



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**ANALYSIS AND DECENTRALISED OPTIMAL FLOW CONTROL
OF HETEROGENEOUS COMPUTER COMMUNICATION
NETWORK MODELS**

KU RUHANA KU MAHAMUD

FPP 1993 5

**ANALYSIS AND DECENTRALISED OPTIMAL FLOW CONTROL
OF HETEROGENEOUS COMPUTER COMMUNICATION
NETWORK MODELS**

By

KU RUHANA KU MAHAMUD

**Dissertation Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of
Science and Environmental Studies,
Universiti Pertanian Malaysia**

December 1993



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe deep gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Abu Talib Othman, Chairman of the supervisory committee, for suggesting the problem to me and for his constant guidance and continuous encouragement without which this work would not have materialised.

I am also thankful to co-supervisors, Dr. Ali Mamat and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Borhanuddin Mohd. Ali for their kind assistance and scholarly guidance.

I am indebted to the Government of Malaysia and Universiti Utara Malaysia for sponsoring this research.

I am also deeply grateful to my husband and my children for their patience, support and care.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
ABSTRACT	xix
ABSTRAK	xxii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Problem	5
Objectives of the Study	9
Significance of the Study	10
Organisation of the Thesis	12
II. MAXIMUM ENTROPY OF GENERAL QUEUEING NETWORK MODELS	14
Introduction	14
Review of Related Literature	14
Single Server General Queueing Networks with Multiclass Users	15
Multiserver General Queueing Networks with Multiclass Users	17
Large General Queueing Networks with Single Class Users, Single Server and/or Multiserver Centres	18
Flow Control in Communication Networks	19
Maximum Entropy in Queueing Theory	21



	The Principle of Maximum Entropy	23
	Norton's Theorem in Queueing Networks	26
	Summary	28
III.	NORTON-MAXIMUM ENTROPY METHOD FOR LARGE GENERAL QUEUEING NETWORKS	30
	Introduction	30
	The General Queueing Model	31
	Service Station Aggregation	35
	Norton-Maximum Entropy Algorithm	39
	Numerical Examples	39
	Summary	51
IV.	SINGLE SERVER GENERAL QUEUEING NETWORKS WITH MULTICLASS USERS	52
	Introduction	52
	Description of the Network	53
	Maximum Entropy Formulations	54
	One-Step Maximum Entropy Recursions	66
	Extension to Load Dependent Queueing Systems	72
	Numerical Examples	74
	Summary	84
V.	MULTISERVER GENERAL QUEUEING NETWORKS WITH MULTICLASS USERS	85
	Introduction	85
	Description of the Network	86
	Maximum Entropy for Multiserver General Queueing System with Multiclass Users	86



	One-Step Maximum Entropy Recursions	103
	Extension to Load Dependent Queueing Systems	110
	Numerical Examples	112
	Summary	120
VI.	DECENTRALISED OPTIMAL FLOW CONTROL OF SINGLE SERVER GENERAL QUEUEING NETWORKS WITH MULTICLASS USERS	122
	Introduction	122
	The Mathematical Model	124
	The Optimisation Criterion	129
	The Optimal Control	136
	Numerical Examples	148
	Summary	157
VII.	DECENTRALISED OPTIMAL FLOW CONTROL OF MULTISERVER GENERAL QUEUEING NETWORKS WITH MULTICLASS USERS	159
	Introduction	159
	The Mathematical Model	151
	The Optimisation Criterion	167
	The Optimal Flow Control of a GE/GE/ ∞ Finite Capacity Queue	171
	The Optimal Flow Control of a GE/GE/c Finite Capacity Queue	177
	Numerical Examples	194
	Summary	206



VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH	207
General Summary	207
Suggestion for Future Research	210
BIBLIOGRAPHY	213
APPENDICES	220
VITA	230



LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Comparison between Simulation (S), Maximum Entropy (ME) and Norton-ME (N-ME) for $M = 8$, $\mu_i = 8$, $i = 2, 3, \dots, 8$, $C_i^2 = 2$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, 8$	42
2	Comparison between Simulation (S), Maximum Entropy (ME) and Norton-ME (N-ME) for $M = 6$, $\mu_2 = 8$, $\mu_3 = \mu_4 = \mu_5 = \mu_6 = 10$, $C_1^2 = 1$, $C_2^2 = 0.5$, $C_3^2 = C_4^2 = C_5^2 = C_6^2 = 5$	44
3	Comparison between Simulation (S), Maximum Entropy (ME) and Norton-ME (N-ME) for $M = 7$, $\mu_3 = 8$, $\mu_i = 10$, $i = 1, 2, 4, \dots, 7$, all $C_i^2 = C_s^2$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, 7$	46
4	Comparison between Simulation (S_1, S_2) and Norton-ME (N-ME) for $M = 4$, $\mu_1 = 7$, $\mu_2 = \mu_3 = 10$, $C_i^2 = C_s^2$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$	48
5	Comparison between Simulation (S_1, S_2) and Norton-ME (N-ME) for $M = 6$, $\mu_1 = 8$, $\mu_i = 10$, $i = 2, 3, \dots, 5$, $C_i^2 = C_s^2$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$	50



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	The Structure of a Computer Communication Network	3
2	Typical Plot of Throughput versus Offered Load	7
3	Typical Plot of Time Delay versus Offered Load	7
4	Queueing Network	27
5	Equivalent Queueing Network	27
6	Subsystem 1 Shorted	28
7	A General Queueing Network with M Service Centres	32
8	A "Shorted" Subnetwork 1 (σ) Cyclic Queueing Network	35
9	A "Shorted" Subnetwork 2 (σ^*) Cyclic Queueing Network	36
10	A Flow Equivalent Load Dependent Two Stage Cyclic Queueing System	37
11	A Closed Queueing Network with Fixed Routing for $M = 8$, $\mu_1 = 8$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, 8$, $C_1^2 = 2$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, 8$	41
12	Time Delay versus Number of Users	42
13	A Closed Queueing Network for $M = 6$, $\mu_2 = 8$, $\mu_3 = \mu_4 = \mu_5 = \mu_6 = 10$, $C_1^2 = 1$, $C_2^2 = 2$, $C_3^2 = C_4^2 = C_5^2 = C_6^2 = 5$	43
14	Throughput versus Number of Users	43



15	A Closed Queueing Network for $M = 7$, $\mu_3 = 8, \mu_1 = 10, i = 1, 2, 4, \dots, 7$, $C_1^2 = C_s^2, i = 1, 2, \dots, 7$	45
16	Time Delay versus Number of Users	45
17	A Closed Queueing with Fixed Routing for $M = 4, c = 3, \mu_1 = 7, \mu_2 = \mu_3 = 10$, $C_1^2 = C_s^2, i = 1, 2, \dots, 4$	47
18	A Flow Equivalent Load Dependent Two Stage Multiserver Cyclic Queueing System	47
19	A Closed Queueing Network with Fixed Routing for $M = 6, c = 2, \mu_1 = 8, \mu_1 = 10$, $i = 2, 3, \dots, 5, C_1^2 = C_s^2, i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$	49
20	A Flow Equivalent Load Dependent Two Stage Multiserver Cyclic Queueing System	49
21	Time Delay versus Number of Users	51
22	Queueing Model for Multiclass Users and Single Server Centres	53
23	Transition Weight Diagram of a $G/G/1/N$ Queue with Single Class Users	58
24	Transition Weight Diagram of a $G/G/1/N$ Queue with Two Classes of Users	58
25	Transition 'Up' and 'Down' Rate of a $GE/GE/1/N$ with Two Classes of Users	69
26	Queueing Model for Two Classes of Users and Load Dependent Centres	73
27	Throughput of Class 1 and 2 users versus Total Offered Load ($N_1 = 5, N_2 = 10$)	75
28	Mean Queue Length of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load ($N_1 = 5, N_2 = 10$)	76
29	Overall Throughput versus Total Offered Load ($N_1 = 5, N_2 = 10$)	76



30	Overall Mean Queue Length versus Total Offered Load ($N_1 = 5, N_2 = 10$)	77
31	Throughput of Class 1, 2 and 3 Users versus Total Offered Load ($N_1 = 5, N_2 = N_3 = 5$)	77
32	Mean Queue Length of Class 1, 2 and 3 Users versus Total Offered Load ($N_1 = 5, N_2 = N_3 = 5$)	78
33	Overall Throughput versus Total Offered Load ($N_1 = 5, N_2 = N_3 = 5$)	78
34	Overall Mean Queue Length versus Total Offered Load ($N_1 = 5, N_2 = N_3 = 5$)	79
35	Virtual Circuit Link Model for Two Classes of Users ($C_0^2 = C_{1a}^2 = C_{1b}^2 = C_{2a}^2 = C_{2b}^2 = C_{2c}^2 = 0.5$)	79
36	Throughput of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load	80
37	Mean Queue length of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load	80
38	A Queueing Model for Virtual Circuit Link with two Classes of Users	81
39	Throughput of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load	82
40	Mean Queue Length of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load	82
41	Queueing Model for Multiclass Users with Single Server and Multiserver Queueing Centres	87
42	Transition Weight of a G/G/2 Queue with Two Classes of Users	92
43	Transition Weight of a G/G/3 Queue with Two Classes of Users	95
44	Transition Weight of a G/G/c Queue with Two Classes of Users	98
45	Transition Weight of a G/G/c/N Queue with Two Classes of Users	100



46	Transition 'Up' and 'Down' Rate of a GE/GE/c/N Queue with Two Classes of Users	106
47	Queueing Model for Two Classes of Users and Load Dependent Centres	111
48	Throughput of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load (G/G/2, $C_{\mu}^2 = 0.5$, $C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 2.0$)	113
49	Mean Queue Length of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load (G/G/2, $C_{\mu}^2 = 0.5$, $C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 2.0$)	113
50	Throughput of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load (G/G/3, $C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 0.5$)	114
51	Mean Queue Length of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load (G/G/3, $C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 0.5$)	114
52	Mean Response Time of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load (G/G/4, $C_{\mu}^2 = 0.5$, $C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 2.0$)	115
53	Mean Queue Length of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load (G/G/4, $C_{\mu}^2 = 0.5$, $C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 2.0$)	115
54	Throughput of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load (G/G/2/N, $N_1 = 5$, $N_2 = 10$, $C_{\mu}^2 = 0.5$, $C_{\lambda_1}^2 = 2.0$, $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0$)	116
55	Mean Queue Length of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load (G/G/2/N, $N_1 = 5$, $N_2 = 10$, $C_{\mu}^2 = 0.5$, $C_{\lambda_1}^2 = 2.0$, $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0$)	116



56	Throughput of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load (G/G/3/N, $N_1 = 5$, $N_2 = 10$, $C_{\mu}^2 = 0.5$, $C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 2.0$)	117
57	Mean Queue Length of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load (G/G/3/N, $N_1 = 5$, $N_2 = 10$, $C_{\mu}^2 = 0.5$, $C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 2.0$)	117
58	Throughput of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load (G/G/4/N, $N_1 = N_2 = 5$, $C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0$)	118
59	Mean Queue Length of Class 1 and 2 Users versus Total Offered Load (G/G/4/N, $N_1 = N_2 = 5$, $C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0$)	118
60	Overall Throughput versus Total Offered Load (G/G/4/N, $N_1 = N_2 = 5$)	119
61	Overall Mean Queue length versus Total Load (G/G/4/N, $N_1 = N_2 = 5$)	119
62	Model for Bottleneck Decentralised Flow Control	125
63	Transition 'Up' and 'Down' Rate of GE(n)/GE(n)/1/N with Two Classes of Users	128
64	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 0.5$, $c_1 = 0.3$, $c_2 = 0.6$, $\mu = 1$)	150
65	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0$, $c_1 = 0.3$, $c_2 = 0.6$, $\mu = 1$)	150



66	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 2.0, c_1 = 0.3, c_2 = 0.6, \mu = 1$)	151
67	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 5.0, c_1 = 0.3, c_2 = 0.6, \mu = 1$)	151
68	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 5.0, c_1 = 0.3, c_2 = 0.4, \mu = 1$)	152
69	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 5.0, c_1 = 0.3, c_2 = 0.2, \mu = 1$)	152
70	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 0.5, c_1 = 0.3, c_2 = 0.6, \mu = 1$)	153
71	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0, c_1 = 0.3, c_2 = 0.6, \mu = 1$)	153
72	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 2.0, c_1 = 0.3, c_2 = 0.6, \mu = 1$)	154
73	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 5.0, c_1 = 0.3, c_2 = 0.6, \mu = 1$)	154



74	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 5.0, c_1 = 0.3, c_2 = 0.4, \mu = 1$)	155
75	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 5.0, c_1 = 0.3, c_2 = 0.2, \mu = 1$)	155
76	Throughput versus Time Delay (L_1 is fixed, $C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0$)	156
77	Throughput versus Time Delay (L_2 is fixed, $C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0$)	156
78	Queueing Model for Bottleneck Decentralised Flow Control	162
79	Transition 'Up' and 'Down' Rate of GE(n)/GE(n)/c/N Queue with Two Classes of Users	165
80	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 0.5, c_1 = 0.6, c_2 = 1.0, \mu = 1, c = 2$)	197
81	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0, c_1 = 0.6, c_2 = 1.0, \mu = 1, c = 2$)	197
82	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 2.0, c_1 = 0.6, c_2 = 1.0, \mu = 1, c = 2$)	198
83	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 0.5, c_1 = 0.6, c_2 = 1.0, \mu = 1, c = 2$)	198



84	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0, c_1 = 0.6, c_2 = 1.0, \mu = 1, c = 2) \dots$	199
85	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 2.0, c_1 = 0.6, c_2 = 1.0, \mu = 1, c = 2) \dots$	199
86	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 0.5, c_1 = 1.2, c_2 = 1.4, \mu = 1, c = 3) \dots$	200
87	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0, c_1 = 1.2, c_2 = 1.4, \mu = 1, c = 3) \dots$	200
88	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 5.0, c_1 = 1.2, c_2 = 1.4, \mu = 1, c = 3) \dots$	201
89	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 5.0, c_1 = 1.2, c_2 = 1.0, \mu = 1, c = 3) \dots$	201
90	Throughput versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 5.0, c_1 = 1.2, c_2 = 0.6, \mu = 1, c = 3) \dots$	202
91	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 0.5, c_1 = 1.2, c_2 = 1.4, \mu = 1, c = 3) \dots$	202



92	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0, c_1 = 1.2, c_2 = 1.4, \mu = 1, c = 3) \dots\dots$	203
93	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 5.0, c_1 = 1.2, c_2 = 1.4, \mu = 1, c = 3) \dots\dots$	203
94	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 5.0, c_1 = 1.2, c_2 = 1.0, \mu = 1, c = 3) \dots\dots$	204
95	Time Delay versus Control ($C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 =$ $C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 5.0, c_1 = 1.2, c_2 = 0.6, \mu = 1, c = 3) \dots\dots$	204
96	Throughput versus Time Delay (L_1 is fixed, $C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0, \mu = 1, c = 3) \dots\dots\dots$	205
97	Throughput versus Time Delay (L_2 is fixed, $C_{\mu}^2 = C_{\lambda_1}^2 = C_{\lambda_2}^2 = 1.0, \mu = 1, c = 3) \dots\dots\dots$	205



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CPU	:	Central Processing Unit
FCFS	:	First-Come-First-Served
GE	:	Generalised Exponential
H_2	:	Two Phase Hyperexponential
I/O	:	Input/Output
ME	:	Maximum Entropy
N-ME	:	Norton-Maximum Entropy
PME	:	Principle of Maximum Entropy
S	:	Simulation



Abstract of dissertation submitted to the Senate of Universiti Pertanian Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

**ANALYSIS AND DECENTRALISED OPTIMAL FLOW CONTROL
OF HETEROGENEOUS COMPUTER COMMUNICATION
NETWORK MODELS**

by

KU RUHANA KU MAHAMUD

December 1993

Chairman : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Abu Talib Othman

Faculty : Science and Environmental Studies

General closed queueing networks are used to model the local flow control in multiclass computer communication networks with single and multiple transmission links. The problem of analysing multiclass general closed queueing network models with single server and multiserver is presented followed by the problem of decentralised optimal local flow control of multiclass general computer communication networks with single and multiple transmission links. The generalised exponential (GE) distributional model with known first two moments has been used to represent general interarrival and transmission time distributions as various users have various traffic characteristics.

A new method of general model reduction using the Norton's theorem for general queueing networks in conjunction with the universal maximum entropy algorithm is proposed for the analysis of



large general closed queueing networks. This extension to Norton's theorem has an advantage over the direct application of the universal maximum entropy approach whereby the study of a subset of queueing centres of interest can be done without repeatedly solving the entire network.

The principle of maximum entropy is used to derive new approximate solutions for the joint queue length distributions of multiclass general queueing network models with single server and multiserver and favourable comparisons with other methods are made. The decentralised optimal local flow control of the multiclass computer communication networks with single and multiple transmission links is shown to be a state dependent window type mechanism that has been traditionally used in practice. The maximum number of packets in transit within the system corresponding to a maximum throughput and can be determined from a preassigned upper bound on the mean time delay, the average allowed load and the parameters of the underlying systems. The direct dependence of the maximum throughput on the mean time delay is also determined. The optimal local flow control with global objectives results in a team decision that does not favour any individual user, and depends only on the relative order of their packet generation rates.

Numerical examples provide useful informations on how critically system behaviour is affected by (i) the distributional form of the interarrival and transmission patterns, (ii) the maximum input rate. The analytic results described in this thesis suggest that (i) analytical analysis for general closed queueing networks which are



used to model computer communication networks can be analysed using the principle of maximum entropy, (ii) congestion problems in computer communication networks with non-exponential data flows should be examined in terms of maximum throughput under a time delay constraint where the offered load appears only as a parameter.



Abstrak disertasi yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Pertanian Malaysia bagi memenuhi syarat untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**ANALISIS DAN KAWALAN ALIRAN OPTIMA NYAHPUSAT
BAGI MODEL-MODEL
RANGKAIAN KOMUNIKASI KOMPUTER HETEROGEN**

Oleh

KU RUHANA KU MAHAMUD

Disember 1993

Pengerusi : Prof. Madya Dr. Abu Talib Othman

Fakulti : Sains dan Pengajian Alam Sekitar

Rangkaian-rangkaian giliran umum tertutup digunakan untuk memodel kawalan aliran setempat dalam rangkaian komunikasi komputer multi-kelas dan satu atau beberapa pautan transmisi. Masalah bagi menganalisis model-model rangkaian giliran tertutup multi-kelas dengan satu-pelayan dan multi-pelayan diperkenalkan diikuti oleh masalah kawalan aliran optima nyahpusat setempat untuk rangkaian-rangkaian komunikasi komputer umum multi-kelas dengan satu dan beberapa pautan transmisi. Model taburan eksponen teritlak (GE) dengan mengetahui dua momen pertama digunakan untuk mewakili taburan-taburan masa antara ketibaan dan transmisi di mana setiap pengguna mempunyai ciri-ciri trafik yang berbagai.

Satu kaedah baru penurunan model umum menggunakan teorem Norton untuk rangkaian giliran umum dan algoritma entropi maksimum umum dicadangkan bagi menganalisis rangkaian-rangkaian giliran tertutup yang besar. Lanjutan kepada teorem Norton ini mempunyai satu kelebihan



dari penggunaan terus entropi maksimum umum yang mana kajian berparameter bagi satu subset pusat giliran yang diminati boleh dilakukan tanpa mengulang menyelesaikan keseluruhan rangkaian.

Prinsip entropi maksimum diguna untuk menerbitkan penyelesaian anggaran baru taburan-taburan gabungan panjang giliran untuk rangkaian giliran umum tertutup multi-kelas dengan satu-pelayan dan multi-pelayan dan perbandingan yang baik dengan kaedah-kaedah lain dibuat. Kawalan aliran optima nyahpusat setempat untuk rangkaian komunikasi komputer multi-kelas dengan satu atau beberapa pautan transmisi adalah mekanisma jenis tingkap bersandar kepada keadaan yang digunakan secara tradisi. Bilangan maksimum paket dalam transit sistem berpadanan dengan perolehan maksimum dan boleh ditentukan dari batas atas yang diberi untuk min masa lewat, purata beban dan parameter-parameter sistem. Persandaran terus perolehan maksimum ke atas min masa lewat juga ditentukan. Kawalan aliran optima setempat dengan objektif sejagat menghasilkan keputusan kumpulan yang tidak mengambil kira setiap pengguna dan sebaliknya bergantung pada giliran relatif pengeluaran paket.

Contoh-contoh numerik memberi maklumat penting tentang bagaimana kritikal perilaku sistem dipengaruhi oleh (i) bentuk taburan antara ketibaan dan corak transmisi (ii) kadar maksimum input. Keputusan analitik dalam tesis ini mencadangkan (i) analisis analitik untuk rangkaian giliran tertutup umum yang digunakan untuk memodel rangkaian-rangkaian komunikasi komputer boleh dianalisis dengan menggunakan prinsip entropi maksimum (ii) masalah kesesakan dalam rangkaian komunikasi komputer dengan aliran data bukan eksponen patut



dikaji dalam sebutan perolehan maksimum di bawah kekangan masa lewat di mana beban yang diberi merupakan satu parameter sahaja.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The interest in computer communication networks has grown enormously in the last thirty years. The growth in the need for data communications comes from a large number of varied application areas. The finance industry including banking and insurance firms, has a growing need for remote data processing (i.e. electronic fund transfers etc.). In the field of medicine and health, there is a need for large information banks with remote access. Educational computing needs currently emphasizes interactive use as opposed to routine data entry, retrieval and acquisition. Large government agencies have vast data exchange requirements. Tactical military computer communication needs are perhaps the largest and most demanding (i.e. secure, rapid, reliable). Application such as these and many others that are providing the manpower, time and money behind the enormous growth of the information processing industry. As the result, computer systems and computer communication networks become highly complicated and complex in term of data management where different classes of users have their own characteristic and quality of service (QOS) requirements such as throughput, time delay, cost and error rate. In this context, a computer network can be viewed as a facility that makes possible communication between computers and other devices. Major components of the network include the connecting links, the interface between devices and the network, and protocols, which are rules for managing the network resources.

