

HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT
OF GRADING THEORY

by

Professor Dr.-Ing. A. Lotze

Director of the Institute

for

Switching and Data Technics

Technical University Stuttgart

Federal Republic of Germany

I. Introduction

This study gives a concise survey of the development of loss calculation methods for gradings within the past 60 years. Some of the older formulae seem to be rather unpretentious from the present point of view. However, simplicity of formulae and easy evaluation were remarkable advantages in the times before digital computers became the daily tool of traffic engineers - and are often advantages still today. Let us not forget that even A.K. Erlang himself has published simple approximation formulae derived from his own exact solutions because of the difficulties of evaluation in his time!

Comparing the results of many simple approximations with later and much more sophisticated ones we can sometimes ascertain only so small differences in the range of small losses ($B \approx 0.005$) that they are not of important practical meaning.

However, modern networks with alternate routing, using high usage groups, require more exact methods of course, but these must always be prepared for easy practical application.

Before beginning now let me explain, what fields of pioneer work in grading research must unfortunately be out of the scope of this abridged review. Firstly, this is the history of artificial traffic tests, from the first manually handled throw-downs forward to artificial traffic machines (the first machine being published as early as 1928 by Elliman and Fraser) up to the daily use of digital computers for traffic simulation, which has, without any doubt, initiated a new epoch in traffic theory.

Secondly, I must resign to present the

widespread and valuable investigations of many authors searching systematically-by means of traffic measurements-for the best possible types of gradings with respect to various applications and different hunting-methods.

Also many economical investigations related to Moe's principle and similar methods cannot be considered in the present paper. And finally, Dr. Bretschneider will handle in a second survey the most modern methods which are calculating the call congestion of individual gradings on digital computers by very large systems of state equations.

II. Abbreviations

For the comparison of the various methods of loss calculation it will be useful to apply uniform abbreviations as follows:

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| G | Number of incoming groups or subgroups resp. |
| k | Availability (accessibility) per selector multiple |
| n | Number of trunks (lines) in the outgoing group (route) |
| h | Interconnection number |
| $H = \frac{G \cdot k}{n}$ | Average (or uniform) interconnection number of a grading (Grading Ratio) |
| A | Offered traffic |
| Y | Carried traffic |
| R | Overflow traffic (non-random rest of traffic offered) |
| V, D | Variance V or variance coefficient D = (V-R) of overflow traffic R |

Beitrag des Instituts für Nachrichtenvermittlung und Datenverarbeitung der Technischen Hochschule Stuttgart zum 5th International Teletraffic Congress New York vom 14. - 20. Juni 1967.

| | |
|---------------|---|
| x | Instantaneous number of existing occupations (calls) in a group, subgroup etc. |
| $p(x), w(x)$ | Probabilities of a state $\{x\}$ |
| FCT 1 | Offered Pure Chance Traffic No. 1, i.e. Poissonian input having constant call intensity |
| FCT 2 | Offered Pure Chance Traffic No. 2, i.e. binomial input, originating from a finite number q of sources |
| q | Number of traffic sources |
| α | Call intensity per idle source in case of FCT 2 |
| E, E_k, E_0 | Time congestion probabilities |
| B, B_k, B_0 | Call congestion probabilities |
| $u(x)$ | Passage probability in the state $\{x\}$ of a trunk group (expect. value) |
| $c(x)$ | Congestion probability in the state $\{x\}$ of a trunk group (expectation value) |

III. General Remarks on Gradings

III. 1 The Introduction of Gradings

With growing amount of automatic telephone traffic it became more and more uneconomic to apply selectors having such a large number k of contacts that each out of n outgoing trunks of a group could be hunted. On the other hand, it led to a rather poor efficiency of the trunks if groups were divided into 2 or more small separate subgroups, (see fig. 1 and fig. 2). The large number of grading types having been developed till now cannot be discussed here in detail. A very impressive introduction to the different grading types can be found for example in Elldin's publication [1].

Generally spoken, any interconnecting scheme between the outlets of $g \geq 2$ selector multiples, each multiple consisting of one or more selectors, may be defined as a grading. The selector multiples have k common outlets each (as a rule $k_1 = k_2 = \dots = k_j = \dots = k_g$, but not necessarily so), and because of $k < n$ each offered call has a limited access to only k out of the n outgoing trunks (lines) of the group.

The interconnections between the different selector multiples form one grading if each subgroup influences directly or indirectly the blocking probability of all the other $(g-1)$ subgroups.

The famous first Grading Patent of E.A. Gray was filed to the U.S. Patent Office already in July 1907 [2].

III. 2 Available Formulae for Full Access

The theory of loss calculation for gradings could start from many formulae already in use for full available groups. The best known are counted up here:




Fig. 1 Call Congestion $B = f(A)$ with $n = 40$ Trunks




Fig. 2 Carried Traffic per Trunk $(Y/n) = f(A)$ for $n = 40$ Trunks

PCT 1 (Infinite number of sources = constant call density)

1908 Campbell:

$$n \approx Y + 3.8 \cdot \sqrt[3]{Y} \quad (B = 0.002)$$

1908 Molina and 1918 Lely:

$$B = e^{-A} \cdot \sum_{x=n}^{\infty} \frac{A^x}{x!}$$

1913 Christensen (and Erlang):

$$B = e^{-A} \cdot \sum_{x=n}^{\infty} \frac{A^x}{x!} \rightsquigarrow n \approx Y + c \cdot \sqrt[2]{Y} \\ (B = 0.001 \rightsquigarrow c = 3.3)$$

1917 Erlang (Exact Solution):

$$B = \frac{\frac{A^n}{n!}}{\sum_{i=0}^n \frac{A^i}{i!}} = E_{1,n}(A)$$

PCT 2 (Finite number q of sources)

1916 Milon:

$$B = \left(\frac{Y}{n}\right)^n$$

1907 Molina and 1918 Lely:

$$B = \sum_{x=n}^{q-1} \binom{q-1}{x} \cdot t^x \cdot (1-t)^{q-1-x}; t = \frac{A}{q}$$

1918 Engset and 1920 O'Dell:

$$B = \frac{\binom{q}{n} \cdot \alpha^n}{\sum_{i=0}^n \binom{q}{i} \cdot \alpha^i} \cdot \frac{q-n}{q-A}; \alpha = \frac{A}{q-A}$$

1918 Erlang, 1923 Martin and 1928 Fry (Exact Solution):

$$B = \frac{\binom{q}{n} \cdot \alpha^n}{\sum_{i=0}^n \binom{q}{i} \cdot \alpha^i} \cdot \frac{q-n}{q-Y}; \alpha = \frac{A}{q-Y}$$

III. 3 Types of Grading Formulae

This survey will proceed the following way. It will not be the chronological way in any case, but is appropriate to handle the

various methods from simple to more complicated ones:

- A. Not Truncated Distributions
- B. Interpolation between Boundary Values
- C. Step by Step Calculation for Sequential Hunting and PCT 1
- D. Statistical Equilibrium combined with Passage Probability
- E. Presumed Truncated Distributions combined with Passage Probability
- F. Alternate Routing with Limited Access

IV. Loss Formulae for Gradings

IV. A. Not Truncated Distributions

All methods described here are based on the assumption "no holes in the multiple". From this follows that all states $\{0 \leq x \leq n\}$ are assumed to exist merely on the considered actual n trunks of a group.

A. 1 E.C. Molina's Formula No.1 for PCT 1 (1921) [3]

Molina continued former pioneer investigations of M. Rorty (1905). Molina made the following assumptions:

Assumption No.1: The carried traffic be equally distributed among all n outgoing lines by appropriate grading and hunting-methods. Then, for "x trunks busy", each out of $\binom{n}{x}$ patterns is equally probable.

Assumption No.2: The probability of state within the finite number of n outgoing lines be approximately a Poisson distribution (cf. III.2):

$$p(x) = e^{-A} \cdot \frac{A^x}{x!} \quad (1)$$

Therefore

$$p(n) = e^{-A} \cdot \frac{A^n}{n!} \quad (2)$$

From assumption No.1 the blocking probability c(x) can be derived that a call occurring during the state {x} cannot find any idle trunk out of these k trunks which can be hunted by its selector group:

$$c(x) = \frac{\binom{x}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \quad (3)$$

The passage probability is

$$u(x) = 1 - c(x) \quad (4)$$

From (1), (3) and (4) one gets the expectation of call congestion (Molina-Formula No.1):

$$B_{k,n}(A) = e^{-A} \cdot \left\{ \sum_{x=k}^{n-1} \frac{A^x}{x!} \cdot c(x) + \sum_{x=n}^{\infty} \frac{A^x}{x!} \right\} \quad (5A)$$

After some transformation and by means of eq.(3) and eq. (5A) one can write this formula in the following terms being appropriate for the evaluation

$$B_{k,n}(A) = A^k \cdot \frac{(n-k)!}{n!} \left\{ 1 - e^{-A} \sum_{x=n-k}^{\infty} \frac{A^x}{x!} \right\} + e^{-A} \sum_{x=n}^{\infty} \frac{A^x}{x!} \quad \dots (5B)$$

From eq.(5B) follows the carried traffic

$$Y = A \cdot \left\{ 1 - B_{k,n}(A) \right\} \quad (6)$$

A. 2 M. Merker's Loss Formula 1924 [4]

Merker considers a grading with sequential hunting having only 2 subgroups, each with k_1 individual outlets and k_2 common outlets. Therefore the selectors have the availability

$$k = k_1 + k_2 \quad (7)$$

Congestion arises (approximately):

a) If one selector group has $(k_1 + j)$ and the other one $(k - j)$ busy outlets.

b) If at least all $n = (2 \cdot k_1 + k_2) = (k_1 + k)$ actual outlets are busy, eventually plus further fictitious outlets $(n_0, (n+1), (n+2), \dots$, assumption "no holes in the multiple").

The traffic offered to each subgroup be A_s , so the total offered traffic is $A = 2 \cdot A_s$.

Therewith one obtains 2 shares of the total loss B:

$$B_a = e^{-A} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{k-k_1} \frac{A_s^n}{(k_1+j)! (k-j)!} \quad (8)$$

$$B_b = e^{-A} \cdot \sum_{x=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{A^x}{x!} \quad (9)$$

Finally $B = B_a + B_b \quad (10)$

A. 3 E.C. Molina's Loss Formula No.2(1931) [5]

Molina investigates the same type of sequentially hunted gradings as Merker in section A. 2, but for the generalized case of $g \geq 2$ selector groups(see figure 3).




Fig. 3

He obtains 2 shares of the total loss B.

a) If in one particular selector group No. j all available $k_1 + k_2 = k$ outlets are busy, caused by its own offered traffic A_j (type PCT 1), the share of call congestion for this case becomes:

$$B_1 = e^{-A_j} \cdot \sum_{x=k}^{\infty} \frac{A_j^x}{x!} \quad (11)$$

b) There may exist exactly $(k_1 + r)$ calls originated from the traffic A_j offered to the considered subgroup No. j, where $r \geq 0$ be prescribed. The corresponding probability is

$$p_1(k_1 + r) = e^{-A_j} \cdot \frac{A_j^{k_1+r}}{(k_1+r)!} \quad (12)$$

Moreover, at least $(k_2 - r)$ calls may exist on the remaining $(k_2 - r)$ common outlets plus further (fictitious) commons ("no holes in the multiple" assumed). Those $(k_2 - r)$ calls are allowed to originate from any s out of the $(g-1)$ other selector groups.

By means of a sophisticated combinatorial method Molina derives the formula for the corresponding probability

$$p_{g-1} \{ \geq (k_2 - r) \}$$

which implies all $(g-1)$ other selector groups. Therewith he obtains:

$$B_2 = \sum_{r=0}^{k_2-1} p_1(k_1+r) \cdot p_{(g-1)} \{ \geq (k_2-r) \} \quad (13)$$

Finally

$$B = B_1 + B_2 \quad (14)$$

A. 4 A.K.Erlang's Approximate Formulae [6]

For easy evaluation, Erlang has derived two simple approximations from his Interconnection Formula (1920). For $n, A \gg k$ and small values of B:

$$B = \left(\frac{A}{n}\right)^k \approx \left(\frac{Y}{n}\right)^k \quad (15)$$

For $A \ll 1$:

$$B = A^k \cdot \frac{(n-k)!}{n!} = \frac{e^{-A} \cdot \frac{A^n}{n!}}{e^{-A} \cdot \frac{A^{n-k}}{(n-k)!}} \quad (16)$$

IV. B. Interpolation between Boundary Values

B.1 G.F. O'Dell's Method(1927) [7]

The famous basic idea of O'Dell starts from the prescribed call congestion B in case of PCT 1 and the corresponding admissible traffic A_0 offered to a full available group of k lines only, where k means the accessibility of the considered group with $n > k$ trunks. Therewith one obtains the carried traffic on k trunks only

$$Y_0 = (1 - E_{1,k}(A_0)) \cdot A_0 \quad (1)$$

with $E_{1,k}(A_0) = B$. Then Y_0/k stands for the lower bound of admissible carried traffic per trunk. (The original publication uses A_0 for very small losses. S.A.Karlsson suggested in [8] the use of Y_0 for the application to higher values of loss.)

With increasing number of lines n and constant accessibility k one obtains the lower bound-loss formula according to A.K. Erlang's approximation for the interconnection formula (see eq. (A.15)):

$$B = \left(\frac{Y}{n}\right)^k \quad (2)$$

Therewith the upper bound of admissible carried traffic per trunk becomes

$$\frac{Y}{n} = B^{1/k} \quad (3)$$

By means of eq. (1), (2) and (3) O'Dell interpolates between lower and upper limit of load per line and writes

$$A = \frac{Y}{1-B} = \left\{ C \cdot B^{1/k} + (1-C) \cdot \frac{Y_0}{k} \right\} \cdot \frac{(n-k)}{(1-B)} + A_0 \quad (4)$$

The interpolation factor C was determined by O'Dell from measurements, using straight (socalled O'Dell-) gradings with smoothly progressing interconnection number and sequential hunting:

$$C = 0.53 \quad \dots \quad B \approx 0.002$$

Einarsson, Håkansson, Lundgren and Tänge thoroughly investigated different kinds of improved gradings using skipped interconnections [9]. They found values of C up to ≈ 0.9 . For smoothed traffic O'Dell recommends $C = 1$.

There is no doubt that O'Dell's elegant and simple approximation of 1927 was one of the

most effective auxiliary means for the dimensioning of limited-access groups.

B.2 The Interpolation Method of Z. Popovič [10]

Popovič starts - like O'Dell - from a given grading (particularly from cyclic gradings) with n outgoing trunks and accessibility k . The call congestion B is prescribed. Random traffic of the type PCT 1 is assumed.

In opposition to O'Dell the interpolation factor is determined by combinatorial methods for the individual grading in consideration.

Firstly, the admissible traffic A_n to a full available group of n trunks is read out of the Erlang-tables for the prescribed loss $B = E_{1,n}(A_n)$.

Secondly, the traffic A_k offered to a full available group of k lines is determined similarly ($B = E_{1,k}(A_k)$). For n/k groups having k trunks each an offered total traffic $A_r = \{n/k\} \cdot A_k$ would be admissible.

The wanted offered traffic A_g to the considered grading becomes according to Popovič

$$A_g = A_r + (A_n - A_r) \cdot \lambda \quad (5)$$

The factor λ represents the quality of the grading. It is calculated by means of combinatorial formulae, which regard some individual properties of the grading. Extensive investigations into this method have been made by M. Huber and M. Glauner [11].

IV. C. Step by Step Calculation for Sequential Hunting and PCT 1

C.1 Calculation without Regard to the Overflow Variance

The simplest approximate calculation "step by step" can be done by reading out the overflow traffics behind all individual or common outlets of the first hunting position from Erlang's $E_{1,n}$ -Table. The appropriate partial overflows are added and are used as the offered random traffic to individuals or commons of the next hunting-position and so forth.

This method yields of course too optimistic values of loss, because the non-randomness of overflow traffic is neglected.

C.2 G.S. Berkeley's One-Parameter-Method (1949) [12]

Berkeley implicitly takes into account an approximate variance of overflow. His wellknown method may be explained by means of the simple example in Fig. 4:




Fig. 4 Berkeley's Loss Calculation

The overflow traffics R_1 and R_2 behind k_1 steps (here $k_1 = 2$) are calculated by means of Erlang's $E_{1,n}$ -tables, where

$$R_1 = A_1 \cdot E_{k_1}(A_1)$$

and $R_2 = A_2 \cdot E_{k_1}(A_2)$.

Then an auxiliary offered traffic A_0 has to be chosen in the Erlang-tables such that for k_1 trunks

$$A_0 \cdot E_{k_1}(A_0) = (R_1 + R_2) \quad (1)$$

Now the next steps (here $k_2 = 3$) which are hunted by the sum of the overflow traffics $(R_1 + R_2)$ are added and one obtains

$$R = A_0 \cdot E_{k_1+k_2}(A_0) \quad (2)$$

R being the approximate value of the actual overflow traffic of the considered grading. Therefore the call congestion is obtained by

$$B = \frac{R}{A_1 + A_2} \quad (3)$$

The method yields good approximate values of B for straight O'Dell gradings without skipping, if the overflowing partial traffics are not too much correlated because of commonly hunted preceding steps. Correlation diminishes the total variance of the different partial overflows. Then the loss calculation tends towards the safe side.

Graphs and tables according to Berkeley's method as well as artificial traffic tests have been published by R.R. Mina [13].

C. 3 The Two Parameter Method (Equivalent Random Method)

Berkeley's approximate regard of the overflow variance is replaced by using overflow traffics with two correct parameters, i.e. mean R and variance V .

This method has been developed and pub-

lished firstly by R.I. Wilkinson and J. Riordan [14] on the I.TC 1955 and later on by G. Bretschneider [15]. Fundamental theoretical investigations about the overflow problem by Vaultot (1935) [16], Kosten (1937) [17], Molina (1941), Nyquist (both see [14]) and Giltay (1953) [18] lead the way to this method. The exact overflow distribution has been calculated by R. Brockmeyer already in 1954 [19].

The way of calculation resembles that of Berkeley. By means of the small grading example in fig. 4 we can distinguish the considered method and the Berkeley method.

Firstly, the overflow traffics R_1 and R_2 are read out of tables or graphs as well as their corresponding values V_1, V_2 . Instead of an auxiliary traffic A_0 only, another equivalent random traffic A^* and a corresponding number n^* of full available trunks have to be chosen such a way that the overflowing traffic has both the mean $R_m = (R_1 + R_2)$ and the variance $V_m = V_1 + V_2$. To these n^* trunks the next $k_2 = 3$ common hunting steps are added and the lost traffic becomes

$$R = A^* \cdot E_{n^*+k_2}(A^*) \quad (4)$$

and the call congestion

$$B = \frac{R}{A_1 + A_2} \quad (5)$$

This method yields mostly somewhat larger losses than the Berkeley method. In many gradings the main reason for this fact is the increasing correlation between different partial overflows with increasing hunting position particularly if skipping is applied. This correlation, which diminishes the overall variance, is not regarded if the correct values V_i are added linearly. The merely approximate regarding of overflow variance by the Berkeley method tends to variances which are smaller than the actual ones. This inaccuracy mostly results in a certain correction of this "correlation-effect". As with the Berkeley method, straight gradings without skipping are therefore best suited for the equivalent random method.

The dominating importance of the two parameter equivalent random method does not concern the calculation of gradings but the design of alternate routing systems.

IV. D. Statistical Equilibrium combined with Passage Probability

D. 1 General Remarks

In any group, no matter if there is full or limited access to n trunks, $(n+1)$ different states are possible, i.e. 0, or 1, or 2 ... or x ... or $(n-1)$ or n trunks busy. Each state $\{x\}$ is composed of $\binom{n}{x}$ different patterns, each having a certain individual pattern probability $p(x, \nu)$, from which the total probability of state $\{x\}$ follows with

$$p(x) = \sum_{\nu=1}^{\binom{n}{x}} p(x)_{\nu} \quad (1)$$

In full available groups it makes no sense to distinguish the various pattern probabilities, if merely the time- or call-congestion have to be calculated. However, in gradings with limited access $k < n$ all patterns of the states $\{x \leq k\}$ can (but must not) cause congestion for one or more out of all g selector groups, depending on their individual topological busy positions among the crosspoints of the grading. From this fact follows that, strictly spoken, in the most general case (without simplification by symmetries) the probabilities of all individual patterns

$$\sum_{x=0}^n \binom{n}{x} = 2^n \quad (2)$$

should be calculated. This leads to the strictly exact ways of solutions by means of huge systems of linear equations having up to 2^n unknowns. Dr. Bretschneider will report on these problems.

The conditional probability $w(x)_{\nu}|x$ that within the existing state $\{x\}$ the pattern $(x)_{\nu}$ exists can be calculated with these exact methods by means of so-called transition probabilities. This probabilities tell us from which certain patterns $(x-1)_{\nu}$ a certain pattern $(x)_{\nu}$ can be born caused by a successful call; and on the other hand, which group of certain patterns $(x-1)_{\nu}$ can arise when our considered pattern $(x)_{\nu}$ dies because any one of these x calls is terminated.

Let us now reflect on a method which could simplify the calculation without giving up the basic principle of Birth and Death Process, used for the strictly exact calculations.

Because of the generally assumed time invariance of the considered stochastic process of traffic flow, each state $\{x\}$ as a whole (including all its $\binom{n}{x}$ patterns) will on the average be born as often as it will die. In other words, we make use of the condition applied for the first time by A.K.Erlang and named the "Statistical Equilibrium" [6]:

The mathematical expectation, that during the existing state $\{x\}$ an occurring call is successful and that the state $\{x\}$ "dies" in upward direction, so that any one of the possible patterns $(x+1)_{\nu}$ is born, be named the Passage Probability $u(x)$. Obviously $u(x)$ can be written

$$u(x) = \sum_{\nu=1}^{\binom{n}{x}} w((x)_{\nu}|x) \cdot u((x)_{\nu}) \quad (3)$$

$u((x)_{\nu})$ being defined by:

non-blocked selector groups in case of $(x)_{\nu}$
 all g selector groups ... (4)

Assuming moreover a negativ exponential distribution of the holding time and with the mean holding time h being unity, the probability density for the death of any existing pattern $(x+1)_{\nu}$ in downward direction, that is to say "for the birth of any pattern $(x)_{\nu}$ ", becomes

$$d(x+1) = (x+1) \cdot \frac{1}{h} = (x+1) \quad (5)$$

For poissonian offered traffic (PCT 1) with the traffic intensity A , we can - by means of (3) and (5) - write the recurrence formula for the statistical equilibrium:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & \underbrace{A \cdot u(x-1) \cdot p(x-1) + (x+1) \cdot p(x+1)}_{\text{Birth of the state } \{x\}} = \\ & \underbrace{A \cdot u(x) \cdot p(x) + x \cdot p(x)}_{\text{Death of the state } \{x\}} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (6)$$

Because of the condition $\sum_0^n p(x) = 1$

the above recurrence formula yields

$$p(x) = \frac{\frac{A^x}{x!} \prod_{z=0}^{x-1} u(z)}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{A^j}{j!} \prod_{z=0}^{j-1} u(z)} \quad (7)$$

The complement to the state-passage-probability $u(x)$ be named the state-congestion-probability

$$c(x) = \{1 - u(x)\} \quad (8)$$

where

$$c(x) = 0 \text{ for } x < k$$

From (7) and (8) follows the time congestion E , which in the case of PCT 1 equals the call congestion B

$$E_{k,n} = B_{k,n} = \sum_{x=k}^n c(x) \cdot p(x) \quad (9)$$

The difficulty in using this method lies in the sufficiently close approximation of $u(x)$ or $c(x)$ resp. Let us now consider some of the most interesting applications.

D. 2 A.K. Erlang's Interconnection Loss Formula (1920) for PCT 1 (EIF) [6]

A.K. Erlang prescribes for his so-called Ideal Erlang Grading

$$g_1 = \binom{n}{k} \quad (10) \quad \text{or} \quad g_2 = \binom{n}{k} \cdot k! \quad (11)$$

2.1 With g_1 selector groups and with balanced offered traffic, each selector group has access to another combination "k out of n trunks". Because of this special grading each out of the possible different $\binom{n}{x}$ states {x} blocks exactly $\binom{x}{k}$ out of all $\binom{n}{k}$ selector groups and effects the same state-congestion-probability $c(x)$ as well as the same state-passage-probability $u(x) = \{1 - c(x)\}$. We obtain

$$c(x) = \frac{\binom{x}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \quad (12)$$

and

$$u(x) = \left\{ 1 - \frac{\binom{x}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \right\} \quad (13)$$

Inserting eq.(13) and (12) in eq.(7) and (9) we get Erlang's famous Interconnection Formula.

In case of random hunting, all x-patterns become equally probable, therewith the individual call congestions of all g selector groups equal B.

2.2 Using selectors with home position, the $\binom{n}{x}$ patterns per state {x} are not equally probable any more, even in case of balanced offered traffic. Nevertheless, the values $c(x)$ and $u(x)$ remain unchanged.

Therefore, eq.(9) yields the correct overall call congestion B. The call congestions of the individual g selector groups cannot be calculated, because they depend on the unknown pattern probabilities $w(x)_v$, which in their turn are traffic-dependent.

2.3 Using now $g_2 = \binom{n}{k} \cdot k!$ selector groups, the formulae $c(x)$ and $u(x)$ according to eq. (12) and (13) do not vary. However, each combination "k out of n trunks" is hunted by the selector groups with home position in each out of $k!$ possible permutations. All $\binom{n}{x}$ patterns of a state {x} will then be equally probable again. Therefore, eq.(9) yields the correct overall call congestion B as well as the uniform values B for each selector group (balanced traffic assumed).

For practically realized gradings with $g < \binom{n}{k}$ selector groups, mostly somewhat too optimistic values of call congestion B are obtained from the EIF. On the other hand, the EIF does not stand for a lower limit of call congestion B (see lit. [6], p.118).

D. 3 H.A. Longley's Investigations (1948) [20]

Longley calculates small gradings of different type exactly by solving the 2^n equations required. Inserting all exactly calculated probabilities of state $p(x)$ into the equations of type (6) he obtains the values $u(x)$ and $c(x)$. The terms $u(x)$ are called K-factors in Longley's publication.

In a second step, larger gradings were investigated where the evaluation of 2^n unknowns was impossible. Here the maximum and minimum values of all K-factors were calculated merely for the much easier limits $A \rightarrow \infty$ and $A \rightarrow 0$.

Longley found that the differences between the two K-series for $A \rightarrow \infty$ and $A \rightarrow 0$ were rather small. Because of these results a simple approximate formula for $u(x)$ is given, which can be inserted into eq.(7,9) for the calculation of loss.

D. 4 Approximate Assumption No.1:

All $\binom{n}{x}$ patterns {x} of a state {x} are equally probable

a) From this assumption No.1 follows that each selector group will have the same state-congestion-probability. Considering one arbitrarily chosen selector group, whose k outlets are busy in the state {x}, we get for the remaining (x-k) existing calls on (n-k) lines $\binom{n-k}{x-k}$ equally probable patterns. Therefore (as for the EIF see D. 2)

$$c(x) = \left\{ 1 - u(x) \right\} = \frac{\binom{n-k}{x-k}}{\binom{n}{x}} = \frac{\binom{x}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \quad (14)$$

$p(x)$ and B result from eq. (7) and (9).

b) If $c(x)$ and $u(x)$ represent sufficiently good expectation values according to eq.(3) though assumption No.1 does not hold exactly, the overall loss B accords with eq.(9), whereas the individual losses of the g selector groups may vary.

D. 5 Approximate Assumption No.2:

a) According to D. 4 b) it suffices to have adequately exact approximate values for the expectation $u(x)$

$$u(x) = \sum_{v=1}^{\binom{n}{x}} w(x)_v / x \cdot u(x)_v \quad (3)$$

where the explicit single values of the sum must not be known. If $u(x)$ is close to reality the overall call congestion B according to eq. (9) yields results close to reality, too.

The actual values $w(x, |x)$ and $u(x, \rho)$ can vary the individual losses of the individual selector groups but not the value B, if $u(x)$ is sufficiently exact.

The approximate function $u(x)$ can, of course, differ from eq. (13) and can be obtained only by measurements or by combinatorial methods with or without respect to some individual properties of the gradings in consideration [21], [22], [23], [24].

b) J.N. Bridgford's Geometric Group Concept (1961) [23]

The state blocking probability $c(x)$ starts with

$$c(n-1) = \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right) \quad (15)$$

This starting value (called "p" in B.'s paper) is exact for homogeneous gradings and is also obtained by means of eq. (12). Then the series is continued

$$c(n-2) = p^2 \quad (16)$$

$$c(n-3) = p^3, \text{ etc.}$$

The method has been applied to grading types used by the Australian GPO and has been found to be well suited.

D. 6 General Remarks to Gradings having a Finite Number of Sources (PCT 2)

The general remarks in section D. 1 hold also for gradings with offered PCT 2. In this case, however, strictly exact solutions cannot be obtained. The instantaneous traffic intensity offered to each individual selector group depends on that number of its sources which take part in the instantaneous existing pattern $(x)_q$. Therefore, the application of "Statistical Equilibrium" can yield approximations only. (Strictly exact solutions are - in the general case - available by means of the solution of 2ⁿ equations of state.) The recurrence formula (for "lost calls cleared") holds:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} &\lambda \cdot (q-x+1) \cdot u(x-1) \cdot p(x-1) + \\ &+ (x+1) \cdot p(x+1) \\ &= \lambda \cdot (q-x) \cdot u(x) \cdot p(x) + x \cdot p(x) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (17)$$

Therewith the probability of a state x becomes

$$p(x) = \frac{\binom{q}{x} \cdot \lambda^x \prod_{z=1}^{x-1} u(z)}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \binom{q}{i} \lambda^i \prod_{z=1}^{i-1} u(z)} \quad (18)$$

The time congestion is given by

$$E_k(\lambda, n, q) = \sum_{x=k}^n c(x) \cdot p(x) \quad (19)$$

and the call congestion by

$$B_k(\lambda, n, q) = \frac{\sum_{x=k}^n (q-x) \cdot p(x) \cdot c(x)}{q - \gamma} \quad (20)$$

D. 7 The Method of Rohde and Störmer [24]

This theory is based on the approximate assumptions "lost calls held" and "no holes in the multiple". The offered traffic is defined by a value

$$A^* = q \cdot p \quad (21)$$

with q being the number of traffic sources and p being the probability for each out of q independent sources to be busy under the condition that an unlimited traffic flow could exist, using $n^* = q$ full available trunks. Starting from these assumptions and using the actual number $n < q$ of trunks hunted with limited access $k < n < q$, the principle of statistical equilibrium is applied. The following loss formula (referred to A^*) is obtained:

$$B_k(A^*, n, q) = \sum_{x=k}^n c(x) \cdot p(x) \cdot \frac{q-x}{q} \quad (22)$$

The value $c(x)$ for gradings is an approximation, derived from a combinatorial solution for two-stage link systems (the exact derivation under their assumptions leads to $\frac{(x)}{q} / \frac{(x)}{q}$). The actually applied approximations yield too pessimistic values of loss for gradings as used in practice [21].

D. 8 Method No. 1 by D. Botsch for Gradings Carrying External and Internal Traffic [25]

In gradings used for both-way traffic a certain share of calls which originate from a certain subscriber (or inlet) of the grading will be connected to another subscriber (or inlet) which belongs to the same grading. In this case the traffic between two subscribers (inlets) of the same grading runs twice through this considered grading. This share of traffic will be called internal traffic and needs two trunks of the same group for one call. The other share of traffic runs only once through the grading and will be called external traffic. N. Rönblom [26] and later on R. Fortet and Ch. Grandjean [27] as well as D. Botsch [25] solved this prob-

lem for full available groups and PCT 1.

For gradings two solutions for PCT 1 and PCT 2 each have been developed by Botsch. The solution No.1 for PCT 1 and PCT 2 is described here, solution No.2 follows in section E.

From the assumption of statistical equilibrium and by means of a function $u(x)$ for the expectation value of the passage probabilities follows the recurrence formula for a finite number q of sources:

$$p(x+2) = \frac{q-x-1}{x+2} \cdot \alpha_{ext} \cdot p(x+1) \cdot u(x+1) + \frac{q-x}{x+2} \cdot 2 \alpha_{int} \cdot p(x) \cdot u(x) \cdot u(x+1) \quad (23)$$

α_{ext} and α_{int} being the call intensities per idle source with respect to the external and internal traffic; the holding time h being unity.

To get time- and call-congestion, the values for the probability distribution $p(x)$ obtained from eq. (23) have to be inserted into the following equations:

Time congestion:

$$E_k = \sum_{x=k}^n p(x) \cdot c(x) + \frac{\alpha_{int}}{\alpha_{ext} + \alpha_{int}} \sum_{x=k-1}^{n-1} p(x) \cdot u(x) \cdot c(x+1) \quad (24)$$

Call congestion:

$$B_k = \frac{1}{q-\gamma} \left\{ \sum_{x=k}^n (q-x) \cdot p(x) \cdot c(x) + \frac{\alpha_{int}}{\alpha_{ext} + \alpha_{int}} \sum_{x=k-1}^{n-1} (q-x) \cdot p(x) \cdot u(x) \cdot c(x+1) \right\} \quad (25)$$

Formulae for Poisson input PCT 1 follow by passing to the limit $q \rightarrow \infty$.

E. Presumed Truncated Distributions Combined with Passage Probability

E. 1 The Palm-Jacobaeus Loss Formula |28|, |29|

This method has firstly been suggested by C. Palm |28|, later on transformed to the formula (1) by C. Jacobaeus |29| who successfully used it also for his famous link-system calculations.

The expectation value of passage probabil-

ity is chosen (see section D. 4):

$$c(x) = \frac{\binom{x}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \quad (D.14)$$

Assuming small losses and offered Poisson traffic A (PCT 1) an Erlang distribution $E_{1,x}(A)$ as in a full available group is presumed approximately.

From this follows for n lines and the accessibility k

$$E_k = B_k = \sum_{x=k}^n c(x) \cdot \frac{A^x}{x!} = \frac{E_n(A)}{E_{n-k}(A)} \quad (1)$$

This formula yields - in the considered range of small losses ($B \approx 1\%$) - and for good progressive gradings with skipping very good results close to reality.

E. 2 The Modified Palm-Jacobaeus Loss Formula |32|, |33|, |34|, |35|

In his wellknown book |30| of 1928 Th.C. Fry has calculated the probability $S(>k)$ that a selector without home position needs more than k steps to find an idle trunk within a full available group having n lines. When the offered traffic is A_0 , an Erlang-distribution with the mean carried traffic Y is produced:

$$Y = A_0 \cdot \{1 - E_{1,n}(A_0)\} \quad (2)$$

Analogously to eq. (1) this leads to the exact formula

$$S(>k) = \frac{E_n(A_0)}{E_{n-k}(A_0)} \quad (3A)$$

Not knowing this early solution of Th.C. Fry, the same idea was mentioned by A.Jensen 1954 |31| in a Danish publication and later on once again (1960) by the author as a useful modification of the PJ-Formula to extend its validity up to high values of loss.

$$B_k = \frac{E_n(A_0)}{E_{n-k}(A_0)} \quad (3B)$$

A_0 being the "generating PCT 1" of a full access group and with

$$Y = A_0 \{1 - E_n(A_0)\} \quad (4)$$

being the prescribed carried traffic. From this follows

$$A_{actual} = \frac{Y}{1 - B_k} \quad (5)$$

By a large number of artificial traffic tests with the availabilities $2 \leq k \leq 30$ it could be shown, that eq. (3) is indeed very close to reality for progressive (sequentially hunted) gradings with good skipping and a sufficiently large average inter-connection number

$$H \approx \frac{2.1}{\log(k+1)} \quad (6)$$

The MFJ-formula has been tabulated in [34] and [35].

Simplified gradings, however, without sophisticated skipping can often save costs remarkably with respect to the installation of local exchanges as well as to the enlargement of grading groups.

Thorough investigations by U. Herzog [36] have shown that - in the interesting range from at least $B = 0.001$ up to $B = 0.50$ the simplification of gradings shifts the MFJ-loss function $B_k = f(A, k, n)$ practically parallel to the axis of the actual offered traffic A . The amount of the adapting shifting-value ΔA can be easily calculated by the empirical loss-independent formula

$$\Delta A = F \cdot \left\{ \frac{n}{k} - 1 \right\}^2 \cdot \left\{ \frac{k-2}{60+4k} \right\} \quad (7)$$

The "Fitting Parameter F " characterizes the type of a grading simplified for economical reasons. Some further details can be seen in this book in the paper of D. Botsch [37].

E. 3 The Bq-Formula for Finite Number of Sources [38], [37]

Because of the good results in using the MPJ-Formula for PCT 1, an analogous type has been derived for PCT 2, i.e. for finite number q of sources. In a paper of Ericsson (1955) [39] the analogue to the FJ-Formula can already be found here applied to link systems using the actual traffic intensity α per idle source to a full available route and combined with the expectation values $c(x)$ according to eq. (D.14).

Applying the MPJ-idea and using - instead of α - that "generating" traffic intensity α_0 from which follows a prescribed carried load Y with Erlang's Bernoulli-distribution, A. Bächle and U. Herzog found the time congestion:

$$E_k(\alpha_0, n, q) = \frac{E_n(\alpha, q)}{E_{n-k}(\alpha_0, q-k)} \quad (8)$$

and the call congestion

$$B_k(\alpha_0, n, q) = \frac{B_n(\alpha_0, q)}{B_{n-k}(\alpha_0, q-k)} \quad (9)$$

With

$$E_n(\alpha_0, q) = \frac{\binom{q}{n} \alpha_0^n}{\sum_{i=0}^n \binom{q}{i} \cdot \alpha_0^i} \quad (10)$$

being Erlang's Bernoulli-Distribution (mean holding time $h = \text{unity}$).

As in the case of the MFJ-formula, eq. (9) holds very true for good progressive gradings with skipping and may be adapted to simplified gradings analogously.

The name "Bq-Formula" has been chosen from "Bernoulli-Distribution-Quotient".

E. 4 Method No.2 of D. Botsch for mixed External and Internal Traffic [25]

The method according to section E. 3 has been applied by D. Botsch (cf. D. 8) also to both way circuits having internal and external traffic.

His corresponding "Solution No 2" uses the same expressions for time congestion E_k (24) and call congestion B_k (25) as in "Solution No 1", but different probabilities of state $p(x)$ are chosen:

The probabilities of state $p(x)$ for "Solution No 2" must be calculated with "generating" offered traffics A_{oext} and A_{oint} (or call intensities α_{oext} and α_{oint} resp.), which lead to the prescribed carried loads Y_{ext} and Y_{int} in case of full accessibility.

See also the paper [37] in this book, moreover [25].

F. Alternate Routing in Case of Groups with Limited Access

As published at the 4th ITC 1964 in London [40] and in [35], [41], [42], [43], [44] the Equivalent Random Method of R.I. Wilkinson [14] or G. Bretschneider resp. [15] could be extended to groups with limited access. The variance coefficient $D = (V-R)$ of overflow traffic behind a grading with n trunks

accessibility k and call congestion B_k is

$$D = p \cdot R^2 \cdot \frac{k}{n} \quad (1)$$

With $R = A \cdot B_k$ being the "rest" of the offered traffic, i.e. the overflow traffic. The parameter $p = f(k, B_k)$ can be drawn from diagrams. Tables are available for $(R, D) = f(A, k, n)$.

The dimensioning of secondary groups, to which overflow traffic (R, D) is offered, makes use of the same idea as the Equivalent Random Method. An equivalent primary grading (EPG) has to be chosen such, that it generates the actual overflow traffic (R, D) . Its ratio n^*/k^* has to be determined such a way that this EPG and the following actual secondary grading together form one total inhomogeneous grading, appropriate for sequential hunting. Further details about this method can be found in this book in the papers [45], [46].

It should be denoted that Bridgford's method developed for two-stage link-systems can also be applied for the special case of one-stage gradings [23].

V. Gradings in Delay Systems

V. 1 Interpolation Methods of E. Gambe [47]

Gambe tried to find simple approximations for the delay probability W and for the mean waiting time τ_w with respect to gradings having the availability k and the number of trunks n . For this purpose he investigated interpolation methods, considering full available groups with k or n trunks respectively.

V. 2 The Interconnection Delay Formula (IDF) of M. Thierer [48]

This seems to be the first exact solution of this problem. It is derived in detail in Thierer's paper, contained in this book [48]. Applying the statistical equilibrium to Ideal Erlang Gradings, Thierer develops a solution for the probability of delay and the mean waiting time. The results of artificial traffic tests with ideal gradings square as exactly as possible with the theory. For familiar non-ideal gradings the method yields good approximate values.

The formulae hold:

$$p(x) = \frac{\frac{A^x}{\prod_{z=1}^x [z - c(z) \cdot A]} \cdot \prod_{z=0}^{x-1} u(z)}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{A^j}{\prod_{z=1}^j [z - c(z) \cdot A]} \cdot \prod_{z=0}^{j-1} u(z)} \quad (1)$$

$$W = \sum_{x=k}^n p(x) \cdot c(x) \quad (2)$$

$$\tau_w = \frac{\sum_{x=k}^n \left\{ p(x) \cdot \sum_{z=k}^x \frac{c(z) \cdot A}{z - c(z) \cdot A} \right\}}{A \cdot \sum_{x=k}^n p(x) \cdot c(x)} \quad (3)$$

Conclusion

In this paper, the author tried to give an abridged but systematic survey of the approximate methods for loss calculation of one stage gradings, which have been developed since 1920. Because of the huge number of publications in this field, it was impossible to mention all interesting studies. Therefore the authors, which couldn't be named are asked to apologize.

There is a large number of problems not yet solved, as for example:

- a) Improved approximate methods for loss calculation, if unbalanced traffic is offered.
- b) Improved methods for loss calculation in case of smooth traffic.
- c) Problems of overflow traffic and alternate routing with finite number of traffic sources.

Therefore, the treatment of gradings will be an interesting field for traffic theorists even in future.

Bibliography

- [1] Elldin, A.: On the Congestion in Gradings with Random Hunting
Ericsson Technics 11 (1955), pp. 33-94
- [2] Gray, E.A.: U.S. Patent Specification 1002388 "Method of and Means for Connecting Telephone Apparatus" (Application filed 1907)
- [3] Molina, E.C.: U.S. Patent No 1528982 "Trunking Systems" (Application filed 1921)
- [4] Merker, M.: "Some Notes on the Use of the Probability Theory to Determine the Number of Switches in an Automatic Exchange" POEEJ 1924, vol. 16, p. 347 and vol. 17, p. 27

- |5| Wilkinson, R.I. : The Interconnection of Telephone Systems Graded Multiples (and Molina, E.C.) BSTJ 10(1931) p.531
- |6| Brockmeyer, E.: The life and works of A.K. Erlang Halström, H.L. Jensen, A. Trans.Danish Acad. Tech.Sci.No 2, 1948 Copenhagen
- |7| O'Dell, G.F.: An Outline of the Trunking Aspect of Automatic Telephony Journal of the IEE 65(1927), p.185-214
- |8| Karlsson, S.A.: Förbättrad Närmeformel for Erlangs Idella Gradering Kraft och Ljus (1949) p.137
- |9| Einarsson, K.A.: Simplified Type of Gradings with Skip-ping. Tele (1961) No 2, pp.74-96 and 3.ITC Paris (1961), Doc.40
- |10| Popović, Z.: The Efficiency of Grading with Cyclic Arrangement (Jugoslavisch mit englischen Summary) Telekomunikacije 1955,pp.1-13
- |11| Glauner, M.: Prüfung des Verfahrens von Popovic zur Berechnung des zulässigen Angebots bei zyklischen Mischungen. Institut for Switching and Data Technics, Technical University Stuttgart (Monograph 1967)
- |12| Berkeley, G.S.: Traffic and Trunking Principles in Automatic Telephony. E.Benn, London, Second Edition 1949
- |13| Mina, R.R.: American and European Traffic Capacity Tables and Practices ITC Paris (1961) Doc.30
- |14| Wilkinson, R.I.: Theories for Toll Traffic Engineering in the USA. 1.ITC Copenhagen (1955)and Bell Syst.Techn.J.35 (1956),p.421-514
- |14b| Wilkinson,R.I.: Simplified Engineering of single-stage Alternate Routing Systems. 4.ITC London(1964), Doc.75
- |15| Bretschneider, G.:Die Berechnung von Leitungsgruppen für überfließenden Verkehr in Fernsprechwählanlagen. Nachr. techn.Zeitschr.9 (1956) S.533-540
- |16| Vaultot, E.: Etude du trafic téléphonique reçu par des lignes explorées dans un ordre déterminé. Rev.Gen.de l'El.38(1933) p.651
- |17| Kosten, L.: Ueber Sperrungswahrscheinlichkeiten bei Staffelschaltungen E.N.T. 14(1937),S.5-12 Französ.Fassung erschienen in Annales P.T.T.26 (1937), pp.1002-1019
- |18| Giltay, J.: Over rangeringen bij de automatische telefonie. De Ingenieur 65 (1953) p.107
- |19| Brockmeyer,E.: The simple Overflow Problem in the Theory of Telephone Traffic Teletechnik 5(1954), pp.361-374
- |20| Longley, K.A.: The Efficiency of Gradings. Post Office Electrical Engineers' Journal 41(1948) pp.45-49 (Part I), pp.67-72 (Part II)
- |21| Standard Elek-Projektierungsunterla-trik Lorenz AG.gen für Vermittlungssysteme Stuttgart(1966)
- |22| Herzog, U.: Die Bestimmung der Sperrwahrscheinlichkeit bei ein- und zweistufigen Koppelanordnungen mit unvollkommener Erreichbarkeit Institut for Switsching and Data Technics Technical University Stuttgart(1967)
- |23| Bridgford,J.N.:The Geometric Group Concept and its Application to the Dimensioning of Link Access Systems. 4.ITC London (1964), Doc. 13
- |24| Rohde, K.: Durchlaßwahrscheinlichkeit bei Vermittlungseinrichtungen der Fernmeldetechnik. Mitteilungsblatt für Mathematische Statistik 5(1953) pp. 185-200
- |25| Botsch, D.: Die Verlustwahrscheinlichkeit einstufiger Koppelanordnungen der Vermittlungstechnik mit Extern- und Internverkehr. Thesis, Technical University Stuttgart 1966
- |26| Rønblom, N.: Traffic loss of a circuit group consisting of both-way circuits, which is accessible for the internal and external traffic of a subscriber group. Tele 1959, pp.79-92

- |27| Fortet, R.: Study of the congestion in a loss system 4. ITC London (1964), Doc. 20
Grandjean, Ch.
- |28| Palm, C.: Några följdsatser ur de Erlang'ska formlerna. Tekn. Medd. från Kungl. Telegrafstyrdsen 1943, nr. 1-3
- |29| Jacobaeus, C.: A Study on Congestion in Link-Systems. Ericsson Technics No. 48 (1950)
- |30| Fry, Rh., C.: Probability and its Engineering Uses, New York 1928
- |31| Syski, R.: Introduction to Congestion Theory in Telephone Systems. Oliver, Edinburgh and London, 1960
- |32| Lotze, A.: Loss Formula, Artificial Traffic Checks and Quality Standards for Characterizing One Stage Gradings. 3. ITC Paris 1961, Doc. 28
- |33| Lotze, A.: Verluste und Güte-merkmale einstufiger Mischungen. NTZ 14 (1961), H. 9, p. 241
- |34| Lotze, A.: Table of the Modified Palm-Jacobaeus Loss Formula. Institute for Switching and Data Technics, Technical University Stuttgart, 1963
Wagner, W.
- |35| Institute for Tables for Overflow Switching and Variance Coefficient and Loss of Gradings and Full Available Groups, Second Edition, Stuttgart 1966
Data Technics, Technical University Stuttgart
- |36| Herzog, U.: Adapting of the MPJ-Formula to Gradings of Arbitrary Type. To be published in NTZ Communications Journal 1967
- |37| Botsch, D.: International Standardizing of Loss Formula? 5. ITC New York 1967
- |38| Bächle, A.: Die Berechnung einstufiger Koppelanordnungen mit unvollkommener Erreichbarkeit bei angebotenenem Zufallsverkehr zweiter Art. To be published in NTZ 1967
Herzog, U.
- |39| L.M. Ericsson: Automatic Telephone Exchanges with Crossbar Switches. Switch Calculations. General Survey. L.M. Ericsson, Stockholm, B 11265, November 1955
- |40| Lotze, A.: A Traffic Variance Method for Gradings of Arbitrary Type
a) ITC London 1964, Doc. No. 80
b) Post Office Telecommunication Journal, Special Issue, Report of the Proceedings of the Fourth International Teletraffic Congress, London, 1964 page 50
- |41| Herzog, U.: Näherungsverfahren zur Berechnung des Streuwerts von Ueberlaufverkehr hinter Mischungen. Institute for Switching and Data Technics, Monograph 1964
- |42| Institute for Tables for Variance Coefficient and Overflow Traffic R of One-Stage Gradings with Limited Access-Calculation of Secondary Routes in Case of Offered Overflow Traffic (R, D) 1965
Data Technics, Technical University Stuttgart.
- |43| Herzog, U.: Das RDA-Verfahren, ein Streuwertverfahren für unvollkommene Bündel. NTZ 19 (1966) No. 11, p. 640
Lotze, A.
- |44| Lotze, A.: Die streuwertgerechte Bemessung von Leitungsbündeln in Wählnetzen mit Leitweglenkung. NTZ 19 (1966) p. 719
Schehrer, R.
- |45| Schehrer, R.: Optimal Design of Alternate Routing Systems. 5. ITC New York, 1967
- |46| Herzog, U.: A General Variance Theory Applied to Link Systems with Alternate Routing. 5. ITC New York, 1967
- |47| Gambe, E.: A Study on the Efficiency of Graded Multiple Delay Systems through Artificial Traffic Trials. 3. ITC Paris, 1961, Doc. 16
- |48| Thierer, M.: Delay Systems with Limited Accessibility. 5. ITC New York (1967).