

Dynamic Transfer Policies for Parallel Queues

Timothy C. Y. Chan, Jangwon Park, Vahid Sarhangian

Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, University of Toronto, ON, CANADA

We consider the problem of load balancing in parallel queues by transferring customers between them at discrete points in time. Holding costs accrue as customers wait in the queue, while transfer decisions incur both fixed (setup) and variable costs proportional to the number and direction of transfers. Our work is primarily motivated by inter-facility patient transfers between hospitals during a surge in demand for hospitalization (e.g., during a pandemic). By analyzing an associated fluid control problem, we show that under fairly general assumptions including time-varying arrivals and convex increasing holding costs, the optimal policy in each period partitions the state-space into a well-defined *no-transfer region* and its complement, such that transferring is optimal if and only if the system is sufficiently imbalanced. In the absence of fixed transfer costs, an optimal policy moves the state to the no-transfer region's boundary; in contrast, with fixed costs, the state is moved to the no-transfer region's relative interior. We further leverage the fluid control problem to provide insights on the trade-off between holding and transfer costs, emphasizing the importance of preventing excessive idleness when transfers are not feasible in continuous-time. Using simulation experiments, we investigate the performance and robustness of the fluid policy for the stochastic system. In particular, our case study calibrated using data during the pandemic in the Greater Toronto Area demonstrates that transferring patients between hospitals could result in up to 27.7% reduction in total cost with relatively few transfers.

Key words: Queueing control; fluid models; parallel queues; load balancing; patient transfers

1. Introduction

The problem of load balancing in parallel queues has applications in various areas including computing and networking, service, and healthcare operations. Most studies in the literature focus on the routing decisions, i.e., which of the queues a newly arriving customer should be routed to upon arrival. See for instance [Van der Boor et al. \(2022\)](#) for a recent survey focusing on applications in communication networks, and [Chen et al. \(2020\)](#) focusing on applications in service and healthcare operations. In this paper, we are concerned with settings where load balancing is conducted through *transfers* between queues, i.e., after customers have joined a queue.

The primary motivation for our study is the use of inter-facility patient transfers between hospitals to address surge in demand for hospitalization. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, patient transfers were frequently used as a means to address the geographical mismatch between demand for hospitalization and the available hospital capacity ([Chan et al. 2023](#)). In contrast to load balancing through ambulance diversion (e.g., [Dolan et al. 2022](#)), inter-facility transfers were

carried out after the arrival and stabilization of patients in the hospitals. In addition, transfer decisions were made and implemented at a much slower time-scale (e.g., weekly or daily) compared to arrivals of new patients as they required significant coordination and information sharing between hospitals.

The problem of inter-facility patient transfers poses several new operational features and constraints that have not been previously considered in the context of load balancing in parallel queues. First, the decision maker can directly control the number of customers in different queues through transfers (while preserving the total number) but incurs a *transfer cost* in doing so. This cost is proportional to the number and direction of transfers, and also includes a fixed component to capture the effort associated with coordination and information sharing required to do even a single transfer. Second, decisions are typically made at discrete times (e.g., every morning or once a week) and over much longer time-scales relative to that of arrivals, service completions, and the time taken to complete transfers. This is in contrast to continuous-time control where decisions are made at arrivals or service completion epochs. Third, a transient control formulation is more appropriate because transfer decisions typically arise in response to a “shock” to the system that has pushed the system to an undesirable state and in presence of non-stationary arrivals. We note that, while our work is primarily motivated by inter-facility patient transfers, these features are also present in other service and telecommunication systems. In cloud computing, for instance, a central load balancer seeks to distribute user requests optimally among data centers in the presence of time-varying demand. [Luo et al. \(2015\)](#) considers control at discrete time intervals by incurring an energy cost proportional to the amount of control; while the authors optimize routing decisions from workload queues to data centers, an alternative formulation can involve direct transfers of user requests among workload queues. See also [Kumar and Kumar \(2019\)](#) for a survey of transfer policies in cloud computing for balancing tasks across nodes.

To capture these new characteristics and gain insights into the structure of optimal transfer policies, we consider a general network of parallel queues. Each queue receives dedicated arrivals according to independent non-stationary Poisson processes. Service times are exponentially distributed with queue-dependent rates. Customers incur holding costs in queues according to queue-dependent convex non-decreasing functions. At each discrete control epoch, a central decision maker can transfer customers between queues to balance holding costs, but incurs variable and fixed transfer costs in doing so. The objective is to minimize the total expected holding and transfer costs over a finite horizon.

Optimal load balancing through transfers has been studied in the literature (e.g., [Down and Lewis 2006](#)) but focusing on two-queue settings with stationary dynamics and under continuous-time control (see [Section 2](#) for a detailed discussion). When the decision maker can control the

system in continuous-time, transfers are made to queues with higher holding costs only when they are empty. But in discrete-time, as we show in this work, determining optimal transfers requires a careful balancing of holding costs, transfer costs, and idleness. The type of control we consider (i.e., instantaneous changes to the state), connects our work to the literature on impulse and singular control, typically studied for one-dimensional diffusion processes and under stationary dynamics. In contrast, we consider a multi-dimensional fluid control problem with non-stationary arrivals; see Section 2 for additional discussion. Our main contributions and results can be summarized as follows.

- **Parallel queueing model with impulse control:** We formulate the problem of dynamic transfers as a discrete-time stochastic control problem for a general parallel queueing network with non-stationary arrivals, fixed and variable (linear) transfer costs, and convex holding costs. We proposed an associated fluid control problem that allows us to characterize and gain insights into the structure of the optimal policy.

- **Structure of the optimal policy:** We characterize the structure of the optimal fluid policy under fairly general assumptions including time-varying arrivals and general convex holding costs. We show that the optimal policy partitions the state-space into a well-defined *no-transfer region* and its complement, such that transferring is optimal if and only if the state of the system is sufficiently imbalanced. When the holding costs accrue linearly at the same rate at all queues, the system’s imbalance is characterized by whether or not there will excessive idleness mid-period. We further establish that when transferring is optimal and there are no fixed costs, it is optimal to move the state to the boundary of the no-transfer region. In contrast, in the presence of fixed costs, it is optimal to move the state to the relative interior of the no-transfer region. Practically, this implies that the optimal policy tends to transfer larger numbers of customers at a time and less frequently in the presence of setup costs. When specialized to a two-queue system, this structure reduces to a state-dependent (s, S) policy commonly arising in inventory control.

- **Numerical results and case study:** Using simulation experiments, we examine the performance of the fluid policy for the original stochastic control problem. Importantly, we numerically confirm that the optimal policy for the stochastic control problem has the same structure as that established for the fluid control problem. Because discrete-time control is a key feature of the problem we study, we further examine the value of increasing the frequency of control epochs. We show that there are diminishing returns as transfers become more frequent (or time between decision epochs is reduced), and consequently, a system controlled at relatively few epochs can still attain most of the benefits of controlling it at every arrival and service completion. Finally, we conduct a case study calibrated using real data from a network of four intensive care units (ICU) in the Greater Toronto Area during the COVID-19 pandemic. In doing so, we also relax some of the

assumptions of the model such as exponential service times, and add additional application-relevant constraints, e.g., an upper-bound on the number of permissible transfers. We demonstrate that the fluid policy can improve the total expected system cost by up to 27.7% over a one-week horizon, reducing the number of patient days over ICU capacity by 42. This is achieved by transferring on 5.5 days of the week on average, with an average of 3.5 patients per day.

Organization of the paper. In Section 2 we provide a brief review of the related literature. We describe the stochastic control problem and its associated fluid control problem in Section 3. We present our main results on the structure of the optimal fluid policy in Section 4. Section 5 summarizes our numerical experiments and the case study. We conclude the paper in Section 6. All proofs are provided in the Online Appendix.

Notation. We denote the non-negative real line using \mathbb{R}_+ and the N -dimensional non-negative Euclidean space by \mathbb{R}_+^N . We use $1\{\cdot\}$ to denote an indicator function, which is evaluated to 1 if the expression is true; 0 otherwise. Given two matrices $U, V \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N \times N}$, we define $U \cdot V \equiv \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} U_{ij} V_{ij}$. We let $(x)^+ \equiv \max(0, x)$. If $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $(x)^+$ is a vector where the i th component is equal to $(x_i)^+$. We use x^\top to indicate the transpose of x . The vector with all components equal to 1 is denoted by \mathbf{e} , whose dimension should be clear from the context.

2. Related Literature

Load balancing in parallel queues. There is a large literature on dynamic load balancing for telecommunications and distributed computing networks. In that context, a single load balancer or a dispatcher directs arrivals dynamically to one of many parallel servers at the point of entry to the system. Ideally, the jobs are routed to the shortest queue, but sampling all queues can be expensive. As such, a large literature body of literature focuses on large-server regimes and the power of sampling only two queues; see, e.g., [Sitaraman \(2001\)](#) for a survey. Routing decisions have also been studied in service and healthcare operations, sometimes jointly with scheduling decisions. Examples include routing calls to different server pools in contact centers, e.g., [Armony \(2005\)](#), [Armony and Ward \(2010\)](#), and joint routing and scheduling of patients to hospital wards ([Chen et al. 2023](#)).

Closer to our work are studies that allow load balancing after arrival of customers. [He and Neuts \(2002\)](#) study a two-queue system under a threshold policy whereby if the difference in queue-length between the two queues exceeds a certain threshold, a fixed number of customers are transferred between the queues. Customers incur holding costs as they wait in the queues and transfers incur a variable cost. [Down and Lewis \(2006\)](#) study the stability of a general parallel queueing network with transfer of customers at general, possibly random points in time. They characterize certain properties of the optimal policy for a two-queue system under general arrival and service processes,

and partially characterize the structure of the optimal policy for a two-queue Markovian system under continuous-time control. They also propose a heuristic policy for systems with more than two queues. [Caudillo-Fuentes et al. \(2010\)](#) extend their analysis and propose heuristic policies for a two-queue system with general, heavy-tailed service distributions. Our work significantly expands the structural results on the optimal policy for a much more general system with multiple queues, time-varying arrivals, and convex holding costs. We establish the structural results for the fluid control problem, but provide numerical evidence that the same structure holds for the stochastic as well.

Impulse control. With respect to the type of control, our work relates to the large body of literature on impulse control. Impulse control finds applications in diverse settings such as inventory control ([Bensoussan et al. 2005](#), [Ormeci et al. 2008](#), [Benkherouf and Bensoussan 2009](#), [Dai and Yao 2013a,b](#)), finance and economics ([Korn 1999](#), [Cadenillas and Zapatero 2000](#), [Mitchell et al. 2014](#)), and internet congestion control ([Avrachenkov et al. 2015](#)). However, this body of literature predominantly focuses on single-dimensional control. In contrast, transfer as a control mechanism is inherently multi-dimensional because of the coupling constraint that it must preserve the total number of customers in the system. For some applications, the absence of this constraint allows one to consider a single-dimensional problem without loss of generality. Furthermore, our work differs from much of the literature by considering a transient (finite horizon) problem with non-stationary dynamics and restricting control to the beginning of discrete time intervals.

Our work contributes to the literature on multi-dimensional impulse control by establishing the structure of the optimal policy in the presence of fixed costs and in the presence of queuing dynamics. Examples of multi-dimensional impulse control problems are found in ride-hailing platforms, where the objective is to minimize the expected lost sales (or maximize profit) by repositioning the inventory such as cars or bikes among geographic locations. [He et al. \(2020\)](#) consider relocation decisions at discrete epochs using a distributionally robust optimization approach in which the decisions are approximated as linear functions of uncertain customer demands. For a two-location problem, the authors characterize the optimal policy as a threshold-type policy. [Benjaafar et al. \(2022\)](#) extend the results to a general N -location problem by considering a stochastic DP formulation. They characterize the optimal policy as a region-of-inaction type policy with the optimal policy moving the state to the boundary when it lies outside of the region. While the structure of the optimal policy in our problem shares similarities with these works, neither of these works consider queuing dynamics or fixed costs. Furthermore, both works consider a closed network, for which the region-of-inaction only needs to be estimated for a fixed value of the total number of vehicles. [Ata et al. \(2020\)](#) consider the joint decision of dispatching cars to customers and centrally relocating cars between geographic areas by considering a closed stochastic processing

network (Harrison 2003) and investigating an associated Brownian control problem. They consider continuous-time control and preclude fixed costs. As we show in this work, considering fixed costs fundamentally changes the structure of the optimal policy. Specifically, it moves the state to the relative interior of the no-transfer region (or region-of-inaction), rather than the boundary.

Transient queueing control: Transient queueing control problems are often challenging due to the complexity of characterizing transient dynamics, even for simple queueing models. As such, fluid and diffusion approximations are often used to derive asymptotically optimal policies as well as insights into the structure of the optimal policy. Our approach relies on a fluid approximation of the queueing dynamics arising from the *conventional heavy-traffic* scaling. Fluid approximations (both under conventional and many-server heavy-traffic regimes) have been leveraged in the literature to study complex scheduling and routing control problems; see for example, Meyn (1997), Maglaras (2000), and Bäuerle (2000) for fluid-based policies for control of general queueing networks, and Zychlinski (2023) for a recent review. Most studies focus on continuous-time control and leverage optimal control theory (see, e.g., Sethi and Thompson 2000) to characterize the structure of the optimal policy. For example, Hu et al. (2022) study proactive scheduling in the presence of customer deterioration and improvement. Chen et al. (2023) study routing and scheduling in parallel queues with time-varying arrivals. Zychlinski et al. (2023) examine scheduling policies when customers may need multiple servers using a discrete-time model with Bernoulli arrivals and Geometric service times. We also consider a discrete-time control problem, but account for continuous-time queueing dynamics between decision epochs. Chan et al. (2021) also consider a discrete-time control but focus on server assignment. Our control problem differs from routing and scheduling problems both in terms of the type of control and the cost components. In particular, compared to routing/scheduling problems which focus on minimizing holding costs, transfer policies must also balance the benefits holding cost reduction with fixed and variable transfer costs. As such, our characterization of the optimal policy relies on showing (multi-dimensional) K -convexity (Gallego and Sethi 2005) of the value function of a discrete-time Dynamic Programming (DP) formulation of the fluid control problem. In Chan et al. (2023) we developed a numerical approach for guiding patient transfers in a network of hospitals modeled as two-stage tandem queues. In contrast, here we focus on characterizing the structure of the optimal transfer policy.

3. Problem Formulation

Consider N parallel single-server, First-Come, First-Served (FCFS) queues indexed by $i \in \mathcal{N} \equiv \{1, \dots, N\}$. Customers arrive to queue i according to a non-stationary Poisson process with rate $\lambda_i(t)$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and have service requirements that are exponentially distributed with rate μ_i for $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Decisions are made over a finite horizon of length T divided into M discrete epochs.

Denote by t_m with $m \in \mathcal{M} \equiv \{0, \dots, M-1\}$ the $(m+1)$ th decision epoch over the horizon and by $\tau = t_{m+1} - t_m$ the length of a single period. At the beginning of each decision epoch, the decision maker can transfer customers between queues.

Denote by $U_{ij}^\pi(t_m)$ the number of customers transferred from queue i to j at time t_m under a (transfer) policy π . We use $U^\pi(t_m)$ to denote the matrix collecting $U_{ij}^\pi(t_m)$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$. Let $X^\pi(t) = (X_1^\pi(t), \dots, X_N^\pi(t))$ denote the process that keeps track of the number of customers in each queue under policy π . A policy π is admissible if it is non-anticipating, $U_{ij}^\pi(t_m) \geq 0$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$, and $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} U_{ij}^\pi(t_m) \leq X_i(t_m^-)$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$.

For each $i \in \mathcal{N}$, let $\{A_i(t); t \geq 0\}$ denote a unit-rate independent Poisson process corresponding to arrivals, and similarly for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$ let $\{S_i(t); t \geq 0\}$ denote an independent Poisson process corresponding to services. The sample paths of X^π satisfy the following for all m and $t \in [t_m, t_{m+1})$:

$$X_i^\pi(t) = X_i^\pi(t_m^-) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (U_{ji}^\pi(t_m) - U_{ij}^\pi(t_m)) + A_i \left(\int_{t_m}^t \lambda_i(s) ds \right) - S_i \left(\int_{t_m}^t \mu_i 1\{X_i^\pi(s) > 0\} ds \right), \quad (1)$$

where $X_i^\pi(0^-) \equiv X_i^\pi(0)$ and $1\{X_i^\pi(s) > 0\} = 1$ if $X_i^\pi(s) > 0$ and 0 otherwise. Note that the terms on the right-hand-side of (1) correspond respectively to the number of customers in queue i right before the transfer decision is made, the *net* number of customers transferred into queue i , the number of new arrivals into queue i up to time $t \in [t_m, t_{m+1})$, and the number of departures up to time $t \in [t_m, t_{m+1})$.

Transferring U_{ij}^π customers in period $m \in \mathcal{M}$ incurs a setup cost (fixed transfer cost) of $\tilde{\kappa}(U)$ and a variable transfer cost of r_{ij} per transferred customer from queue i to j . We assume $\tilde{\kappa}(U) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \tilde{K}_{ij} 1\{U_{ij} > 0\}$, which accumulates \tilde{K}_{ij} for any number of customers transferred from queue i to j . The system additionally incurs a holding cost at rate $h(X(t))$ where $h(\cdot)$ is a convex function. The objective is then to find an admissible policy that minimizes the total expected cost over the horizon starting at $X(0)$:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} h(X^\pi(s)) ds + r \cdot U^\pi(t_m) + \tilde{\kappa}(U^\pi(t_m)) \right] \quad (2)$$

It is natural to think of $X(0)$ being a large and imbalanced starting state just prior to making any transfer decisions, possibly after a “shock” to the system, and the number of periods (horizon-length) to be large enough so that the effect of the shock can subside during the horizon.

Finally, we note that from (1) it is clear that the sample path dynamics for each queue only depend on the *net-transfer* $\tilde{U}_i(t_m) \equiv \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} (U_{ji}^\pi(t_m) - U_{ij}^\pi(t_m))$, $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Hence, by picking the lowest-cost transfers U that achieves a given net-transfer \tilde{U} in each period we can equivalently express the problem using the lower-dimensional control \tilde{U} . We leverage this observation when considering the dynamic programming formulation of the fluid control problem in Section 4.1.

3.1. The Fluid Control Problem

The fluid control problem is obtained by approximating the queueing dynamics during each period with a deterministic fluid approximation justified by a Functional Law of Large Number (FLLN) (Mandelbaum and Massey 1995) while keeping the same discrete-time control structure as in the original model. The fluid approximation is obtained by uniformly increasing the arrival and service rates, while keeping the number of servers unscaled. As such, it also serves as an approximation for multiserver queues. We provide further details on the asymptotic framework in Section 5.

Let $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ denote the fluid state at time $t \geq 0$. We use $x[m] \equiv x(m\tau^-)$ to denote the state of the system at the beginning of period $m \in \mathcal{M}$ before the transfer decision is made. Further, let $u[m] \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \times \mathbb{R}_+^N$ be the fluid transfer matrix in period m . The post-transfer state $y[m]$ then satisfies $y[m] = x[m] + (u[m]^\top - u[m])\mathbf{e}$ where u^\top denotes the transpose of u and \mathbf{e} is a vector of all ones. Denote by $f^m : \mathbb{R}_+^N \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^N$ the state transition function that returns the state of the system at a given time during period m and starting from a given (post-transfer) state at the beginning of period m . Then, $f^m(y, t)$ is the solution to the following initial value problem starting from y :

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = \lambda_i(t) - \mu_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{N} \text{ and } t \in [m\tau, (m+1)\tau), \quad (3)$$

with $\dot{x}_i(t) \geq 0$ whenever $x_i(t) = 0$. Let $H^m(y)$ denote the holding cost incurred in period m , and starting from post-transfer state y . We have

$$H^m(y) = \int_{m\tau}^{(m+1)\tau} h(f^m(y, s)) ds. \quad (4)$$

Finally, let $g^m(x, u)$ denote the total single-period cost in period m , starting from (pre-transfer) state x , and under transfer decision u . We have

$$g^m(y, u) = H^m(x + (u^\top - u)\mathbf{e}) + r \cdot u + \tilde{\kappa}(u). \quad (5)$$

The fluid control problem can be presented as follows. Starting with a given initial condition x^0 , the objective is to find a sequence of control matrices $\{u[m]; m \in \mathcal{M}\}$ to minimize the total cost over the horizon:

$$\min \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} g^m(x[m], u[m]) \quad (6)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x[m+1] = f^m(x[m] + (u[m]^\top - u[m])\mathbf{e}, (m+1)\tau), \quad \forall m \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{0\}, \quad (7)$$

$$x[0] = x^0, \quad (8)$$

$$u[m]^\top \mathbf{e} \leq x[m], \quad \forall m \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (9)$$

$$u_{ij}[m] \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}, j \in \mathcal{N}, m \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (10)$$

Eq. (7) relates the state of system at the beginning of the next period to state and transfer decision in the current period. Eq. (8) ensures that we start from the given initial condition. Eqs. (9) and (10) parallel the admissibility conditions of the control policy for the stochastic system.

In general, the fluid control problem is a nonlinear, non-convex, discrete-time control problem. We can however solve large instances of the problem after re-formulating it as a mixed-integer linear program; see Appendix A for details. The solution of the fluid control problem can be directly translated to an admissible control for the stochastic problem using a model predictive control approach. Specifically, denote by $u^*[m]$ a solution to the fluid problem (6)–(10) starting from $x^0 = X(t_m^-)$ in period m . One can construct the transfer matrix $U(t_m) = \lfloor u^*[m] \rfloor$ for the stochastic system, where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the floor function applied component-wise, and implement only the solution corresponding to the immediate period. The fluid control problem is then re-solved with the observed initial state at the beginning of the next period.

4. Characterization of the Optimal Fluid Policy

In this section, we characterize the structure of the optimal policy for the fluid control problem. We present these results in the general case of time-varying arrivals and convex holding costs. By considering the special case of stationary arrivals and linear holding costs, we provide further insights into the trade-off between the holding cost, transfer cost, and idleness.

4.1. Dynamic Programming (DP) Formulation

The fluid control problem can be formulated as a DP. To reduce the dimension of the DP, we use the fact that the dynamics depend only on the net-transfers. Let $\Delta(n) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}_+^N : e^\top y = n\}$ denote the set of all feasible states just *after* transferring, where n is the total number of customers that must be preserved at the time of the transfer decisions. Consider two states x and $y \in \Delta(e^\top x)$. Let $C(y - x)$ denote the minimum transfer cost associated with the net-transfer $y - x$, given by

$$\begin{aligned} C(y - x) &= \min_u \quad r \cdot u + \tilde{\kappa}(u) \\ &\text{s.t.} \quad (u^\top - u)e = y - x, \\ &\quad u \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Denote the value function by $V^m : \mathbb{R}_+^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$. Then $V^m(x)$ is the minimum cost-to-go starting from x in period m and the optimal cost is given by $V^0(x^0)$. The value function satisfies the optimality equation,

$$V^m(x) = \min_{y \in \Delta(e^\top x)} [H^m(y) + C(y - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y, (m+1)\tau))], \tag{12}$$

with $V^M \equiv 0$. To characterize the structure of the optimal cost and policy, we make the following three assumptions about the system's arrival rates, the holding cost function per unit time $h_i(\cdot)$, and the variable transfer costs per customer r_{ij} .

ASSUMPTION 1. For all $i \in \mathcal{N}$, the arrival rates $\{\lambda_i(t) : t \geq 0\}$ are non-negative, piecewise monotone, and have finitely many pieces.

ASSUMPTION 2. $h_i(\cdot)$ is convex, continuous, and non-decreasing for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$.

ASSUMPTION 3. The unit variable transfer costs satisfy the triangle inequality, i.e.,

$$r_{ij} \leq r_{il} + r_{lj}, \quad \forall i, j, l \in \mathcal{N}.$$

Assumption 1 allows for many widely-used time-varying arrival rate functions (e.g., piecewise-constant, piecewise-linear, sinusoidal). Assumption 2 allows for convex increasing holding costs, suitable for practical settings. In healthcare, for instance, the impact of congestion on clinical outcomes can increase past a certain point in hospital occupancy (e.g., [Kuntz et al. 2015](#), [Berry Jaeker and Tucker 2017](#)), implying convex, increasing holding costs. Lastly, Assumption 3 states that the transfer cost from one queue to another cannot be made smaller by going through an intermediary queue, and is common in the literature (e.g., [Zeng et al. 2018](#), [Benjaafar et al. 2022](#)).

4.2. The Joint Setup Cost

As we establish in the sequel, in the presence of fixed transfer costs, the value function is no longer convex. As such, we exploit the notation of K -convexity ([Scarf 1960](#)) and its extension to \mathbb{R}^N proposed by [Gallego and Sethi \(2005\)](#).

DEFINITION 1. Let $\tilde{\kappa} : \mathbb{R}_+^{N \times N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a generic setup cost function with parameter $\tilde{K} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N \times N}$. A function $V : \mathbb{R}_+^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is \tilde{K} -convex if

$$V(\theta x + (1 - \theta)y) \leq \theta V(x) + (1 - \theta)[V(y) + \tilde{\kappa}(u)],$$

for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$ and all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ with $y \in \Delta(e^\top x)$, where u is the minimum-cost transfer matrix that achieves the net-transfer $y - x$, i.e., solves [\(11\)](#).

We now specialize this definition to a particular kind of setup cost function, whereby a transfer between any pair of queues incurs a fixed cost of K for the entire system. For any given net-transfer $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $K > 0$, we define the *joint setup cost* function as,

$$\kappa(z) = K1\{z \neq 0\} = \begin{cases} K, & \text{if } z \neq 0; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Despite its simplicity, the joint setup cost is practically relevant in applications involving a central decision maker, where there is a preference or necessity for less frequent interventions and where the initial cost of planning and preparing for transfers is significant. Additionally, it satisfies the following properties which are key for establishing the structure of the value function.

LEMMA 1. The joint setup cost function in [\(13\)](#) satisfies the following properties:

(i) (Subadditivity): For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have $\kappa(x + y) \leq \kappa(x) + \kappa(y)$.

(ii) (Homogeneous of degree 0): For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $c \neq 0$, we have $\kappa(cx) = \kappa(x)$. In particular, $\kappa(-x) = \kappa(x)$, i.e., $\kappa(\cdot)$ is an even function.

(iii) (Decomposition of total transfer cost): Denote by $R(y - x)$ the transfer cost in going from x to $y \in \Delta(\mathbf{e}^\top x)$ without accounting for the joint setup cost, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} R(y - x) &= \min_u r \cdot u \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (u^\top - u)\mathbf{e} = y - x, \\ & u \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Then we have $C(y - x) = R(y - x) + \kappa(y - x)$.

The third property states that we can calculate the variable transfer cost and the setup cost independently. As a result, we can solve the linear program (14) to obtain the variable transfer cost $R(y - x)$, which is convex in $y - x$, and simply add the setup cost afterward, rather than solving the original non-convex problem (11).

Note that we can restrict the domain of $\kappa(\cdot)$ to \mathbb{R}^N because the joint setup cost function depends only on the net-transfer, as opposed to the entire transfer matrix. In the rest of the paper, we simply state that a function is K -convex when Definition 1 is satisfied using the joint setup cost function $\kappa(\cdot)$ with parameter K .

4.3. Structure of the Optimal Policy

We first establish the structural properties of the single-period holding cost function $H(\cdot)$ and the value function $V^m(\cdot)$, which are key in characterizing the structure of the optimal policy.

LEMMA 2. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, $H(\cdot)$ is convex, continuous, and non-decreasing.

THEOREM 1. Let $\kappa(\cdot)$ be the joint setup cost function in (13). Under Assumptions 1 and 2, $V^m(\cdot)$ is K -convex, continuous, and non-decreasing for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$.

An important special case is when there are no setup costs ($K = 0$). Then, the joint setup cost $\kappa(z) = 0$ for all z and Definition 1 reduces to the standard definition of convexity. In this case, the value function $V^m(\cdot)$ is convex and the optimal policy can be obtained by solving a convex optimization problem.

COROLLARY 1. Suppose $K = 0$. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, $V^m(\cdot)$ is convex, continuous, and non-decreasing for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$.

We later highlight the impact of setup cost on the structure of the optimal policy.

The significance of the above results lies in their generality under time-varying arrival rates and convex holding costs satisfying Assumptions 1 and 2. The challenge in these cases is in obtaining the

closed-form expression for the state transition function $f^m(y, t)$, which is difficult to characterize since the queue length process may be highly non-linear and may not stay at zero once (and if) it is reached. In the proof provided in Appendix B.2, our argument uses a recursive expression for $f^m(y, t)$ within each period based on specific time points such that between two successive points, the queue length process is monotone. In the rest of this section, we will assume the joint setup cost (13) in our model and always assume that Assumptions 1–3 hold.

Our characterization of the structure of the optimal policy is through partitioning of the state-space into the *no-transfer region* and its complement. Let $n \geq 0$ denote the total number of customers in the system at the beginning of period m and before transfer decisions are made. We define the no-transfer region for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$ as follows:

$$\Sigma(n) = \{x \in \Delta(n) : H^m(x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x, \tau)) \leq H^m(y) + C(y - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau)), \forall y \in \Delta(n), y \neq x\},$$

where we have suppressed the dependence of $\Sigma(n)$ on m for ease of exposition. The left-hand side of the inequality is the cost of starting at a given state x while the right-hand side is the cost of starting at another state y plus the transfer and setup cost incurred in moving the state from x to y . If the cost of staying at x is less than or equal to moving to state y , then it is not optimal to move to y . A state belongs in the no-transfer region if this holds for all $y \in \Delta(n)$ other than x itself, and therefore, the optimal policy at that state is simply not to transfer any customers. Conversely, if a state does not belong in $\Sigma(\cdot)$, it is optimal to transfer customers at that state. Throughout this section, we refer to the post-transfer state under the optimal policy as the *target state*.

Before presenting the main result, we present an intermediary result which establishes the existence of an *efficient* optimal policy that never transfers customers into and out of the same queue within the same period.

PROPOSITION 1. *There exists an optimal policy such that when customers are transferred, no queues are both sending and receiving customers in the same period.*

Proposition 1 states that in any period, we can partition the set of queues into disjoint sets — the senders, the receivers, and the non-participants — and consequently reduce the search of an optimal policy to the set of policies under which each queue has a dedicated role.

Denote by $\partial\Sigma(n)$ and $\text{ri}(\Sigma(n))$ the boundary and the relative interior of $\Sigma(n)$, respectively. We now provide a characterization of the optimal policy.

THEOREM 2. *In every period $m \in \mathcal{M}$, the no-transfer region $\Sigma(n)$ is non-empty, compact, and connected for all $n \geq 0$. If $x \in \Sigma(n)$, it is optimal not to move from x . Otherwise:*

- (No transfer and setup costs): if $\kappa(\cdot) = 0$ and $r = 0$, there exists a single target state y^m such that it is optimal to move to y^m from any $x \notin \Sigma(n)$;

- (No setup costs): if $\kappa(\cdot) = 0$, it is optimal to move to a target state $y^m \in \partial\Sigma(n)$;
- (Joint setup cost): if $\kappa(\cdot)$ is the joint setup cost function (13), it is optimal to move to a target state $y^m \in \text{ri}(\Sigma(n))$.

This result establishes the structure of the optimal policy at increasing levels of complexity of the problem to highlight the impact of different cost components. First, Theorem 2 states that if there are no transfer and setup costs, a constant (period-dependent) target state is optimal from any initial condition with equal total customers. Since transferring does not cost anything, the result implies that the no-transfer region can be expressed as a singleton $\Sigma(\cdot) = \{y^*\}$, containing only the target state. However, in the presence of variable transfer costs, the no-transfer region $\Sigma(\cdot)$ no longer only includes a single target state. It is expanded to a compact and connected set of states at which it is (strictly) optimal not to transfer customers. This indicates that transferring becomes optimal if and only if the state of the system is sufficiently imbalanced. Moreover, target states exist on the boundary of the no-transfer region, $\partial\Sigma(\cdot)$, and generally depend on the initial condition. A boundary state implies that a small perturbation can induce the policy to switch from doing nothing to transferring, and upon transfer, return to a boundary state. Consequently, the optimal policy in this case tends to move customers frequently and in small numbers, and just enough to rectify excessive imbalance. In contrast, when the joint setup cost is included, target states are positioned in the relative interior of the no-transfer region, $\text{ri}(\Sigma(\cdot))$. In particular, they cannot lie on the boundary of the no-transfer region, $\partial\Sigma(\cdot)$, which implies that the optimal policy will not switch to transferring unless the number of customers fall “low enough” at certain queues. Thus, the optimal policy tends to transfer less often and in larger numbers. We provide a numerical illustration of the structure in the presence and absence of setup costs in Section 4.5.

Intuitively, K -convexity of the value function allows us to extend the structure because for any $x \notin \Sigma(n)$ and its target state y , it implies that there is a range of values $\Theta \subset [0, 1]$ such that for all $\theta \in \Theta$, the point $\theta y + (1 - \theta)x$ also lies in the no-transfer region. Hence, there is a positive gap between the boundary of the no-transfer region and a target state. In Appendix B.2.3, we also show that K -convexity of the value function allows us to characterize additional properties, which are key for proving compactness and connectedness of the no-transfer region in Appendix B.3.2.

In closing, we elaborate on the difficulty of extending Theorem 2 to the general setup cost function $\tilde{\kappa} : \mathbb{R}_+^{N \times N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, defined as

$$\tilde{\kappa}(u) = \tilde{K}_0 1\{u \neq 0\} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \tilde{K}_{ij} 1\{u_{ij} > 0\}, \quad (15)$$

where the joint setup cost function is a special case with $\tilde{K}_0 > 0$ and $\tilde{K}_{ij} = 0, \forall i, j$. However, extending Theorem 2 under (15) introduces several challenges. First, the total transfer cost cannot be

decomposed without affecting the optimal transfer decisions. In other words, the optimal solutions to (11) and (14) are not the same in general, thus violating the third property of Lemma 1. Second, the “induction step” in the proof becomes difficult to establish, i.e., showing \tilde{K} -convexity of $V^m(\cdot)$ assuming \tilde{K} -convexity of $V^{m+1}(\cdot)$. Lastly, the joint setup cost function in (13), while simpler, is practically relevant and more appropriate for applications with a central decision maker, as discussed in Section 4.2. Nevertheless, we conjecture that the structure of the optimal policy continues to hold under the general setup cost structure and provide numerical evidence for this conjecture in Section 4.5.

4.3.1. Special Case: The Two-Queue Model. For a two-queue system, Theorem 2 reduces to a state-dependent threshold policy. For any $n \geq 0$, $\Delta(n)$ is simply a line segment connecting $(n, 0)$ and $(0, n)$ in \mathbb{R}_+^2 . Given its non-emptiness, compactness, and connectedness, the no-transfer region $\Sigma(n)$ is the shorter line segment connecting $(s_1, n - s_1)$ and $(n - s_2, s_2)$; these two points correspond to the boundary of $\Sigma(n)$. As a direct consequence of the target states belonging either to the boundary or the relative interior of $\Sigma(n)$, there also exist S_i satisfying $s_i \leq S_i$ such that when customers are transferred to queue i , its new state becomes S_i . We formalize this observation below. Again, for ease of exposition, we suppress the dependence of the parameters on the period.

COROLLARY 2. *Consider a two-queue system and let $n \geq 0$ be the initial number of customers at a given period. In every period $m \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists an optimal $(s_1(n), S_1(n), s_2(n), S_2(n))$ policy such that customers are only transferred from queue i to j for $x_j < s_j(n)$, and after transferring, the number of customers in queue j is $S_j(n)$. Furthermore:*

- (No transfer and setup costs): If $\kappa(\cdot) = 0$ and $r_{12} = r_{21} = 0$, then $s_1(n) = S_1(n) = s_2(n) = S_2(n)$;
- (No setup costs): If $\kappa(\cdot) = 0$, then $s_i(n) = S_i(n)$ for $i = 1, 2$;
- (Joint setup cost): If $\kappa(\cdot)$ is the joint setup cost function (13), then $s_i(n) < S_i(n)$ for $i = 1, 2$.

The corollary states that each queue has a pair of (period-dependent) parameters $(s_i(n), S_i(n))$, $i = 1, 2$, representing the optimal “re-order” and “order-up-to” points, respectively. Therefore, customers are not transferred to a queue unless the number of customers in that queue falls below the re-order point, and when it does, it is replenished to the order-up-to point. While Corollary 2 is a direct consequence of Theorem 2, it presents a specialized structure in which the parameters $(s_i(n), S_i(n))$, $i = 1, 2$, are invariant with the distribution of the customers between the two queues so long as the total number n is preserved. With three or more queues, the target state depends on the entire state vector and may be different for two initial conditions even when they have the same total number of customers. Finally, we can always find $s_1(n)$ and $s_2(n)$ such that $x_1 < s_1(n)$ and $x_2 < s_2(n)$ are never possible for a given initial condition x . This implies that each queue is

either receiving or sending customers, but not both; the existence of such an optimal policy is guaranteed by Proposition 1. We provide a numerical illustration of the structure in Section 4.5.

We note that in the special case of a two-queue system, the general setup cost in (15) is identical to the joint setup cost, provided that the cost parameters are symmetric. For instance, consider the “pairwise” setup cost function $\tilde{\kappa}(u) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \tilde{K}_{ij} 1\{u_{ij} > 0\} = \tilde{K}_{12} 1\{u_{12} > 0\} + \tilde{K}_{21} 1\{u_{21} > 0\}$ with $\tilde{K}_{12} = \tilde{K}_{21}$. By Proposition 1, u_{12} and u_{21} are never positive at the same time, which reduces $\tilde{\kappa}(u)$ to the joint setup cost function.

Corollary 2 is consistent with and extends the partial characterization of the optimal policy in Down and Lewis (2006). They show that under continuous-time control, each queue has a constant optimal order-up-to point. The authors conjectured, but did not prove, that when the optimal policy does not move customers to queue i at state $x_i < S_i(n)$, it should also not move customers at state $x_i + \delta < S_i(n)$ for $\delta > 0$. Our results provide a complete characterization of the optimal policy under discrete-time control.

4.4. On the Role of Idleness

When control is restricted to discrete points in time, avoiding idleness becomes an important consideration for the optimal policy. For instance, a policy that transfers all customers to the queue with the smallest holding cost is suboptimal since it will incur “excessive” idleness due to the inability to re-transfer mid-period. Some idleness, however, may be optimal depending on the associated holding and transfer costs. To gain further insights into the role of idleness, we focus on a simpler model with stationary arrivals and linear holding costs.

Our insights are characterized through what we call the non-idleness index, $\tau(\mu_i - \lambda_i)^+$, which represents the number of customers required to avoid idleness for one period at queue i . The key insight we formalize in this section is that non-idleness at certain queues serves as a sufficient condition for when transferring to them is suboptimal. When holding costs accrue linearly at the same rate at all queues, this index leads to an approximation of the no-transfer region. Furthermore, in the absence of transfer and setup costs, it becomes a sufficient and necessary condition for when transferring is suboptimal, thus exactly characterizing the no-transfer region. We note that while it is more challenging to characterize such an index under more complex time-varying arrival rates, the same insight into the role of idleness continues to apply.

With a slight abuse of notation, let $h = (h_1, \dots, h_N)$ be the vector of unit holding cost per customer per unit time at each queue, where $h_N \geq \dots \geq h_1$ without loss of generality.

PROPOSITION 2. *Let $\kappa(\cdot)$ be the joint setup cost function in (13) and let x be an initial condition.*

(i) If $h_N \geq \dots \geq h_1$, then for any i, j with $i < j$, there exists an optimal policy that transfers customers from queue i to j only when $x_j < \tau(\mu_j - \lambda_j)^+$.

(ii) If $h_1 = \dots = h_N$, then it is optimal not to transfer when $x \geq \tau(\mu - \lambda)^+$.

If $x_j \geq \tau(\mu_j - \lambda_j)^+$, queue j does not incur any idleness during the period. Therefore, the first part of Proposition 2 states that it is optimal to transfer customers into a queue with a higher unit holding cost only to prevent idleness at it. If $\lambda_j \geq \mu_j$, queue j never experiences idleness and an optimal policy never transfer customers into that queue. Due to symmetry, if $h_1 = \dots = h_N$, the second part of Proposition 2 follows directly and states that the optimal policy is to not transfer when we can guarantee non-idleness at all queues for the upcoming period. Whether or not idleness immediately warrants transfers, however, depends on the transfer costs. Therefore, we must have $\Sigma(n) \supseteq \{y \in \Delta(n) : y \geq \tau(\mu - \lambda)^+\}$, which implies that transferring is optimal if and only if there will be excessive idleness.

In the absence of transfer costs, the optimal policy only balances myopic holding cost reduction and idleness. In this case, we can characterize the target states more explicitly.

PROPOSITION 3. *Let x be an initial condition and suppose there are no transfer and setup costs, i.e., $\kappa(\cdot) = 0$ and $r = 0$.*

(i) *If $h_N \geq \dots \geq h_1$, then a target state y^m satisfies $y_i^m \leq \tau(\mu_i - \lambda_i)^+$ for all $i \geq 2$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$.*

(ii) *If $h_1 = \dots = h_N$, then it is optimal not to transfer if and only if $x \geq \tau(\mu - \lambda)^+$. Moreover, any $y \geq \tau(\mu - \lambda)^+$ is a target state.*

The first part of this result states that for all queues other than the “cheapest” one, an optimal policy never prescribes any more than what is strictly necessary to avoid idleness. Furthermore, if $h_1 = \dots = h_N$, idleness *does* immediately warrant transfers due to the absence of transfer and setup costs, leading to the exact characterization $\Sigma(n) = \{y \in \Delta(n) : y \geq \tau(\mu - \lambda)^+\}$. Moreover, any non-idling policy is optimal in this case.

In essence, idleness primarily determines when (not) to transfer customers. In the case of no transfer and setup costs, it can additionally determine how many customers to transfer, i.e., just enough to avoid idleness. In the next section, we verify these insights numerically.


4.5. Illustrative Examples

In this section, we use numerical examples to illustrate and provide additional observations on the structure of the optimal policy and the no-transfer region $\Sigma(\cdot)$.

4.5.1. Structure of the Optimal Policy. First, we illustrate and contrast the structure of the optimal policy established in Theorem 2 with and without the joint setup cost. Figure 1 illustrates the optimal policy through 10,000 randomly sampled initial conditions for a three-queue system with parameters $\lambda_i = 0.9$, $\mu_i = 1$, $h_i = 1$ for all i and $r_{12} = r_{21} = 2$, $r_{13} = r_{31} = 4$, $r_{23} = r_{32} = 3$, $\tau = 5$, $M = 5$, and the joint setup cost function with $K = 0$ and $K = 5$, respectively. The total

number of customers in the system in all cases is equal to five. The target states are obtained by solving the associated fluid control problem (6)–(10) with a long-enough horizon to empty the system, hence resulting in a stationary policy. The collection of blue points make up the no-transfer region, which is non-empty, compact, and connected in both cases. However, when there is no setup cost (Figure 1a), we confirm that the target states belong to the boundary of the no-transfer region. In contrast, in the presence of the joint setup cost, target states lie in the relative interior of the no-transfer region (Figure 1b).

Figure 1: Structure of the optimal policy for a three-queue system. Red dots correspond to states where transferring is optimal; green to target states; and blue to states where transferring is not optimal.




Note. $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0.9, \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = 1, h_1 = h_2 = h_3 = 1, r_{12} = r_{21} = 2, r_{13} = r_{31} = 4, r_{23} = r_{32} = 3, \tau = 5, M = 5$.

Figure 2 illustrates the optimal structure for a two-queue system for initial conditions from $\{(x_1, x_2) : x_1 + x_2 \leq 10, x_1, x_2 \geq 0\}$. Considering a diagonal line through the state-space, we restrict the state-space to a fixed total number of customers $n = 4$ and illustrate the four parameters $(s_i(n), S_i(n)), i = 1, 2$. For instance, in Figure 2a, at point A, $x_1 < s_1(4)$, making it optimal to transfer customers from queue 2 to 1, or along the direction of the white arrow. The target state is point B, where $x_1 = s_1(4) = S_1(4)$. In contrast, Figure 2b shows that at point A, we again have $x_1 < s_1(4)$, but the target state is point C, as opposed to point B. This illustrates that with a positive setup cost, we have $s_i(n) < S_i(n)$ for all n . Additionally, we verify Proposition 2 in both

cases: the non-idleness index $\tau(\mu_i - \lambda_i)$ equals 1.5 for both queues, and given $h_1 = h_2$, the no-transfer region (blue) contains the set $\{(x_1, x_2) : x_1, x_2 \geq 1.5\}$ (for any $n \geq 3$). (This is also true for Figures 1a and 1b, but would be easier to recognize after aligning the view angle with each axis.)

Figure 2: Structure of the optimal policy for a two-queue system




Note. $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.7, \mu_1 = \mu_2 = 1, h_1 = h_2 = 1, r_{12} = r_{21} = 1, K = 3, \tau = 5, M = 10$.

4.5.2. General Setup Cost Function. Next, we provide an example in Figure 3a demonstrating that Theorem 2 may be generalized to the general setup cost function in (15). We use the “pairwise” setup cost function by setting $\tilde{K}_0 = 0$ and $\tilde{K}_{ij} = 5$ for all i, j for simplicity. For other parameters, we use $\lambda_i = 0.9, \mu_i = 1, h_i = 1$ for all $i, r_{ij} = 2$ for all $i, j, \tau = 10$ and $M = 5$. We verify that the no-transfer region is non-empty, compact, and connected. Moreover, all target states lie in the relative interior of the no-transfer region, demonstrating that the optimal policy does not switch to transferring unless the number of customers fall low enough at certain queues.

4.5.3. Non-Convexity of the No-Transfer Region. Finally, we demonstrate through a counter-example that the no-transfer region is generally non-convex, even for the case of stationary arrival rates, identical linear holding costs, and joint setup cost. In Figure 3b, we illustrate the optimal policy with parameters $\lambda = (0.9, 0.9, 0.85), \mu = (1.2, 1, 1), h = (1, 1, 1), r_{ij} = 1$ for all $i, j, K = 3, \tau = 5,$ and $M = 5$. In this example, the non-convexity arises from imbalanced traffic intensities: queue 2 is more heavily loaded than the rest, and therefore, even if queue 2 is at risk of idleness, it is not necessarily optimal to transfer customers into it, if that results in (excessive) idleness at other queues. However, transferring can become optimal just by re-balancing customers primarily

Figure 3: Illustrations of the no-transfer region



Note. (a): $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0.9, \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = 1, h_1 = h_2 = h_3 = 1, r_{ij} = 2, \tilde{K}_{ij} = 5, \forall i, j \in \mathcal{N}, i \neq j, \tau = 10, M = 5$.

(b): $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.9, \lambda_3 = 0.85, \mu_1 = 1.2, \mu_2 = \mu_3 = 1, h_1 = h_2 = h_3 = 1, r_{ij} = 1, \forall i, j \in \mathcal{N}, i \neq j, K = 3, \tau = 5, M = 5$.

between queues 1 and 3. In Figure 3b, moving from point A to B, the gain in the number of customers at queue 3 ultimately makes it possible to transfer customers to queue 2 while avoiding excessive idleness in both queues. This corresponds to some convex combinations of A and B lying outside of the no-transfer region. Non-convexity makes computing the no-transfer region more challenging, as finding two points in it does not imply that the whole line segment connecting the two is also in the region. We note that convexity of the value function also does not guarantee a convex no-transfer region.

5. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we conduct numerical experiments to examine whether the same optimal policy structure shown for the fluid control problem also holds for the original stochastic control problem. We further investigate the performance of the fluid policy for the stochastic system using simulation experiments. In Section 5.3, we conduct a case study where we quantify the potential benefits of the fluid policies for the inter-facility patient transfer application.


5.1. Comparison to the Optimal Policy

We first examine the structure of the optimal policy for the stochastic control problem. The discrete-time stochastic control problem can be modeled as a Markov decision process (MDP). However, even for small systems, solving the discrete-control MDP is both computationally and analytically

hard. This is mainly due to the complexity of computing transition probabilities compared to the continuous-control MDP, where one can apply uniformization to obtain a discrete-time MDP with simple transition probabilities. Our approach here is therefore to solve a continuous-control MDP instead and compare the structure of the continuous-time MDP policy to that of the fluid policy. The uniformization approach is described in detail in Appendix C.1. To derive an (approximately) continuous-control fluid problem that is comparable to the continuous-control MDP, we set the length of each period τ to be equal to the average time between two successive events (arrival or service completion).

Figure 4 presents an example of the MDP policy (left) and the fluid policy (right), where positive (negative) numbers indicate transfers from queue 1 to 2 (2 to 1). We observe that the optimal transfer policy for the stochastic system has the same structure as the fluid policy, as evident from the compactness and connectedness of the no-transfer region (grey). Further, we observe that there are constant re-order and order-up-to points for each fixed n , i.e., the total number of customers. However, the specific values of these parameters differ. For example, at $n = 13$, the MDP policy suggests $s_2(13) = 6$ and $S_2(13) = 8$ while the fluid policy suggests $s_2(13) = 8$ and $S_2(13) = 9$. Despite these deviations, we next show that the optimality gap of the fluid policy is small.

Figure 4: Example comparison of an MDP policy and a fluid policy



Note. $\lambda_1 = 0.9, \lambda_2 = 1.5, \mu_1 = 1.5, \mu_2 = 2.5, h_1 = 1.3, h_2 = 1, r_{12} = r_{21} = 1, K = 1$.

We examine the sub-optimality of the fluid policy by comparing its performance to that of the optimal (continuous-time) policy. Because the fluid model becomes more accurate as the arrival and service rates increase, we examine the performance of the fluid policy by considering a sequence of

Table 1: Optimality gap of the fluid policy to MDP policy (optimal policy) under scaling parameter $\eta = 5$, $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 1, h_1 = h_2 = 1, r_{12} = r_{21} = 2, K = 5$

Case (a): $\rho = 0.8, \lambda_1 = 0.7, \lambda_2 = 0.9$				Case (b): $\rho = 0.8, \lambda_1 = 0.75, \lambda_2 = 0.85$			
	Mean gap	Min. gap	Max. gap		Mean gap	Min. gap	Max. gap
MDP policy	1.83%	0.56%	3.47%	MDP policy	1.16%	0.25%	2.15%
No-transfer policy	-31.98%	-73.22%	-13.04%	No-transfer policy	-26.57%	-61.61%	-8.46%
Case (c): $\rho = 0.6, \lambda_1 = 0.5, \lambda_2 = 0.7$				Case (d): $\rho = 0.6, \lambda_1 = 0.55, \lambda_2 = 0.65$			
	Mean gap	Min. gap	Max. gap		Mean gap	Min. gap	Max. gap
MDP policy	0.09%	-0.33%	0.13%	MDP policy	0.25%	0.07%	0.54%
No-transfer policy	-20.25%	-59.54%	-2.23%	No-transfer policy	-19.75%	-52.66%	-2.22%

Note. The negative gaps relative to the no-transfer policy indicates that the fluid policy improves (reduces) the system cost.

control problem. Specifically, we consider a sequence of systems as described in Section 3, indexed by η , such that the arrival rates, service rates, and the initial number of customers in the system are linearly increased. That is, the η th system has arrival rate $\lambda_i^\eta(t) = \lambda_i(t)\eta$, $\mu_i^\eta = \mu_i\eta$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{N}$, and initial condition $X^\eta(0) = \eta x^0$. Because the number of customers and hence the size of transfers is increasing, we also scale the fixed setup cost such that $\kappa^\eta(\cdot) = \eta\kappa^\eta(\cdot)$ for the η th system, while the holding and variable transfer costs remain unscaled. Similarly, the time between decision epochs τ remains unscaled to preserve the discrete-time structure of the control problem.

We consider four two-queue systems in Table 1 and under the scaling parameter $\eta = 5$ with parameters $\mu = (1, 1)$, $h = (1, 1)$, $r_{12} = r_{21} = 2$, and $K = 5$. We vary the traffic intensity of the system $\rho \equiv (\lambda_1/\mu_1 + \lambda_2/\mu_2)/2$ between 0.6 and 0.8 in the experiments. For each ρ , the systems further differ by the arrival rates between the two queues. We set $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 = 0.2$ in one case and $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 = 0.1$ in the other. Transfer costs are set to $r_{ij} = 2$ for all i, j and $K = 5$. For each system, we use a common set of 20 randomly sampled initial conditions from $\mathcal{I} = \{x^0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : 10 \leq x_1^0 + x_2^0 \leq 20\}$. Using 1,000 sample paths starting from each sampled initial condition, we compute the optimality gap, defined as the mean expected relative difference between the system costs under the fluid policy and the MDP policy until the first time its state reaches $(0, 0)$. The optimality gaps are then averaged across all initial conditions. Table 1 shows that the mean optimality gap is small in all cases. Moreover, the maximum optimality gap is always less than 5%. To ensure that the small optimality gaps are not due to cases with negligible transfers, we also demonstrate that the fluid policy performs significantly better than the no-transfer policy.

We report additional results under $\eta = 1, 2, 3, 4$ in Appendix C.2. We observe that even for small or moderately sized systems under $\eta = 1$ or 2, the mean optimality gaps of the fluid policy are close to or less than 5% in all cases.

5.2. Impact of the Frequency of Control

In this section, we examine the impact of changing τ , i.e., time between subsequent decision epochs, on the performance of the fluid policy. In our motivating application, for instance, patient transfers were conducted once per day or week. We examine how much performance is lost when the frequency of control is reduced, compared to the case of continuous-time control where control is as frequent as the number of arrivals and service completions as before.


More specifically, we examine the same four systems as in Table 1 under scaling parameter $\eta = 5$ and use the same 20 initial conditions simulated in Section 5.1. For each initial condition x^0 and a fixed value of τ , the fluid policy is derived using the number of periods $M(x^0, \tau) = \max_{i=1,2} \{x_i^0 / (\tau(\mu_i - \lambda_i))\}$ such that the length of the horizon $\tau M(x^0, \tau)$ is long enough for the system to empty. We use $V(x^0; \tau)$ to denote the expected total cost achieved under the fluid policy with τ until the first time that the system reaches $(0, 0)$ starting from x^0 , estimated using 1,000 sample paths. Then $V(x^0; \infty)$ and $V(x^0; \tau_c)$ represent the total costs under the no-transfer policy and the continuous-time fluid policy, respectively, where we set $\tau_c \equiv (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \mu_1 + \mu_2)^{-1}$, as discussed in Appendix C.1. Our performance measure is “percentage of limiting performance” defined for each x^0 and τ as

$$\% \text{ of limiting performance} = \frac{V(x^0; \infty) - V(x^0; \tau)}{V(x^0; \infty) - V(x^0; \tau_c)} \times 100\%. \quad (16)$$

To investigate the impact of varying τ on this performance measure, we further define “percentage of full flexibility” as $M(x^0, \tau) / M(x^0, \tau_c)$, where $M(x^0, \tau_c)$ is the average number of decision epochs where transfers could happen under continuous-time control. For instance, for case (a) in Table 1, the continuous-time fluid policy requires 724 decision epochs on average. Intuitively, the percentage of full flexibility can be viewed as normalized frequency of control.

Figure 5 presents the percentage of the limiting performance achieved by the (discrete-time) fluid policy as the percentage of full flexibility increases, averaged across the 20 initial conditions. First, we observe diminishing returns in Figure 5 for all cases. Thus, the marginal value of additional decision epochs is decreasing and we initially observe the greatest marginal benefit with the first few decision epochs. Second, only a small degree of flexibility is sufficient to achieve the majority of the benefits of continuous-time control, particularly for systems under heavier loads and larger variability in traffic intensities. For instance, for case (a), the system already achieves 50% of the limiting performance at 2.5% of full flexibility, which is equivalent to 18 decision epochs compared to 724 under continuous-control. Similarly, for case (b), the system achieves 50% of the limiting performance at 7% of full flexibility, or 50 decision epochs, relative to 723 decision epochs under continuous-time control.

Figure 5: Percentage reduction in system cost achieved by the fluid policy compared to the no-transfer policy



Note. The cases correspond to the same four systems in Table 1.

5.3. Case Study: Inter-Facility Patient Transfer

Finally, we conduct a case study using a simulation model calibrated with data from four hospitals in the Greater Toronto Area during the COVID-19 pandemic; see [Chan et al. \(2023\)](#) for additional details on the data. This study aims to demonstrate the benefits and robustness of the fluid policy under various model assumptions. Specifically, we evaluate the policies for systems with multiple servers, log-normally distributed service times, restrictions on the number of transfers, and both time-varying arrivals and convex holding costs.

Simulation model. The simulation model consists of four parallel multiserver queues. The servers represent beds in the intensive care units (ICU) and queues represent boarding from the acute ward or emergency department (ED). We note that keeping patients in the ward or ED until ICU capacity becomes available (as opposed to diverting) was common during the pandemic, see, e.g., [Bellani et al. \(2021\)](#), [Douin et al. \(2021\)](#).

Patients arrive to each queue according to a non-homogeneous Poisson process with piecewise-constant rates (during each day of the week). Service times are assumed to be exponentially distributed, but we also perform a sensitivity analysis with log-normal service times. We compare the no-transfer policy and several fluid-based policies denoted by $\text{FP}(\tau)$, where τ is the length of a period, i.e., $\text{FP}(\tau)$ transfers patients at most every τ days. Under any policy, we solve the fluid control problem (6)–(10) using a model predictive control approach. Specifically, we re-solve the fluid problem with $M = 7$ at the beginning of each period and estimate the expected costs for each policy over the resulting 14-day horizon. We also consider policies that are limited to transfer at most three patients per day for practicality and denote them as $\text{FP}_3(\tau)$.

Calibration of simulation input parameters. The daily arrival rates are estimated using the average number of arrivals for each day of the preceding four weeks of the horizon in our dataset, which includes internal transfers to the ICU from acute wards. We choose a one-week horizon corresponding to a time during the pandemic when some hospitals faced increasing numbers of COVID patients. Thus, the arrival rates are a sum of the arrival rates of non-COVID patients and the growing arrival rates corresponding to COVID admissions. We estimate the growth rate using log-linear regression fitted to the COVID admission counts over the preceding four-week period, using the number of days since the start of the four-week period and a weekend indicator as features. The parameters of the service time distributions are estimated using the length-of-stay (LOS) data. We note that COVID patients’ particularly long and variable LOS was a significant contributor to hospital congestion (Chan et al. 2023). The initial conditions at each queue is set to the non-negative difference between the occupancy at the beginning of the horizon and the number of beds at each ICU. A summary of the parameters is given in Table 2.

Cost parameters. The unit variable transfer costs r_{ij} reflect the distance between hospital i and j and are normalized to be in $[0, 1]$ after dividing by the maximum distance among all hospitals. As transfer decisions were overseen by a central decision maker in the Greater Toronto Area, we use the joint setup cost function with $K = 4$, which ensures that it is non-trivial compared to the holding cost. For example, as we will see in Table 3, transfer costs account for about 11% of the system cost under a policy allowing daily transfers. Of this, roughly two-thirds are attributed to the joint setup cost, which is appropriate as care coordination requires much more effort than the actual transport (Chan et al. 2023). Lastly, we use a piecewise-linear increasing holding cost function defined with two “kinks” denoted by $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+^4$, i.e.,

$$h(x) = \max\{x, 2x - k_1, 3x - k_1 - k_2\}. \quad (17)$$

To capture the increasing clinical cost of delay in care (Kuntz et al. 2015, Berry Jaeker and Tucker 2017), the holding cost accrues at the rate of 1 per patient per unit time when the queue length is below k_1 (mild congestion), but it doubles between k_1 and k_2 (moderate congestion) and triples above k_2 (severe congestion). We set k_1 and k_2 to 20% and 40% of ICU capacities.

Results and discussion. The results of the case study are summarized in Table 3. We first observe that the $FP_3(1)$ policy achieves significant reductions in the total cost (last row) compared to the no-transfer policy with an average reduction of 27.7%. These improvements lead to a reduction of 42 patient days over ICU capacity and are attained through a limited number of transfers: typically, transfers occur on 5 to 6 days of the week, with an average of 3.5 patients being transferred each time. The $FP_3(7)$ policy, which allows transfers only once a week, still offers a moderate

Table 2: Summary of the simulation inputs for the case study

	Queue			
	1	2	3	4
Arrival rate (weekday, weekend)	(4.5, 3.9)	(10.5, 8.8)	(5.5, 5.2)	(4.0, 3.5)
$(\beta_0, \beta_i, \gamma_i)$	(-0.57, 0.03, 0.03)	(-1.26, 0.05, -1.28)	(0.76, 0.01, -0.40)	(1.26, -0.07, -0.80)
Service time (mean, std.)	(7.2, 13.7)	(5.7, 13.1)	(6.8, 10.7)	(6.1, 9.5)
Capacity (beds)	23	33	35	26
Initial condition	20	29	32	17
Variable costs $(r_{i1}, r_{i2}, r_{i3}, r_{i4})$	(0, 0.5, 1.0, 0.7)	(0.5, 0, 0.8, 0.2)	(1.0, 0.8, 0, 0.7)	(0.7, 0.2, 0.7, 0)

Note. $(\beta_0, \beta_i, \gamma_i)$ presents estimated coefficients of a log-linear regression model used for COVID admissions (ward and ICU). β_i is the coefficient on the number of days since the start of the preceding four-week period and γ_i is the coefficient on the weekend indicator.


cost reduction, yielding an improvement of 6.0%, or 10 patient days over ICU capacity. Considering just the total holding cost, the reductions are 37.0% and 7.5% under $FP_3(1)$ and $FP_3(7)$, respectively. Although increasing the frequency of transfers generally enhances performance, we verify that when there is no constant limit on the number of daily transfers, there are diminishing returns, as illustrated in Figure 6a. For example, under $FP(\tau)$, conducting transfers on 2 days of the week captures the majority (60%) of the benefits associated with transferring on 5 to 6 days of the week. This trend of diminishing returns does not hold when the number of transfers is restricted, i.e., under $FP_3(\tau)$, since it directly limits our ability to re-organize the same number of transfers to a fewer number of days. We thus find that more frequent transfers can yield proportionally increasing benefits when the number of daily transfers is constrained. These observations persist even when service times are log-normally distributed with the mean and standard deviation reported in Table 2, as demonstrated in Figure 6b. We provide detailed results of this robustness check in Table 5 in Appendix C.3 and show that the benefits of the fluid policies largely remain.

We additionally report the holding costs accrued over each of the three regions — mild, moderate, or severe (first three rows of Table 3). The holding cost in each region is proportional to duration of time that the queue length remains within that region. We note that the improvements in the performance from the fluid policies stem from the reduction in the “severe” holding cost, but the levels of mild and moderate congestion can actually increase. We provide a closer examination in Figure 7, which shows the empirical cumulative distribution of the holding cost over each of the three regions. The example reveals that under the fluid policy, the system is less likely to experience severe congestion levels, but more likely to experience mild or moderate congestion. In other words, the fluid policy seeks a more balanced distribution of load across the system by letting more queues bear some degree of non-severe congestion levels so as not to have any one queue sustain severe congestion levels.

Table 3: Summary of the simulation outputs for the case study using exponential service times

Performance measure	Policies				
	No-transfer	FP ₃ (1)	FP ₃ (2)	FP ₃ (3)	FP ₃ (7)
Expected holding cost:					
Mild	20.8 ± 2.2	28.6 ± 2.3	25.4 ± 2.4	23.6 ± 2.2	21.9 ± 2.2
Moderate	68.4 ± 7.1	82.2 ± 8.4	76.9 ± 8.6	75.5 ± 8.0	71.9 ± 8.3
Severe	320.2 ± 37.0	151.1 ± 28.0	217.9 ± 31.1	246.8 ± 32.3	280.5 ± 33.1
Total holding cost	409.5 ± 34.7	261.8 ± 27.4	320.2 ± 29.2	346.0 ± 30.5	374.3 ± 31.4
% Reduction in total holding cost		37.0 ± 2.8%	21.8 ± 2.5%	15.4 ± 2.3%	7.5 ± 2.4%
Patient days over ICU capacity	161.8 ± 11.2	120.0 ± 9.3	136.5 ± 9.6	143.7 ± 9.9	151.4 ± 10.3
Expected transfer cost		31.6 ± 1.2	17.8 ± 0.7	11.9 ± 0.4	5.0 ± 0.3
Avg. # of days with transfers/week		5.5	2.9	2.0	1.0
Avg. # of transfers/week		19.1	10.7	6.9	2.4
Expected total cost	409.5 ± 34.7	293.4 ± 27.9	338.0 ± 29.4	357.9 ± 30.6	379.4 ± 31.5
% Reduction in total cost		27.7 ± 2.9%	16.5 ± 2.5%	11.8 ± 2.3%	6.0 ± 2.4%

Note. The numbers after ± correspond to the 95% confidence intervals. “Mild” refers to the portion of the total holding cost accrued when the queue length is less than 20% of the ICU capacity. Similarly, “moderate” and “severe” are holding costs accrued when the queue length is between 20% and 40% or greater than 40% of the ICU capacity, respectively.

Figure 6: Percentage reduction in total cost achieved by FP(τ) and FP₃(τ) compared to the no-transfer policy


Note. The grey bars correspond to the 95% confidence intervals.

Finally, from Tables 6 and 7 in Appendix C.3, we show that when the rate of holding cost is 0.5 or 2 instead of 1, the improvements in the total holding cost, still achieved through a limited number of transfers, are practically unchanged. This suggests that reductions in congestion are robust under small changes in the rate of holding cost.

6. Conclusion

In this work, we study the problem of transferring customers between parallel queues at discrete time intervals to balance transfer and congestion costs. We study an associated fluid control problem that allows us to obtain transfer policies under fairly general assumptions including time-varying

Figure 7: Empirical cumulative distribution of the holding cost under $FP_3(1)$ with exponential service times



arrivals and convex holding costs. Our analysis of the optimal fluid policy reveals several implications for managing imbalanced load for parallel queueing systems. By a careful trade-off among holding costs, transfer costs, and idleness between periods, we show that effective control policies are characterized by the so-called no-transfer region — a region of the state-space where a state is considered balanced and doing nothing is optimal. When holding costs accrue linearly at the same rate at all queues, control is warranted if and only if there will be excessive idleness mid-period. Our results also highlight the impact of fixed costs on the structure of the optimal policy. In the presence of fixed costs, transfers should move the state to the relative interior of the no-transfer region, rather than the boundary. Therefore, frequent, small transfers are not cost effective in the presence of fixed costs.

Our structural results can further be leveraged in designing approximate control policies for more complex parallel queueing networks. Given the compactness and connectedness of the no-transfer region, one approach is to iteratively approximate the boundary of the no-transfer region within an Approximate Dynamic Programming (ADP) approach and use it to bypass the optimization step in computing a target state (an optimal post-transfer state). However, this is more challenging with a non-convex value function, which may not be well-approximated by a pointwise supremum of affine functions and prevents the use of a check based on its subgradients, as done in [Benjaafar et al. \(2022\)](#). Moreover, given an open queueing network, we need to estimate the no-transfer region for all values of the total number of customers, not just for one fixed value. Additionally, our results highlight that the target states for the N -queue system are functions of the entire state vector, rather than just the total number of customers as in the two-queue case. One could therefore focus on parameterizing and estimating these functions. Finally, our fluid policies and their extensions to more complex networks can provide a “good” starting policy which can then be improved through, e.g., approximate policy iteration. We leave the development of these methods for future work.

References

- Armony M (2005) Dynamic routing in large-scale service systems with heterogeneous servers. *Queueing Systems* 51:287–329.
- Armony M, Ward AR (2010) Fair dynamic routing in large-scale heterogeneous-server systems. *Operations Research* 58(3):624–637.
- Ata B, Barjesteh N, Kumar S (2020) Dynamic Dispatch and Centralized Relocation of Cars in Ride-Hailing Platforms. Available at SSRN 3675888 .
- Avrachenkov K, Habachi O, Piunovskiy A, Zhang Y (2015) Infinite horizon optimal impulsive control with applications to Internet congestion control. *International Journal of Control* 88(4):703–716.
- Bäuerle N (2000) Asymptotic optimality of tracking policies in stochastic networks. *The Annals of Applied Probability* 10(4):1065–1083.
- Bellani G, Grasselli G, Cecconi M, Antolini L, Borelli M, De Giacomo F, Bosio G, Latronico N, Filippini M, Gemma M, Giannotti C, Antonini B, Petrucci N, Zerbi SM, Maniglia P, Castelli GP, Marino G, Subert M, Citerio G, Radrizzani D, Mediani TS, Lorini FL, Russo FM, Faletti A, Beindorf A, Covello RD, Greco S, Bizzarri MM, Ristagno G, Mojoli F, Pradella A, Severgnini P, Da Macallè M, Albertin A, Ranieri VM, Rezoagli E, Vitale G, Magliocca A, Cappelleri G, Docci M, Aliberti S, Serra F, Rossi E, Valsecchi MG, Pesenti A, Foti G (2021) Noninvasive Ventilatory Support of Patients with COVID-19 outside the Intensive Care Units (WARD-COVID). *Annals of the American Thoracic Society* 18(6):1020–1026.
- Benjaafar S, Jiang D, Li X, Li X (2022) Dynamic Inventory Repositioning in On-Demand Rental Networks. *Management Science* 68(11):7861–7878.
- Benkherouf L, Bensoussan A (2009) Optimality of an (s, S) Policy with Compound Poisson and Diffusion Demands: A Quasi-Variational Inequalities Approach. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 48(2):756–762.
- Bensoussan A, Liu RH, Sethi SP (2005) Optimality of an (s, S) Policy with Compound Poisson and Diffusion Demands: A Quasi-variational Inequalities Approach. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 44(5):1650–1676.
- Berry Jaeker JA, Tucker AL (2017) Past the Point of Speeding Up: The Negative Effects of Workload Saturation on Efficiency and Patient Severity. *Management Science* 63(4):1042–1062.
- Cadenillas A, Zapatero F (2000) Classical and Impulse Stochastic Control of the Exchange Rate Using Interest Rates and Reserves. *Mathematical Finance* 10(2):141–156.
- Caudillo-Fuentes LA, Kaufman DL, Lewis ME (2010) A simple heuristic for load balancing in parallel processing networks with highly variable service time distributions. *Queueing Systems* 64(2):145–165.
- Chan CW, Huang M, Sarhangian V (2021) Dynamic Server Assignment in Multiclass Queues with Shifts, with Applications to Nurse Staffing in Emergency Departments. *Operations Research* 69(6):1936–1959.

-
- Chan T, Park J, Pogacar F, Sarhangian V, Hellsten E, Razak F, Verma A (2023) Optimizing Inter-Hospital Patient Transfer Decisions During a Pandemic: A Queueing Network Approach. *Available at SSRN 3975839* .
- Chen J, Dong J, Shi P (2020) A survey on skill-based routing with applications to service operations management. *Queueing Systems* 96(1):53–82.
- Chen J, Dong J, Shi P (2023) Optimal routing under demand surges: The value of future arrival rates. *Operations Research* 0(0).
- Dai JG, Yao D (2013a) Brownian Inventory Models with Convex Holding Cost, Part 1: Average-Optimal Controls. *Stochastic Systems* 3(2):442–499.
- Dai JG, Yao D (2013b) Brownian Inventory Models with Convex Holding Cost, Part 2: Discount-Optimal Controls. *Stochastic Systems* 3(2):500–573.
- Dolan E, Johnson N, Kepler T, Lam H, Lelo de Larrea E, Mohammadi S, Olivier A, Quayyum A, Sanabria E, Sethuraman J, et al. (2022) Hospital load balancing: A data-driven approach to optimize ambulance transports during the covid-19 pandemic in new york city. *Available at SSRN 4094485* .
- Douin DJ, Ward MJ, Lindsell CJ, Howell MP, Hough CL, Exline MC, Gong MN, Aboodi MS, Tenforde MW, Feldstein LR, Stubblefield WB, Steingrub JS, Prekker ME, Brown SM, Peltan ID, Khan A, Files DC, Gibbs KW, Rice TW, Casey JD, Hager DN, Qadir N, Henning DJ, Wilson JG, Patel MM, Self WH, Ginde AA (2021) ICU Bed Utilization During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic in a Multistate Analysis—March to June 2020. *Critical Care Explorations* 3(3):e0361.
- Down DG, Lewis ME (2006) Dynamic load balancing in parallel queueing systems: Stability and optimal control. *European Journal of Operational Research* 168(2):509–519.
- Gallego G, Sethi S (2005) K-Convexity in R_n . *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 127.
- Harrison JM (2003) A broader view of brownian networks. *The Annals of Applied Probability* 13(3):1119–1150.
- He L, Hu Z, Zhang M (2020) Robust Repositioning for Vehicle Sharing. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 22(2):241–256.
- He QM, Neuts MF (2002) Two M/M/1 Queues with Transfers of Customers. *Queueing Systems* 42(4):377–400.
- Hu Y, Chan CW, Dong J (2022) Optimal Scheduling of Proactive Service with Customer Deterioration and Improvement. *Management Science* 68(4):2533–2578.
- Korn R (1999) Some applications of impulse control in mathematical finance. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research* 50(3):493–518.
- Kumar P, Kumar R (2019) Issues and Challenges of Load Balancing Techniques in Cloud Computing: A Survey. *ACM Computing Surveys* 51(6):120:1–120:35, ISSN 0360-0300.

- Kuntz L, Mennicken R, Scholtes S (2015) Stress on the Ward: Evidence of Safety Tipping Points in Hospitals. *Management Science* 61(4):754–771.
- Luo J, Rao L, Liu X (2015) Spatio-Temporal Load Balancing for Energy Cost Optimization in Distributed Internet Data Centers. *IEEE Transactions on Cloud Computing* 3(3):387–397, ISSN 2168-7161.
- Maglaras C (2000) Discrete-review policies for scheduling stochastic networks: Trajectory tracking and fluid-scale asymptotic optimality. *The Annals of Applied Probability* 10(3):897–929.
- Mandelbaum A, Massey WA (1995) Strong approximations for time-dependent queues. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 20(1):33–64.
- Meyn S (1997) Stability and optimization of queueing networks and their fluid models. *Lectures in applied mathematics-American Mathematical Society* 33:175–200.
- Mitchell D, Feng H, Muthuraman K (2014) Impulse control of interest rates. *Operations research* 62(3):602–615.
- Ormeçi M, Dai JG, Vate JV (2008) Impulse control of brownian motion: The constrained average cost case. *Operations Research* 56(3):618–629.
- Rockafellar RT (2015) Convex Analysis. *Convex Analysis* (Princeton University Press), ISBN 978-1-4008-7317-3.
- Scarf H (1960) The Optimality of (s,S) Policies in the Dynamic Inventory Problem. *Mathematical Methods in the Social Sciences* .
- Sethi SP, Thompson GL (2000) Economic applications. *Optimal Control Theory: Applications to Management Science and Economics* 289–306.
- Sitaraman R (2001) The power of two random choices: A survey of techniques and results .
- Van der Boor M, Borst SC, Van Leeuwen JSH, Mukherjee D (2022) Scalable Load Balancing in Networked Systems: A Survey of Recent Advances. *SIAM Review* 64(3):554–622.
- Zeng Y, Zhang L, Cai X, Li J (2018) Cost Sharing for Capacity Transfer in Cooperating Queueing Systems. *Production and Operations Management* 27(4):644–662.
- Zychlinski N (2023) Applications of fluid models in service operations management. *Queueing Systems* 103(1):161–185.
- Zychlinski N, Chan CW, Dong J (2023) Managing queues with different resource requirements. *Operations Research* 71(4):1387–1413.

Appendix A: Numerical Solution Approach for the Fluid Control Problem

The fluid control problem (6)–(10) can be solved numerically under any continuous time-varying arrivals and convex holding costs by the following general framework. We first approximate the continuous fluid dynamics within each period using L discrete intervals of fixed width. We define by

$$\bar{\lambda}_{lm} = \frac{L}{\tau} \int_{m\tau+l(\tau/L)}^{m\tau+(l+1)(\tau/L)} \lambda(t) dt$$

the average arrival rate over interval $l, l \in \{0, 1, \dots, L-1\}$, within period m . Within each interval, the fluid state $x(t)$ is assumed constant, and from interval l to $l+1$ of period m , it changes by $(\bar{\lambda}_{lm} - \mu)(\tau/L)$. Given an initial condition $x[m]$ and control $u[m]$ in period m , we use $g_i(x[m], u[m])$ to denote the single-period cost at queue i such that $g(x[m], u[m]) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} g_i(x[m], u[m])$. Then,

$$g_i(x[m], u[m]) \approx \frac{\tau}{L} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{0\}} h_i \left(\frac{z_{il}[m] + z_{i,l-1}[m]}{2} \right) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} r_{ij} u_{ij}[m] + \tilde{\kappa}(u[m]),$$

where $\mathcal{L} = \{0, \dots, L\}$ and $h_i : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ denotes a generic convex function, which can be approximated by the pointwise maximum of J affine functions

$$h_i(a) \approx \max\{h_{i1}a + b_{i1}, \dots, h_{iJ}a + b_{iJ}\},$$

which can be linearized using auxiliary variables $w_{il} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ after imposing the constraints $w_{il} \geq h_{ij}a + b_{ij}$ for all j for each $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $l \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{0\}$. The goodness of the approximation improves with larger L and J . The following constraints replace (7)–(9) to approximate the fluid dynamics:

$$y_{il}[m] = y_{i,l-1}[m] + (\bar{\lambda}_{lm} - \mu_i)(\tau/L), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}, l \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{0\}, m \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (18)$$

$$z_{il}[m] \geq y_{il}[m], \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}, l \in \mathcal{L}, m \in \mathcal{M}, m = l \neq 0, \quad (19)$$

$$z_{il}[m] \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}, l \in \mathcal{L}, m \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (20)$$

$$y_{i0}[m] = z_{iL}[m-1] + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} u_{ji}[m] - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} u_{ij}[m], \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}, m \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{0\}, \quad (21)$$

$$y_{i0}[0] = z_{i0}[0] + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} u_{ji}[0] - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} u_{ij}[0], \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (22)$$

$$z_{i0}[0] \geq x^0[0], \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (23)$$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} u_{ij}[m] \leq z_{iL}[m-1], \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}, m \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{0\}, \quad (24)$$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} u_{ij}[0] \leq z_{i0}[0], \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (25)$$

The variables $y_{il}[m]$ represent the fluid state of queue i at each of the L intervals within a period following the piecewise-constant dynamics, which is enforced in equation (18). In equations (19) and (20), variables $z_{il}[m]$ take the non-negative part of $y_{il}[m]$ to ensure feasibility. At the beginning of each period, $y_{il}[m]$ is set to the fluid state just after transferring, which is specified through equations (21) and (22). Equation (23) is the initial condition. Finally, we dictate in equations (24) and (25) that the total transfers out of any queue is always bounded above by its state just prior to transferring. The resulting optimization problem is a mixed-integer linear program.

Appendix B: Proofs

B.1. Proof of Lemma 1: Properties of the Joint Setup Cost Function

Proof of Lemma 1. The first two properties of the joint setup cost function follow directly from the fact that the indicator function $1\{z \neq 0\}$ satisfies $1\{x + y \neq 0\} \leq 1\{x \neq 0\} + 1\{y \neq 0\}$ for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $1\{-z \neq 0\} = 1\{z \neq 0\}$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$. For the third property, we note that if $x = y$, the joint setup cost is zero, but equals K otherwise. Thus, for any x and y , the joint setup cost can be calculated without the knowledge of the particular transfer matrix in moving the state from x to y . Moreover, for all feasible non-zero transfer decision matrices, the joint setup cost is constant. This implies that the joint setup cost cannot affect the optimal transfer decision matrix and vice versa, i.e., $C(y - x) = R(y - x) + \kappa(y - x)$. \square

B.2. Properties of the Value Function

In this section, we provide proofs of the properties of the holding cost function (Lemma 2) and the value function (Theorem 1). Upon establishing K -convexity of the value function, we conclude by outlining its additional properties which are important in characterizing the optimal policy.

B.2.1. Proof of Lemma 2: Properties of the Holding Cost Function

Proof of Lemma 2. We show the properties by proving that the state transition function $f^m(\cdot, \tau)$ is convex, continuous, and non-decreasing, which is done by first deriving an equivalent recursive expression for it. From this, the properties of the holding cost function follow.

Since the holding cost can be analyzed separately by each queue and period, in what follows we will focus on a given queue i and the first period and suppress the dependency of the holding cost function on the period for ease of exposition. Recall that the holding cost function at queue i is defined as

$$H_i(y_i) = \int_0^\tau h_i(f_i(y_i, s)) ds.$$

We proceed by a recursive expression for $f_i(y_i, t)$. Let \mathcal{T}_i be the union of the set of time points in $(0, \tau)$ such that $\lambda_i(t)$ is monotone between successive points, and the set of all zeros of the fluid dynamics $\lambda_i(t) - \mu_i$. Under Assumption 1, \mathcal{T}_i is finite. Denote these points by t_1, \dots, t_P , arranged in increasing order. Additionally, let $t_0 = 0$ and $t_{P+1} = \tau$. We define $f_i^p : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as

$$f_i^{p+1}(y_i, t) = \left(f_i^p(y_i, t_p) + \int_{t_p}^t \lambda_i(s) ds - \mu_i(t - t_p) \right)^+, \quad t \in [t_p, t_{p+1}) \text{ and } p = 0, \dots, P, \quad (26)$$

with $f_i^0(y_i, t_0) = y_i$. For all $t \in [t_p, t_{p+1}]$, the expression $\lambda_i(t) - \mu_i$ must be either positive or negative. Consequently, the queue length process is monotone in each interval $[t_p, t_{p+1}]$, and as a result, if the queue length reaches zero at any point in $[t_p, t_{p+1}]$, it will remain at zero until t_{p+1} . Therefore, the pointwise maximum operator in (26) correctly calculates the queue length throughout each interval and we arrive at the following equivalent expression for $f_i(y_i, t)$:

$$f_i(y_i, t) = \begin{cases} f_i^1(y_i, t), & 0 = t_0 \leq t < t_1, \\ f_i^2(y_i, t), & t_1 \leq t < t_2, \\ \vdots & \\ f_i^{P+1}(y_i, t), & t_P \leq t < t_{P+1} = \tau. \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

Crucially, each $f_i^p(y_i, t)$ is convex, continuous, and non-decreasing in y_i as the composition of such functions preserves these properties. To calculate the holding cost at queue i , we can decompose it as a sum of the holding cost over each interval as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} H_i(y_i) &= \int_0^\tau \left[h_i(f_i^0(y_i, s))1\{0 \leq s < t_1\} + \cdots + h_i(f_i^{P+1}(y_i, s))1\{t_P \leq s < \tau\} \right] ds \\ &= \int_0^{t_1} h_i(f_i^0(y_i, s))ds + \cdots + \int_{t_P}^\tau h_i(f_i^{P+1}(y_i, s))ds \\ &= \sum_{p=0}^P \int_{t_p}^{t_{p+1}} h_i(f_i^p(y_i, s))ds. \end{aligned}$$

Under Assumption 2, $H_i(\cdot)$ is convex, continuous, and non-decreasing as it is a sum of $P+1$ such functions. Thus, the holding cost of the system $H(y) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} H_i(y_i)$ is convex, continuous, and non-decreasing. \square

B.2.2. Proof of Theorem 1. Before proving the properties of the value function, we first establish properties of the transfer cost $R(\cdot)$ in (11).

LEMMA 3. Let $\mathcal{Z} = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^N : e^\top z = 0\}$. The transfer cost function $R(\cdot)$ has the following properties:

- (Positive homogeneity): $R(tz) = tR(z)$ for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $t \geq 0$.
- (Convexity): $R(\theta z_1 + (1-\theta)z_2) \leq \theta R(z_1) + (1-\theta)R(z_2)$ for all $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $\theta \in [0, 1]$.
- (Subadditivity): $R(z_1 + z_2) \leq R(z_1) + R(z_2)$ for all $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}$.
- (Continuity): $R(z)$ is continuous in $z \in \mathcal{Z}$.

Proof of Lemma 3. We note that the $R(z)$ is a bounded and feasible linear program for any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$. Therefore, by strong duality, we can write $R(z) = \max\{p \cdot z : p_j - p_i \leq r_{ij}, \forall i, j \in \mathcal{N}\}$. The rest of the proof follows the same approach from Lemma EC.1 of [Benjaafar et al. \(2022\)](#). Observe that,

$$R(tz) = \max\{tp \cdot z : p_j - p_i \leq r_{ij}, \forall i, j \in \mathcal{N}\} = t \max\{p \cdot z : p_j - p_i \leq r_{ij}, \forall i, j \in \mathcal{N}\} = tR(z),$$

for all $t \geq 0$, i.e., $R(\cdot)$ is positively homogeneous. As $R(\cdot)$ is a pointwise supremum of affine and continuous functions, it is convex and lower semicontinuous. Moreover, \mathcal{Z} is a polyhedron, and hence, a locally simplicial set. Thus, $R(\cdot)$ is upper semicontinuous, which makes it continuous ([Rockafellar 2015](#), Theorem 10.2). Finally, using convexity and positive homogeneity, we have

$$R(z_1 + z_2) = 2C \left(\frac{1}{2}z_1 + \frac{1}{2}z_2 \right) \leq 2 \left(\frac{1}{2}R(z_1) + \frac{1}{2}R(z_2) \right) = R(z_1) + R(z_2),$$

i.e., $R(\cdot)$ is sub-additive. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Since showing K -convexity requires monotonicity, we will first establish monotonicity and then K -convexity by induction and lastly continuity. For ease of exposition, we again suppress the dependence of the holding cost function $H^m(\cdot)$ on the period.

To show monotonicity, consider two initial conditions y and z such that $y \geq z$. We will use the following equivalent representation for the value function:

$$V^{M-1}(x) = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \left[H(x + (u^\top - u)e) + R((u^\top - u)e) + \kappa((u^\top - u)e) \right],$$

where $\mathcal{U}(x) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N \times N} : u^\top e \leq x, \forall i \in \mathcal{N}\}$. For convenience, we will use $\phi(u)$ to denote the net transfer $(u^\top - u)e$ and $\phi_i(u)$ to denote its i th component. Intuitively, we now minimize over all feasible transfer decision matrices, rather than post-transfer states. Denote by u^* the optimal transfer matrix at y . We will construct a feasible transfer matrix \hat{u} at z from u^* in the following way. For each $i \in \mathcal{N}$:

- If $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} u_{ij}^* \leq z_i$, do nothing. This solution is also feasible at z .
- Otherwise, this means u^* is not feasible at z since more customers are transferred out of queue i than are available. Choose any number of values from $u_{i1}^*, \dots, u_{iN}^*$ and reduce by some arbitrary amount such that we will ultimately have $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \hat{u}_{ij} = z_i$ while maintaining $\hat{u}_{ij} \geq 0, \forall j \in \mathcal{N}$.

We then have,

$$\begin{aligned} V^{M-1}(y) &= H(y + \phi(u^*)) + R(\phi(u^*)) + \kappa(\phi(u^*)) \\ &\geq H(z + \phi(\hat{u})) + R(\phi(\hat{u})) + \kappa(\phi(\hat{u})) \\ &\geq \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}(z)} [H(z + \phi(u)) + R(\phi(u)) + \kappa(\phi(u))] = V^{M-1}(z). \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality holds because \hat{u} is feasible at z , but not optimal in general. To see that the first inequality holds, we note that by construction, we have $u_{ij}^* \geq \hat{u}_{ij}, \forall i, j \in \mathcal{N}$, which implies $\kappa(\phi(u^*)) \geq \kappa(\phi(\hat{u}))$ and $R(\phi(u^*)) = r \cdot u^* \geq r \cdot \hat{u} = R(\phi(\hat{u}))$. Next, to show $H(y + \phi(u^*)) \geq H(z + \phi(\hat{u}))$, we note that $H(x) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} H_i(x)$, so it is sufficient to show this for a fixed $i \in \mathcal{N}$. To this end, we consider two cases, where queue i is a sender or a receiver.

Case 1. Queue i is a “sender.” If $\phi_i(u^*) = \phi_i(\hat{u})$, then clearly $y_i + \phi_i(u^*) \geq z_i + \phi_i(\hat{u})$ since $y_i \geq z_i$. Otherwise, we have $z_i + \phi_i(\hat{u}) = 0$ by construction, implying $H_i(z_i + \phi(\hat{u})) = 0$. Either way, we have $H_i(y_i + \phi_i(u^*)) \geq H_i(z_i + \phi_i(\hat{u}))$ by monotonicity of $H(\cdot)$.

Case 2. Queue i is a “receiver.” Since $u_{ji}^* \geq \hat{u}_{ji}$ for all j , queue i receives fewer customers in total under \hat{u} . Therefore, $y_i + \phi_i(u^*) \geq z_i + \phi_i(\hat{u})$ and $H_i(y_i + \phi_i(u^*)) \geq H_i(z_i + \phi_i(\hat{u}))$ by monotonicity of $H(\cdot)$.

Note that we do not consider the case where it can be both since Proposition 1, which does not rely on the properties of the value function, guarantees the existence of an optimal policy under which each queue is either one or the other. This concludes that $V^{M-1}(\cdot)$ is non-decreasing.

Now, suppose the claim holds for period $m+1, \dots, M-1$. In period m , given an initial condition x ,

$$V^m(x) = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} [H(x + \phi(u)) + R(\phi(u)) + \kappa(\phi(u)) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x + \phi(u), \tau))].$$

Since $V^{m+1}(\cdot)$ is non-decreasing by assumption and $f^m(\cdot, \tau)$ is non-decreasing under Assumptions 1 and 2 based on its recursive definition (27), we can use the same argument as before to show that $V^m(y) \geq V^m(z)$ for any $y \geq z$. Thus, $V^m(\cdot)$ is non-decreasing for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$.

Using induction, we next show that $V^m(\cdot)$ is K -convex for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$ by verifying that for any two states x^1 and x^2 , $V^m(\cdot)$ satisfies Definition 1 under the joint setup cost in (13) with parameter $K > 0$.

Consider the last period $M-1$. Given an initial condition x ,

$$V^{M-1}(x) = \min_{y \in \Delta(e^\top x)} [H(y) + R(y - x) + \kappa(y - x)].$$

Fix $n \geq 0$. Let $x^i \in \Delta(n)$ for $i = 1, 2$ and assume $x^1 \neq x^2$ without loss of generality. Let $\bar{x} = \theta x^1 + (1 - \theta)x^2$ for any $\theta \in [0, 1]$. If $x^i \in \Sigma(n)$ for $i = 1, 2$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} V^{M-1}(\bar{x}) &\leq H(\bar{x}) \\ &\leq \theta H(x^1) + (1 - \theta)[H(x^2) + \kappa(x^2 - x^1)] \\ &= \theta V^{M-1}(x^1) + (1 - \theta)[V^{M-1}(x^2) + \kappa(x^2 - x^1)]. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality holds by convexity of $H(\cdot)$ (Lemma 2) and because $\kappa(x^2 - x^1) \geq 0$. Since $x^i \in \Sigma(n)$, the last step follows from $V^{M-1}(x^i) = H(x^i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. This shows $V^{M-1}(\cdot)$ is K -convex when $x^i \in \Sigma(n)$, $\forall i$.

So, assume that at least one of x^1 or x^2 lie outside of $\Sigma(n)$, and suppose, without loss of generality, that $x^1 \notin \Sigma(n)$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exist $y^i \in \Delta(n)$ for $i = 1, 2$, such that

$$H(y^i) + R(y^i - x^i) + \kappa(y^i - x^i) \leq V^{M-1}(x^i) + \epsilon, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

In particular, if $x^i \notin \Sigma(n)$, we may assume that there always exists $y^i \neq x^i$ that satisfies the above inequality for any $\epsilon > 0$. Now, let $\theta \in [0, 1]$, and for ease of notation, let $\bar{x} = \theta x^1 + (1 - \theta)x^2$ and $\bar{y} = \theta y^1 + (1 - \theta)y^2$. We observe

$$\begin{aligned} V^{M-1}(\bar{x}) &= \min_{y \in \Delta(n)} [H(y) + R(y - \bar{x}) + \kappa(y - \bar{x})] \\ &\leq H(\bar{y}) + R(\bar{y} - \bar{x}) + \kappa(\bar{y} - \bar{x}) \\ &\leq \theta [H(y^1) + R(y^1 - x^1) + \kappa(\bar{y} - \bar{x})] + (1 - \theta) [H(y^2) + R(y^2 - x^2) + \kappa(\bar{y} - \bar{x})] \\ &\leq \theta [H(y^1) + R(y^1 - x^1) + \kappa(y^1 - x^1)] + (1 - \theta) [H(y^2) + R(y^2 - x^2) + \kappa(y^2 - x^2) + \kappa(x^2 - x^1)] \\ &\leq \theta V^{M-1}(x^1) + (1 - \theta) [V^{M-1}(x^2) + \kappa(x^2 - x^1)] + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds by \bar{y} being a feasible solution. The second inequality holds by substituting the definitions of \bar{x} and \bar{y} and by convexity of $H(\cdot)$ and $R(\cdot)$ (Lemma 3). For the third inequality, we use the fact that $\kappa(\bar{y} - \bar{x}) = \kappa(y^1 - x^1)$ and $\kappa(\bar{y} - \bar{x}) \leq \kappa(y^2 - x^2) + \kappa(x^2 - x^1)$. Since this observation holds for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$V^{M-1}(\bar{x}) \leq \theta V^{M-1}(x^1) + (1 - \theta) [V^{M-1}(x^2) + \kappa(x^2 - x^1)].$$

This shows that $V^{M-1}(\cdot)$ is K -convex.

Now, suppose the claim holds for periods $m + 1, \dots, M - 1$. We note that by monotonicity of $V^m(\cdot)$ for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$, and by convexity of the state transition function $f^m(\cdot, \tau)$ under Assumptions 1 and 2 based on its recursive definition (27), $V^t(f^{t-1}(\cdot, \tau))$ is K -convex for $t \in \{m + 1, \dots, M - 1\}$. In period m , again fix $n \geq 0$, $\epsilon > 0$, and let $x^i \in \Delta(n)$ for $i = 1, 2$, where $x^1 \neq x^2$ without loss of generality. If $x^i \in \Sigma(n)$ for $i = 1, 2$, then by a similar argument as before, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} V^m(\bar{x}) &\leq H(\bar{x}) + V^{m+1}(f^m(\bar{x}, \tau)) \\ &\leq \theta [H(x^1) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x^1, \tau))] + (1 - \theta) [H(x^2) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x^2, \tau)) + \kappa(x^2 - x^1)] \\ &= \theta V^m(x^1) + (1 - \theta) [V^m(x^2) + \kappa(x^2 - x^1)], \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $V^m(\cdot)$ is K -convex. The second step holds by convexity of $H(\cdot)$ and K -convexity of $(V^{m+1} \circ f^m)(\cdot)$.

So, assume that at least one of x^1 or x^2 lie outside of $\Sigma(n)$, and suppose, without loss of generality, that $x^1 \notin \Sigma(n)$. Then there exist $y^i \in \Delta(n)$ for $i = 1, 2$, such that

$$H(y^i) + R(y^i - x^i) + \kappa(y^i - x^i) \leq V^m(x^i) + \epsilon, \quad \forall i = 1, 2.$$

Letting $\theta \in [0, 1]$ and defining $\bar{x} = \theta x^1 + (1 - \theta)x^2$ and $\bar{y} = \theta y^1 + (1 - \theta)y^2$, the rest of the proof follows a similar argument as before:

$$\begin{aligned}
V^m(\bar{x}) &= \min_{y \in \Delta(n)} [H(y) + R(y - \bar{x}) + \kappa(y - \bar{x}) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau))] \\
&\leq H(\bar{y}) + R(\bar{y} - \bar{x}) + \kappa(\bar{y} - \bar{x}) + V^{m+1}(f^m(\bar{y}, \tau)) \\
&\leq \theta [H(y^1) + R(y^1 - x^1) + \kappa(y^1 - x^1) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y^1, \tau))] \\
&\quad + (1 - \theta) [H(y^2) + R(y^2 - x^2) + \kappa(y^2 - x^2) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y^2, \tau)) + \kappa(x^2 - x^1)] \\
&\leq \theta V^m(x^1) + (1 - \theta) [V^m(x^2) + \kappa(x^2 - x^1)] + \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Since this observation holds for any $\epsilon > 0$, this shows that $V^m(\cdot)$ is K -convex for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$.

Lastly, we show continuity of $V^m(\cdot)$. Define $v^m(y; x) = H(y) + R(y - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau))$ where $R(y - x)$ is the variable transfer cost of going from a given initial condition x to y . Let n be the total number of customers at x . For period $m = M - 1$, $v^{M-1}(\cdot)$ is clearly continuous on $\Delta(n)$. Furthermore, since $\Delta(n)$ is compact, v^{M-1} is uniformly continuous on $\Delta(n)$. Then let any two points $x_1, x_2 \in \Delta(n)$ such that $\|x_1 - x_2\| < \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$ and let y_1^* and y_2^* denote the target states, respectively. We can consider two cases: $x_1 \notin \Sigma(n)$ and $x_1 \in \Sigma(n)$. If $x_1 \notin \Sigma(n)$, there exists $y_1^* \neq x_1$ and we can find some $y_2 \in \Sigma(n)$ such that $\|y_1^* - y_2\| < \delta$. Then by uniform continuity of v^{M-1} on $\Delta(n)$, this implies that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that,

$$V^{M-1}(x_1) = K + v^{M-1}(y_1^*; x_1) \geq K + v^{M-1}(y_2; x_2) - \epsilon \geq V^{M-1}(x_2) - \epsilon,$$

holds. In the second case where $x_1 \in \Sigma(n)$, there must exist $y_1^* = x_1$. So,

$$V^{M-1}(x_1) = v^{M-1}(x_1; x_1) \geq v^{M-1}(x_2; x_2) - \epsilon \geq V^{M-1}(x_2) - \epsilon.$$

In both cases, we have $V^{M-1}(x_1) \geq V^{M-1}(x_2) - \epsilon$. Using the same argument, we can show that $V^{M-1}(x_2) \geq V^{M-1}(x_1) - \epsilon$. This indicates that $|V^{M-1}(x_1) - V^{M-1}(x_2)| \leq \epsilon$ and hence $V^{M-1}(\cdot)$ is continuous. Now, assume $V^{m+1}(\cdot)$ is continuous for some $m \leq M - 2$. Using continuity of $f^m(\cdot, \tau)$, it follows that $v^m(\cdot)$ is also continuous. Therefore, following the same analysis as period $M - 1$, $V^m(\cdot)$ is continuous. \square

B.2.3. Additional Properties of the Value Function. Finally, we outline additional properties of a K -convex function. These properties were first demonstrated by [Gallego and Sethi \(2005\)](#) in \mathbb{R}^N for the N -product inventory control problem. We show these results for the value function under the joint setup cost in (13), which will be useful for characterizing the compactness and connectedness of the no-transfer region $\Sigma(\cdot)$ in the proof of Theorem 2.

LEMMA 4. For all $m \in \mathcal{M}$, we have:

- (i) $V^m(\cdot)$ is L -convex for any $L \geq K$.
- (ii) If $W(\cdot)$ is L -convex, then for any $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta \geq 0$, $\alpha V^m(\cdot) + \beta W(\cdot)$ is $(\alpha K + \beta L)$ -convex.
- (iii) Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ and $y \in \Delta(e^\top x)$. Suppose $V^{m+1}(f^m(\cdot, \tau))$ is K -convex. Define $g^m : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as

$$g^m(\theta) = H^m(x + \theta(y - x)) + R(\theta(y - x)) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x + \theta(y - x), \tau)).$$

Then $g(\cdot)$ is K -convex (in the univariate sense of [Scarf 1960](#)).

Proof of Lemma 4. The first property follows directly from $K1\{z \neq 0\} \leq L1\{z \neq 0\}$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $K \leq L$. To show the second property, we note that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, $x \neq y$, and $\theta \in [0, 1]$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha V + \beta W)(\theta x + (1 - \theta)y) &= \alpha V(\theta x + (1 - \theta)y) + \beta W(\theta x + (1 - \theta)y) \\ &\leq \alpha(\theta V(x) + (1 - \theta)[V(y) + K1\{y - x \neq 0\}]) \\ &\quad + \beta(\theta W(x) + (1 - \theta)[W(y) + L1\{y - x \neq 0\}]) \\ &= \theta[\alpha V(x) + \beta W(x)] + (1 - \theta)[\alpha V(y) + \beta W(y) + \alpha K1\{y - x \neq 0\} + \beta L1\{y - x \neq 0\}] \\ &= \theta(\alpha V + \beta W)(x) + (1 - \theta)[(\alpha V + \beta W)(y) + (\alpha K + \beta L)1\{y - x \neq 0\}], \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $\alpha V^m(\cdot) + \beta W(\cdot)$ is $(\alpha K + \beta L)$ -convex.

Lastly, we prove the third property by contradiction. Suppose $g^m(\cdot)$ is not K -convex. Then there exist $\eta \in [0, 1]$ and $\theta_1 \leq \theta_2$ such that,

$$g^m(\eta\theta_1 + (1 - \eta)\theta_2) > \eta g^m(\theta_1) + (1 - \eta)[g(\theta_2) + K].$$

For ease of notation, let $\bar{\theta} = \eta\theta_1 + (1 - \eta)\theta_2$ and let $z_1 = x + \theta_1(y - x)$ and $z_2 = x + \theta_2(y - x)$. The above inequality implies,

$$\begin{aligned} g^m(\bar{\theta}) &= H^m(x + \bar{\theta}(y - x)) + R(\bar{\theta}(y - x)) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x + \bar{\theta}(y - x), \tau)) \\ &= H^m(\eta z_1 + (1 - \eta)z_2) + \bar{\theta}R(y - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(\eta z_1 + (1 - \eta)z_2, \tau)) \\ &> \eta g(\theta_1) + (1 - \eta)[g(\theta_2) + K] \\ &= \eta H^m(z_1) + (1 - \eta)H^m(z_2) + \eta R(\theta_1(y - x)) + (1 - \eta)R(\theta_2(y - x)) \\ &\quad + \eta V^{m+1}(f^m(z_1, \tau)) + (1 - \eta)[V^{m+1}(f^m(z_2, \tau)) + \kappa(y - x)] \\ &= \eta H^m(z_1) + (1 - \eta)H^m(z_2) + \bar{\theta}R(y - x) + \eta V^{m+1}(f^m(z_1, \tau)) + (1 - \eta)[V^{m+1}(f^m(z_2, \tau)) + \kappa(y - x)] \end{aligned}$$

However, we note that,

$$H^m(\eta z_1 + (1 - \eta)z_2) \leq \eta H^m(z_1) + (1 - \eta)H^m(z_2),$$

must hold by Lemma 2 and,

$$\begin{aligned} V^{m+1}(f^m(\eta z_1 + (1 - \eta)z_2, \tau)) &\leq \eta V^{m+1}(f^m(z_1, \tau)) + (1 - \eta)[V^{m+1}(f^m(z_2, \tau)) + \kappa(z_2 - z_1)] \\ &\leq \eta V^{m+1}(f^m(z_1, \tau)) + (1 - \eta)[V^{m+1}(f^m(z_2, \tau)) + \kappa(y - x)], \end{aligned}$$

must hold by assumption. The second inequality holds because $\kappa(z_2 - z_1) \leq \kappa(y - x)$, as shown below:

$$\kappa(z_2 - z_1) = \kappa((\theta_2 - \theta_1)(y - x)) = \begin{cases} 0, & \theta_2 - \theta_1 = 0 \\ \kappa(y - x), & \theta_2 - \theta_1 > 0 \end{cases} \leq \kappa(y - x),$$

Therefore, this is a contradiction, and as a result, $g^m(\cdot)$ must be K -convex. \square

B.3. Proofs of the Results in Section 4.3

B.3.1. Proof of Proposition 1.

Proof of Proposition 1. Consider an initial condition $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ and a post-transfer state $y \in \Delta(e^\top x)$, $y \neq x$. For fixed y , the holding cost $H^m(y)$, the value function $V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau))$, and the joint setup cost $\kappa(y - x) = K$ are constant. Therefore, it suffices to show that there exists an optimal transfer decision matrix u^* such that its cost is $R(y - x)$ and it satisfies $u_{ij}^* u_{jl}^* = 0, \forall i, j, l \in \mathcal{N}$. This means that if queue j is receiving customers ($u_{ij}^* > 0$ for some i), queue j cannot be sending customers to any queue at the same time ($u_{jl}^* = 0, \forall l$) and vice versa.

Suppose that there exist $i, j, l \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $u_{ij}^* u_{jl}^* > 0$. We will construct another feasible transfer matrix \hat{u} in the following way. If $i = l$, then we can simply force to zero the smaller of u_{ij}^* and u_{ji}^* . Without loss of generality, assume that $u_{ij}^* = \min\{u_{ij}^*, u_{ji}^*\}$. Then we can set $\hat{u}_{ij} = 0$ and $\hat{u}_{ji} = u_{ji}^* - u_{ij}^* > 0$. By implementing \hat{u} , we would reduce the total cost by $r_{ij} u_{ij}^* \geq 0$. So, \hat{u} does equally well, if not better, than u^* . If $i \neq l$, we have two cases: $u_{ij}^* \geq u_{jl}^*$ or $u_{ij}^* < u_{jl}^*$. In the first case, we can set $\hat{u}_{jl} = 0$, $\hat{u}_{ij} = u_{ij}^* - u_{jl}^* \geq 0$, and $\hat{u}_{il} = u_{il}^* + u_{jl}^*$. Then we would reduce the total cost by $r_{ij} u_{jl}^* + r_{jl} u_{jl}^* - r_{il} u_{jl}^* = u_{jl}^* (r_{ij} + r_{jl} - r_{il}) \geq 0$ (Assumption 3). So, \hat{u} again does equally well or better. In the second case that $u_{ij}^* < u_{jl}^*$, we can following a similar analysis and reach the same conclusion. Therefore, there always exists an optimal policy under which each queue is either sending or receiving customers, but not both, in the same period. \square

B.3.2. Proof of Theorem 2. In the following proof, we first establish the properties of the no-transfer region $\Sigma(n)$ in the order of non-emptiness, compactness, and connectedness, which is followed by the properties of the optimal policy. For ease of exposition, we will suppress the dependence of the holding cost function $H^m(\cdot)$ on the period.

Proof of Theorem 2. Fix $n \geq 0$. We first show that $\Sigma(n)$ is non-empty. For any given initial condition $x \in \Delta(n)$, denote its target state by x^* , which exists since $\Delta(n)$ is non-empty and compact. It is then easy to see that $x^* \in \Sigma(n)$. Suppose otherwise. Then, there exists $y \in \Delta(n)$, $y \neq x^*$, such that:

$$\begin{aligned} V^m(x) &= H(x^*) + R(x^* - x) + \kappa(x^* - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x^*, \tau)) \\ &> R(x^* - x) + \kappa(x^* - x) + V^m(x^*) \\ &= R(x^* - x) + \kappa(x^* - x) + H(y) + R(y - x^*) + \kappa(y - x^*) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau)) \\ &> H(y) + R(y - x) + \kappa(y - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau)). \end{aligned}$$

The second and third lines hold by assumption that $x^* \notin \Sigma(n)$, which implies $H(x^*) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x^*, \tau)) > V^m(x^*) = H(y) + R(y - x^*) + \kappa(y - x^*) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau))$. The last inequality holds by subadditivity of $\kappa(\cdot)$ (Lemma 1) and $R(\cdot)$ (Lemma 3). This contradicts the optimality of x^* as it suggests that moving to y yields a strictly lower cost. Therefore, $x^* \in \Sigma(n)$, and $\Sigma(n)$ is non-empty.

Secondly, we show that $\Sigma(n)$ is compact. Since $\Sigma(n) \subseteq \Delta(n)$, and $\Delta(n)$ is compact, it suffices to show that $\Sigma(n)$ is closed, which we show by proving its complement $\sigma(n) = \Sigma^c(n)$ is open. Consider $x \in \sigma(n)$ and let x^* be a target state corresponding to x . Define $g: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as

$$g(\theta) = H(x + \theta(x^* - x)) + R(\theta(x^* - x)) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x + \theta(x^* - x), \tau)),$$

which is K -convex in the univariate sense (Lemma 4). By definition of $\sigma(n)$, $g(0) > g(1) + K$ must hold. Furthermore, by K -convexity of $g(\cdot)$, there exist $\theta_b \in (0, 1)$ such that $g(\theta_b) = g(1) + \kappa(x^* - x)$, and for all

$\theta \in [0, \theta_b)$, $g(\theta) > g(1) + \kappa(x^* - x)$. This implies that for any $\epsilon > 0$, we can find $\hat{\theta} > 0$ and define $y = x + \hat{\theta}(x^* - x)$ such that $\|y - x\|_2 = \hat{\theta}\|x^* - x\|_2 < \epsilon$. This shows that $\sigma(n)$ is an open set. Thus, $\Sigma(n)$ is closed, and in turn, compact.

Thirdly, we show that $\Sigma(n)$ is connected. For a given initial condition x , we let

$$\begin{aligned} y^*(x) &= \{y \in \Delta(n) : H(y) + R(y - x) + \kappa(y - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau)) \\ &\leq H(z) + R(z - x) + \kappa(z - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(z, \tau)), \forall z \in \Delta(n), z \neq y\}, \end{aligned}$$

be the set of all target states corresponding to x . Then we have $\Sigma(n) = \cup_{x \in \Delta(n)} y^*(x)$. To see this, consider any $x \in \Delta(n)$. If $x \notin \Sigma(n)$, $y^*(x)$ is the set of all equally optimal target states corresponding to x , all of which must be contained in $\Sigma(n)$. If $x \in \Sigma(n)$, $y^*(x)$ includes x itself and possibly others in $\Sigma(n)$ to which we are indifferent with regard to transferring or not. Repeating this for every $x \in \Delta(n)$, one can see that the union of $y^*(x)$ must be equal to $\Sigma(n)$.

Now, consider y_1 and y_2 in $y^*(x)$ such that $y_1 \neq y_2$. If $y_1 = y_2$, we note that the proof below becomes trivial. For ease of notation, let $\bar{y} = \theta y_1 + (1 - \theta)y_2$ for some $\theta \in (0, 1)$. We show below that $\bar{y} \in \Sigma(n)$, which will ultimately be useful in proving that $\Sigma(n)$ is connected. Observe that,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\bar{y}) + R(\bar{y} - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(\bar{y}, \tau)) &\leq \theta[H(y_1) + R(y_1 - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y_1, \tau))] \\ &\quad + (1 - \theta)[H(y_2) + R(y_2 - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y_2, \tau)) + \kappa(y_2 - y_1)] \\ &\leq H(z) + R(z - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(z, \tau)) + K, \quad \forall z \in \Delta(n). \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds by convexity of $H(\cdot)$ and $R(\cdot)$ (Lemmas 2 and 3) and K -convexity of $V^{m+1}(f^m(\cdot, \tau))$ (Theorem 1). The second inequality holds by definition of $y^*(x)$. Then, rearranging $R(\bar{y} - x)$ to the right-hand side, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} H(\bar{y}) + V^{m+1}(f^m(\bar{y}, \tau)) &\leq H(z) + R(z - x) - R(\bar{y} - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(z, \tau)) + K, \quad \forall z \in \Delta(n) \\ &\leq H(z) + R(z - \bar{y}) + V^{m+1}(f^m(z, \tau)) + K, \quad \forall z \in \Delta(n), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by subadditivity of $R(\cdot)$ (Lemma 3). This result indicates that it is better to remain at \bar{y} than to move to any other states in $\Delta(n)$. Therefore, $\bar{y} \in \Sigma(n)$. Intuitively, what we have shown is that any convex combination of two target states corresponding to x must lie in $\Sigma(n)$.

Suppose now, for sake of contradiction, that $\Sigma(n)$ is not connected. Then $\Sigma(n)$ can be expressed as a union of two non-empty, separated sets, i.e., $\Sigma(n) = \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2$ where $\mathcal{V}_1 \neq \emptyset$, $\mathcal{V}_2 \neq \emptyset$, and $\mathcal{V}_1 \cap \mathcal{V}_2 = \emptyset$. (\mathcal{V}_1 and \mathcal{V}_2 are compact as $\Sigma(n)$ is compact.) We note that for all $x \in \Delta(n)$, $y^*(x)$ must lie in either \mathcal{V}_1 or \mathcal{V}_2 , but not both. To see this, suppose that there exist y_1 and y_2 in $y^*(x)$ such that $y_1 \in \mathcal{V}_1$ and $y_2 \in \mathcal{V}_2$. Then there must exist some $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\bar{y} = \theta y_1 + (1 - \theta)y_2 \notin \Sigma(n)$. However, we have just shown that all convex combinations of two target states corresponding to x must lie in $\Sigma(n)$, which contradicts that $y_1 \in \mathcal{V}_1$ and $y_2 \in \mathcal{V}_2$. Now, let $\mathcal{U}_1 = y^{*-1}(\mathcal{V}_1)$ and $\mathcal{U}_2 = y^{*-1}(\mathcal{V}_2)$. Then \mathcal{U}_1 and \mathcal{U}_2 are two non-empty, separated sets such that $\Delta(n) = \mathcal{U}_1 \cup \mathcal{U}_2$. This implies that $\Delta(n)$ is in fact not connected, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $\Sigma(n)$ must be connected.

Finally, we establish the properties of the optimal policy. Note that if $x \in \Sigma(n)$, the existence of a target state y such that $y = x$ is clear from the definition of $\Sigma(n)$, meaning that it is optimal not to move. So, assume $x \notin \Sigma(n)$. We consider the three cases from Theorem 2 in order:

• If $\kappa(\cdot) = 0$ and $r_{ij} = 0$ for all i, j , we note that $V^m(\cdot)$ is convex for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$ (as a special case of Theorem 2) and $V^m(x) = \min_{y \in \Delta(n)} [H(y) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau))]$. This suggests that the target state y can be obtained by solving a convex optimization problem over a compact set whose cost is independent of x . Thus, there must exist a global target state y such that it is optimal to move to y from any $x \notin \Sigma(n)$.

• Suppose $\kappa(\cdot) = 0$ and let x^* denote a target state corresponding to x such that $x^* \in \text{ri}(\Sigma(n))$. Then for small enough $\theta \in (0, 1)$, there must exist $y = x^* + \theta(x - x^*) \in \Sigma(n)$ and:

$$\begin{aligned} R(y - x) + H(y) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau)) &\leq R(y - x) + R(x^* - y) + H(x^*) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x^*, \tau)) \\ &\leq R(y - x) + R(x^* - x) + H(x^*) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x^*, \tau)) \\ &= (1 - \theta)R(x^* - x) + \theta R(x^* - x) + H(x^*) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x^*, \tau)) \\ &= R(x^* - x) + H(x^*) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x^*, \tau)). \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds by the assumption that $y \in \Sigma(n)$. The first equality holds by substituting the definition of y . This shows that going to y is just as good, if not better, than going to x^* from x . Therefore, there must exist a target state $y \in \partial\Sigma(n)$.

• Let $\kappa(\cdot)$ be the joint setup cost function (13). Let x^* denote a target state corresponding to x , $x^* \neq x$. Suppose $x^* \in \partial\Sigma(n)$. Then there must exist $y \in \Sigma(n)$, $y \neq x^*$, such that we are indifferent to staying at x^* or to moving from x^* to y . However, this leads to a contradiction:

$$\begin{aligned} V^m(x) &= H(x^*) + R(x^* - x) + \kappa(x^* - x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x^*, \tau)) \\ &= R(x^* - x) + \kappa(x^* - x) + R(y - x^*) + \kappa(y - x^*) + H(y) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau)) \\ &> R(y - x) + \kappa(y - x) + H(y) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau)), \end{aligned}$$

i.e., x^* is not a target state corresponding to x . Therefore, all target states belong to $\text{ri}(\Sigma(n))$. □

B.4. Proof of the Results in Section 4.4

Since the queueing dynamics are assumed to be stationary in Section 4.4, we omit the dependence of the holding cost function on the period.

B.4.1. Proof of Proposition 2.

Proof of Proposition 2. We will first show the result for a two-queue system and extend the argument to a general N -queue system. We prove the contrapositive: when $h_j \geq h_i$ and $x_j \geq \tau(\mu_j - \lambda_j)$, a policy which does not transfer customers from queue i to j is better than (or as good as) a policy which does.

Without loss of generality, suppose $h_2 \geq h_1$. We compare the total costs of two processes under two different transfer policies starting from the same initial condition. Consider two processes $x^m = (x_1^m, x_2^m)$ and $y^m = (y_1^m, y_2^m)$, $m \in \mathcal{M}$. These processes represent the queue lengths at the start of each period just *after* transfers. We will denote the states *prior* to transfers by $q^\pi[m] = (q_1^\pi[m], q_2^\pi[m])$, with the initial condition being $q^\pi[0]$. Suppose $q_2^\pi[0] \geq \tau(\mu_2 - \lambda_2)^+$. The first process follows a policy $\pi = \{\pi^m\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ which calls for transferring $u > 0$ customers from queue 1 to 2 in period 0. This is denoted by $\pi^0 = u$, where $\pi^m > 0$ indicates that customers are transferred from queue 1 to 2. The second process follows another policy $\tilde{\pi}$ which is the

same as π except that in period 0, the policy $\tilde{\pi}$ does *not* move customers from queue 1 to 2, i.e., $\tilde{\pi}^0 = 0$. Then at the start of period 1, just prior to transferring, we are in one of two scenarios: either (1) $q_1^\pi[1] > 0$, or (2) $q_1^\pi[1] = 0$.

Case 1. In the first case, it implies that $x_1^0 > \tau(\mu_1 - \lambda_1)^+$ (after transferring $\pi^0 = u$ to queue 2). Thus, we can set $\pi^1 = 0$ and $\tilde{\pi}^1 = u$ and the two processes will coincide in period 1. We then let $\pi = \tilde{\pi}$ thereafter. Denote by $\Delta_{\pi-\tilde{\pi}} \in \mathbb{R}$ the total cost of the first process minus that of the second process. We observe

$$\Delta_{\pi-\tilde{\pi}} = \tau(h_2 - h_1)u \geq 0,$$

i.e., policy $\tilde{\pi}$ performs equally well or better. In calculating $\Delta_{\pi-\tilde{\pi}}$, the term $\tau h_2 u$ represents the holding cost at queue 2 over period 0 when we follow policy π . This assumes that policy π does not involve any transfers out of queue 2. Since Proposition 1 ensures the existence of an optimal policy where no queues are both sending and receiving customers in the same period, this assumption is without loss of optimality.

Case 2. The second case implies $x_1^0 \leq \tau(\mu_1 - \lambda_1)^+$ (after transferring $\pi^0 = u$ to queue 2). This means that queue 1 under policy π will empty before period 1 and $q_1^\pi[1] = 0$ must hold. Moreover, $0 \leq q_1^{\tilde{\pi}}[1] \leq u$ holds, i.e., by the start of period 1, just prior to transferring any customers, the state of queue 1 in the second process cannot be larger than u . Thus, set $\pi^1 = 0$ and $\tilde{\pi}^1 = \hat{u} \equiv q_1^{\tilde{\pi}}[1]$, where $0 \leq \hat{u} \leq u$. We note that $\hat{u} = 0$ may be the only feasible policy. Then $x_1^1 = y_1^1 = 0$, i.e., the states of queue 1 under the two processes coincide. We let the two processes follow the respective optimal (fluid) trajectories thereafter. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\pi-\tilde{\pi}} &\geq ru - r\hat{u} + \tau h_2 u - \tau h_1 u + V^1(0, x_2^1) - V^1(0, y_2^1) \\ &\geq r(u - \hat{u}) + \tau(h_2 - h_1)u \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $V^1(\cdot)$ is the minimum cost-to-go starting from period 1. The first inequality holds because the fourth term, $\tau h_1 u$, is the maximum difference in the holding costs at queue 1 between the first and the second processes over the course of period 0; by using u , which is the largest difference in the queue lengths by the start of period 1, we have established a lower bound on $\Delta_{\pi-\tilde{\pi}}$. The second inequality follows from $V^1(0, x_2^1) - V^1(0, y_2^1) \geq 0$, which holds by monotonicity of $V^m(\cdot)$ for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$ (Theorem 1). Note that $x_2^1 \geq y_2^1$ holds because under policy $\tilde{\pi}$, queue 2 in the second process receives $\hat{u} \leq u$ customers at the start of period 1. The last inequality follows from $u \geq \hat{u}$ and $h_2 \geq h_1$. Therefore, $\tilde{\pi}$ performs equally well or better. This shows that for a two-queue system, there is always an optimal policy which does not involve transferring to a more expensive queue when its state is already large enough to last a period without emptying.

To extend this result to a general N -queue system, consider again two processes $x^m = (x_1^m, \dots, x_N^m)$ and $y^m = (y_1^m, \dots, y_N^m)$, $m \in \mathcal{M}$, which start from the same initial condition but follow policies π and $\tilde{\pi}$, respectively. Suppose that π involves transferring $\pi_{ij}^0 = u_{ij} > 0$ customers from queue i to j , $i \neq j$, at the start of period 0 when $h_j \geq h_i$ and $q_j^\pi[0] \geq \tau(\mu_j - \lambda_j)^+$. The policy $\tilde{\pi}$ is identical to π except that in period 0, it does *not* move customers from queue i to j , i.e., $\tilde{\pi}_{ij}^0 = 0$. Since the two processes are identical other than at queues i and j , we can follow the same analysis above with the two-queue system (where we replace queue 2 with j and queue 1 with i) and show that $\tilde{\pi}$ performs equally well or better than π . We can thus think of a

sequence of policies $\{\tilde{\pi}_n\}$ where policy $\tilde{\pi}_n$ improves upon policy $\tilde{\pi}_{n-1}$ in the same manner until there are no pairs of queues (k, l) under $\tilde{\pi}_n$ with $u_{kl} > 0$ in period 0 when $h_l \geq h_k$ and $q_l^\pi[0] \geq \tau(\mu_l - \lambda_l)^+$. This shows that there always exists an optimal policy which does not transfer customers to a more expensive queue when it already has enough customers to last a period without emptying. \square

B.4.2. Preliminaries for Proving Proposition 3. In this section, we formally define the concept of directional derivative, derive the closed-form expression for the derivative of the single-period holding cost function for a two-queue system, and lastly prove monotonicity of the value function in the *total* number of customers when there are no transfer and setup costs.

We first define the concept of directional derivatives. Let z be a feasible direction at x , i.e., $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} z_i = 0$ and $x + z \geq 0$. The condition $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} z_i = 0$ ensures that any new state along the feasible direction preserves the total number of customers. Define $W^m(x) = H^m(x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x, \tau))$ for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$, and define the directional derivative of $W^m(x)$ at x along the feasible direction z as

$$\nabla_z W^m(x) \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{W^m(x + tz) - W^m(x)}{t}.$$

If $\kappa(\cdot) = 0$ (no setup costs), $W^m(\cdot)$ is convex and continuous and $\nabla_z W^m(\cdot)$ is well-defined, i.e., it always exists and is finite.

LEMMA 5. *Suppose $\kappa(\cdot) = 0$. For all $m \in \mathcal{M}$, it is optimal not to transfer if and only if $\nabla_z W^m(x) \geq -R(z)$ for all feasible direction z at a given initial condition x .*

Proof. The proof approach is available in [Benjaafar et al. \(2022\)](#), which we include here. Suppose that it is optimal not to transfer at x . Then, based on the optimality equation, we must have

$$W^m(x + tz) + tR(z) \geq W^m(x) \iff \frac{W^m(x + tz) - W^m(x)}{t} \geq -R(z)$$

for all $t > 0$. Taking the limit as $t \rightarrow 0^+$, we obtain $\nabla_z W^m(x) \geq -R(z)$.

Now, suppose that $\nabla_z W^m(x) \geq -R(z)$ holds for all feasible direction z at x . Define $\omega_m(t) = W^m(x + tz)$. Then $\omega_m(t)$ is convex in t , $\omega_m(0) = W^m(x)$, and $\nabla_z W^m(x)$ can be expressed as $\omega'_m(0^+)$. By the subgradient inequality, we have $\omega_m(t) \geq \omega_m(0) + t\omega'_m(0^+) \geq \omega_m(0) - tR(z)$, where the second inequality holds by assumption. Thus, $\omega_m(t) - \omega_m(0) = W^m(x + tz) - W^m(x) \geq -R(z)$. So, it is optimal not to transfer customers at x . \square

Next, we explicitly characterize the derivative of the holding cost function for a two-queue system under the assumption of stationary arrival rates and linear holding costs. For any $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, the holding cost at queue i is given by

$$H_i(y_i) = \int_0^\tau h_i(y_i + \lambda s - \mu s)^+ ds = \begin{cases} \frac{h_i}{2(\mu_i - \lambda_i)} y_i^2, & \text{if } 0 \leq y_i \leq \tau(\mu_i - \lambda_i)^+, \\ h_i[y_i \tau + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_i - \mu_i)\tau^2], & \text{if } y_i \geq \tau(\mu_i - \lambda_i)^+, \end{cases}$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and thus

$$H(y) = H_1(y_1) + H_2(y_2) = \begin{cases} \frac{h_1}{2(\mu_1 - \lambda_1)} y_1^2 + \frac{h_2}{2(\mu_2 - \lambda_2)} y_2^2, & y \in \mathcal{A}_1, \\ h_1 [y_1 \tau + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - \mu_1)\tau^2] + \frac{h_2}{2(\mu_2 - \lambda_2)} y_2^2, & y \in \mathcal{A}_2, \\ \frac{h_1}{2(\mu_1 - \lambda_1)} y_1^2 + h_2 [y_2 \tau + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \mu_2)\tau^2], & y \in \mathcal{A}_3, \\ h_1 [y_1 \tau + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - \mu_1)\tau^2] + h_2 [y_2 \tau + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \mu_2)\tau^2], & y \in \mathcal{A}_4, \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_1 &\equiv \{y : y_1 \leq \tau(\mu_1 - \lambda_1)^+ \text{ and } y_2 \leq \tau(\mu_2 - \lambda_2)^+\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_2 &\equiv \{y : y_1 \geq \tau(\mu_1 - \lambda_1)^+ \text{ and } y_2 \leq \tau(\mu_2 - \lambda_2)^+\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_3 &\equiv \{y : y_1 \leq \tau(\mu_1 - \lambda_1)^+ \text{ and } y_2 \geq \tau(\mu_2 - \lambda_2)^+\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_4 &\equiv \{y : y_1 \geq \tau(\mu_1 - \lambda_1)^+ \text{ and } y_2 \geq \tau(\mu_2 - \lambda_2)^+\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since the total number of customers must be preserved at the time of the transfer decision, we note that once the state of a queue is decided, the other is automatically determined. Let n denote the initial number of customers. Then we have

$$H'(y) = \frac{dH(y)}{dy_1} = \begin{cases} h_1 \frac{y_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} - h_2 \frac{n - y_1}{\mu_2 - \lambda_2}, & y \in \mathcal{A}_1, \\ h_1 \tau - h_2 \frac{n - y_1}{\mu_2 - \lambda_2}, & y \in \mathcal{A}_2, \\ h_1 \frac{y_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} - h_2 \tau, & y \in \mathcal{A}_3, \\ h_1 \tau - h_2 \tau, & y \in \mathcal{A}_4. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

Finally, we show that when there are no transfer and setup costs, the value function is in fact non-decreasing in the *total* number of customers. This means that even when a state is not component-wise smaller than another, if the total number of customers at that state is smaller, its value function must be smaller.

LEMMA 6. *Suppose $\kappa(\cdot) = 0$ and $r_{ij} = 0$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$. Then for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$, $V^m(x) \geq V^m(z)$ for any x and z such that $e^\top x \geq e^\top z$, i.e., $V^m(\cdot)$ is non-decreasing in the total number of customers.*

Proof. The proof is by induction. Assume period $M - 1$. Denote by y the target state corresponding to a given initial condition x . Consider another state z such that $e^\top x \geq e^\top z$. Suppose we construct a state $\hat{z} \in \Delta(e^\top z)$ in the following way. Prescribe all customers at queue 1 until $\hat{z}_1 = y_1$. If this is impossible (because $e^\top z < y_1$), stop; otherwise, continue on to queue 2 and prescribe all remaining customers ($e^\top z - y_1$) until there are none left or until $\hat{z}_2 = y_2$. Proceeding in this way with queues 3, \dots , N , we must have that $y \geq \hat{z}$. Then given no transfer and setup costs, we observe

$$V^{M-1}(x) = H(y) \geq H(\hat{z}) \geq V^{M-1}(z).$$

This shows that $V^{M-1}(\cdot)$ is non-decreasing in the total number of customers.

Now, suppose the claim holds for period $m + 1, \dots, M - 1$. In period m , for an arbitrary initial condition x , we have

$$V^m(x) = \min_{y \in \Delta(e^\top x)} [H(y) + V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau))].$$

Consider again a state z such that $e^\top x \geq e^\top z$. Denote by y the target state corresponding to the initial condition x and a state $\hat{z} \in \Delta(e^\top z)$ which we construct in the same manner as before. Due to the monotonicity of $H(\cdot)$, $V^{m+1}(\cdot)$, and $f^m(\cdot, \tau)$, it follows by the same argument that $V^m(x) \geq V^m(z)$. \square

B.4.3. Proof of Proposition 3.

Proof of Proposition 3. (i) We prove the bounds on the target state by showing that in any period, if $x_i > \tau(\mu_i - \lambda_i)^+$ for some $i \geq 2$, we can always find a feasible direction along which the total cost improves. The contrapositive of this statement states that if it is optimal not to transfer at a state (i.e., no feasible directions improve the total cost), it must satisfy $x_i \leq \tau(\mu_i - \lambda_i)^+$ for all $i \geq 2$.

Consider any period $m \in \mathcal{M}$. Suppose a given initial condition x satisfies $x_i > \tau(\mu_i - \lambda_i)^+$ for some $i \geq 2$. Consider a policy which transfers customers from queue i to 1 while preserving the total number of customers between the two, in such a way that no other queues are affected. This policy can be represented by a feasible direction $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $z_i = -\delta$ and $z_1 = \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$ and $z_l = 0$ for all other l . Define $W^m(x) = H(x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x, \tau))$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_z W^m(x) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{H(x + tz) - H(x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x + tz, \tau)) - V^{m+1}(f^m(x, \tau))}{t} \\ &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} [th_1 - th_i] \tau \delta + \nabla_z V^{m+1}(f^m(x, \tau)) \\ &\leq (h_1 - h_i) \tau \delta \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that z is a feasible direction that leads to an equally good or better state. To see that the first inequality holds, we note the feasible direction z ensures $f(x + tz, \tau)^\top e \leq f(x, \tau)^\top e$, i.e., by the end of the period, the total number of customers starting from $x + tz$ is less than or equal to that starting from x . Thus, by Lemma 6, $V^{m+1}(f^m(x + tz, \tau)) - V^{m+1}(f^m(x, \tau)) \leq 0$ holds for small enough $t > 0$. Dividing both sides by t and taking the limit $t \rightarrow 0^+$, we have $\nabla_z V^{m+1}(f^m(x, \tau)) \leq 0$. The directional derivative is well-defined by convexity and continuity of $V^m(\cdot)$ and $f^m(\cdot, \tau)$ for all m when $\kappa(\cdot) = 0$. The last inequality holds since $R(z) = 0$ for any z by assumption. By Lemma 5, therefore, it is optimal to transfer customers. Repeating this argument for all $i \geq 2$, we conclude that a target state y must satisfy $y_i \leq \tau(\mu_i - \lambda_i)^+$ for $i \geq 2$.

(ii) We first want to show that it is optimal not to transfer if and only if an initial condition x satisfies $x \geq \tau(\mu - \lambda)^+$. The reverse direction follows directly from Proposition 2. To prove the forward direction, assume that it is not optimal to transfer at x . For sake of contradiction, suppose $x_i < \tau(\mu_i - \lambda_i)^+$ for some i . Consider any period $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and a policy which transfers $\delta > 0$ customers to queue i from j , where $j \neq i$ and $x_j > \tau(\mu_j - \lambda_j)^+$. Define $W^m(x) = H(x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x, \tau))$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_z W^m(x) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{H(x + tz) - H(x) + V^{m+1}(f^m(x + tz, \tau)) - V^{m+1}(f^m(x, \tau))}{t} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} \left(th_i \frac{x_i}{\mu_i - \lambda_i} - th_j \tau \right) \delta + \nabla_z V^{m+1}(f^m(x, \tau)) \\ &\leq h_i \left(\frac{x_i}{\mu_i - \lambda_i} - \tau \right) \delta < 0, \end{aligned}$$

which by Lemma 5, implies that it is *strictly* optimal to transfer at x . Contradiction. Therefore, if it is not optimal to transfer at x , it must satisfy $x_i \geq \tau(\mu_i - \lambda_i)^+$ for all i .

Next, we show that *any* $y \geq \tau(\mu - \lambda)^+$ is a target state. Consider an initial condition x and suppose its corresponding target state is $y \geq \tau(\mu - \lambda)^+$. Consider another candidate target state \hat{y} such that $\hat{y} \neq y$, $e^\top \hat{y} = e^\top y$, and $\hat{y} \geq \tau(\mu - \lambda)^+$. Since there are no transfer and setup costs, we note that the net transfer

$\hat{y} - y$ can be represented as a series of vectors z_1, \dots, z_K in \mathbb{R}^N involving two queues at a time such that $\sum_{k=1}^K z_k = \hat{y} - y$. Following a similar analysis as above, we observe that for all $k = 1, \dots, K$,

$$\nabla_{z_k} W^m(y) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} (th_i - th_j)\tau\delta + \nabla_{z_k} V^{m+1}(f^m(y, \tau)) = (h_i - h_j)\tau\delta = 0.$$

This indicates that we are indifferent to the choice of y and \hat{y} when moving the state from x , and as a result, both are optimal. \square

Appendix C: Additional Details and Computations for Section 5.1

C.1. MDP Solutions

We provide details of the two-queue MDP formulation and solution method which are used to produce the figures in Section 5.1.

The original state space of the two-queue system is described by $\mathcal{S} = \{(n, i) \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \times \mathbb{Z}_+ : i \leq n\}$, where n is the total number of customers in the system and i is the number of customers at queue 2. This is truncated such that the maximum number in the system is at most $\bar{n} = 40$. To implement this, we impose the arrival rates to be $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$ when $n = 40$. The action space is described by $\mathcal{A} = \{a \in \mathbb{Z} : -i \leq a \leq n - i\}$, which represents the number of customers to transfer from queue 1 to 2. When a is negative, it signifies the opposite direction. Let $\Lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \mu_1 + \mu_2$. We solve the following equations.

$$V(n, i) = \min_{a \in \{-i, \dots, n-i\}} \left[K1\{a \neq 0\} + r|a| + \frac{1}{\Lambda} \{(n-i-a)h_1 + (i+a)h_2 + W(n, i+a)\} \right],$$

where

$$W(n, i) = \lambda_1 V(n+1, i) + \lambda_2 V(n+1, i+1) + \mu_1 V((n-1)^+, i) + \mu_2 V((n-1)^+, (i-1)^+),$$

and $W(0, 0) = 0$, which enforces the terminal cost of zero when the system reaches an empty (absorbing) state.

C.2. Additional Results for Section 5.1

In Table 1 of Section 5.1, we demonstrate that the optimality gap of the fluid policy to the MDP policy is small under scaling $\eta = 5$. Table 4 reports the mean optimality gap of the fluid policy and its relative difference in performance to the no-transfer policy for smaller scales η from 1 to 4 for each of the same four two-queue systems as Table 1. The mean gaps are computed based on 1,000 sample paths for each of the same 20 initial conditions sampled from $\mathcal{I} = \{x^0 \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : 10 \leq x_1^0 + x_2^0 \leq 20\}$. The mean gaps are then averaged across the different initial conditions. We note that the fluid model approximates the stochastic system less closely under smaller η . Nevertheless, we observe that even for small or moderately sized systems under $\eta = 1$ or 2, the mean optimality gaps of the fluid policy are close to or less than 5% in all cases while still performing significantly better than the no-transfer policy.

C.3. Additional Case Study Results for Section 5.3

We first report additional results obtained under log-normal service times (with the rate of holding cost set to 1). We note that our insights remain largely the same as in the exponential case. We also summarize the performance of the fluid policies $\text{FP}_3(\tau)$ relative to the no-transfer policy when the rate of holding cost is set to 0.5 or 2 instead of 1 in Tables 6 and 7, respectively. We observe that with a smaller rate, the improvements in the total (system) cost are curtailed because transferring is relatively costly, but the magnitudes are still significant. Moreover, the improvements in the holding cost are practically unchanged in all cases, which suggests that reductions in congestion are insensitive to small changes in the unit holding cost.

Table 4: Optimality gap of the fluid policy to MDP policy (optimal policy) under increasing scaling parameter and $\mu_1 = \mu_2$, $h_1 = h_2 = 1$, $r_{12} = r_{21} = 2$, and $K = 5$

Case (a): $\rho = 0.8, \lambda_1 = 0.7, \lambda_2 = 0.9$				
η	Mean gap	Min. gap	Max. gap	Mean gap to no-transfer policy
1	6.54%	4.99%	9.24%	-30.52%
2	4.13%	1.83%	7.46%	-33.67%
3	3.02%	1.42%	5.05%	-33.67%
4	2.52%	0.97%	4.44%	-33.61%
5	1.83%	0.56%	3.47%	-31.98%
Case (b): $\rho = 0.8, \lambda_1 = 0.75, \lambda_2 = 0.85$				
η	Mean gap	Min. gap	Max. gap	Mean gap to no-transfer policy
1	2.02%	0.76%	3.41%	-28.90%
2	2.34%	0.97%	4.32%	-29.83%
3	1.70%	0.71%	3.07%	-28.75%
4	1.30%	0.56%	2.33%	-27.55%
5	1.16%	0.25%	2.15%	-26.57%
Case (c): $\rho = 0.6, \lambda_1 = 0.5, \lambda_2 = 0.7$				
η	Mean gap	Min. gap	Max. gap	Mean gap to no-transfer policy
1	0.17%	-0.36%	1.70%	-17.06%
2	0.39%	0.05%	1.21%	-19.73%
3	0.08%	-0.55%	0.83%	-20.14%
4	-0.02%	-0.33%	0.40%	-20.22%
5	0.09%	-0.33%	0.13%	-20.25%
Case (d): $\rho = 0.6, \lambda_1 = 0.55, \lambda_2 = 0.65$				
η	Mean gap	Min. gap	Max. gap	Mean gap to no-transfer policy
1	0.07%	-0.43%	0.73%	-16.59%
2	0.49%	-0.02%	1.03%	-19.61%
3	0.42%	0.14%	0.77%	-19.41%
4	0.27%	0.05%	0.48%	-19.66%
5	0.25%	0.07%	0.54%	-19.75%

Note. The last column represents the relative difference to the no-transfer policy, where negative numbers indicate improvement (reduction) in system cost.

Table 5: Summary of the simulation outputs for the case study using log-normal service times

Performance measure	Policies				
	No-transfer	FP ₃ (1)	FP ₃ (2)	FP ₃ (3)	FP ₃ (7)
Expected holding cost:					
Mild	13.7 ± 1.4	16.6 ± 1.6	14.0 ± 1.4	14.1 ± 1.4	13.3 ± 1.3
Moderate	39.7 ± 5.6	29.2 ± 5.3	38.6 ± 6.2	38.0 ± 6.0	38.9 ± 6.1
Severe	72.7 ± 17.7	15.8 ± 8.9	33.2 ± 12.4	42.5 ± 13.4	56.1 ± 15.7
Total holding cost	126.2 ± 19.2	61.6 ± 11.9	85.8 ± 15.2	94.6 ± 16.0	108.3 ± 17.9
% Reduction in total holding cost		48.8 ± 4.0%	33.0 ± 4.9%	27.0 ± 5.0%	16.4 ± 5.8%
Patient days over ICU capacity	57.8 ± 6.9	36.5 ± 5.1	44.4 ± 5.9	47.3 ± 6.2	51.5 ± 6.7
Expected transfer cost		20.3 ± 1.6	12.6 ± 0.8	9.3 ± 0.5	4.5 ± 0.3
Avg. # of days with transfers/week		3.9	2.5	1.8	0.8
Avg. # of transfers/week		9.8	6.0	4.4	1.9
Expected total cost	126.2 ± 19.2	81.9 ± 12.9	98.3 ± 15.7	103.9 ± 16.3	112.8 ± 17.9
% Reduction in total		24.2 ± 5.6%	16.4 ± 5.3%	13.5 ± 5.2%	8.5 ± 5.6%

Note. The numbers after ± correspond to the 95% confidence intervals. “Mild” refers to the portion of the total holding cost accrued when the queue length is less than 20% of the ICU capacity. Similarly, “moderate” and “severe” are holding costs accrued when the queue length is between 20% and 40% or greater than 40% of the ICU capacity, respectively.

Table 6: Summary of the simulation outputs for the case study using exponential service times and 0.5 as the rate of holding cost

Performance measure	Policies				
	No-transfer	FP ₃ (1)	FP ₃ (2)	FP ₃ (3)	FP ₃ (7)
Expected holding cost:					
Mild	10.4 ± 1.1	14.0 ± 1.1	12.4 ± 1.1	11.8 ± 1.1	11.0 ± 1.1
Moderate	34.2 ± 3.5	42.4 ± 4.5	37.7 ± 4.1	37.3 ± 4.0	35.8 ± 4.1
Severe	160.1 ± 18.5	78.4 ± 14.1	113.7 ± 15.9	124.6 ± 16.3	140.2 ± 16.6
Total holding cost	204.7 ± 17.3	134.9 ± 13.8	163.9 ± 14.9	173.7 ± 15.4	187.0 ± 15.7
% Reduction in total holding cost		35.3 ± 2.6%	20.1 ± 2.5%	15.3 ± 2.4%	7.6 ± 2.4%
Patient days over ICU capacity	161.8 ± 11.2	120.0 ± 9.3	136.5 ± 9.6	143.7 ± 9.9	151.4 ± 10.3
Expected transfer cost		30.9 ± 1.1	17.1 ± 0.6	11.7 ± 0.4	5.0 ± 0.3
Avg. # of days with transfers/week		5.6	2.9	2.0	1.0
Avg. # of transfers/week		17.5	9.9	6.8	2.4
Expected total cost	204.7 ± 17.3	165.8 ± 14.2	181.0 ± 15.2	185.4 ± 15.5	192.0 ± 15.8
% Reduction in total cost		16.9 ± 3.2%	9.9 ± 2.7%	8.1 ± 2.5%	4.6 ± 2.5%

Note. The numbers after ± correspond to the 95% confidence intervals. “Mild” refers to the portion of the total holding cost accrued when the queue length is less than 20% of the ICU capacity. Similarly, “moderate” and “severe” are holding costs accrued when the queue length is between 20% and 40% or greater than 40% of the ICU capacity, respectively.

Table 7: Summary of the simulation outputs for the case study using exponential service times and 2 as the rate of holding cost

Performance measure	Policies				
	No-transfer	FP ₃ (1)	FP ₃ (2)	FP ₃ (3)	FP ₃ (7)
Expected holding cost:					
Mild	41.7 ± 4.4	58.4 ± 4.6	50.4 ± 4.7	47.5 ± 4.4	44.2 ± 4.5
Moderate	136.8 ± 14.1	164.1 ± 17.3	153.4 ± 17.0	148.9 ± 16.3	141.7 ± 16.0
Severe	640.4 ± 73.9	293.3 ± 56.0	434.9 ± 61.8	493.7 ± 64.8	561.8 ± 66.4
Total holding cost	818.9 ± 69.3	515.9 ± 54.7	638.7 ± 57.8	690.1 ± 61.3	747.8 ± 62.8
% Reduction in total holding cost		38.2 ± 2.7%	21.9 ± 2.5%	15.8 ± 2.3%	7.6 ± 2.4%
Patient days over ICU capacity	161.8 ± 11.2	120.0 ± 9.3	136.5 ± 9.6	143.7 ± 9.9	151.4 ± 10.3
Expected transfer cost		31.8 ± 1.2	18.4 ± 0.7	12.4 ± 0.4	5.1 ± 0.3
Avg. # of days with transfers/week		5.5	2.9	2.0	1.0
Avg. # of transfers/week		19.2	11.2	7.3	2.5
Expected total cost	818.9 ± 69.3	547.7 ± 55.2	657.1 ± 58.1	702.5 ± 61.3	752.9 ± 62.9
% Reduction in total cost		33.5 ± 2.7%	19.2 ± 2.5%	13.9 ± 2.3%	6.9 ± 2.4%

Note. The numbers after ± correspond to the 95% confidence intervals. “Mild” refers to the portion of the total holding cost accrued when the queue length is less than 20% of the ICU capacity. Similarly, “moderate” and “severe” are holding costs accrued when the queue length is between 20% and 40% or greater than 40% of the ICU capacity, respectively.