ON THE OPTIMALITY OF 'JOIN THE SHORTEST WORKLOAD'

PASCAL MOYAL

ABSTRACT. We investigate the optimality of the 'Join the Shortest Workload' (JSW) policy for a system of several parallel queues. After stating a general stability result for any parallel system of $S$ queues in which the incoming customers join the queue having the $P$th shortest workload ($P \leq S$), whenever no server is immediately available, we show in which sense JSW is optimal at equilibrium among this class of allocation policies. We show by the way, in what sense it is better to have more parallel queues for JSW systems.

1. Introduction

Assume that a customer enters a system of $S$ parallel single-server queues, from which he/she knows the exact remaining quantity of work to be achieved. It seems good sense that this customer will aim to join the queue having the shortest remaining workload, as this will in turn, minimize his/her sojourn time in the system (at least if the service discipline in each queue if First In, First Out). In this paper, we adopt the point of view of the system designer, by wondering whether the later allocation policy, called hereafter JSW for 'Join the Shortest Workload', is preferable for the system itself. Is JSW optimal, and if it is, in what sense?

Neveu [12] shows a stability condition for parallel queues under the JSW policy and general assumptions, based on the representation of Kiefer and Wolfowitz: to describe the JSW system by a stochastic recursive sequence, one keeps track upon arrival times, of a random vector gathering all residual service times, in increasing order. In what follows, this vector will be called service profile of the system. Then, the latter stability results are inherited from the monotonicity of the service profile sequence in some sense, and a minimal stationary profile is given by Loynes’s Theorem [10]. Foss [5] and Brandt [3] then introduce the concept of maximal stationary profile for JSW queues.

It is interesting to notice that all these seminal papers on parallel queues adopt a priori the JSW policy without putting forward any mathematical argument other than the intuitive explanation provided above. However, it should be clear that identifying the shortest workload to chose the right queue to welcome any incoming customer, is algorithmically expensive. So it would be insightful to motivate the choice of this particular policy by some objective optimality property at equilibrium, from the point of view of the system designer. Let us notice that an abundant literature has investigated the optimality of the Join the Shortest Queue (JSQ) policy, when no information is known on the workload of each server, see [13] [7] [9] [8]. The extension of these approaches to the case addressed in this paper is not
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mathematically pertinent: the state descriptor is of completely different nature, as it keeps track of the number of customers in each queue, an information which is not available with our representation. Moreover, the underlying process can be studied dynamically using Markovian techniques only under specific assumptions on the input of the system, such as independence and (sub/super) exponential distributions for the random sequences under consideration. So such models are mathematically quite different from the ones addressed here. Note nevertheless that [8] gives under such statistical assumptions, a particular optimality criterion for JSW with respect to JSQ.

The aim of this paper is to provide, under the most general statistical assumptions on the system parameters, a proper mathematical framework to address the question of optimality of the JSW policy. We compare JSW with alternative policies consisting in sending, if no queue is empty, any incoming customer to the queue having the $P$-th shortest workload ($P \geq 1$). For this, we first propose an exhaustive stability study for this wide class of systems, hence generalizing the stability results quoted above. Then, we show that JSW is optimal at equilibrium, in a certain sense that is specified in Theorem 2. As a by-product of this result, we show in Section 6 in what sense, a JSW system of $S$ queues performs better at equilibrium than one of $N$ queues for $N \leq S$. The main comparison results underpining our main results are left to the Appendix.

2. Preliminary

In what follows, $\mathbb{R}$ denotes the real line and $\mathbb{R}^+$, the subset of non-negative numbers. Denote $\mathbb{N}$ (respectively $\mathbb{N}^*$, $\mathbb{Z}$), the subset of non-negative (resp. positive, relative) integers. For any two elements $p$ and $q$ in $\mathbb{N}$, $[p, q]$ denotes the finite family \{p, p + 1, ..., q\}. Let $S \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We denote for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^S$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$x = (x(1), x(2), ..., x(S));$$
$$\lambda x = (\lambda x(1), ..., \lambda x(S));$$
$$x + y = (x(1) + y(1), ..., x(S) + y(S));$$
$$0 = (0, ..., 0);$$
$$e_i = (0, ..., 1_i, ..., 0) \text{ for all } i \in [1, S];$$
$$x^+ = (x(1)^+, x(2)^+, ..., x(S)^+);$$
$$\bar{x}, \text{ the fully ordered version of } x, \text{ i.e. } \bar{x}(1) \leq ... \leq \bar{x}(S).$$

Denote then $\mathbb{R}^+$ the subset of fully ordered vectors, furnished with the euclidian norm. We equip $\mathbb{R}^+$ with the following orderings:

**Definition 1.** Let $u$ and $v \in (\mathbb{R}^+)$.  

(i) We denote $u \prec v$ if

$$u(i) \leq v(i) \text{ for all } i \in [1, S].$$

(ii) We denote $u \prec_* v$ if

$$\sum_{i=k}^{S} u(i) \leq \sum_{i=k}^{S} v(i), \text{ for all } k \in [1, S].$$
(ii) Let $P \in [1, S]$. We write $u \prec_P v$ if

$$\begin{cases} u \prec_\ast v; \\ u(\ell) \leq v(\ell) \text{ for all } \ell \in [P, S]. \end{cases}$$

The natural coordinatewise ordering "\(\prec\)" is a partial ordering, whereas "\(\prec_\ast\)" and "\(\prec_P\)" are two partial semi-orderings on \((\mathbb{R}_+)^S\), which are non-mass conservative declinations of the Schur-convex partial semi-ordering "\(\prec_\ast\)", defined in Definition 2.

3. Join one of $S$ parallel queues

We consider a queueing system having $S$ servers ($S \in \mathbb{N}^*$) working in parallel, each of them providing service in First in, first out (FIFO). We assume that a global information is available to all entering customers, on the quantity of work to be completed by each of the $S$ servers (termed workload of the corresponding server). Consider the following allocation policies: for any $P \in [1, S]$, in what will be called a $P$-system, any incoming customer is sent:

(i) to the queue having the $P$-th smallest workload among the $S$ servers if all the servers are busy, or

(ii) to a free server, if any.

Once in a given line, it is not possible anymore for any customer to leave the queue for another one. We add a superscript $^p$ to the parameters of the $P$-system. In particular, for $P = 1$ the customer allocation corresponds to the well-known Join the Shortest Workload (JSW) policy. For this particular case, we omit the superscript $^1$.

We will also be led to consider the following alternative allocation policies: for all $P \in [1, S]$, in the modified $P$-system the new customer joins the $P$-th smallest workload server, regardless of the fact that some server is available at this time or not. All the parameters of this system will be added a $^\sim$ and an exponent $^p$.

The input of the system is represented by a marked stationary point process, for which $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \theta)$ denotes the Palm probability space. We thereby assume that $P$-a.s. a customer enters the system at time 0 (the latter is denoted by $C_0$), requesting a service time of duration $\sigma$ (in an arbitrary time unit), and the following customer $C_1$ enters the system at time $\xi$. As a consequence of these basic assumptions, customer $C_n$ (where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$) requests a service duration $\sigma \circ \theta^n$, and the inter-arrival epoch between the arrivals of $C_n$ and $C_{n+1}$ equals $\xi \circ \theta^n$. We finally assume that $\theta$ is $P$-stationary and ergodic, that $\sigma$ and $\xi$ are integrable and that $\xi > 0$, $P$-a.s.. The reader is referred to the classical monograph [1, 4] for a complete overview of the ergodic-theoretical representation of queueing systems.

If $E$ is a partially ordered Polish space having a minimal point $0$, $X$ is a $E$-valued random variable (r.v. for short) and $\Psi$ is a $E$-valued random mapping, the stochastic recursive sequence (SRS) descending from $X$ and driven by $\Psi$ is defined by

$$\begin{cases} X_n = X; \\ X_{n+1} = \Psi \circ \theta^n (X_n), \ n \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases}$$
It is then routine to check that a time-stationary sequence having, on a reference probability space, the same distribution as \( \{X_n\} \) corresponds to a solution \( X \) defined on \( \Omega \) to the functional equation

\[
X \circ \theta = \Psi (X), \quad \text{a.s.}
\]

As stated by Loynes’s Theorem ([10], see also section 2.5.2 of [1]), in the case where \( \Psi \) is a.s. \( \prec \)-nondecreasing and continuous, a solution to \( (1) \) is given by the almost sure limit of the so-called Loynes’s sequence \( \{M_n\} \), defined by

\[
\begin{align*}
M_0 &= 0; \\
M_{n+1} &= \Psi \circ \theta^{-1} (M_n \circ \theta^{-1}), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.
\end{align*}
\]

**The service profile.** All systems of \( S \) parallel queues will be represented upon the arrival of \( C_n \), by the \((\mathbb{R}^+)^S\)-valued r.v. \( V_n \), representing the residual workloads of all servers (i.e. for each server, the sum of the service times of all the customers in line, and of the residual service time of the customer in service, if any, counted in time unit). The workloads of the servers are sorted increasingly, i.e. \( V_n(1) \leq V_n(2) \leq \ldots \leq V_n(S) \). \( V_n \) will be called *service profile* of the system.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
V(1) & V(2) & V(3) & V(S) \\
\hline
& & & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{2 customers} \\
\text{3 customers} \\
\hline
\text{2 customers} \\
\hline
\text{4 customers} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

**Figure 1.** The service profile

Define for all \( P \in \llbracket 1, S \rrbracket \), the following random maps:

\[
G : \begin{cases}
(\mathbb{R}^+)^S & \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^+)^S; \\
\quad u & \mapsto [u + \sigma e_1 - \xi, 1]^+;
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\tilde{G}^p : \begin{cases}
(\mathbb{R}^+)^S & \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^+)^S; \\
\quad u & \mapsto [u + \sigma e_P - \xi, 1]^+;
\end{cases}
\]

\[
G^p : \begin{cases}
(\mathbb{R}^+)^S & \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^+)^S; \\
\quad u & \mapsto G(u) 1_{u(1)=0} + \tilde{G}^p(u) 1_{u(1)>0};
\end{cases}
\]
\[ H^p : \begin{cases} \left( \mathbb{R}^+ \right)^S & \to \left( \mathbb{R}^+ \right)^S; \\ u & \mapsto H^p(u) \text{ s.t.} \\ H^p(u)(j) = \begin{cases} (u(j) \lor \sigma) \land u(j + 1) - \xi^+, & j \in [1, P - 1], \\ G^p(u)(j), & j \in [P, S]. \end{cases} \end{cases} \]

In particular, it clearly appears that \( G \equiv G^1 \).

Fix \( p \in [1, S] \). The dynamics of the \( p \)-system can be described as follows. Starting at 0 from the initial profile \( V^p_0 = (V^p_0(1), \ldots, V^p_0(S)) \in \left( \mathbb{R}^+ \right)^S \), the following generalization of the Kiefer and Wolfowitz equation is easily checked: for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \),

\[ V^p_{n+1} = G^p \circ \theta^n (V^p_n) \text{ a.s.} \]

Then, from (1) a time-stationary service profile is a \( \left( \mathbb{R}^+ \right)^S \)-valued r.v. \( V^p \), solution to the functional equation

\[ V^p \circ \theta = G^p (V^p), \text{ a.s.} \]

For \( P = 1 \), the random map \( G \) is a.s. \( \prec \)-nondecreasing and continuous, so Loynes’s Theorem entails that whenever

\[ \mathbb{E} [\sigma] < S \mathbb{E} [\xi], \]

there exists a solution \( V \) to

\[ V \circ \theta = G (V) \text{ a.s.}, \]

that is such that \( P [V(1) = 0] > 0 \). The aim of the following section is to solve (3) for any \( P \leq S \) and thereby, to generalize the latter result to any value of \( P \).

4. Stability study

Fix \( P \in [1, S] \) throughout the section. We address the questions of existence and uniqueness of a solution to (3). Clearly, if \( P \neq 1 \) the random map \( G^p \) defined above is neither \( \prec \)-nondecreasing, nor \( \prec_p \)-nondecreasing. Consequently, these questions cannot be addressed by a Loynes-type argument. We are therefore led to stochastically compare the SRS to a more simple one, driven by the random map \( H^p \) defined above. Define for all \( \ell \in \mathbb{N}^* \),

\[ Z_\ell = \left[ \sup_{k \geq \ell} \left( \sigma \circ \theta^{-k} - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \xi \circ \theta^{-i} \right) \right]^+. \]

We first have the following result.

**Proposition 1.** Let \( P \leq S \). If

\[ \mathbb{E} [\sigma] < \mathbb{E} [(S - P - 1)\xi] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\ell=2}^{P-1} Z_\ell \land \xi \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ Z_1 - \xi \right]^+, \]

the functional equation

\[ Y^p \circ \theta = H^p (Y^p) \text{ a.s.} \]

admits at least one \( \left( \mathbb{R}^+ \right)^S \)-valued solution \( Y^p \).
Proof. From Lemma \[6\] \((\mathbb{R}^+)^S\) is a.s. stable by \(H^p\) and \(H^p\) is a.s. \(\prec\)-nondecreasing. So Loynes’s Theorem guarantees the existence of a \(\prec\)-minimal solution \(Y^p\), towards which Loynes’s sequence \(\{M_n^p\}\) tends a.s. coordinatewise and increasingly. It remains to check that the r.v. \(Y^p\) is proper. We have for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}\),

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{M}_{n+1}^p(j) \circ \theta &= \begin{cases} 
\left( \hat{M}_n^p(j) \lor \sigma 1_{\hat{M}_n^p(1)=0} \right) \land \hat{M}_n^p(j+1) - \xi, & j \in [1, P - 1], \\
\left( \hat{M}_n^p(j) \lor \left( \sigma + \hat{M}_n^p(P) 1_{\hat{M}_n^p(1)>0} \right) \right) \land \hat{M}_n^p(j+1) - \xi, & j \in [P, S].
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

So taking the a.s. limit yields in particular

\[
Y^p(S) \circ \theta = \left[ Y^p(S) \lor \left( \sigma + Y^p(P) 1_{Y^p(1)>0} \right) - \xi \right]^+.
\]

In view of Lemma 1 of \[11\], we thus have that

\[
Y^p(S) = \left[ \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*} \left( \left( \sigma + Y^p(P) 1_{Y^p(1)>0} \right) \circ \theta^{-j} - \sum_{i=1}^{j} \xi \circ \theta^{-i} \right) \right]^+.
\]

Consequently, as \(E[\xi] \geq 0\), up to a negligible event we have that

\[
\{Y^p(S) = \infty\} \subset \{Y^p(P) = \infty\}
\]

and thus, as \(Y^p\) is sorted in increasing order,

\[
\{Y^p(S) = \infty\} = \{Y^p(i) = \infty, i = P, \cdots, S\}.
\]

As the event on the left-hand side is \(\theta\)-contracting, we are in the following alternative:

\(Y^p(i) < \infty\) a.s. for all \(i = P, \cdots, S\)

or

\(Y^p(i) = \infty\) a.s. for all \(i = P, \cdots, S\).

Consider the event

\[
D = \{Y^p(1) = 0\}
\]

and let for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}\),

\[
\tilde{U}_n = \sum_{i=1}^{S} \hat{M}_n^p.
\]

As \(\hat{M}_n^p(1) \not\prec Y^p(1)\) a.s., on \(D\) for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}\) we have that \(\hat{M}_n^p(1) = 0\), so

\[
\tilde{U}_{n+1} \circ \theta - \tilde{U}_n = [\sigma - \xi]^+ + \sum_{j=2}^{S} \left( \left[ \hat{M}_n^p(j) - \xi \right]^+ - \hat{M}_n^p(j) \right)
\]

\[
= [\sigma - \xi]^+ - \sum_{j=2}^{S} \hat{M}_n^p(j) \land \xi.
\]
Now, on $\tilde{D}$ there exists a (random) index $N$ after which for all $n$, $\tilde{M}_n^p(1) > 0$, so

\[
\begin{align*}
(9) \quad & \tilde{U}_{n+1} \circ \theta - \tilde{U}_n = \left[ (\sigma \vee \tilde{M}_n^p(1)) \wedge \tilde{M}_n^p(1) - \xi^+ - \tilde{M}_n^p(1) - \sum_{j=2}^{p-1} \tilde{M}_n^p(j) \wedge \xi \right. \\
& \quad \quad \quad - \sum_{j=P+1}^{S} \tilde{M}_n^p(j) \wedge \xi + \left( \tilde{M}_n^p(1) + \sigma - \xi \right)^+ - \tilde{M}_n^p(1) \\
& \quad \quad \quad = \left[ (\sigma \vee \tilde{M}_n^p(1)) \wedge \tilde{M}_n^p(1) - \xi^+ - \tilde{M}_n^p(1) \right. \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad - \sum_{j=2}^{S} \tilde{M}_n^p(j) \wedge \xi - \tilde{M}_n^p(1) \wedge (\xi - \sigma).
\end{align*}
\]

So if we have $Y^p(i) = \infty$ a.s. for all $i \in [P, S]$, from a certain rank we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{U}_{n+1} \circ \theta - \tilde{U}_n \\
& = (\tilde{U}_{n+1} \circ \theta - \tilde{U}_n) 1_D + (\tilde{U}_{n+1} \circ \theta - \tilde{U}_n) 1_{\tilde{D}} \\
(10) \quad & = [\sigma \vee \tilde{M}_n^p(1) - \xi^+ - \tilde{M}_n^p(1) - \sum_{j=2}^{S} \tilde{M}_n^p(j) \wedge \xi - (S - P)\xi - (\xi - \sigma)].
\end{align*}
\]

On another hand, $Y^p(P) = \infty$ implies that

\[
Y^p(P - 1) \circ \theta = [Y^p(P - 1) \vee \sigma - \xi]^+,
\]

which implies, again in view of Lemma 1 of [11], that

\[
Y^p(P - 1) = \left[ \sup_{k \geq 1} \left( \sigma \circ \theta^{-k} - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \xi \circ \theta^{-i} \right) \right]^+ = Z_1.
\]

Now, if we had $Z_1 > Y^p(P - 2) \vee \sigma$, we would have that

\[
Y^p(P - 2) \circ \theta = [Y^p(P - 2) \vee \sigma - \xi]^+,
\]

or in other words $Y^p(P - 2) = Z_1$ a.s., an absurdity. Therefore, $Z_1 \leq Y^p(P - 2) \vee \sigma$, hence $Y^p(P - 2) \circ \theta = [Z_1 - \xi]^+$, or in other words

\[
Y^p(P - 2) = \left[ Z_1 \circ \theta^{-1} - \xi \circ \theta^{-1} \right]^+ = Z_2.
\]

On an on, we obtain that

\[
Y^p(j) = Z_{P - j} \text{ for all } j \in [1, P - 1].
\]

So as the sequence $\{\tilde{U}_n\}$ is a.s. non-decreasing, by monotone convergence in (10), we obtain that

\[
0 \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ (\sigma \vee Y^p(1) - \xi)^+ - Y^p(1) - \sum_{j=2}^{P-1} Z_{P - j} \wedge \xi - (S - P)\xi - (\xi - \sigma) \right].
\]
In other words, \( Y^p(j) = \infty \) a.s. for all \( j \in [P, S] \) implies that

\[
\mathbb{E}[\sigma] \geq \mathbb{E}[(S - P - 1)\xi] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=2}^{P-1} Z_{P-j} \wedge \xi\right] + \mathbb{E}[Y^p(1)] - \mathbb{E}\left[(\sigma \vee Y^p(1) - \xi^+\right]
\]

\[
\geq \mathbb{E}[(S - P - 1)\xi] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{P-1} Z_{P-j} \wedge \xi\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[(\sigma \vee Y^p(P - 1) - \xi^+\right]
\]

\[
\geq \mathbb{E}[(S - P - 1)\xi] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{P-1} Z_j \wedge \xi\right] - \mathbb{E}[Z_1],
\]

which concludes the proof.

\( \square \)

We obtain the following stability result for the \( p \)-system:

**Theorem 1.** Assume that the input is GI/GI (i.e. the inter-arrival times and service times are mutually independent i.i.d. sequences) and that the distribution of \( \xi \) has unbounded support. Assume furthermore that either condition (6) holds, or

\[
(11) \quad \mathbb{E}[\sigma] < (S - P + 1)\mathbb{E}[\xi].
\]

Then, the equation (3) admits a proper solution \( V^p \).

**Proof.** First assume that (6) holds, and let again \( Y^p \) be the minimal solution of (7). The sequence \( \{Y^p \circ \theta^n\} \) thus corresponds to the stochastic recursion of initial value \( Y^p \), driven by the random map \( H \). Consider the event

\[
\mathcal{G} = \{Y^p(1) = 0\} \cap \left\{ \bigcap_{\ell = 2}^{S} \left\{ Y^p(\ell) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \xi \circ \theta^i \right\} \right\}
\]

and the following family of \((\mathbb{R}^+)^S\)-valued random variables:

\[
\mathcal{I} = \{Z; Z \prec Y^p\}.
\]

Fix \( Z \in \mathcal{I} \) and denote \( \{V^p_{Z,n}\} \), the service profile sequence of the \( p \)-system, starting from an initial profile \( Z \). It readily follows from assertion (iii) of Lemma 6 by a simple induction, that \( V^p_{Z,n} \prec Y \circ \theta^n \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Therefore, on \( \theta^{-n}\mathcal{G} \) we have that

\[
V^p_{Z,n}(1) = 0;
\]

\[
V^p_{Z,n}(\ell) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \xi \circ \theta^i; \ell \in [2, S].
\]

It is then easy to check that on \( \theta^{-n}\mathcal{G} \),

- in \( V^p_{Z,n+1} \), the coordinate corresponding to \( V^p_{Z,n}(2) \) vanishes and that corresponding to \( V^p_{Z,n}(1) \) becomes \([\sigma \circ \theta^n - \xi \circ \theta^n]^+\);
- in \( V^p_{Z,n+2} \), the coordinate corresponding to \( V^p_{Z,n}(3) \) vanishes, that corresponding to \( V^p_{Z,n}(2) \) becomes \([\sigma \circ \theta^{n+1} - \xi \circ \theta^{n+1}]^+\), and that corresponding to \( V^p_{Z,n}(1) \) equals \([\sigma \circ \theta^n - \xi \circ \theta^n - \xi \circ \theta^{n+1}]^+\).
... $V_{Z,n+S-1}^p$ has at least 1 null coordinate, and its $S-1$ last coordinates all are functions of $\{\sigma \circ \theta^i, \sigma \circ \theta^i\}, i \in \llbracket 1, n+S-2 \rrbracket$.

This entails that $\{\theta^{-n}G\}$ is a stationary sequence of renovating events of length $S-1$ for any sequence $\{V_{Z,n}^p\}$ with $Z \in \mathcal{I}$. Theorem 4 in [6] (see as well Theorem 1 p.260 in [2] and Corollary 2.5.1 in [1]) implies the existence of a solution to (3) provided that $\mathbb{P}[G] > 0$. To prove this, from the independence assumption and the unboundedness of the distribution of $\xi$ we clearly obtain that it suffices to show that

$$ (12) \quad \mathbb{P}[Y^p(1) = 0] > 0. $$

Let us assume that $Y^p(1) > 0$ a.s.. By monotone convergence in (9) we get that

$$ \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sigma \vee Y^p(1)\right) \wedge Y^p(P) - \xi^+\right] - \mathbb{E}[Y^p(1)] $$

$$ - \sum_{j=2; j \neq P}^S \mathbb{E}[Y^p(j) \wedge \xi] - \mathbb{E}[Y^p(P) \wedge (\xi - \sigma)] \geq 0. $$

So if we assume that

$$ (13) \quad \sigma \vee Y^p(1) > \xi \text{ a.s. and } Y^p(2) > \xi \text{ a.s.,} $$

we obtain the following inequality:

$$ \mathbb{E}[\sigma] \geq (S-1)\mathbb{E}[\xi] + \mathbb{E}[Y^p(1)] - \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sigma \vee Y^p(1)\right) \wedge Y^p(P) - \xi^+\right] $$

$$ = (S-2)\mathbb{E}[\xi] + \mathbb{E}[Y^p(1) + 2\xi] - \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sigma \vee Y^p(1)\right) \wedge Y^p(P)\right]. $$

On the other hand, (13) clearly entails that

$$ (14) \quad \mathbb{E}[\sigma] < (S-2)\mathbb{E}[\xi] - \mathbb{E}[Z_1]. $$

But since

$$ Z_1 \circ \theta = \left[\sup_{k \geq 1} \left(\sigma \circ \theta^{-k+1} - \sum_{i=1}^k \xi \circ \theta^{-i+1}\right)\right]^+ \geq \sigma - \xi, $$

since $Z_1$ is clearly integrable in view of Birkhoff’s Theorem, we obtain that

$$ \mathbb{E}[Y^p(1) + 2\xi - (\sigma \vee Y^p(1)) \wedge Y^p(P) + Z_1] $$

$$ = \mathbb{E}[Y^p(1) + 2\xi - (\sigma \vee Y^p(1)) \wedge Y^p(P)] + \mathbb{E}[Z_1 \circ \theta] $$

$$ \geq \mathbb{E}[Y^p(1) + 2\xi - (\sigma \vee Y^p(1)) \wedge Y^p(P) + \sigma - \xi] $$

$$ = \mathbb{E}[\sigma \wedge Y^p(1) + \sigma] \geq 0. $$

So (14) is in contradiction with (15). Consequently, (13) is false, which implies in turn that on a non-negligible event

$$ Y^p(1) \circ \theta = \left[(Y^p(1) \vee \sigma) \wedge Y^p(2) - \xi^+\right] = 0. $$

This contradicts the fact that $Y^p(1) > 0$ a.s., and this concludes the proof of (12).

Assume now that (11) holds. Set $\hat{V}^p$, the minimal solution to the equation

$$ \hat{V}^p \circ \theta = \hat{G}^p\left(\hat{V}^p\right) \text{ a.s..} $$
It is easily seen that \( \tilde{V}_p \) is nothing but the vector \( \left( 0, \ldots, 0, \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \right) \), where \( \tilde{\mathbf{V}} \) is the minimal \((\mathbb{R}^+)^{S-P+1}\)-valued stationary profile for a JSW system of \( S-P+1 \) parallel queues. In view of (11), the latter is finite and such that
\[
P \left[ \tilde{\mathbf{V}}(1) = 0 \right] > 0.
\]
We can then apply the same argument as above: setting the family of \((\mathbb{R}^+)^S\)-valued random variables
\[
\mathcal{J} = \left\{ Z; Z \prec \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^p \right\}
\]
and the event
\[
\mathcal{H} = \left\{ \tilde{V}^p(P) = 0 \right\} \bigcap \left\{ \bigcap_{\ell=P+1}^{S} \left\{ \tilde{V}^p(\ell) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-P-1} \xi \circ \theta^i \right\} \right\},
\]
item (iv) of Lemma 5 and an immediate induction then entails that \( \{\theta^{-n}\mathcal{H}\} \) are renovating events of length \( S-P \) for any sequence \( \{V^p_{Z,n}\} \) with \( Z \in \mathcal{J} \). Here again, \( P[\mathcal{H}] > 0 \) in view of (10) and the independance assumptions.

5. Optimality of JSW

The following result makes precise in what sense JSW is preferable to any other server allocation.

**Theorem 2.** Assume that (11) holds. Let \( V \) be the \( \prec \)-minimal solution of (3). Let \( P \leq S \). Then, all solutions \( V^p \) of (3) (if any) are such that \( V \prec V^p \), or in other words
\[
V(\ell) \leq V^p(\ell) \text{ for all } \ell \in [P, S];
\]
\[
\sum_{i=k}^{S} V(k) \leq \sum_{i=k}^{S} V^p(k) \text{ for all } k \in [1, S].
\]
Moreover,
\[
P [V \prec V^p] > 0.
\]
**Proof.** Define the following events :
\[
\mathcal{A} = \{ V \prec V^p \} ;
\]
\[
\mathcal{B} = \{ V^p(1) = 0 \} ;
\]
\[
\mathcal{C} = \{ V(1) = 0 \} ;
\]
\[
\mathcal{E} = \{ V \prec V^p \} .
\]
Recall that
\[
V^p \circ \theta = G(V^p) 1_{\mathcal{B}} + \tilde{G}^p(V^p) 1_{\mathcal{E}} .
\]
We first remark that
\[
P [\mathcal{B}] > 0.
\]
Indeed, if we had \( V^p(1) = 0 \) a.s. we would have a.s.
\[
V^p \circ \theta = \tilde{G}^p(V^p),
\]
which implies that a.s.

\[ V^p(1) \circ \theta = V^p(1) - \xi \]

and therefore \( E[V^p(1) - V^p(1) \circ \theta] < 0 \), a contradiction to the Ergodic Lemma (see [1], Lemma 2.2.1).

Define the r.v.

\[ \tilde{V} := V^p(1)_{\tilde{C} \cap \tilde{B}} + V 1_{C \cup \bar{B}}. \]

Then, a.s.

\[
\tilde{V} \circ \theta = G^p(V^p) 1_{\tilde{C} \cap \tilde{B}} + G(V) 1_{C \cup \bar{B}} \\
= G(V^p) 1_{\tilde{C} \cap \tilde{B}} + G(V) 1_{C \cup \bar{B}} \\
= G(V),
\]

which means that \( \tilde{V} \) is a \((\mathbb{R}^+)^S\)-valued solution of (5). So from the \(<\)-minimality of \( V \), we have \( V < \tilde{V} \) a.s.. But on \( \tilde{C} \cap \tilde{B} \),

\[ \tilde{V}(1) = V^p(1) = 0 < V(1) \]

and thus \( V \not< \tilde{V} \). This implies that \( P[\tilde{C} \cap \tilde{B}] = 0 \), or in other words

\[(21) \quad \{V^p(1) = 0\} \subset \{V(1) = 0\} \quad \text{up to a negligible event.}\]

Apply now the same argument to the r.v.

\[ \bar{V} = V^p 1_{\bar{E} \cap \bar{B}} + V 1_{E \cup \bar{B}}. \]

This is as well a \((\mathbb{R}^+)^S\)-valued solution of (5). So \( V < \bar{V} \). But on \( \bar{E} \cap \bar{B} \), \( \bar{V} = V^p \), so \( V \not< \bar{V} \). Hence \( P[\bar{E} \cap \bar{B}] = 0 \), which implies in turn with (20) that

\[ P[\bar{E}] \geq P[E \cap \bar{B}] = P[B] > 0 \]

and thus (19). Moreover, as \( u < v \) clearly implies \( u <_p v \) for all vectors \( u \) and \( v \), we also have

\[(22) \quad P[A] \geq P[\bar{E}] > 0.\]

Now, applying item (ii) of Lemma 5 yields that on \( \mathcal{A} \cap B \cap C \),

\[ V \circ \theta = G(V) <_p G(V^p) = V^p \circ \theta, \]

whereas from item (i) of Lemma 5 on \( \mathcal{A} \cap \bar{B} \),

\[ V \circ \theta = G(V) <_p G^p(V^p) = V^p \circ \theta. \]

So from (21), up to a negligible event we have that \( \mathcal{A} \subset \theta^{-1} \mathcal{A} \), in other words \( \mathcal{A} \) is \( \theta \)-contracting. (22) then implies that \( V <_p V^p \) a.s.. \( \square \)

**Remark 1.** The latter comparison result (and likewise, corollary 1, Theorem 3 and Corollary 4 below) can be adapted from the Palm representation that is adopted here, to the primary time-stationary queue, using a classical representation argument based on Strassen Theorem. More precisely, it can be deduced from Theorem 4 that on a reference probability space \((\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{P})\) on which the primary stationary sequences
of inter-arrival and service times are defined, the time-stationary distributions of the service profiles \( \bar{V} \) for JSW and \( \bar{V}^p \) for the \( p \)-system, satisfy

\[
\bar{V}(\ell) \leq_{st} \bar{V}^p(\ell) \quad \text{for all } \ell \in [P, S];
\]

\[
\sum_{i=k}^{S} \bar{V}(k) \leq_{st} \sum_{i=k}^{S} \bar{V}^p(k) \quad \text{for all } k \in [1, S],
\]

where "\( \leq_{st} \)" denotes the strong stochastic ordering associated to \( \mathbf{P} \).

**Corollary 1.** The JSW policy minimizes almost surely the waiting time at equilibrium among all admissible policies.

**Proof.** Let \( W \) (resp. \( W^p \)) denotes the stationary waiting time for JSW (resp. for the \( p \)-system). Then, in view of (17) and (21) we have a.s.

\[
W = V(1) \mathbb{1}_{V^p(1) > 0} \\
\leq V^p(S - P + 1) \mathbb{1}_{V^p(1) > 0} \\
= W^p.
\]

\( \square \)

6. **Comparison of two JSW systems**

We show hereafter, in which sense increasing the number of servers improves the performances of the system. Let \( 1 \leq N \leq S \) two integers, and consider two JSW systems having respectively \( S \) and \( N \) servers. We add to all the parameters involved, exponents \( s \) and \( n \) to emphasize the dependence on the number of servers. In the following, "\( \prec_s \)" is the partial ordering introduced in definition 1.

**Theorem 3.** If \( \mathbb{E}[\sigma] < N \mathbb{E}[\xi] \), then the minimal solutions of \( \bar{V}^s \) and \( \bar{V}^n \), respectively for \( S \) and \( N \) servers, satisfy a.s.

\[
\forall \ell \in [1, N], \quad V^s(S - N + \ell) \leq V^n(\ell);
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{S} V^s(i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} V^n(i).
\]

**Proof.** Define by \( \{M^s_n\} \) (resp. \( \{M^n_n\} \)), Loynes’s sequence for the service profile of the system of \( S \) (resp. \( N \)) parallel queues, representing the service profile seen by customer \( C_0 \) upon arrival, when assuming that customer \( C_{-n} \) entered an empty system (and accordingly for \( \{M^s_n\} \)). Let us consider for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), the \( (\mathbb{R}^+)^S \)-valued r.v. \( \tilde{M}^n_n \) defined by

\[
\tilde{M}^n_n = \left( 0, ..., 0, M^s_n(1), M^s_n(2), ..., M^s_n(N) \right).
\]

It is easily checked that for all \( n \),

\[
\tilde{M}^n_{n+1} = \tilde{G}^n \circ \theta^{-1} \left( \tilde{M}^n_n \circ \theta^{-1} \right).
\]
So as \( \{M^*_n\} \) and \( \{\tilde{M}^*_n\} \) descend from the same initial value 0, applying item (i) of Lemma 5 for \( P = S - N + 1 \) yields by a simple induction that a.s. for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \),
\[
\forall \ell \in \llbracket N, S \rrbracket, \quad M^*_n(\ell) \leq \tilde{M}^*_n(\ell);
\]
\[
M^*_n \prec \tilde{M}^*_n,
\]
which implies in turn that
\[
\forall \ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket, \quad M^*_n(S - N + \ell) \leq \tilde{M}^*_n(\ell);
\]
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{S} M^*_n(i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{M}^*_n(i)
\]
and (23) and (24) follow by taking the limit. \( \square \)

**Corollary 2.** If both systems are stable, the JSW system of \( S \) servers minimizes the waiting time as well at equilibrium w.r.t. that of \( N \) servers: almost surely,
\[
V^*(1) \leq V^*(1).
\]

**Appendix A. Partial (semi-) orderings on \((\mathbb{R}^+)^p\)**

We present hereafter several basic comparison results related to the various partial orderings used in the paper. The proofs of Lemmas 1 and 2 below are straightforward.

**Lemma 1.** For all \( u, v \in (\mathbb{R}^N)^S \),
\[
u \prec v \iff u + x.e_1 \prec_u v + y.e_1 \text{ for all } x \leq y.
\]

Let \( p \geq 1 \). The Schur-convex ordering "\( \prec_c \)" is defined in the following way:

**Definition 2.** For all \( u, v \in \mathbb{R}^N \), we write \( u \prec_c v \) whenever
\[
\begin{cases}
\sum_{i=1}^{p} u(i) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} v(i), \\
\sum_{i=k}^{p} \bar{u}(i) \leq \sum_{i=k}^{p} \bar{v}(i), \quad \text{for all } k \in [2, p],
\end{cases}
\]

**Lemma 2.** For all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^p \),
\[
x \prec_c y \iff -x \prec_c -y.
\]

For all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^p \) and any permutation \( \gamma \) of \([1, p]\), define
\[
x_\gamma = (x(\gamma(1)), ..., x(\gamma(p))).
\]

A mapping \( F : \mathbb{R}^p \to E \) is then termed symmetric whenever \( F(x) = F(x_\gamma) \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^p \) and all permutations \( \gamma \). We then have (see e.g. [1], Prop. 4.1.1 p.262 and Lemma 4.1.1 p.266) that

**Lemma 3.**
(i) For all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^p \) such that \( x \prec_c y \),
\[
x \prec_c y \iff F(x) \leq F(y), \text{ for all convex symmetric } F : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R};
\]
(ii) For all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^p \),
\[
x - y \prec_c x - \bar{y}.
\]
Lemma 4. Let \( u, v \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^S \) such that \( u \prec_v v \). Then,

(i) For all \( x \in \mathbb{R} \),
\[
[u - x.1]^+ \prec_* [v - x.1]^+.
\]

(ii) For all \( j \in [1, S] \) such that \( u(j) \leq v(j) \), for all \( y \in \mathbb{R}^+ \),
\[
u + y.\tilde{e}_j \prec_* v + y.\tilde{e}_j.
\]

Proof. (i) The result is trivial if \( u(N) \leq x \). Else, for all \( k \in [1, S] \), for some \( \ell \geq k \),
\[
\sum_{i=k}^S (u(i) - x)^+ = \sum_{i=\ell}^S (u(i) - x) \leq \sum_{i=\ell}^S (v(i) - x) \leq \sum_{i=k}^S (v(i) - x)^+.
\]

(ii) For all \( k > j \),
\[
\sum_{i=k}^S (u + y.\tilde{e}_j) (i) = \left( \sum_{i=k}^S u(i) \right) \vee \left( u(j) + y + \sum_{i=k+1}^S u(i) \right) \\
\leq \left( \sum_{i=k}^S v(i) \right) \vee \left( v(j) + y + \sum_{i=k+1}^S v(i) \right) \\
= \sum_{i=k}^S (v + y.\tilde{e}_j) (i),
\]
whereas for all \( k \leq j \),
\[
\sum_{i=k}^S (u + y.\tilde{e}_j) (i) = \sum_{i=k}^S u(i) + y \leq \sum_{i=k}^S v(i) + y = \sum_{i=k}^S (v + y.\tilde{e}_j) (i).
\]

Lemma 5. Let \( P \in [1, S] \) and \( u, v \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^S \) be such that \( u \prec_P v \). Then, a.s.,

(i) \( G(u) \prec_P \tilde{G}^\sigma(v) \);
(ii) If \( u(1) = 0 \), then \( G(u) \prec_P G(v) \);
(iii) \( \tilde{G}^\sigma(u) \prec_P \tilde{G}^\sigma(v) \);
(iv) \( G^\sigma(u) \prec_P \tilde{G}^\sigma(v) \).

Proof. (i) Set \( u(S + 1) = \infty \) and \( v(S + 1) = \infty \). We have for all \( \ell \in [P, S] \), a.s.
\[
G(u)(\ell) = \left[ u(\ell) \vee ((u(1) + \sigma) \wedge u(\ell + 1)) - \xi \right]^+ \\
\leq |u(\ell) \vee ((u(P) + \sigma) \wedge u(\ell + 1)) - \xi|^+ \\
\leq |v(\ell) \vee ((v(P) + \sigma) \wedge v(\ell + 1)) - \xi|^+ \\
= \tilde{G}^\sigma(v)(\ell).
\]

This implies in particular that for all \( k \geq P \),
\[
\sum_{i=k}^S G(u)(i) \leq \sum_{i=k}^S \tilde{G}^\sigma(v)(i) \text{ a.s.}
\]
Consequently, in order to verify (25) it suffices to check that

\[(28) \sum_{i=k}^{S} G(u)(i) \leq \sum_{i=k}^{S} \tilde{G}^\alpha(v)(i) \text{ for all } k < P.\]

We have for all such \(k\),

\[(29) \sum_{i=k}^{S} G(u)(i) = \sum_{i=k+1}^{S} [u(i) - \xi]^+ + [(u(1) + \sigma) \vee u(k) - \xi]^+;\]
\[(30) \sum_{i=k}^{S} \tilde{G}^\alpha(v)(i) = \sum_{i=k; i \neq P}^{S} [v(i) - \xi]^+ + [v(P) + \sigma - \xi]^+.\]

If \(u(k) \geq u(1) + \sigma\), then (29) equals

\[\sum_{i=k}^{S} [u(i) - \xi]^+ \leq \sum_{i=k}^{S} [v(i) - \xi]^+ \leq \sum_{i=k}^{S} \tilde{G}^\alpha(v)(i) \text{ a.s.,}\]

where we used item (i) of Lemma 4 in the first inequality. Consequently only the case where \(u(k) < u(1) + \sigma\) remains to be treated. Then, (29) equals

\[(31) [u(1) + \sigma - \xi]^+ + \sum_{i=k+1}^{S} [u(i) - \xi]^+.\]

The vector \((u(1), u(k+1), ..., u(S))\) is fully ordered in \(\mathbb{R}^{S-k+1}\) and a.s.,

\[\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
\xi - \sigma, & \xi, & \cdots, & \xi \\
1, & 2, & \cdots, & S-k+1
\end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{cccc}
\xi - \sigma, & \xi, & \cdots, & \xi \\
1, & \cdots, & P-k+1, & S-k+1
\end{array}\right).
\]

So in view of (26) and (27),

\[(u(1), u(k+1), ..., u(P), ..., u(S)) - (\xi - \sigma, \xi, \cdots, \xi) \prec_c (u(1), u(k+1), ..., u(P), ..., u(S)) - \left(\begin{array}{cccc}
\xi - \sigma, & \xi, & \cdots, & \xi \\
1, & \cdots, & P-k+1
\end{array}\right),\]

where \(\prec_c\) is the Schur-convex semi-ordering on \(\mathbb{R}^{S-k+1}\). Therefore, from the symmetry and convexity of the map

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
(\mathbb{R}^+)^{S-k+1} & \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\
u & \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^{S-k+1} u^+,
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]
in view of (20) the sum (29) satisfies a.s.

$$u(1)+\sigma-\xi^+ + \sum_{i=k+1}^{S} [u(i)-\xi]^+$$

$$\leq [u(1)-\xi]^+ + \sum_{i=k+1; i \neq P}^{S} [u(i)-\xi]^+ + [u(P)+\sigma-\xi]^+$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1; i \neq P}^{S} [u(i)-\xi]^+ + [u(P)+\sigma-\xi]^+.$$}

On the other hand, as $u(P) \leq v(P)$, from the assertions (ii) and then (i) of Lemma 4 entail a.s.

$$[u+\sigma.e_P - \xi.1]^+ \prec_* [v+\sigma.e_P - \xi.1]^+.$$}

In particular,

$$\sum_{i=k; i \neq P}^{S} [u(i)-\xi]^+ + [u(P)+\sigma-\xi]^+ \leq \sum_{i=k; i \neq P}^{S} [v(i)-\xi]^+ + [v(P)+\sigma-\xi]^+, $$

and we deduce (28) from (29), (30), (32) and (33).

(ii) Assume now that $u \prec_\rho v$ and $u(1) = 0$. For all $\ell \in [P, S]$, a.s.

$$G(u)(\ell) = [u(\ell) \lor (\sigma \land u(\ell + 1)) - \xi]^+$$

$$\leq [v(\ell) \lor ((v(1)+\sigma) \land v(\ell + 1)) - \xi]^+$$

$$= G(v)(\ell),$$

which implies that for all $k \geq P$,

$$\sum_{i=k}^{S} G(u)(i) \leq \sum_{i=k}^{S} G(v)(i) \text{ a.s.}$$}

Now, for all such $k < P$,

$$\sum_{i=k}^{S} G(u)(i) = \sum_{i=k+1}^{S} [u(i)-\xi]^+ + [\sigma \lor u(k) - \xi]^+ ;$$

$$\sum_{i=k}^{S} G(v)(i) = \sum_{i=k+1}^{S} [v(i)-\xi]^+ + [(v(1)+\sigma) \lor v(k) - \xi]^+ . $$

If $u(k) \geq \sigma$, then from (i) of Lemma 4, (34) equals

$$\sum_{i=k}^{S} [u(i)-\xi]^+ \leq \sum_{i=k}^{S} [v(i)-\xi]^+ \leq \sum_{i=k}^{S} G(v)(i) \text{ a.s.} , $$

whereas if $u(k) < \sigma$, (34) equals

$$[\sigma - \xi]^+ + \sum_{i=k+1}^{S} [u(i)-\xi]^+ \leq [(v(1)+\sigma) \lor v(k) - \xi]^+ + \sum_{i=k+1}^{S} [v(i)-\xi]^+ ,$$
where we use once again item (i) of Lemma 4. Therefore,
\[
\sum_{i=k}^{S} G(u)(i) \leq \sum_{i=k}^{S} G(v)(i) \text{ for all } k < P.
\]
(iii) For all \( \ell \in [P, S] \), a.s.
\[
\tilde{G}^p(u)(\ell) = [u(\ell) \lor ((u(P) + \sigma) \land u(\ell + 1)) - \xi^+]^+
\leq [v(\ell) \lor ((v(P) + \sigma) \land v(\ell + 1)) - \xi^+]^+
= \tilde{G}^p(v)(\ell).
\]
On another hand, as \( u(P) \leq v(P) \), Lemma 3 entail a.s.
\[
\tilde{G}^p(u) \prec \tilde{G}^p(v).
\]
(iv) Apply (i) if \( u(1) = 0 \) and (iii) else.

**Lemma 6.** Let \( 1 \leq P \leq S \). The random map \( H^p : [\mathbb{R}^+)^S \rightarrow [\mathbb{R}^+)^S \) is

(i) such that \( [\mathbb{R}^+)^S \) is a.s. stable by \( H^p \);

(ii) \( \prec \)-increasing;

(iii) such that for all \( u, p \in [\mathbb{R}^+)^S \) such that \( u \prec v \),
\[
G^p(u) \prec H^p(v) \text{ a.s.}
\]

**Proof.** (i) Plainly, for all \( u \in [\mathbb{R}^+)^S \) and all \( j \in [1, P - 2] \),
\[
H^p(u)(j) = \left[(u(j) \lor \sigma) \land u(j + 1) - \xi^+\right]^+
\leq \left[(u(j + 1) \lor \sigma) \land u(j + 2) - \xi^+\right]^+ = H^p(u)(j + 1).
\]
Also,
\[
H^p(u)(P - 1) = [(u(P - 1) \lor \sigma) \land u(P) - \xi^+]^+
\leq \left[(u(P) \lor (\sigma + u(P)1_{u(1) > 0})) \land u(P + 1) - \xi^+\right]^+ = H^p(u)(P - 1),
\]
whereas for all \( j \in [P, S] \), as \( [\mathbb{R}^+)^S \) is a.s. stable by \( G^p \),
\[
\]
(ii) Let \( u \prec v \) in \( [\mathbb{R}^+)^S \). Then for all \( j \leq P - 1 \),
\[
H^p(u)(j) = \left[(u(j) \lor \sigma) \land u(j + 1) - \xi^+\right]^+
\leq \left[(v(j) \lor \sigma) \land v(j + 1) - \xi^+\right]^+ = H^p(v)(j)
\]
and for \( j \geq P \),
\[
H^p(u)(j) = \left[(u(j) \lor (\sigma + u(P)1_{u(1) > 0})) \land u(j + 1) - \xi^+\right]^+
\leq \left[(v(j) \lor (\sigma + v(P)1_{v(1) > 0})) \land v(j + 1) - \xi^+\right]^+ = H^p(v)(j).
\]
(iii) Let \( u \prec v \). Just notice that for all \( j \leq P - 1 \),
\[
G^p(u)(j) = \left[(u(j) \lor \sigma 1_{u(1) = 0}) \land u(j + 1) - \xi^+\right]^+
\leq \left[(v(j) \lor \sigma) \land v(j + 1) - \xi^+\right]^+ = H^p(v)(j).
\]
References