FRONTLINE MARKETING MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS JOURNAL
(ISSN – 2752-700X)
VOLUME 03 ISSUE 11 Pages: 10-15
SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2021: 5.277) (2022: 5.694) (2023: 6.834)
OCLC – 1276793382
Publisher: Frontline Journals

Journal Website: https://frontlinejournals.org/journals/index.php/fmmej

Research Article

TRADING PLACES: AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY COMPARING REALLOCATION MECHANISMS FOR PRIORITY QUEUING

Submission Date: November 12, 2023, **Accepted Date:** November 17, 2023,
Published Date: November 22, 2023
Crossref doi: https://doi.org/10.37547/marketing-fmmej-03-11-02

Aleid Van Dijk
International Strategy & Marketing,Faculty Of Economics And Business,University Of Amsterdam, Amsterdam,The Netherlands

Abstract

This experimental study investigates the efficacy of different reallocation mechanisms in the context of priority queuing, exploring how entities can dynamically "trade places" to optimize performance. Through controlled experiments, we evaluate the impact of various reallocation strategies on queue dynamics, service efficiency, and overall system effectiveness. The research aims to provide insights into the strengths and limitations of different mechanisms, offering practical guidance for optimizing priority queuing systems in diverse applications.

Keywords

Priority Queuing, Reallocation Mechanisms, Queue Dynamics, Experimental Study, Trading Places, Service Efficiency, Optimization Strategies, Queue Management, System Effectiveness, Dynamic Resource Allocation.

Introduction

In dynamic environments where entities contend for limited resources, the efficient allocation and reallocation of priorities play a pivotal role in optimizing system performance. Priority queuing systems are prevalent in various domains, including telecommunications, computer networks, and service industries, where the prompt processing of high-priority tasks is paramount. To enhance the effectiveness of these systems, it becomes essential to explore and understand the impact of different reallocation mechanisms on priority queuing dynamics.

This experimental study delves into the intricate realm of priority queuing, focusing specifically on the concept of "trading places" — the dynamic reallocation of priorities among entities within a queue. The objective is to empirically compare various reallocation mechanisms to determine their effectiveness in enhancing system efficiency, minimizing wait times, and optimizing overall performance.

Priority queuing is a widely employed strategy to ensure that high-priority tasks or entities receive preferential treatment in accessing system resources. However, the static assignment of priorities may not be optimal in dynamic scenarios where the urgency or importance of tasks fluctuates. Reallocation mechanisms, by allowing entities to dynamically trade places in the queue based on changing conditions, introduce a level of adaptability that can significantly impact system performance.

This study addresses the gap in existing literature by conducting controlled experiments to rigorously evaluate the performance of different reallocation mechanisms. By systematically comparing the outcomes of these mechanisms, we aim to identify strengths, weaknesses, and trade-offs associated with each approach. The insights gained from this research will contribute to the refinement of priority queuing systems, enabling practitioners and system designers to make informed decisions about the most suitable reallocation mechanisms for specific applications.

As we navigate through this experimental exploration, our focus is on uncovering the nuances of trading places within priority queuing systems and understanding how dynamic reallocation can be harnessed to optimize resource utilization and improve overall system efficiency.

FRONTLINE MARKETING MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS JOURNAL
(ISSN – 2752-700X)
VOLUME 03 ISSUE 11 Pages: 10-15
SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2021: 5.277) (2022: 5.694) (2023: 6.834)
OCLC – 1276793382
Publisher: Frontline Journals

METHOD

To systematically investigate and compare reallocation mechanisms for priority queuing, a carefully designed experimental setup was implemented. The study involved the creation of a simulation environment to replicate the dynamics of a priority queuing system, allowing for controlled testing and evaluation of various reallocation strategies. The following outlines the key components and steps undertaken in the experimental methodology.

Simulation Environment:

A discrete-event simulation model was developed to emulate the behavior of a priority queuing system. The simulation considered factors such as task arrival times, priority levels, and processing times, aiming to create a realistic representation of dynamic queuing scenarios. The system was parameterized to allow for the adjustment of key variables, including the number of entities, priority distribution, and reallocation intervals.

Reallocation Mechanisms:

Several reallocation mechanisms were identified and implemented within the simulation environment. These mechanisms included dynamic priority adjustment based on task urgency, fair queuing strategies, and adaptive reallocation algorithms. Each mechanism was designed to represent a distinct approach to trading places within the queue, enabling a comprehensive comparison of their effects on system performance.

Experimental Conditions:

The study considered various experimental conditions to capture a range of scenarios. Different levels of system load, variations in task priority distributions, and varying frequencies of reallocation were systematically tested. This approach aimed to assess the robustness and adaptability of each reallocation mechanism under diverse operational conditions.

Performance Metrics:

Quantitative metrics were employed to evaluate the performance of each reallocation mechanism. Key metrics included average wait times, system throughput, and fairness in resource allocation. These metrics provided a comprehensive view of the impact of each reallocation strategy on queue dynamics, efficiency, and overall system effectiveness.

FRONTLINE MARKETING MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS JOURNAL
(ISSN – 2752-700X)
VOLUME 03 ISSUE 11 Pages: 10-15
SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2021: 5.277) (2022: 5.694) (2023: 6.834)
OCLC – 1276793382
Publisher: Frontline Journals

Statistical Analysis:

Statistical analysis techniques, including hypothesis testing and comparative analysis, were employed to assess the significance of differences observed in the performance metrics. The results were subjected to rigorous statistical scrutiny to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings.

By adopting a systematic and controlled experimental methodology, this study aimed to generate empirical insights into the comparative effectiveness of different reallocation mechanisms for priority queuing. The simulation approach allowed for the isolation of variables, providing a nuanced understanding of how each mechanism influences system behavior under varying conditions.

RESULTS

The experimental study yielded insightful results regarding the comparative performance of various reallocation mechanisms within the priority queuing system. Metrics such as average wait times, system throughput, and fairness in resource allocation were carefully analyzed under different experimental conditions. The reallocation mechanisms were observed to have distinct impacts on queue dynamics and overall system efficiency.

Findings indicated that dynamic priority adjustment based on task urgency significantly reduced average wait times for high-priority tasks, demonstrating its effectiveness in responding to changing conditions. Fair queuing strategies exhibited more equitable resource allocation, contributing to improved fairness in task processing. Adaptive reallocation algorithms showcased versatility in adapting to varying levels of system load, demonstrating a robust performance across different experimental conditions.

DISCUSSION

The observed differences in the performance of reallocation mechanisms prompt a nuanced discussion about the trade-offs and considerations associated with each approach. While dynamic priority adjustment proves beneficial in addressing immediate urgencies, fair queuing strategies offer a more balanced distribution of resources over time. Adaptive reallocation algorithms strike a balance by adapting to changing conditions, providing a

FRONTLINE MARKETING MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS JOURNAL
(ISSN – 2752-700X)
VOLUME 03 ISSUE 11 Pages: 10-15
SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2021: 5.277) (2022: 5.694) (2023: 6.834)
OCLC – 1276793382
Publisher: Frontline Journals

flexible approach that suits dynamic queuing environments.

The implications of these findings extend to diverse applications, from telecommunications to service industries, where effective priority queuing is paramount. The discussion delves into the practical considerations for implementing these reallocation mechanisms in real-world scenarios, considering factors such as system architecture, computational requirements, and scalability.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this experimental study has provided valuable insights into the comparative effectiveness of different reallocation mechanisms for priority queuing. The results offer practical guidance for system designers and practitioners seeking to optimize queue dynamics in dynamic environments. Dynamic priority adjustment, fair queuing strategies, and adaptive reallocation algorithms each present unique advantages, and the choice among them should be informed by the specific requirements and characteristics of the application.

As technology continues to evolve and systems become increasingly dynamic, the findings from this study contribute to the ongoing refinement of priority queuing strategies. By understanding how entities can effectively "trade places" within a queue, stakeholders can make informed decisions to enhance system efficiency, reduce wait times, and improve overall resource utilization in priority queuing systems. Future research avenues may explore the integration of machine learning techniques or adaptive algorithms to further enhance the adaptability of reallocation mechanisms in response to evolving queuing dynamics.

REFERENCES

1. Afèche, P., & Mendelson, H. (2004). Pricing and priority auctions in queueing systems with a generalized delay cost structure.ManagementScience,50(7), 869–882.
2. Arkes, H. R., & Blumer, C. (1985). The psychology of sunk cost.Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,35(1), 124–140.Baliga, S., & Ely, J. C. (2011). Mnemonomics: The sunk cost fallacy as a memory kludge.American

FRONTLINE MARKETING MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS JOURNAL (ISSN – 2752-700X)
VOLUME 03 ISSUE 11 Pages: 10-15
SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2021: 5.277) (2022: 5.694) (2023: 6.834)
OCLC – 1276793382
Publisher: Frontline Journals

Economic Journal: Microeconomics,3(4),35–67.

3. Barzel, Y. (1974). A theory of rationing by waiting.The Journal of Law and Economics,17(1), 73–95.
4. Bendoly, E., Croson, R., Goncalves, P., & Schultz, K. (2010). Bodies of knowledge for research in behavioral operations.Production andOperations Management,19(4), 434–452.
5. Chatterjee, K., & Samuelson, W. (1983). Bargaining under incomplete information.Operations Research,31(5), 835–851.
6. Eliaz, K., Offerman, T., & Schotter, A. (2008). Creating competition out of thin air: An experimental study of right-to-choose auctions.Gamesand Economic Behavior,62(2), 383–416.
7. Feng, J. (2008). Optimal mechanism for selling a set of commonly ranked objects.Marketing Science,27(3), 501–512.
8. Friedman, D., Pommerenke, K., Lukose, R., Milam, G., & Huberman, B. A. (2007). Searching for the sunk cost fallacy.ExperimentalEconomics,10(1), 79–104.
9. Gershkov, A., & Schweinzer, P. (2010). When queueing is better than push and shove.International Journal of Game Theory,39(3), 409–430.
10. Glazer, A., & Hassin, R. (1986). Stable priority purchasing in queues.Operations Research Letters,4(6), 285–288.