta_0), & x \leq \theta_0, \\ 0, & x > \theta_0. \end{cases}$$

We then have, by [11, 23], with as usual \star defining the convolution operator,

$$\pi_0 = \left(1 + \rho + \rho \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \rho^n G_e^{(n)}(\theta_0) \right)^{-1}, \quad (5)$$

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} \pi_0 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \rho^n g_e^{(n)}(x), & 0 \leq x \leq \theta_0, \\ \pi_0 \rho g_e(x) + \pi_0 \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \rho^n G_e^{(n-1)}(\theta_0) \cdot [g_{e,\theta_0}^{(n-1)} \star g_e](x), & x > \theta_0, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Example 2 (Exponential service times). If the service times follow an exponential distribution with mean $1/\mu$, we have by [23, 34] that

$$\pi_0 = \left(1 + \lambda \int_0^\infty \exp \left[-\mu x + \lambda \int_0^x \overline{H}(y) dy \right] dx \right)^{-1},$$

$$v(x) = \pi_0 \overline{H}(0) \lambda \exp \left[-\mu x + \lambda \int_0^x \overline{H}(y) dy \right], \quad x \geq 0.$$

3. PARAMETRIC ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

In the setting considered, we focus on the first non-balking $n + 1$ customers. We set the time origin $t = 0$ to the time instant that a non-balking customer joins the system. We record the effective arrival times $\tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2, \dots, \tilde{A}_n$, the workloads $V(0), V(\tilde{A}_1), \dots, V(\tilde{A}_n)$ as observed by the corresponding non-balking customers, and their service requirements X_0, X_1, \dots, X_n . In this section the goal is to estimate, in a parametric context, the arrival rate and patience-level distribution from the data.

The crucial observation is that we can construct a likelihood function of the patience-level distribution using an observed sample of effective interarrival times A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n , waiting times $W_0 = V(0), W_1 = V(\tilde{A}_1), W_2 = V(\tilde{A}_2), \dots, W_n = V(\tilde{A}_n)$, and service requirements X_0, X_1, \dots, X_n , which can be reconstructed from the observed sequences mentioned in the previous paragraph. We work under the natural assumption that the observed system is in stationarity, so that W_0 is the stationary waiting time of a non-balking customer and X_0 is an independent job size.

Remark 1. To make the sequence of waiting times W_1, W_2, \dots, W_n stationary, we should let the time origin coincide with an arrival instant of a non-balking customer. The validity of this statement can be argued as follows.

First it is observed that assuming the workload at time $t = 0$ being stationary does *not* imply that the waiting time W_1 of the first customer follows the stationary distribution W . To see this, consider (for simplicity) an ordinary M/G/1 queue (without customer impatience, that is). If the workload at time $t = 0$ follows the stationary workload distribution V , then the first customer arriving after time $t = 0$ finds the system empty with probability

$$P(W_1 = 0) = P(V = 0) + \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda x} v(x) dx > P(V = 0).$$

Since the stationary waiting time W has the same distribution as the stationary workload V in the ordinary M/G/1 queue (due to PASTA), we find the inequality

$$P(W_1 = 0) > P(V = 0) = P(W = 0).$$

This shows that the waiting time W_1 of the first-arriving customer is biased, in that it is not distributed as W .

Intuitively, the bias is a consequence of the fact that a customer arriving after a long interarrival time is more likely chosen as the first arriving customer in our experiment (cf. the well-known inspection paradox in renewal theory), and such a customer tends to observe the system less congested than time-average. It is easily seen that letting time $t = 0$ correspond to the arrival instant of a non-balking customer makes the sequence of waiting times W_1, W_2, \dots, W_n stationary. \diamond

We next describe the construction of the likelihood function. We first recall that the effective interarrival times A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n are *not* exponentially distributed, due to the fact that between two effective arrival instants there may have been arriving customers who observed a workload level exceeding their patience level (as depicted in Figure 2). Despite this, we can still characterize the effective interarrival time distribution in terms of the observed quantities. To see this, suppose that, for some $t \geq 0$, there have been no effective arrivals in the interval $(\tilde{A}_{i-1}, \tilde{A}_{i-1} + t]$. An arrival in $(\tilde{A}_{i-1} + t, \tilde{A}_{i-1} + t + \Delta t]$ then occurs with probability $\lambda \Delta t + o(\Delta t)$, as $\Delta t \downarrow 0$. The corresponding customer joins the system (i.e., becomes effective) with probability $\bar{H}(V(\tilde{A}_{i-1}) - t)$ because (i) the workload seen on the arrival equals $\max\{0, V(\tilde{A}_{i-1}) - t\}$ and (ii) $\bar{H}(x) = 1$ for $x < 0$. Therefore, the occurrence of the next (i.e., the i -th) effective arrival follows a time-inhomogeneous Poisson process with time-dependent intensity $\lambda \bar{H}(V(\tilde{A}_{i-1}) - t)$. Noting that $V(\tilde{A}_{i-1}) = W_{i-1} + X_{i-1}$ (for $i = 1, 2, \dots$), we thus conclude that

$$P(A_i > t \mid W_{i-1} + X_{i-1} = v) = \exp\left(-\lambda \int_0^t \bar{H}(v - u) du\right).$$

This representation of the distribution of the effective interarrival times facilitates the evaluation of the likelihood. The (conditional) likelihood function for $\mathbf{A} := (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)$ given $\mathbf{W} := (W_1, W_2, \dots, W_n)$ and $\mathbf{X} := (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ is given by the product of the conditional densities

$$f_{A_i|v}(t) = -\frac{d}{dt}P(A_i > t \mid W_{i-1} + X_{i-1} = v) \quad (7)$$

$$= \lambda \bar{H}(v - t) \exp\left(-\lambda \int_0^t \bar{H}(v - u) du\right). \quad (8)$$

This yields the conditional likelihood function

$$\begin{aligned} L_n(H; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W} \mid \mathbf{X}) &= \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda \bar{H}(W_{i-1} + X_{i-1} - A_i) \exp\left(-\lambda \int_0^{A_i} \bar{H}(W_{i-1} + X_{i-1} - u) du\right) \\ &= \lambda^n \prod_{i=1}^n \bar{H}(W_i) \exp\left(-\lambda \int_0^{A_i} \bar{H}(W_{i-1} + X_{i-1} - u) du\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Lindley-type recursion

$$W_k = \max\{W_{k-1} + X_{k-1} - A_k, 0\}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (9)$$

Note here that the patience-level distribution and the arrival rate do not affect the distribution of \mathbf{X} , so that maximization of $L_n(H; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W} \mid \mathbf{X})$ with respect to them is equivalent to that of the unconditional likelihood function for $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{X})$. This specifically entails that in our estimation procedure there is no need to simultaneously estimate the service-requirement distribution.

In the rest of this section, we assume that the patience-level distribution is characterized by a finite-dimensional vector of parameters $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$. For $\theta \in \Theta$, let H_θ and \bar{H}_θ denote the cdf and complementary cdf, respectively, of the patience-level distribution given parameter θ . Let any H_θ , with $\theta \in \Theta$, be identifiable in the conventional Kullback-Leibler sense. The maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of (λ, θ) is then given by

$$(\hat{\lambda}_n, \hat{\theta}_n) \in \arg \max_{(\lambda, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Theta} L_n(\lambda, \theta; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W} \mid \mathbf{X}),$$

where

$$L_n(\lambda, \theta; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W} \mid \mathbf{X}) := \lambda^n \prod_{i=1}^n \overline{H}_\theta(W_i) \exp \left(-\lambda \int_0^{A_i} \overline{H}_\theta(W_{i-1} + X_{i-1} - u) du \right). \quad (10)$$

In the sequel we provide an asymptotic analysis describing the performance of this MLE. We first focus, in Sections 3.1–3.2, on the parameters pertaining to the patience only; i.e., the estimation does not cover the arrival rate λ . The object of study is, in self-evident notation, for $\lambda > 0$ given,

$$\widehat{\theta}_n \in \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} L_n(\theta; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W} \mid \mathbf{X}).$$

Extending this to a procedure to also include estimation of the arrival rate is relatively straightforward; we get back to it in Section 3.3.

In more detail, the remainder of this section is organized as follows. First we establish (in Section 3.1) conditions for strong consistency and asymptotic normality of our estimator of the patience parameters, with the errors scaled by \sqrt{n} , focusing on continuous patience-level distributions. We then consider (in Section 3.2) the case of deterministic patience and establish consistency (independently) for this case as well. It is noted that in the latter case the asymptotic errors are *not* normally but rather exponentially distributed, with the errors scaled by n . This is due to the fact that for deterministic patience the MLE is obtained on the boundary of the sample data, much like in the well-known case of estimating the parameter θ of a uniform distribution on $[0, \theta]$. As mentioned, Section 3.3 discusses the estimation of the arrival rate.

3.1. Continuous patience-level distribution. This subsection covers the asymptotic performance of the MLE for the case that the patience-level distribution is continuous and parametric. Let θ_0 denote the true parameter. Throughout the following analysis the underlying probability measure is P_{θ_0} , i.e., the probability measure corresponding to the true patience-level distribution. For the asymptotic results we make the following assumptions, which will be discussed in Section 3.1.1.

Assumption. *The following assumptions are imposed:*

- (A1) *The parameter space $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ is a compact set such that the true parameter lies in the interior of the set, i.e., $\theta_0 \in \Theta^\circ$.*
- (A2) *The observation period commences at $t = 0$ which corresponds to the stationary arrival instant of a non-balking customer, and thus the sequence of waiting times W_1, W_2, \dots, W_n is stationary.*
- (A3) *Let $\overline{H}_{\inf}(x) := \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \overline{H}_\theta(x)$. Depending on whether the right endpoint*

$$h_{\sup} := \inf\{x \geq 0 : \overline{H}_{\inf}(x) = 0\}$$

takes a finite value or not, we assume one of the following properties: (i) If $h_{\sup} = \infty$, then there exists a positive non-decreasing function $f(\cdot)$ such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) \in (0, \infty]$ and for some constants $c_1, c_2 \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{-f(x)}}{\overline{H}_{\inf}(x)} = c_1, \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) \overline{H}_{\theta_0}(x) = c_2.$$

(ii) If $h_{\text{sup}} < \infty$, then there exists a positive non-decreasing function $f(\cdot)$ such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow h_{\text{sup}}^-} f(x) \in (0, \infty]$ and for some constants $c_1, c_2 \in [0, \infty)$,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow h_{\text{sup}}^-} \frac{e^{-f(x)}}{\overline{H}_{\text{inf}}(x)} = c_1, \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow h_{\text{sup}}^-} f(x) \overline{H}_{\theta_0}(x) = c_2.$$

(A4) The gradient vector and Hessian matrix of H_θ are continuous with respect to θ . With $\Psi_1(\theta)$ denoting the Hessian matrix of the log-likelihood corresponding to a single waiting time (in stationarity), $\mathbb{E}\Psi_1(\theta)$ has finite elements in all coordinates for any $\theta \in \Theta$.

(A5) The collection of functions $\{H_\theta(x) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ is equicontinuous: for any $x \geq 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $|H_\theta(x) - H_\theta(y)| < \epsilon$ for any y such that $|x - y| < \delta$, uniformly over all $\theta \in \Theta$.

We now state the main results of this subsection. In the sequel, $N(\mu, \Sigma)$ denotes a normally distributed random variable with mean vector μ and covariance matrix Σ .

Theorem 1. *If Assumptions (A1)–(A3) and (A5) are satisfied, then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\widehat{\theta}_n \rightarrow_{\text{as}} \theta_0. \quad (11)$$

Theorem 2. *If Assumptions (A1)–(A5) hold, then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \rightarrow_d N(0, I^{-1}(\theta_0)), \quad (12)$$

where $I(\theta_0) := -\mathbb{E}\Psi_1(\theta_0)$ and $I^{-1}(\theta_0)$ denotes the inverse of $I(\theta_0)$.

The proofs of the above theorems are provided in Section 3.1.2, after the detailed discussion of (A1)–(A5) that we give in Section 3.1.1.

3.1.1. Discussion of assumptions. We next provide more background on the assumptions imposed. In addition we discuss their possible relaxation.

- (1) Assumption (A1) is natural, as it requires that the parameter space is big enough so that it contains the true parameter. In practice the parameter space can be adjusted on-the-fly, for example if for large n we obtain boundary solutions for the first order conditions.
- (2) Assumption (A2) facilitates the use of known results on the convergence of stationary dependent sequences. Note that, as long as a stationary workload distribution exists (for which we have given condition in Section 2), the same results should hold without making this assumption because of the regenerative nature of the process. However, without this assumption the conditions for both consistency and asymptotic normality are harder to verify. In particular, the crucial step for consistency is the uniform convergence of the log-likelihood, established in Lemma 1 below. More elaborate conditions for uniform convergence are detailed in for example [1, 30, 31].
- (3) If there are patient customers who do not balk regardless of the waiting time, that is, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \overline{H}_{\theta_0}(x) > 0$, then Assumption (A3) requires that the parameter space Θ is chosen so that the existence of patient customers ($\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \overline{H}_\theta(x) > 0$) is assumed for all $\theta \in \Theta$, which is a reasonable assumption in modeling a service system where both patient and impatient customers exist. In the case of $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \overline{H}_{\theta_0}(x) = 0$, on the other hand, Assumption (A3) requires that the decay rate of $\overline{H}_\theta(x)$ does not vary too strongly among the distributions H_θ , with θ in the parameter space Θ . In

practice, this assumption is seldom violated. For example, if the true patience-level distribution decays exponentially, i.e., $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} e^{\nu x} \overline{H}_{\theta_0}(x) = c$ for some $\nu > 0$ and $c > 0$, then (A3) is satisfied if the infimum tail function $\overline{H}_{\inf}(x)$ does not decay faster than the doubly exponential function $e^{-e^{\nu x}}$ (which evidently decays exceptionally fast). As another example, supposing that the true patience-level distribution obeys a power law, i.e., $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^k \overline{H}_{\theta_0}(x) = c$ for some $k > 0$ and $c > 0$, then (A3) is satisfied if $\overline{H}_{\inf}(x)$ does not decay faster than e^{-x^k} .

- (4) Assumption (A4) enables the construction of a standard martingale CLT for the asymptotic distribution of the estimation error of the MLE. It is not a necessary condition, but in cases where the assumption is not satisfied one is typically required to apply ad-hoc analysis to derive an asymptotic distribution. In Section 3.2 we show that for a deterministic patience level, that does not satisfy (A4), the asymptotic distribution of the error is exponential and not normal. Assumption (A2) implies that the expectation of the Hessian matrix of the log-likelihood $\Psi_1(\theta)$ is the covariance matrix of the gradient, and thus it is always positive definite. As a consequence, one just needs to verify that the coordinates are finite for (A4) to hold.
- (5) The equicontinuity assumption (A5) enables concise analysis and can be verified for many continuous patience-level distributions. For example, if there exists a bounded density for every $H_{\theta}(\cdot)$, then it is Lipschitz continuous, and a uniform bound is given by the supremum of the constants in the compact set Θ . The assumption does not hold if the support of the distribution depends on θ . If $H_{\theta}(x)$ has some discontinuities (with respect to x), one could pursue replacing (A5) by an appropriate upper semi-continuity assumption; see [13, Thm. 16b] and [30]. We will present such an example in Section 4.4. Our asymptotic results may hold by replacing (A5) by (A4) and verifying additional measurability conditions on $\inf_{\eta \in \mathcal{B}_{\theta}} \overline{H}_{\eta}(x)$ for a neighborhood \mathcal{B}_{θ} of any $\theta \in \Theta$ (see [1, Corr. 2]).

3.1.2. *Proofs.* From (10), first note that we can express the log-likelihood $\ell_n(\theta; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W} | \mathbf{X}) := \log L_n(\theta; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W} | \mathbf{X})$ by

$$n \log \lambda + \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\log \overline{H}_{\theta}(W_i) - \lambda \int_0^{A_i} \overline{H}_{\theta}(W_{i-1} + X_{i-1} - u) du \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\overline{H}_{\theta}(W_i) > 0\}}. \quad (13)$$

With $W := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} W_i$ existing, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the continuous mapping theorem yields

$$\frac{1}{n} \ell_n(\theta; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W} | \mathbf{X}) \rightarrow_{\text{as}} \mathbb{E}[\ell_1(\theta; A_1, W_0, W_1 | X_0)], \quad (14)$$

where A_1 is the effective interarrival time when the initial workload level is $W_0 + X_0$ and $W_0 =_d W$, i.e., the stationary initial workload. From now on we use the compact notations $\ell_n(\theta) := \ell_n(\theta; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W} | \mathbf{X})$ and $\ell(\theta) := \mathbb{E}[\ell_1(\theta; A_1, W_1, W_0 | X_0)]$. The density of the effective interarrival times (7) is uniquely determined by the function $H_{\theta}(\cdot)$, and thus so is the likelihood (10). This is because the function

$$H_{\theta}(\cdot) := \left\{ H_{\theta}(x) := \int_{[0, x]} d\nu_{\theta}(u) : x \geq 0 \right\}$$

is uniquely determined by θ , as a consequence of the fact that for every $\theta \in \Theta$ the measure $\nu_{\theta}(\cdot)$ corresponds to a different distribution (in the almost-everywhere sense, that is). As a consequence, $\{H_{\theta}(\cdot) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ is a parametric collection of distribution functions such that

there is no pair $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$ for which $H_{\theta_1}(\cdot) = H_{\theta_2}(\cdot)$ almost everywhere. This entails that the model is identifiable in the Kullback-Leibler sense (see e.g. [13, Ch. 17]), and hence

$$\ell(\theta) - \ell(\theta_0) < 0, \quad \forall \theta \neq \theta_0. \quad (15)$$

The key step in the proof of Theorem 1 is establishing a uniform version of (14); then strong consistency follows by the methodology of Wald [13, Chapters 16–17]. The workload observations are not independent but by (A2) they are stationary, so that we can apply a uniform law for stationary sequences that is commonly used in the econometrics literature. We specifically rely on a theorem taken from [31] and its extensions, in particular the ones developed in [1, 30].

Lemma 1. *If Assumptions (A1)–(A3) and (A5) hold, then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \ell_n(\theta) - \ell(\theta) \right| \rightarrow_{\text{as}} 0. \quad (16)$$

Proof. Assuming (A1)–(A3) and (A5), we verify the conditions for (16) as given in [31, Thm. 6.4]. These are: (i) Θ is compact, (ii) $(A_n, W_n, X_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a stationary ergodic sequence, (iii) the function $\frac{1}{n} \ell_n(\theta)$ converges almost surely pointwise to $\ell(\theta)$, (iv) the set $\{\ell_i(\theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ is equicontinuous with respect to (A, X, W) , (v) there exists a function $K : [0, \infty)^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\ell_1(\theta; a, z, y, x) \leq K(a, z, y, x), \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta; \quad \mathbb{E}[K(A_1, W_0, W_1, X_0)] < \infty. \quad (17)$$

Condition (i) is assumed in (A1). The service requirements X_n are i.i.d. and (A2) states that W_n is a stationary ergodic sequence, which also implies that the same is true for A_n (because conditional on $W_i = z$ the distribution of A_i is determined by z and the external arrival process), thus yielding the validity of (ii). Condition (iii) is (14). The equicontinuity assumption (A5) on H_θ implies that the same holds for the set of log-likelihood functions because both the log and the integral terms in (13) are continuous functions with respect to the observations (A, X, W) , so that we have established (iv). In the remainder of the proof we verify (v).

Recall, from (A3), the definition $\overline{H}_{\inf}(y) = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \overline{H}_\theta(y)$ for any $y \geq 0$. As Θ is compact and all functions H_θ are continuous, we have that $\overline{H}_{\inf}(\cdot)$ is a continuous monotone non-increasing function such that $\overline{H}_{\inf}(0) \in (0, 1]$. Defining

$$K(a, y) := |\log \lambda| + |\log \overline{H}_{\inf}(y)| \mathbf{1}_{\{\overline{H}_{\inf}(y) > 0\}} + \lambda a,$$

by recalling that $H_\theta(y) \leq 1$ for any $y \geq 0$ we conclude from (13) and the triangle inequality that

$$|\ell_1(\theta; a, z, y, x)| \leq K(a, y), \quad \forall a, z, y, x \geq 0.$$

Clearly $\mathbb{E}A_1 < \infty$ and so to complete the proof we need to show that $\mathbb{E}|\log \overline{H}_{\inf}(W_1)| < \infty$. Recall that $W_1 \sim W_0$ is the stationary workload seen by an effective arrival, whose pdf $w(\cdot)$ is given by (cf. (3))

$$w(y) = \frac{v(y) \overline{H}_{\theta_0}(y)}{1 - P_\ell}.$$

As mentioned in Section 3.1.1, (A5) ensures that the support of the distribution H_θ does not depend on θ . The above equation thus implies $W_0 < h_{\text{sup}}$ with probability one.

Note that we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\log \overline{H}_{\inf}(W_0)| = \Pr(W_0 = 0)(-\log(\overline{H}_{\inf}(0))) + \Pr(W_0 > 0)\mathbb{E}[-\log(\overline{H}_{\inf}(W_0)) | W_0 > 0],$$

where the first term on the right-hand side is always finite. We thus provide a proof of $\mathbb{E}[-\log(\overline{H}_{\inf}(W_0)) | W_0 > 0] < \infty$ below.

Regardless of whether $h_{\sup} < \infty$ or $h_{\sup} = \infty$, it follows from (A3) that for any $\epsilon \in (0, \infty)$, there exist $0 < y_1^* < h_{\sup}$ and $0 < y_2^* < h_{\sup}$ such that

$$\frac{e^{-f(y)}}{\overline{H}_{\inf}(y)} < c_1 + \epsilon, \quad y \geq y_1^*, \quad 0 < f(y)\overline{H}_{\theta_0}(y) < c_2 + \epsilon, \quad y \geq y_2^*.$$

Using these inequalities, with $y^* := \max\{y_1^*, y_2^*\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - P_\ell)\mathbb{E}[-\log(\overline{H}_{\inf}(W_0)) | W_0 > 0] \\ &= (1 - P_\ell) \int_0^{h_{\sup}} (-\log(\overline{H}_{\inf}(y)))w(y) dy \\ &= \int_0^{h_{\sup}} (-\log(\overline{H}_{\inf}(y)))\overline{H}_{\theta_0}(y)v(y) dy \\ &< \int_0^{y^*} (-\log(\overline{H}_{\inf}(y)))\overline{H}_{\theta_0}(y)v(y) dy + \int_{y^*}^{h_{\sup}} \left(-\log\left(\frac{e^{-f(y)}}{c_1 + \epsilon}\right)\right) \frac{c_2 + \epsilon}{f(y)} \cdot v(y) dy \\ &\leq -\log(\overline{H}_{\inf}(y^*)) \int_0^{y^*} v(y) dy + \int_{y^*}^{h_{\sup}} (f(y) + |\log(c_1 + \epsilon)|) \cdot \frac{c_2 + \epsilon}{f(y)} \cdot v(y) dy \\ &\leq -\log(\overline{H}_{\inf}(y^*)) + (c_2 + \epsilon) \int_{y^*}^{h_{\sup}} v(y) dy + \frac{|\log(c_1 + \epsilon)|(c_2 + \epsilon)}{f(y^*)} \int_{y^*}^{h_{\sup}} v(y) dy \\ &\leq -\log(\overline{H}_{\inf}(y^*)) + (c_2 + \epsilon) \left(1 + \frac{|\log(c_1 + \epsilon)|}{f(y^*)}\right) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\mathbb{E}[-\log(\overline{H}_{\inf}(W_0)) | W_0 > 0] < \infty$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Observe that the strong consistency follows from the identifiability property (15) and from Lemma 1. Note in particular that the proof of [13, Thm. 17] does not rely on i.i.d. observations once uniform convergence has been established, and so the same steps can be applied here. In particular, a sufficient condition (relying on uniform convergence for strong consistency when observations are dependent) can also be found in [20]: for every $\theta \neq \theta_0$ there exists a neighborhood $\mathcal{B}_\delta(\theta)$ such that

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(\theta)} \left(\frac{1}{n} \ell_n(\gamma) - \frac{1}{n} \ell_n(\theta_0) \right) < 0, \quad (18)$$

almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This follows directly from (15) and (16). \square

We continue by proving asymptotic normality that was stated in Theorem 2. This amounts to showing that the estimation error $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0)$ is asymptotically normal as $n \rightarrow \infty$, assuming that (A1)–(A5) are satisfied. To this end we apply the well-known delta method and an appropriate version of the martingale CLT (see e.g. [21, Thm. 12.6]).

Proof of Theorem 2. For any given v , we let $\nabla \overline{H}_\theta(v) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\nabla^2 \overline{H}_\theta(v) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ denote the gradient and Hessian, respectively, of \overline{H}_θ . These are both continuous with respect to any coordinate θ_k of η , as a consequence of (A4). Thus, both the gradient and the Hessian

of the log-likelihood are continuous functions. These are given by $\nabla \ell_n(\theta) := \dot{\ell}_n(\theta)$ and $\nabla^2 \ell_n(\theta) := \sum_{i=1}^n \Psi_i(\theta)$, respectively, where, for $k = 1, \dots, p$,

$$(\dot{\ell}_n(\theta))_k = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\nabla_k \bar{H}_\theta(W_i)}{\bar{H}_\theta(W_i)} - \lambda \int_0^{A_i} \nabla_k \bar{H}_\theta(W_{i-1} + X_{i-1} - u) du \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{H}_\theta(W_i) > 0\}}, \quad (19)$$

and, for $k, l = 1, \dots, p$,

$$(\Psi_i(\theta))_{kl} = \left(\frac{\bar{H}_\theta(W_i) \nabla_{kl}^2 \bar{H}_\theta(W_i) - \nabla_k \bar{H}_\theta(W_i) \nabla_l \bar{H}_\theta(W_i)}{\bar{H}_\theta(W_i)^2} - \lambda \int_0^{A_i} \nabla_{kl}^2 \bar{H}_\theta(W_{i-1} + X_{i-1} - u) du \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{H}_\theta(W_i) > 0\}}. \quad (20)$$

Following the lines of the standard delta method [36, Ch. 3], we consider the expansion of $\dot{\ell}_n(\cdot)$ at the MLE $\hat{\theta}_n$ around the true parameter:

$$\frac{1}{n} \dot{\ell}_n(\hat{\theta}_n) = \frac{1}{n} \dot{\ell}_n(\theta_0) + (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \int_0^1 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Psi_i(\alpha \hat{\theta}_n + (1 - \alpha) \theta_0) d\alpha. \quad (21)$$

If $\theta_0 \in \Theta$, then due to the strong consistency that we found in Theorem 1 we have, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, that

$$\hat{\theta}_n \rightarrow_{\text{as}} \theta_0.$$

Furthermore, as $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ by assumption (A1), the smoothness assumption (A4) implies that, as n grows large, $\ell_n(\theta)$ converges to a concave function and the MLE is given by a sequence of roots $\hat{\theta}_n$ satisfying $\dot{\ell}_n(\hat{\theta}_n) = 0$, i.e., from some N on there is no boundary solution for any $n \geq N$ with probability one. Therefore (21) yields, with

$$B_n := - \int_0^1 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Psi_i(\alpha \hat{\theta}_n + (1 - \alpha) \theta_0) d\alpha,$$

that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) B_n \stackrel{d}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \dot{\ell}_n(\theta_0), \quad (22)$$

i.e., both sides of (22) converge to the same distribution (if the limits exist). In Lemma 2 we apply the stationarity of W_i in (A2) to show that $B_n \rightarrow_{\text{as}} I(\theta_0)$, where $I(\theta_0) = -E\Psi_1(\theta_0)$. Furthermore, $\dot{\ell}_n(\theta_0)/\sqrt{n}$ is shown to satisfy a martingale CLT with asymptotic variance $I(\theta_0)$. As $E\nabla \ell_1(\theta_0) = 0$, Assumption (A2) implies that the asymptotic variance equals the stationary covariance of the gradient

$$I(\theta_0) = E\nabla^2(\ell_1(\theta_0)) = E[\nabla(\ell_1(\theta_0))\nabla(\ell_1(\theta_0))^\top], \quad (23)$$

hence $I(\theta_0)$ is a positive definite matrix (see [13, Ch. 18] for more details). Assumption (A4) further demands that the elements of $I(\theta_0)$ are all finite, and then combining the above and applying Slutsky's theorem to (22) yields Theorem 2. \square

We are thus left with proving Lemma 2.

Lemma 2. *If (A1)–(A5) hold and $I(\theta_0) = -E\Psi_1(\theta_0)$ is a positive definite matrix with finite elements, then (a) as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $B_n \rightarrow_{\text{as}} I(\theta_0)$, and (b) as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \dot{\ell}_n(\theta_0) \rightarrow_d N(0, I(\theta_0)). \quad (24)$$

Proof. (a) With Lemma 1 and Theorem 1 at our disposal, the proof essentially follows standard arguments. For instance, see the proof of [13, Thm. 18] for i.i.d. observations, or the proof of [32, Lemma 14] that applies a martingale CLT for an MLE based on dependent workload observations in the M/G/1-queue context.

(b) We construct a martingale CLT for stationary sequences [4, Thm. 18.3] and verify that the corresponding conditions are satisfied. Let $Z_i := \dot{\ell}_i(\theta_0) - \dot{\ell}_{i-1}(\theta_0)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, where $\dot{\ell}_0(\theta_0) := 0$. The identifiability condition (15) implies that the smooth function $\ell(\theta)$ is maximized at θ_0 , hence $\dot{\ell}(\theta_0) := \nabla \ell(\theta_0) = 0$, i.e., all coordinates equal zero. Therefore, if W_{i-1} is stationary we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[(Z_i)_k | W_{i-1}] = \mathbb{E}[(\dot{\ell}_1(\theta_0))_k | W_0] = (\dot{\ell}(\theta_0))_k = 0, \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, p\},$$

and

$$Z_{ni} := K_n^{-1} Z_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\},$$

is a martingale difference, where $K_n K_n^\top = \text{Var}[\dot{\ell}_n(\theta_0)]$ is the Cholesky decomposition of the covariance matrix of $\dot{\ell}_n(\theta_0)$. Furthermore,

$$\frac{1}{n} \text{Var}[\dot{\ell}_n(\theta_0)] = \text{Var}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \dot{\ell}_n(\theta_0)\right] \xrightarrow{\text{as}} -\mathbb{E}\Psi_1(\theta_0) = I(\theta_0),$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and as $I(\theta_0) < \infty$ by (A4) we have that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (K_n)_k = \infty$ for all $k = 1, \dots, p$, and in addition

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K_n}{\sqrt{n}} = K,$$

where K is defined through $KK^\top = I(\theta_0)$. Therefore by [21, Thm. 12.6] (which is the multi-dimensional counterpart of [4, Thm. 18.1]) we conclude that $\sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ni}$ converges to a standard normal random variable, and thus

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \dot{\ell}_n(\theta_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} K_n \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ni} \xrightarrow{\text{d}} K \mathbf{N}(0, 1),$$

which is equivalent to (24). \square

3.2. Constant patience-level MLE. We next consider the case where all customers have the same patience level θ_0 , i.e., $H(y) = \mathbf{1}_{\{y \geq \theta_0\}}$; observe that in this case the assumptions of Section 3.1 do not apply. As we will see, in this case the properties of the MLE are markedly different from those identified in Section 3.1.

In this setting, the likelihood function (10) reduces to, with the event \mathcal{E}_i denoting $\{W_{i-1} + X_{i-1} \leq \theta\}$ and \mathcal{E}_i^c its complement,

$$\begin{aligned} L(\theta; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W} | \mathbf{X}) &= \lambda^n \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{W_i < \theta\}} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{E}_i\}} e^{-\lambda \int_0^{A_i} du} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{E}_i^c\}} e^{-\lambda \int_{W_{i-1} + X_{i-1} - \theta}^{A_i} du} \right) \\ &= \lambda^n \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{W_i < \theta\}} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{E}_i\}} e^{-\lambda A_i} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{E}_i^c\}} e^{-\lambda(A_i + \theta - W_{i-1} - X_{i-1})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $L(\theta; \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W} | \mathbf{X})$ (i) equals zero for $\theta \in [0, \max_{i=1,2,\dots,n} W_i)$, (ii) has an upward discontinuity at $\theta = \max_{i=1,2,\dots,n} W_i$ and decreases for

$$\theta \in \left[\max_{i=1,2,\dots,n} W_i, \max_{i=1,2,\dots,n} \{W_i + X_i\} \right),$$

and (iii) takes a constant value for $\theta \geq \max_{i=1,2,\dots,n}\{W_i + X_i\}$. We thus find the intuitively appealing property that the MLE is given by

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \max_{i=1,2,\dots,n} W_i, \quad (25)$$

i.e., the maximum workload at jump times. Note that this estimator resembles the MLE of the parameter θ when the observations are uniformly distributed on $[0, \theta]$.

While the estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ is clearly biased (which follows from $\mathbb{E}_{\theta_0}[\hat{\theta}_n] < \theta_0$ for all n), we show that it converges almost surely to θ_0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In addition, we prove that the estimation error scaled at rate n converges to an exponential random variable.

Theorem 3. As $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{\text{as}} \theta_0, \quad (26)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(n(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}_n) \geq x\right) \rightarrow e^{-v(\theta_0)x/(1-P_\ell)}, \quad (27)$$

where P_ℓ is the stationary loss probability given by (4) and (5), and the pdf of the workload $v(x)$ at $x = \theta_0$ is given by (6). In addition, the asymptotic variance of the estimation error agrees with the variance of the limiting exponential distribution, and is given by

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^2 \text{Var} \left[\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}_n \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\{n(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}_n)\}^2 \right] - \left(\mathbb{E} \left[n(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}_n) \right] \right)^2 \right\} \quad (28)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1 - P_\ell}{v(\theta_0)} \right)^2. \quad (29)$$

Remark 2. Observe that the loss probability P_ℓ can be estimated by first estimating the stationary probability of the server being idle by

$$\hat{\pi}_0 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{W_i=0\}},$$

and then plugging this estimator into (4).

Proof of Theorem 3. The proof constructs lower and upper bounds for the MLE and establishes that they both converge to θ_0 . The same bounds are also used to characterize the asymptotic distribution of the estimation error.

▷ *Lower bound.* Note that for $\theta_0 > W_{k-1}$, we have

$$A_k \sim \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}_{\lambda,k}, & W_{k-1} + X_{k-1} \leq \theta_0, \\ W_{k-1} + X_{k-1} - \theta_0 + \mathbb{E}_{\lambda,k}, & W_{k-1} + X_{k-1} > \theta_0, \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

where $(\mathbb{E}_{\lambda,k})_{k=1,2,\dots}$ denotes a sequence of i.i.d. exponentially distributed random variables with parameter λ . Let $\mathcal{N}_n^+ \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ denote the set of indices of observed workloads such that

$$\mathcal{N}_n^+ = \{k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} : W_{k-1} + X_{k-1} \geq \theta_0\}.$$

We see from (9) and (30) that given $k \in \mathcal{N}_n^+$, the observed workload W_k is stochastically identical to $\max\{0, \theta_0 - A'_k\}$, where $(A'_k)_{k=0,1,\dots}$ denotes a sequence of i.i.d. random variables that are exponentially distributed with parameter λ . Therefore, $(W_k)_{k \in \mathcal{N}_n^+}$ are i.i.d. with

$$\mathbb{P}(W_k \leq x \mid k \in \mathcal{N}_n^+) = e^{-\lambda(\theta_0 - x)}, \quad x \in [0, \theta_0], \quad (31)$$

so that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^+} W_i \leq x\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^+} \mathbf{1}_{\{W_i \leq x\}}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda(\theta_0 - x) \cdot |\mathcal{N}_n^+|}\right], \quad (32)$$

where $|\mathcal{N}_n^+|$ denotes the number of elements in \mathcal{N}_n^+ .

Obviously, we have $\theta_0 \geq \widehat{\theta}_n$ and

$$\widehat{\theta}_n \geq \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^+} W_i, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (33)$$

Let, as before, $v(\cdot)$ and $w(\cdot)$ denote the pdfs of the stationary workload and the stationary waiting time of non-balking customers, and let P_ℓ denote the stationary loss probability. From the ergodicity, we have

$$\frac{|\mathcal{N}_n^+|}{n} \xrightarrow{\text{as}} \Pr(W = 0)\overline{G}(\theta_0) + \int_0^{\theta_0} w(y)\overline{G}(\theta_0 - y) dy = \frac{v(\theta_0)}{\lambda(1 - P_\ell)}, \quad (34)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where the second equality follows from (1) and (3).

Because (34) implies $|\mathcal{N}_n^+| \xrightarrow{\text{as}} \infty$, we have for any $\epsilon > 0$, using (32) and (33),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta_0| > \epsilon\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{\theta}_n < \theta_0 - \epsilon\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^+} W_i \leq \theta_0 - \epsilon\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda\epsilon \cdot |\mathcal{N}_n^+|}\right] \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We therefore have that $\widehat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \theta_0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Convergence in probability implies that there exists a subsequence $(\widehat{\theta}_{n_m})_{m=1}^\infty$ such that $\widehat{\theta}_{n_m} \xrightarrow{\text{as}} \theta_0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, and as $\widehat{\theta}_n$ is a monotone non-decreasing sequence we conclude (26), i.e., the MLE is strongly consistent.

Furthermore, it follows from (32) and (34) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(n\left\{\theta_0 - \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^+} W_i\right\} \geq x\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^+} W_i \leq \theta_0 - \frac{x}{n}\right) \\ &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda x \cdot |\mathcal{N}_n^+|/n}\right], & 0 \leq x < n\theta_0, \\ 0, & x \geq n\theta_0, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

so that for each $x \geq 0$, we obtain from the continuous mapping theorem,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(n\left\{\theta_0 - \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^+} W_i\right\} \geq x\right) = e^{-v(\theta_0)x/(1-P_\ell)}. \quad (36)$$

▷ *Upper bound.* Let $\mathcal{N}_n^* \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ denote the set of indices of observed workloads such that

$$\mathcal{N}_n^* = \left\{k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}; W_{k-1} + X_{k-1} > \max_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}} W_i\right\}.$$

By definition, we have

$$\widehat{\theta}_n = \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^*} W_i. \quad (37)$$

For $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we define

$$Z_k := \max\{0, \theta_0 - [A_k - \max\{0, W_{k-1} + X_{k-1} - \theta_0\}]\}$$

$$= \begin{cases} \max\{0, \theta_0 - A_k\}, & W_{k-1} + X_{k-1} \leq \theta_0, \\ \max\{0, W_{k-1} + X_{k-1} - A_k\}, & W_{k-1} + X_{k-1} > \theta_0. \end{cases}$$

From (9) and (30) it follows that $W_i \leq Z_i$ a.s. for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$. We then have from (37),

$$\widehat{\theta}_n \leq \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^*} Z_i, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (38)$$

Furthermore, Z_k is stochastically identical to $\max\{0, \theta_0 - E_{\lambda, k}\}$, where $(E_{\lambda, k})_{k=1,2,\dots}$ are i.i.d. exponential random variables with parameter λ as defined above. $\{Z_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{N}_n^*}$ thus forms a sequence of i.i.d. non-negative random variables with the same cdf as (31), so that (cf. (32))

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^*} Z_i \leq x \right) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda(\theta_0 - x) \cdot |\mathcal{N}_n^*|} \right],$$

which implies (cf. (35))

$$\mathbb{P} \left(n \left\{ \theta_0 - \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^*} Z_i \right\} \geq x \right) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda x \cdot |\mathcal{N}_n^*|/n} \right], & 0 \leq x < n\theta_0, \\ 0, & x \geq n\theta_0. \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

Let $\phi_{\theta_0}(x)$ ($x \in (0, \theta_0]$) denote the stationary probability that the workload just after an acceptance of a customer takes a value in $(\theta_0 - x, \theta_0)$:

$$\phi_{\theta_0}(x) = \pi_0 \mathbb{P}(\theta_0 - x < G < \theta_0) + \int_0^{\theta_0} v(y) \mathbb{P}(\theta_0 - y - x < G < \theta_0 - y) dy.$$

Because we have $\int_0^{\theta_0} v(y) dy < \infty$, it follows from the dominated convergence theorem that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \phi_{\theta_0}(x) = 0,$$

so that we have

$$\forall \delta > 0, \exists d_0 > 0 : \quad \phi_{\theta_0}(d_0) < \frac{\delta}{4}. \quad (40)$$

Now define $\mathcal{N}_n^{**} := \mathcal{N}_n^* \setminus \mathcal{N}_n^+$, which concretely means that

$$\mathcal{N}_n^{**} = \left\{ k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}; \max_{i=1,2,\dots,k-1} W_i < W_{k-1} + X_{k-1} < \theta_0 \right\}.$$

As \mathcal{N}_n^+ and \mathcal{N}_n^{**} are two disjoint sets whose union is \mathcal{N}_n^* , we have that

$$|\mathcal{N}_n^*| = |\mathcal{N}_n^+| + |\mathcal{N}_n^{**}|. \quad (41)$$

Note that (26) implies

$$\exists n_0 \in \{0, 1, \dots\}, \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\theta}_n < \theta_0 - d_0) < \frac{\delta}{4} \quad \text{for } n = n_0, n_0 + 1, \dots \quad (42)$$

Because $\widehat{\theta}_n$ is non-decreasing in n a.s., we have for $n = n_0, n_0 + 1, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathcal{N}_n^{**}| \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathcal{N}_{n_0}^{**}| + |\mathcal{N}_n^{**} \setminus \mathcal{N}_{n_0}^{**}| \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathcal{N}_{n_0}^{**}| \right] + \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\theta}_{n_0} < \theta_0 - d_0) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathcal{N}_n^{**} \setminus \mathcal{N}_{n_0}^{**}| \mid \widehat{\theta}_{n_0} < \theta_0 - d_0 \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\theta}_{n_0} \geq \theta_0 - d_0) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathcal{N}_n^{**} \setminus \mathcal{N}_{n_0}^{**}| \mid \widehat{\theta}_{n_0} \geq \theta_0 - d_0 \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[|\mathcal{N}_{n_0}^{**}|\right] + \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\theta}_{n_0} < \theta_0 - d_0) \cdot (n - n_0 + 1) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\theta}_{n_0} \geq \theta_0 - d_0) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[|\{k \in \{n_0, n_0 + 1, \dots, n\}; d_0 < W_{k-1} + X_{k-1} < \theta_0\}|\right]. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from (40) and (42) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\mathcal{N}_n^{**}|}{n}\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\mathcal{N}_{n_0}^{**}|}{n}\right] + \frac{\delta}{4} \cdot \frac{n - n_0 + 1}{n} \\ &\quad + \frac{n - n_0 + 1}{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\{k \in \{n_0, n_0 + 1, \dots, n\}; d_0 < W_{k-1} + X_{k-1} < \theta_0\}|}{n - n_0 + 1}\right] \\ &\rightarrow \frac{\delta}{4} + \phi_{\theta_0}(d_0) \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which is majorized by $\delta/2$. We conclude that we have established that $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{N}_n^{**}|/n] \leq \delta$ for sufficiently large n . Because $\delta > 0$ is arbitrary, we find

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\mathcal{N}_n^{**}|}{n}\right] = 0. \quad (43)$$

Using Markov's inequality, we have for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{N}_n^{**}|}{n} > \epsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\mathcal{N}_n^{**}|}{n}\right],$$

so that (43) immediately implies that $|\mathcal{N}_n^{**}|/n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Upon combining the above, we have from (34) and (41),

$$\frac{|\mathcal{N}_n^*|}{n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \frac{v(\theta_0)}{\lambda(1 - P_\ell)} \quad (n \rightarrow \infty). \quad (44)$$

Therefore, we obtain from (39),

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(n \left\{ \theta_0 - \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^*} Z_i \right\} \geq x\right) = e^{-v(\theta_0)x/(1 - P_\ell)}. \quad (45)$$

Finally, noting that (33) and (38) imply

$$\mathbb{P}\left(n \left\{ \theta_0 - \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^*} Z_i \right\} \geq x\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(n(\theta_0 - \widehat{\theta}_n) \geq x\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(n \left\{ \theta_0 - \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^+} W_i \right\} \geq x\right),$$

we have from (36) and (45),

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(n(\theta_0 - \widehat{\theta}_n) \geq x\right) = e^{-v(\theta_0)x/(1 - P_\ell)}.$$

Also, (28), (33), and (38) yield the following bounds for the scaled variance of the estimation error:

$$\begin{aligned} n^2 \text{Var}\left[\theta_0 - \widehat{\theta}_n\right] &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\{n \left(\theta_0 - \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^*} Z_i\right)\right\}^2\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\left\{n \left(\theta_0 - \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^+} W_i\right)\right\}\right]^2, \\ n^2 \text{Var}\left[\theta_0 - \widehat{\theta}_n\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\{n \left(\theta_0 - \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^+} W_i\right)\right\}^2\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[n \left(\theta_0 - \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n^*} Z_i\right)\right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

We can (i) explicitly calculate the right-hand sides of these inequalities using (35) and (39), and (ii) verify (with (34) and (44)) that their limits (as $n \rightarrow \infty$) coincide and are given by $((1 - P_\ell)/v(\theta_0))^2$; we omit the details of these straightforward calculations. \square

3.3. Estimating the arrival rate. Where in the preceding subsections we focused on estimating the patience-level distribution (in a parametric context) for a given value of the arrival rate λ , we now discuss the estimation λ . There are several ways to estimate it, the most basic one relying on the idle period observations. Let $C_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{W_i=0\}}$ denote the number of idle periods observed up until (and including) the n -th effective arrival. Denote the duration of the k -th idle period by I_k . Then we propose the estimator

$$\widehat{\lambda}_n = \frac{C_n}{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n} I_k}. \quad (46)$$

The rationale behind this estimator is that I_1, I_2, \dots is a sequence i.i.d. exponentially distributed random variables with rate λ . Therefore, the estimator $\widehat{\lambda}_n$ is a standard MLE of the rate parameter of an exponentially distributed random variable, and satisfies all desired asymptotic properties.

Of course, the above procedure does not exploit a substantial amount of potentially useful data that is collected during busy periods. For the case of a deterministic patience level θ_0 , the above estimator is easily improved upon. Recall that $\widehat{\theta}_n$ was defined as $\max\{W_1, W_2, \dots, W_n\}$, with the immediate consequence that $\widehat{\theta}_n \leq \theta_0$. Supposing we observe an arrival such that immediately after this arrival the workload level is still below the current value of the estimator, then the next arrival is an effective arrival, and hence occurs after an exponentially distributed random variable with rate λ . In this way we generate more observations, thus allowing to estimate λ with a better precision. Observe that the new observations and the idle times form an i.i.d. sequence.

For the case of a continuous patience-level distribution one may use (46), or alternatively set up a joint MLE for λ and θ . The latter has clear advantages, in particular for small samples or heavily loaded systems. As the log-likelihood function (13) is a smooth and concave function with respect to λ , the MLE of the arrival rate for any estimator θ_n of θ is

$$\widehat{\lambda}_n(\theta_n) = \theta \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{A_i} \overline{H}_{\theta_n}(W_{i-1} + X_{i-1} - u) \, du \mathbf{1}_{\{\overline{H}_{\theta_n}(W_i) > 0\}} \right]^{-1}. \quad (47)$$

The asymptotic results of Section 3.1 can therefore be extended in a straightforward manner, so as to cover the joint estimation of (λ, θ) . We demonstrate this in Section 4.1, where we detail a procedure for jointly estimating the arrival rate and the patience parameter for the case of an exponentially distributed patience level.

4. EXAMPLES, EXTENSIONS, AND RAMIFICATIONS

The first two subsections of this section provide detailed analysis of the MLE for the case of exponentially and hyperexponentially distributed patience, including numerical examples based on simulation. The remainder of this section covers a number of extensions and ramifications.

4.1. Exponentially distributed patience. Suppose that the arrival rate λ_0 is unknown and that the patience-level distribution is exponential, i.e., $H_{\theta_0}(x) = 1 - e^{-\theta_0 x}$ for an unknown θ_0 (and $x \geq 0$). Due to (13) it can be verified, by distinguishing between the cases $W_0 + X_0 \geq$

A_1 and $W_0 + X_0 < A_1$, that the log-likelihood for a single observation is

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_1(\lambda, \theta) &= \log \lambda - \theta W_1 - \lambda \int_0^{A_1} e^{-\theta(W_0 + X_0 - u)^+} du \\ &= \log \lambda - \theta W_1 - \frac{\lambda}{\theta} (e^{-\theta W_1} - e^{-\theta(W_0 + X_0)} + \theta(A_1 - W_0 - X_0)^+); \end{aligned}$$

here the Lindley recursion (9) has been used.

Our objective is to analyze the MLE of both λ and θ for a sample of size n , which we denote by $(\hat{\lambda}_n, \hat{\theta}_n)$. We assume (A1)–(A2) hold, i.e., compact parameter space and stationary W_0 . In addition, (A3) holds because H_θ is exponential for all $\theta \in \Theta$. The log-likelihood $\ell_1(\lambda, \theta)$ is Lipschitz continuous (with respect to the observations) and so (A5) holds. We thus have that Theorem 1 holds and the MLE for (λ, θ) is strongly consistent.

Clearly this is a smooth function. We proceed by computing the gradient and Hessian with respect to (θ, λ) . It takes some elementary calculus to verify that gradient is given by

$$\nabla(\ell_1(\lambda, \theta))_\lambda = \frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\theta} (e^{-\theta W_1} - e^{-\theta(W_0 + X_0)} + \theta(A_1 - W_0 - X_0)^+), \quad (48)$$

$$\nabla(\ell_1(\lambda, \theta))_\theta = -W_1 - \frac{\lambda}{\theta^2} [(\theta(W_0 + X_0) + 1)e^{-\theta(W_0 + X_0)} - (\theta W_1 + 1)e^{-\theta W_1}]. \quad (49)$$

For any given value of θ , $\ell_1(\lambda, \theta)$ is a concave function in λ , and therefore the MLE of (47) is given by

$$\hat{\lambda}_n(\theta) = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (e^{-\theta W_i} - e^{-\theta(W_{i-1} + X_{i-1})} + \theta(A_i - W_{i-1} - X_{i-1})^+) \right)^{-1} \theta. \quad (50)$$

The MLE $\hat{\theta}_n$ now follows by maximizing $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_1(\theta, \hat{\lambda}_n(\theta))$ for $\theta \in \Theta$. The optimizing θ is obtained either on the boundary of the parameter space Θ or by solving the first order condition $\nabla(\ell_1(\theta, \hat{\lambda}_n(\theta)))_\theta = 0$. As $n \rightarrow \infty$ we are guaranteed to find an interior solution as long as $\theta_0 \in \Theta^\circ$.

Taking second derivatives, we find that the entries of the Hessian matrix are given by

$$\nabla^2(\ell_1(\lambda, \theta))_{\lambda, \lambda} = -\frac{1}{\lambda^2},$$

$$\nabla^2(\ell_1(\lambda, \theta))_{\theta, \lambda} = \nabla^2(\ell_1(\lambda, \theta))_{\lambda, \theta} = -\frac{1}{\theta^2} [(\theta(W_0 + X_0) + 1)e^{-\theta(W_0 + X_0)} - (\theta W_1 + 1)e^{-\theta W_1}],$$

$$\nabla^2(\ell_1(\lambda, \theta))_{\theta, \theta} = -\frac{\lambda}{\theta^3} \left[(1 + (\theta W_1 + 1)^2)e^{-\theta W_1} - (1 + (\theta(W_0 + X_0) + 1)^2)e^{-\theta(W_0 + X_0)} \right].$$

As $w^k e^{-\theta w}$ is a bounded function on $w \in [0, \infty)$ for any $\theta > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we conclude that $-\text{E}\nabla^2(\ell_1(\lambda_0, \theta_0)) < \infty$ and therefore (A4) applies, which implies that Theorem 2 holds. In particular, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sqrt{n} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\lambda}_n - \lambda_0 \\ \hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow_d \text{N}(0, I(\lambda_0, \theta_0)),$$

and the asymptotic covariance is given by the inverse of the Hessian,

$$I(\lambda_0, \theta_0) = -\text{E}\nabla^2(\ell_1(\lambda_0, \theta_0)).$$

We performed numerical experiments to assess the performance of the estimation procedure. Table 1 presents approximated confidence intervals for the maximum-likelihood

estimators $(\widehat{\lambda}_n, \widehat{\theta}_n)$; in addition we also evaluated the estimator of the arrival rate based on idle periods, denoted by $\widetilde{\lambda}_n$, as discussed in Section 3.3. The confidence intervals are evaluated for three congestion levels, namely $\rho = \lambda EX \in \{0.5, 1, 2\}$. In all experiments the sample size (of observed waiting times) was $n = 1000$. Evidently, however, the heavier the system load, the fewer the number of idle periods: on average $C_n = C_{1000}$ equals 665, 457, and 267 for the three congestion levels.

The numerical output is summarized in Table 1. A first observation is that the MLE for $\widehat{\theta}_n$ is more accurate as the system load increases. This is because the patience threshold is reached more often and therefore the data is more informative. Furthermore, for a lightly loaded system the MLE $\widehat{\lambda}_n$ and idle-period based estimator $\widetilde{\lambda}_n$ yield similar (accurate) results, as opposed to the high-load regime in which the two estimators behave quite differently:

- As a consequence of the fact that idle periods are observed considerably less frequently for a high load, $\widetilde{\lambda}_n$ becomes substantially less accurate.
- The accuracy of $\widehat{\lambda}_n$, however, is only slightly reduced in the high-load regime. This is potentially due to the better accuracy of the estimation of θ , being jointly estimated with λ in the MLE procedure.

In the most heavily loaded example ($\rho = 2$, that is) the 95% confidence interval of the MLE is very similar to the 80% confidence interval of the idle-period based estimator. We conclude that even though the observations of the waiting times and the effective interarrival observations are highly dependent, the MLE $\widehat{\lambda}_n$ provides substantially better confidence intervals than the idle-period based estimator $\widetilde{\lambda}_n$.

4.2. (Generalized) hyperexponential patience. This subsection focuses on the case of the patience-level distribution being generalized hyperexponential (GHE), meaning that the corresponding cdf can be written as a mixture of exponential cdfs, with weights that sum to 1 but that are not necessarily positive — this in contrast with the standard hyperexponential (HE) distribution, where the weights are assumed to be positive. This case is particularly relevant because, as argued in [33], this distribution has a good empirical fit to patience data. Another motivation for considering this distribution lies in the known fact that the cdf of any continuous positive random variable can be approximated arbitrarily accurately (in terms of a suitably defined metric) by a GHE cdf [5].

For convenience we now assume the arrival rate λ to be known, but it is noted that it can be estimated in a similar manner as in the exponential case discussed in Section 4.1. Suppose the degree of the GHE distribution is $p \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\overline{H}_\theta(x) = \sum_{k=1}^p \alpha_k e^{-\beta_k x}, \quad x \geq 0,$$

where $\theta = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p) \in \mathbb{R}^{2p}$, $\sum_{k=1}^p \alpha_k = 1$ (where we, importantly, do not assume the α_k to be positive) and $\beta_k > 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$. Without loss of generality we assume that $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \dots > \alpha_p$. Denote the coordinates of the true parameter θ_0 by $(\alpha_{0k}, \beta_{0k})$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$. It means that we are to identify the $2p$ -dimensional parameter vector

$$\theta_0 = (\alpha_{01}, \dots, \alpha_{0p}, \beta_{01}, \dots, \beta_{0p}).$$

Similarly to the previous example of the exponential distribution, Assumptions (A1)–(A3) and (A5) are satisfied when assuming stationary waiting times and a compact parameter

| Estimator Load | | 80% | 90% | 95% | 99% |
|---------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| $\hat{\theta}_n$ | $\rho = 0.5$ | [0.423, 0.592] | [0.403, 0.620] | [0.386, 0.645] | [0.352, 0.691] |
| | $\rho = 1$ | [0.454, 0.555] | [0.441, 0.571] | [0.431, 0.586] | [0.407, 0.612] |
| | $\rho = 2$ | [0.469, 0.536] | [0.460, 0.546] | [0.453, 0.555] | [0.440, 0.573] |
| $\hat{\lambda}_n$ | $\rho = 0.5$ | [0.958, 1.048] | [0.948, 1.061] | [0.937, 1.074] | [0.918, 1.099] |
| | $\rho = 1$ | [0.955, 1.053] | [0.944, 1.067] | [0.933, 1.081] | [0.912, 1.104] |
| | $\rho = 2$ | [0.951, 1.061] | [0.936, 1.079] | [0.924, 1.096] | [0.901, 1.128] |
| $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ | $\rho = 0.5$ | [0.953, 1.052] | [0.941, 1.069] | [0.929, 1.082] | [0.909, 1.110] |
| | $\rho = 1$ | [0.944, 1.063] | [0.928, 1.083] | [0.915, 1.101] | [0.890, 1.134] |
| | $\rho = 2$ | [0.928, 1.085] | [0.908, 1.110] | [0.892, 1.134] | [0.862, 1.182] |

TABLE 1. Confidence intervals for the MLEs $(\hat{\theta}_n, \hat{\lambda}_n)$, as well as the arrival rate estimated from idle periods $\tilde{\lambda}_n$, for different confidence levels. A total of $n = 1000$ waiting observations were generated, $M = 10000$ times for each parameter setting. The parameter of the exponential patience parameter was $\theta = 0.5$, the arrival rate was $\lambda = 1$, and the service requirements followed a Gamma distribution with parameters (η, μ) with $\mu = 1$ and $\eta \in \{0.5, 1, 2\}$.

space Θ . Therefore, the MLE is strongly consistent by Theorem 1. One should be cautious when fitting a GHE distribution because of further conditions to be imposed on the parameters to make sure $\overline{H}_\theta(\cdot)$ is a proper cdf. Even though convergence to the true parameters of the distribution is eventually guaranteed, for finite samples the estimated parameters may not yield a proper distribution. For an in-depth discussion on these conditions and the identifiability of GHE distributions, we refer [5, Section 3].

Using the representation (13), the log-likelihood pertaining to a single observation is calculated in a similar manner as in the exponential case, yielding

$$\ell_1(\theta) = \log \lambda + \log \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \alpha_k e^{-\beta_k W_1} \right) - \lambda \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\alpha_k}{\beta_k} (e^{-\beta_k W_1} - e^{-\beta_k (W_0 + X_0)}) - \lambda (A_1 - W_0 - X_0)^+.$$

As follows with some elementary algebra, the gradient is then given by, for $j = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla(\ell_1(\theta))_{\alpha_j} &= \frac{e^{-\beta_j W_1}}{\sum_{k=1}^p \alpha_k e^{-\beta_k W_1}} - \frac{\lambda}{\beta_j} (e^{-\beta_j W_1} - e^{-\beta_j (W_0 + X_0)}), \\ \nabla(\ell_1(\theta))_{\beta_j} &= -\frac{W_1 \alpha_j e^{-\beta_j W_1}}{\sum_{k=1}^p \alpha_k e^{-\beta_k W_1}} - \frac{\lambda \alpha_j}{\beta_j^2} [(\beta_j (W_0 + X_0) + 1) e^{-\beta_j (W_0 + X_0)} - (\beta_j W_1 + 1) e^{-\beta_j W_1}]. \end{aligned}$$

The Hessian can be derived by computing the matrix of second derivatives. For the evaluation of the asymptotic covariance, a convenient alternative is to apply (23), i.e.,

$$I(\theta_0) = -\mathbb{E}\nabla^2(\ell_1(\theta_0)) = \mathbb{E}[\nabla(\ell_1(\theta_0))\nabla(\ell_1(\theta_0))^\top],$$

so as to avoid the symbolic evaluation of the matrix of second derivatives. The entries of $I(\theta_0)$ are finite because these are combinations of terms of the following types:

- Products of polynomials (of degree at most 2) and exponentials. For example, we come across a term that is, up to a multiplicative constant, $W_0^2 e^{-\beta_j W_0}$. Observe that the mapping $x \mapsto x^k e^{-x}$ is bounded for $x \geq 0$.
- Ratios of the form, e.g., up to a multiplicative constant

$$\left| \frac{W_1 e^{-\beta_j W_1}}{\sum_{k=1}^p \alpha_k e^{-\beta_k W_1}} \right| \leq W_1.$$

In addition, it is verified that if the patience-level distribution is light-tailed (which is the case for the GHE distribution), then the stationary waiting time W is also light-tailed and has finite moments. Indeed, note that (1) implies

$$v(x) \leq \lambda \bar{H}(0) \pi_0 + \lambda \int_0^\infty v(y) \bar{H}(y) dy = \lambda(1 - P_\ell),$$

so that we have from (3) that the density of W is bounded as $w(x) \leq \lambda \bar{H}(x)$, i.e., if the patience level distribution is light-tailed, so is W . As a consequence, from the above and Theorem 2, the estimation errors (scaled by \sqrt{n} , that is) converge to a multivariate normal distribution.

Although there are theoretical guarantees for the asymptotic performance of the MLE, computation of the MLE is not straightforward, even for small parameter spaces such as $p = 3$. It requires maximizing $\ell_n(\theta)/n$, i.e., solving a non-linear and non-concave program in $p \times (p - 1)$ variables, with both equality and inequality constraints. This is computationally highly challenging, and standard optimization methods may lead to local maxima. In particular, observe that $\nabla(\ell_1(\theta))_{\beta_j}$ is very small for large values of β_j , which implies that $\ell_n(\theta)/n$ displays very ‘flat’ behavior for large values of these β_j . Our experiments revealed that a direct implementation using standard optimization packages often led to points that were even not local maxima. As a consequence, we decided to write dedicated code to compute the MLE.

In our numerical experiments we have applied the following nested two-step optimization method.

- (a) For each vector of $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p)$ the objective functions $\ell_n(\theta)/n$ was maximized with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)$ using a conventional coordinate descent algorithm. This step was typically fast and accurate, as for given $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ the objective function behaves nicely. Now we have reduced the problem to an optimization over $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$.
- (b) Then a standard L-BFGS quasi-Newton method (see e.g. [9]) is applied to $\ell_n(\theta)/n$, so as to search for the optimal vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, with $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ being parameterized by $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, and with in addition the constraint $\sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i = 1$ being imposed.

Moreover, the search for the optimizing vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ was conducted multiple times for different initial values. The resulting method was rather slow, especially for a relatively large sample sizes n and/or a relatively large dimension p of the parameter space. However, it typically

| Estimator Load | | 80% | 90% | 95% | 99% |
|---------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| $\hat{\alpha}_{1n}$ | $\rho = 0.5$ | [0.500, 0.908] | [0.500, 0.967] | [0.500, 1.000] | [0.500, 1.000] |
| | $\rho = 1$ | [0.609, 0.791] | [0.583, 0.817] | [0.560, 0.840] | [0.516, 0.884] |
| | $\rho = 2$ | [0.660, 0.740] | [0.649, 0.750] | [0.639, 0.761] | [0.620, 0.780] |
| $\hat{\beta}_{1n}$ | $\rho = 0.5$ | [0.183, 0.317] | [0.164, 0.336] | [0.147, 0.353] | [0.115, 0.385] |
| | $\rho = 1$ | [0.223, 0.277] | [0.216, 0.284] | [0.209, 0.291] | [0.196, 0.304] |
| | $\rho = 2$ | [0.240, 0.260] | [0.237, 0.262] | [0.235, 0.265] | [0.230, 0.270] |
| $\hat{\beta}_{2n}$ | $\rho = 0.5$ | [0.539, 1.460] | [0.408, 1.592] | [0.295, 1.705] | [0.073, 1.930] |
| | $\rho = 1$ | [0.768, 1.232] | [0.702, 1.298] | [0.645, 1.355] | [0.533, 1.467] |
| | $\rho = 2$ | [0.870, 1.130] | [0.833, 1.167] | [0.801, 1.199] | [0.739, 1.261] |

TABLE 2. Confidence intervals for the MLEs ($\hat{\alpha}_{1n}, \hat{\beta}_{1n}, \hat{\beta}_{2n}$) based on a normal approximation for a sample size of $n = 100\,000$, for different confidence levels. The true values of the parameters ($\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$) of the HE patience were (0.7, 0.3, 0.25, 1), the arrival rate was $\lambda = 1$, and the service requirements followed a Gamma distribution with parameters (η, μ) with $\mu = 1$ and $\eta \in \{0.5, 1, 2\}$.

returns considerably more robust results than off-the-shelf optimization routines (that in addition tended to converge very slowly).

Table 2 presents the marginal confidence intervals obtained by the normal approximation for an example of a HE cdf $H_\theta(\cdot)$ with $p = 2$. Observe that the variance of the estimation error is large, even for a substantial sample size. The accuracy is much higher for the low rate of $\beta_1 = 0.25$ than the higher rate of $\beta_2 = 1$. This may be explained by the fact that the likelihood function is almost flat for high values of β_2 .

The results presented in Table 2 show that the estimates are concentrated around the true values. The variance of the estimation error, however, is high, even more so given the large number of observations used. It should be realized, though, that HE distributions are not always easily distinguishable, in the sense that seemingly different HE distributions may lead to a very similar cdf. Clearly, from a practical standpoint the main question is not whether the correct parameters are recovered, but rather whether the cdf corresponding to the estimated parameters provides a good fit with the true cdf. In this respect the main conclusion of our experiments is that our MLE procedure performs remarkably well. For example, in Figure 3 we illustrate this by presenting the true cdf and the estimated cdf based on four random samples (using $n = 10\,000$ observations). We have used the same

parameters as in Table 2, with $\rho = 1$. We observe that, although the fitted parameters greatly differ from the correct ones, the fit of the (complementary) cdf is highly accurate.




FIGURE 3. Tail distribution of HE customer patience compared with the estimated counterparts. The true values of the parameters $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2)$ are given by $(0.7, 0.3, 0.25, 1)$. The fitted distributions $H_{\hat{\theta}_n^{(i)}}(t)$, with $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, are based on independent samples of $n = 10\,000$ observations with the HE MLE for $p = 2$. The MLE parameters of the fitted functions are: $\hat{\theta}_{n,1} = (0.529, 0.471, 0.193, 0.736)$, $\hat{\theta}_{n,2} = (0.884, 0.116, 0.297, 1.969)$, $\hat{\theta}_{n,3} = (0.75, 0.25, 0.269, 1.031)$, and $\hat{\theta}_{n,4} = (0.573, 0.427, 0.212, 0.746)$. The arrival rate in the example is $\lambda = 1$, and the service requirements are Gamma distributed with parameters $(3, 2)$.

In the remainder of this subsection we further study the performance of the HE MLE. Our experiments lead to the conclusion that HE MLE provides a good fit even in cases where the true distribution is *not* HE (i.e., in misspecified scenarios). The examples mainly focus on fitting the target distribution by a (conventional) HE distribution, rather than a GHE distribution, by computing the MLE. The motivation behind this choice is that, when working with a GHE distribution, there is the additional complication that the estimated parameters may not yield a proper cdf. More specifically, the space of valid parameters is hard to characterize, let alone to be coded in terms of constraints of an optimization problem. Nevertheless, we would still like to exploit the extra versatility that the GHE class offers, so as to improve the fit (when compared to the HE MLE). This is especially relevant for scenarios in which the model is misspecified, bearing in mind that, as mentioned earlier, in principle any distribution can be arbitrarily accurately approximated by a GHE distribution..

With the above considerations in mind, we decided to implement the following (seemingly naïve) heuristic model selection method. We generate various *random* weight vectors α (equipped with a random size $p \in \mathbb{N}$). Then, for each of them, we optimize the likelihood function over β using only step (a) above. The best model is then chosen by comparing the various combinations of α and p relying on the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC).

The AIC encompasses both the log-likelihood and, in order to avoid overfitting, a penalty for the number of parameters [8]. Because step (a) can be performed highly efficiently, a main advantage of this heuristic is that it works very fast, even for bigger values of p , thus providing us with a technique to fit general continuous distributions. Recall from [5] that if we order the components of the weight vector (i.e., $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \dots > \alpha_p$), then a sufficient condition for $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ to yield a cdf is that $\alpha_1 > 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i \beta_i > 0$; we use this principle to select feasible solutions produced by the above heuristic.

Figures 4-6 illustrate the estimated survival function of using the HE MLE with varying weights for three examples of patience-level distributions. In the first example the patience-level distribution is indeed HE with $p = 4$, whereas the second and third example are misspecified (corresponding to a lognormal and Gamma patience-level distribution, respectively). For each distribution the MLE was computed using $p = 1, 2$, and 4 (where $p = 3$ has been left out because it is barely distinguishable from $p = 4$).

- As was the case in the setting of Figure 3, the experiments corresponding to the HE patience-level distribution show that, even for $p = 4$ and as many as $n = 10\,000$ waiting-time observations, the MLE does not accurately capture the true parameters. Nevertheless, the fit in terms of the cdf, as displayed in Figure 4, is remarkably good. We in addition performed the GHE fitting heuristic, which also provide a highly accurate fit and is considerably faster to compute than the MLE for $p = 4$.
- The case of lognormal patience, as illustrated by Figure 5, shows that the fit is quite good for all estimators except for $p = 1$ (i.e., an exponential distribution).
- Figure 6 presents the fitted distributions for Gamma patience. The fit of the HE MLE is decent, but, importantly, in this case the GHE heuristic performs considerably better than the HE MLE (for $p = 1, 2, 4$). The GHE heuristic selects a model with $p = 10$ weights.

4.3. Multiple servers and discrete queue length information. With some slight adaptations in place, our estimation procedure extends to the multiple-server case. The framework presented in this subsection differs from the previous analysis for the single-server case, in that we now consider the situation that the queue length is observed (rather than the workload). More precisely: we focus on the setting of an M/G/s queue (with $s \in \mathbb{N}$ denoting the number of servers), in which the service provider observes the number of customers in the system as well as the age of the jobs that are in service at any given time. Based on this information, the service provider announces the expected waiting time for a newly arriving customer.

We consider three possible scenarios here.

- (1) *Deterministic service:* We consider the case that $X_i = x$ for some $x > 0$. In this case the exact workload process can be reconstructed from the number of clients present in combination with the age of the clients in service. As a consequence, if $s = 1$ then the analysis of Section 3 can be directly applied. For $s > 1$ the likelihood (10) can be evaluated in a similar manner. Let $Q(t)$ denote the number of clients in the system at time t , including the clients in service. If $Q(t) < s$ then clearly the virtual waiting time is $W(t) = 0$ and any newly arriving client will join. Suppose now that at time t there are $Q(t) > s$ customers are in the system (implying that all s servers




FIGURE 4. Tail distribution of the customer patience, compared with its estimated counterparts. The true distribution $H_{\theta_0}(t)$ is HE, with its parameters $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4)$ given by $(0.5, 0.3, 0.15, 0.05, 0.4, 1.5, 0.1, 1)$. The fitted distributions $H_{\hat{\theta}_n^{(p)}}(t)$ are based on a sample of $n = 10\,000$ observations with the HE MLE for $p \in \{1, 2, 4\}$, and the GHE heuristic with $p = 4$. The arrival rate is $\lambda = 1$, and the service requirements follow a Gamma distribution with parameters $(3, 2)$.




FIGURE 5. Tail distribution of the customer patience, compared with its estimated counterparts. The true distribution $H_{\theta_0}(t)$ is lognormal with parameters $\mu = 0.5$ and $\sigma = 1$. The fitted distributions $H_{\hat{\theta}_n^{(p)}}(t)$ are based on a sample of $n = 10\,000$ observations with the HE MLE for $p \in \{1, 2, 4\}$, and the GHE heuristic with $p = 4$. The arrival rate is $\lambda = 1$, and the service requirements follow a Gamma distribution with parameters $(3, 2)$.

are working), and denote by $(r_1, \dots, r_s) \in [0, x]^s$ the ordered residual service times at all servers (so that $r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \dots \leq r_s$). If $Q(t)$ is between s and $2s$, then the newly arriving client has to wait for $Q(t) - s + 1$ clients to have left before her service starts. If $Q(t)$ is larger than $2s$, then all clients in service must have left, as well as




FIGURE 6. Tail distribution of the customer patience, compared with its estimated counterparts. The true distribution $H_{\theta_0}(t)$ is Gamma distributed with parameters $(1.5, 0.5)$. The fitted distributions $H_{\hat{\theta}_n^{(p)}}(t)$ are based on a sample of $n = 10\,000$ observations with the HE MLE for $p \in \{1, 2, 4\}$, and the GHE heuristic with $p = 10$. The arrival rate is $\lambda = 1$, and the service requirements follow a Gamma distribution with parameters $(3, 2)$.

all other clients in front of the new client (each of those taking x service time). More precisely, given $Q(t)$, the virtual waiting time faced by a new arrival at t is

$$W(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } Q(t) < s, \\ \sum_{k=1}^{Q(t)-s+1} r_k, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2}(Q(t) + 1) \leq s \leq Q(t), \\ \sum_{k=1}^s r_k + (Q(t) - 2s + 1)x, & \text{if } s < \frac{1}{2}(Q(t) + 1). \end{cases}$$

As long as there are no new arrivals, the virtual waiting time decreases linearly at rate s . A new arrival with patience Y joins if $Y \geq W(t)$. Therefore, the arrival process for the i -th arrival given an initial virtual waiting time of W_{i-1} is a time-inhomogenous Poisson process with rate $\lambda \bar{H}(W_{i-1} + x - s(t - \tilde{A}_{i-1}))$. The likelihood function (10) and subsequent MLE analysis can then be adapted accordingly.

- (2) *Exponential service*: If X_i is exponentially distributed with mean μ^{-1} , then the expected residual service time is μ^{-1} for any busy server, irrespective of the corresponding age. As a consequence, the expected waiting time for an arrival at time t , given the value of $Q(t)$, is

$$E[W(t)|Q(t)] = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } Q(t) < s, \\ \frac{1}{\mu}(Q(t) - s + 1), & \text{if } Q(t) \geq s. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, at state $Q(t)$, the effective arrival process is a homogenous Poisson process with rate $\lambda \bar{H}(E[W(t) | Q(t)])$. However, now every transition of the queue length, i.e.,

arrival or departure, changes the Poisson rate, so that the likelihood function is a product of the likelihoods of all up or down transitions of $Q(t)$. For deterministic patience ($Y = \theta$, that is) the MLE can only retrieve $\lfloor \theta \mu \rfloor$, as the expected waiting time jumps in units of the expected service time. This is because customers join according to a threshold rule such that they join only if

$$\frac{Q(t)}{\mu} \leq \theta,$$

and balk otherwise. Therefore, if \bar{q}_n is the highest observed queue length after n observations, then any $\theta \in [\bar{q}_n/\mu, (\bar{q}_n + 1)/\mu)$ is an MLE.

- (3) *General service*: If X_i has an arbitrary non-negative distribution, then the expected waiting time is determined by the queue length and the order statistic distribution of the residual service times. Consider for example the case $s = 2$. Then we have that, if $Q(t) = 2$ and the ages and residuals of the jobs in service at time t are (S_1, S_2) and (R_1, R_2) , respectively, then

$$E W(t) = E[\min\{R_1, R_2\} \mid S_1, S_2].$$

This computation may be rather elaborate in general. If this expectation can be evaluated, then we can again compute the rates of the inhomogeneous arrival rate between transitions of the queue.

The above can also be extended to different scheduling policies. For example the servers may have different queues and a new arriving client is routed to the queue with the shortest expected waiting time (conditional on this expected waiting time being lower than the client's patience level).

4.4. Unknown proportion of impatient customers. In this subsection we consider a system where an unknown proportion $\theta \in (0, 1)$ of the arriving customers has a known deterministic patience threshold $w > 0$. The other customers are patient and always join the queue. Suppose one wishes to estimate the fraction θ from data.

To this end, first observe that

$$H_\theta(x) = \theta \mathbf{1}_{\{x > w\}}.$$

Assumption (A4) is not satisfied because $H_\theta(x)$ is not continuous (in x) at $x = w$. However, with respect to θ we *do* have that $H_\theta(x)$ is continuous. In addition, $\ell_n(\theta)$ is concave, and therefore the MLE is given by the first order condition $\ell'_n(\hat{\theta}_n) = 0$. In this case we can apply results from [20] to establish strong consistency. In particular, the smoothness of $\ell'_n(\theta)$ enables direct verification of the sufficient condition (18). Asymptotic normality then follows by verifying the conditions of Theorem 2 directly.

4.5. Noisy delay messages. Suppose that the patience threshold is a constant θ but the customers do not observe their exact waiting time but rather some noisy estimate $W_e = e(W)$ for some random function e such that $E[W_e \mid W] = W$. We assume customers join based on this 'perturbed delay' W_e , i.e., if $W_e \leq \theta$. Suppose we are in the context that the parameters underlying the noise distribution are known, but the threshold θ is not.

The probability of joining at workload level W can be computed given the specific noise distribution. A few examples are:

- *Additive perturbations.* In this case $W_e = W + \epsilon$. One could for instance consider normally distributed perturbations: $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$, independent of W , with $\sigma > 0$. Let customers facing $W_e < \theta$ join the system. We thus have, with $\Phi(\cdot)$ the cdf of the standard normal distribution,

$$\overline{H}_\theta(v) = P(W_e \leq \theta | W = v) = P(\epsilon \leq \theta - v) = \Phi\left(\frac{\theta - v}{\sigma}\right).$$

- *Multiplicative perturbations.* Now $W_e = WG$, with G non-negative unit-mean, and independent of W . In this case

$$\overline{H}_\theta(v) = P(W_e \leq \theta | W = v) = P\left(G \leq \frac{\theta}{v}\right).$$

4.6. Admission price. Our estimation procedure can be exploited in the context of various problems rooted in operations research. Evidently, when having estimates of the arrival rate and the patience-level distribution, one could consider the option of increasing the service rate so as to potentially raise profits. Thus, the operational decision to be made is whether the increased revenues outweigh the cost of speeding up the service rate. In this subsection we consider another operations research related problem.

Suppose that the queue has an admission price of p and that customers are homogenous with a utility function as featuring in the Naor model [29]. More concretely, let there be constants r and c such that a customer will join the queue only if the workload w upon their arrival satisfies

$$r - p - cw \geq 0,$$

or, alternatively, w is smaller than the threshold value $(r - p)/c$. Now observe that for any fixed price p the threshold $\theta(p) = (r - p)/c$ can be estimated using the MLE procedure presented in Section 3.2. If one of the cost function parameters r and c is known, then the other parameter can be estimated directly. If both are unknown, then their estimation can be performed by an exploration procedure: set two prices, say p_1 and p_2 , and observe the system for each price. Supposing each of these two experiments is done with n clients, we let $\hat{\theta}_n(p_i)$ be the MLE for price $i = 1, 2$. Then the estimators for the cost function parameters r and c are given by, respectively,

$$\hat{r}_n = \frac{\hat{\theta}_n(p_1)p_2 - \hat{\theta}_n(p_2)p_1}{\hat{\theta}_n(p_1) - \hat{\theta}_n(p_2)}, \quad \hat{c}_n = \frac{\hat{r}_n - p_1}{\hat{\theta}_n(p_1)}.$$

Theorem 3, in combination with the continuous mapping theorem, implies that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, both $\hat{r}_n \rightarrow_{\text{as}} r$ and $\hat{c}_n \rightarrow_{\text{as}} c$. Furthermore, for large n confidence intervals for the stationary average revenue per unit of time can be approximated using (27). In particular, observing that the loss probability depends on the price, in self-evident notation,

$$n(\theta(p_i) - \hat{\theta}_n(p_i)) \rightarrow_d \text{Exp}\left[\frac{v_i(\theta(p_i))}{1 - P_\ell(p_i)}\right], \quad i = 1, 2,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This opens the possibility of approximating, for n large, the (joint) distribution of $n(\hat{r}_n - r_0, \hat{c}_n - c_0)$. Note that the loss probability P_ℓ needs to be estimated as well, e.g., by estimating the probability upon arrival for a given price and using (4) as outlined in Remark 2 in Section 3.2.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper has considered a service system in which clients potentially balk based on the workload level they face at arrival. The main objective concerned the development of a framework for estimating the arrival rate and patience-level distribution. Our approach resolves the complication that in our setup only non-balking clients are observed. Distinguishing between the case of a continuous patience-level distribution and constant patience, we developed MLE estimators and quantified their asymptotic properties. Through a sequence of examples and ramifications we have illustrated the performance and broad applicability of our findings.

We followed a parametric approach, a prerequisite being that we have knowledge of the parametric class of distributions in which the patience is contained. In this respect we can use earlier studies on client behavior such as [33] to pick a candidate class. In addition, as was argued in [5], generalized hyperexponential distributions are capable of approximating any positive distribution arbitrarily accurately, making them particularly appropriate. It is noted that determining the best degree p of this generalized hyperexponential distribution can be seen as a conventional model selection problem; see e.g. [8].

An alternative approach would be to pursue non-parametric estimation; cf. the results in [17] for the conventional case without balking. In this respect it may be of help that we can write, with $W(x)$ and $D(x)$ denoting the cdfs of the waiting times and sojourn times of non-balking customers respectively,

$$\overline{H}(x) = \frac{w(x)}{\lambda(W(x) - D(x))} \quad (51)$$

if $w(x) > 0$ and 0 else; the validity of (51) follows from combining (3) with the level-crossing identity

$$v(x) = \lambda(1 - P_\ell)(W(x) - D(x)), \quad x \geq 0, \quad (52)$$

whose right-hand side equals that of (1). The representation (51) entails that, to estimate $\overline{H}(x)$ non-parametrically, we are left with the task of estimating $w(x)$, $W(x)$, and $D(x)$ from the data. While it is clear how to do this for $W(x)$ and $D(x)$, estimation of $w(x)$ is more challenging; kernel-based techniques may turn out useful in this context.

While we have developed estimation procedures assuming the independence between the customers' service requirements and patience levels, one could think of an extension that allows dependence. Such an extension could, for example, model the situation in which customers with larger service requirements can be assumed to have more patience. Multi-class queueing models can be used to capture such dependence in service requirements and patience levels [35]. More specifically, suppose that there are two customer classes 1 and 2, where class k ($k = 1, 2$) customers arrive with rate λ_k and have service requirements (resp. patience levels), i.i.d. according to a class-dependent cdf $G_k(\cdot)$ (resp. $H_k(\cdot)$). It is natural to assume that the customer class is unobservable by the estimator, thus yielding a sequence of *dependent* service requirements and patience levels. In this setting, we have to estimate the service-requirement cdf $G_k(\cdot)$ jointly with the patience-level cdf $H_k(\cdot)$ (and the arrival rate λ_k) to compute the likelihood function corresponding to an observed sequence $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{X})$.

Another possible direction for future work concerns the situation in which each customer decides to balk based on her *sojourn time*, i.e., the workload seen by this customer just *after*

(instead of before) her arrival. If the customer precisely knows her service requirement, this problem is easily reduced to the one considered in this paper. The other obvious option is that she balks if the workload just before her arrival increased by a ‘guess’ of her service requirement exceeds her patience threshold.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. ANDREWS (1987). Consistency in nonlinear econometric models: A generic uniform law of large numbers. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 55:1465–1471.
- [2] S. ASMUSSEN (2003). *Applied Probability and Queues*, 2nd edition. Springer, New York.
- [3] F. BACCELLI, P. BOYER, G. HEBUTERNE (1984). Single-server queues with impatient customers. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 16:887–905.
- [4] P. BILLINGSLEY (1999). *Convergence of Probability Measures*. Wiley, Chichester, UK.
- [5] R. BOTTA AND C. HARRIS (1986). Approximation with generalized hyperexponential distributions: weak convergence results. *Queueing Systems*, 1:169–190.
- [6] O. BOXMA, D. PERRY, W. STADJE (2011). The M/G/1+G queue revisited. *Queueing Systems*, 67:207–220.
- [7] O. BOXMA, D. PERRY, W. STADJE, S. ZACKS (2010). The busy period of an M/G/1 queue with customer impatience. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 47:130–145.
- [8] K. BURNHAM, D. ANDERSON (2002). *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: a Practical Information-Theoretic Approach*. Springer, New York.
- [9] R. H. BYRD, P. LU, J. NOCEDAL, C. ZHU (1995). A limited memory algorithm for bound constrained optimization. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 16:1190–1208.
- [10] K. DĘBICKI, M. MANDJES (2015). *Queues and Lévy fluctuation theory*. Springer, New York.
- [11] A. DE KOK, H. TIJMS (1985). A queueing system with impatient customers. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 22:688–696.
- [12] J. DONG, E. YOM-TOV, G. YOM-TOV (2019). The impact of delay announcements on hospital network coordination and waiting times. *Management Science*, 65:1969–1994.
- [13] T. FERGUSON (1996). *A Course in Large Sample Theory*. Chapman & Hall, Routledge.
- [14] A. GORST-RASMUSSEN, M. HANSEN (2009). Asymptotic inference for waiting times and patiences in queues with abandonment. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, 38:318–334.
- [15] P. GUO, P. ZIPKIN (2007). Analysis and comparison of queues with different levels of delay information. *Management Science*, 53:962–970.
- [16] P. GUO, P. ZIPKIN (2008). The effects of information on a queue with balking and phase-type service times. *Naval Research Logistics*, 55:406–411.
- [17] M. HANSEN, S. PITTS (2006). Nonparametric inference from the M/G/1 workload. *Bernoulli*, 12:737–759.
- [18] R. HASSIN. (2016). *Rational Queueing*, CRC Press.
- [19] R. HASSIN AND M. HAVIV. (2003). *To Queue or Not to Queue: Equilibrium Behavior in Queueing Systems*, Springer.
- [20] R. HEIJMANS, J. MAGNUS (1986). Consistent maximum-likelihood estimation with dependent observations: the general (non-normal) case and the normal case. *Journal of Econometrics*, 32:253–285.
- [21] C. HEYDE (1997). *Quasi-Likelihood and its Application: A General Approach to Optimal Parameter Estimation*. Springer Science & Business Media, New York.
- [22] R. IBRAHIM (2018). Sharing delay information in service systems: a literature survey. *Queueing Systems*, 89:49–79.
- [23] Y. INOUE, T. TAKINE (2015). Analysis of the loss probability in the M/G/1+G queue. *Queueing Systems*, 80:363–386.
- [24] I. KOVALENKO (1961). Some queueing problems with restrictions. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications*, 6:205–208.
- [25] L. LIU, V. KULKARNI (2006). Explicit solutions for the steady state distributions in M/PH/1 queues with workload dependent balking. *Queueing Systems*, 52:251–260.

- [26] L. LIU, V. KULKARNI (2008). Busy period analysis for M/PH/1 queues with workload dependent balking. *Queueing Systems*, 59:37–51.
- [27] A. MANDELBAUM, N. SHIMKIN (2000). A model for rational abandonments from invisible queues. *Queueing Systems*, 36:141–173.
- [28] A. MANDELBAUM, N. SHIMKIN (2004). Rational abandonment from tele-queues: Nonlinear waiting costs with heterogeneous preferences. *Queueing Systems*, 47:117–146.
- [29] P. NAOR (1969). The regulation of queue size by levying tolls. *Econometrica*, 37:15–24.
- [30] B. PÖTSCHER, I. PRUCHA (1989). A uniform law of large numbers for dependent and heterogeneous data processes. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 57:675–683.
- [31] R. RANGA RAO (1962). Relations between weak and uniform convergence of measures with applications. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 33:659–680.
- [32] L. RAVNER, O. BOXMA, M. MANDJES (2019). Estimating the input of a Lévy-driven queue by Poisson sampling of the workload process. *Bernoulli*, 25:3734–3761.
- [33] A. ROUBOS, O. JOUINI (2013). Call centers with hyperexponential patience modeling. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 141:307–315.
- [34] R. STANFORD (1979). Reneging phenomena in single channel queues. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 4:162–178.
- [35] Y. SAKUMA, T. TAKINE (2017) Multi-class M/PH/1 queues with deterministic impatience times. *Stochastic Models*, 33:1–29.
- [36] A. VAN DER VAART (1998). *Asymptotic Statistics*, volume 3. Cambridge University Press.