



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Statistics and Probability Letters

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/stapro

Per-site occupancy in the discrete parking problem[☆]

Seva Shneer^a, Peter M. van de Ven^{b,*}^a School of MACS, Department of AMS, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, EH14 4AS, United Kingdom^b Centrum Wiskunde & Informatica (CWI), P.O. Box 94079, 1090 GB Amsterdam, The Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 29 August 2016

Received in revised form 13 September 2016

Accepted 20 September 2016

Available online 7 October 2016

Keywords:

Generating functions

Jamming density

Parking problem

Wireless networks

ABSTRACT

We consider the classical discrete parking problem, in which cars arrive uniformly at random on any two adjacent sites out of n sites on a line. An arriving car parks if there is no overlap with previously parked cars, and leaves otherwise. This process continues until there is no more space available for cars to park, at which point we may compute the jamming density E_n/n , which represents the expected fraction of occupied sites. We extend the classical results by not just considering the total expected number of cars parked, but also the probability of each site being occupied by a car. This we then use to provide an alternative derivation of the jamming density.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Car parking is a classical problem first studied by Rényi (1963), where cars of unit length arrive on a line segment uniformly at random. The car parks at this location if and only if there is no overlap with existing cars. This process continues until the configuration of parked cars is such that no new cars can be fitted, at which point we may compute the fraction of the line segment that is utilized for parking, or jamming density. Rényi determined this parking constant as the length of the line segment grows to infinity.

We are interested in the discrete parking problem, which was introduced by Flory (1939) and rediscovered by Page (1959). Recall the setting of Page (1959): there are n sites which form $n - 1$ pairs of neighbouring sites. At the first step, a pair $(k, k + 1)$ is chosen uniformly at random for the car to park. In the next step, another pair of sites is chosen uniformly at random to form a parking spot for the next car. If this second pair is $(k - 1, k)$, $(k, k + 1)$, or $(k + 1, k + 2)$ the second car leaves as cars may not overlap; otherwise it parks and remains indefinitely. This procedure is repeated until there is no unoccupied pair of neighbouring sites left. In Flory (1939) and Page (1959) the authors demonstrate that the jamming density grows as $E_n/n \rightarrow 1 - e^{-2}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, with E_n the expected number of occupied sites. Similar results have been obtained for larger cars in Friedman et al. (1964), Klaassen and Runnenburg (2003) and Pinsky (2014). Asymptotic normality of the occupied space was demonstrated in Runnenburg (1982) and Klaassen and Runnenburg (2003). The case with multiple rows of parking space is considered by Georgiou et al. (2009) and Chern et al. (2015), and trees in Penrose and Sudbury (2005) and Dehling et al. (2008).

This model has many applications, including polymer chemistry Flory (1939) and Mackenzie (1962), granulometry Gotoh et al. (1978), elections Itoh and Ueda (1979), condensation and coagulation Cooper (1987), genome sequencing Roach et al. (2000) and communication networks Coffman et al. (1998). We are motivated by the application of resource sharing in

[☆] Some results appeared without proofs in Shneer and van de Ven (2011).

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: v.shneer@hw.ac.uk (S. Shneer), ven@cwi.nl (P.M. van de Ven).

communication networks, in particular wireless random-access networks. Random-access protocols such as Carrier-Sense Multiple-Access (CSMA) Kleinrock and Tobagi (1975) have gained much popularity for their ability to regulate the access of network nodes to a shared medium in a fully distributed fashion, and are for example used in the IEEE 802.11 standard. A node using the CSMA protocol attempts to transmit a packet after some random time, except if any nearby node is already active.

The stochastic process describing the wireless network behaves as follows. We assume that time is slotted, and that each transmission lasts 1 time slot. At the beginning of a time slot, all nodes are inactive, and the time slot is divided into a contention period and a transmission period. During the contention period each node draws a random back-off time, after which it activates as long as no nearby node is already active. This dictates the order in which nodes activate, with the additional constraint that a node may not activate if one of its neighbours is already active.

It is readily seen that these dynamics are identical to that of the parking problem. The application to wireless networks provides us with a useful alternative characterization of the process according to which parking spots are filled, where instead of newly arriving cars selecting a spot uniformly at random, we assume each spot has one dedicated car, and the order in which cars arrive determines the evolution of the parking process. This interpretation was previously used in Gerin (2015) to provide an alternative approach to determining the parking constant.

Previous studies of the parking problem have focused on metrics such as the jamming density or the distribution of the gap sizes. Instead, we are interested in the probability that each site is occupied, both in the case of a finite n and the asymptotic regime. This is motivated by the application to wireless networks, where the probability of a site being occupied is equivalent to the throughput of the wireless transmitter located on that site.

We start the next section by providing a rigorous definition of the activation process in a network governed by the CSMA protocol and explain its equivalence to the classical parking problem. We then proceed to derive the probability that a given node of a network of n nodes is active, which is the main result of the paper. This then allows us to recover two classic results from Flory (1939) and Page (1959) as a corollary. First we retrieve the probability of sites 1 and 2 being occupied, and the second corollary is to derive the expected number of active nodes in a network of length n . This is equal to the expected number of cars that can park on a line segment of length $n - 1$.

2. Model and result

Consider a linear network of n sites numbered $1, \dots, n$. We draw a random permutation of sites $\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(n)$, and sites attempt to activate in this order. Such an attempt is successful if neither of the site's neighbours is already active. The set of sites active at the end of this process is fully determined by the permutation, and the end configuration is such that the gap between two active sites is at most 2, i.e., no additional sites can be activated. The relation to the classical parking problem is immediate: the site with the highest priority order may be considered to be the left one of the pair of sites (out of sites $1, 2, \dots, n + 1$) chosen first. Subsequent steps are also equivalent.

It is worth mentioning that in both the classical parking problem and the setting of our note, one can consider cars (or interference regions) of length bigger than 1 and our technique may be applied in this general setting. However, we limit ourselves to the case of length 1 for ease of presentation.

We are interested in the probability of a site being active. This quantity corresponds to the per-node throughputs in a wireless network. We denote by $T_i(n)$ the probability that node i is active. To obtain a connection between this quantity, and the probability $S_i(n)$ that site i is occupied in the classical parking setting, observe that the two ways site i can be occupied is by placing a car on sites $(i - 1, i)$ or on $(i, i + 1)$. This is equivalent to activating either node $i - 1$ or i . Thus,

$$S_i(n) = T_i(n - 1) + T_{i-1}(n - 1)$$

with the convention that $T_{-1}(k) = 0$ for all k .

The following Theorem was first presented in Shneer and van de Ven (2011), and is our main result.

Theorem 1. For $n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$T_i(n) = \begin{cases} 1 + \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{n-i}{2}} d_{i,i+2k}, & \text{if } (n - i) \text{ is even,} \\ \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{n-i-1}{2}} d_{i,i+2k+1}, & \text{if } (n - i) \text{ is odd,} \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where

$$d_{i,i+l} = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \frac{(-1)^{l+k}}{k!} \left(\frac{1}{(i+l-k)!} - \frac{1}{l!} \right). \tag{2}$$

Proof. Conditioning on the first node to activate yields the following recursive equation:

$$T_i(n) = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{i-2} T_{i-j-1}(n-j-1) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=i+2}^n T_i(j-2) = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{i-2} T_{i-j-1}(n-j-1) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=i}^{n-2} T_i(j). \tag{3}$$

With $\psi_i(\rho) = \sum_{n=i}^{\infty} T_i(n)\rho^n$, summing (3) over n gives the differential equation

$$\psi_i'(\rho) = \sum_{j=1}^{i-2} \rho^j \psi_{i-j-1}(\rho) + \frac{\rho^{i-1}}{1-\rho} + \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \psi_i(\rho), \tag{4}$$

with initial condition $\psi_i(0) = 0$.

We shall show below that

$$\psi_i(\rho) = \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left(\rho^i + (-1)^{i+1} - e^{-\rho} \rho^i a_i + (-1)^i e^{-\rho} \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \frac{\rho^k}{k!} \right), \tag{5}$$

which leaves (1) to prove. To this end we shall find the Taylor expansion for (5) with respect to the powers of ρ . Let us start with the last term inside the brackets in (5):

$$e^{-\rho} \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \frac{\rho^k}{k!} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^m \rho^m}{m!} \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \frac{\rho^k}{k!} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} c_m \rho^m$$

with

$$c_m = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } m = 0, \\ \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(-1)^{m-k}}{k!(m-k)!} = 0, & \text{if } 0 < m \leq i-1, \\ \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \frac{(-1)^{m-k}}{k!(m-k)!} = b_{i,m}, & \text{if } m \geq i, \end{cases}$$

and

$$b_{i,n} = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \frac{(-1)^{n-k}}{k!(n-k)!}. \tag{6}$$

Substituting this into (5) and using the Taylor expansion for the exponential function

$$e^{-\rho s} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (-1)^m \frac{\rho^m}{m!} s^m \tag{7}$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_i(\rho) &= \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left(\rho^i + a_i \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \sum_{m=i}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{m-i}}{(m-i)!} \rho^m + (-1)^i \sum_{m=i}^{\infty} b_{i,m} \rho^m \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left(\rho^i + \sum_{m=i}^{\infty} d_{i,m} \rho^m \right), \end{aligned}$$

with $d_{i,m}$ defined in (2). The $T_i(n)$ then readily follow from $\psi_i(\rho)$.

This proves Theorem 1. It remains to be shown that (5) holds. Introducing

$$v(\rho, s) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \psi_i(\rho) s^i,$$

and using (4) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial v(\rho, s)}{\partial \rho} &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \psi'_i(\rho) s^i = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{i-2} \rho^j \psi_{i-j-1}(\rho) s^i + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\rho^{i-1} s^i}{1-\rho} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \psi_i(\rho) s^i \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \rho^j \sum_{i=j+2}^{\infty} \psi_{i-j-1}(\rho) s^i + \frac{s}{(1-\rho)(1-\rho s)} + \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} v(\rho, s) \\ &= \left(\frac{\rho s^2}{1-\rho s} + \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \right) v(\rho, s) + \frac{s}{(1-\rho)(1-\rho s)}, \end{aligned}$$

and $v(0, s) = 0$. Solving this standard differential equation we obtain

$$v(\rho, s) = \frac{s(1 - e^{-\rho(s+1)})}{(s+1)(1-\rho)(1-\rho s)}. \tag{8}$$

We now need to write the Taylor expansion for the latter expression. Using

$$\frac{s}{s+1} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{m+1} s^m \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{1-\rho s} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \rho^k s^k$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{s}{s+1} \frac{1}{1-\rho s} &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \rho^k (-1)^{l-k+1} \right) s^l = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{l+1} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \rho^k (-1)^{-k} \right) s^l \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{l+1} \frac{1 - (-\rho)^l}{1 + \rho} s^l = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{\rho^l + (-1)^{l+1}}{1 + \rho} s^l. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Substituting (9) and (7) into (8) gives

$$\begin{aligned} v(\rho, s) &= \frac{s}{s+1} \frac{1}{1-\rho} \frac{1}{1-\rho s} (1 - e^{-\rho(s+1)}) = \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (\rho^m + (-1)^{m+1}) s^m \cdot (1 - e^{-\rho(s+1)}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (\rho^m + (-1)^m) s^m - e^{-\rho} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \rho^m s^m \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} + e^{-\rho} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m s^m \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \frac{\rho^k}{k!} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which yields (5). □

Theorem 1 provides us with a closed-form but unwieldy expression for the individual throughputs. This allows us to recover two classical results on the parking problem. In case the network size grows to infinity we can obtain a more elegant expression for the throughputs of nodes 1 and 2 (recovering results from Page, 1959).

Corollary 1. As $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$T_1(n) \rightarrow 1 - e^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad T_2(n) \rightarrow e^{-1}.$$

From **Theorem 1** we can also recover E_n and the jamming density E_n/n , first obtained in Flory (1939), defined as the fraction of occupied sites in the classical parking problem. To do this, observe that due to boundary effects, $E_n = 2F_{n-1}$, where F_{n-1} represents the expected number of active nodes in an $n - 1$ node wireless network. By adding the individual activation probabilities we obtain the following result.

Corollary 2. The total expected number of active nodes is given as

$$F_n = \sum_{k=1}^n (-1)^{k+1} \frac{2^{k-1}}{k!} (n - k + 1), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Before proceeding to the proof, note that it is straightforward to check that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F_n}{n} = \frac{1}{2} (1 - e^{-2}) = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E_n}{n},$$

and we recover the results of Flory (1939) and Page (1959) on the jamming density.

Let us now prove the corollary.

Proof. Let n be even; the proof for odd n is analogous. By summing over the individual throughputs from (1), the total throughput may be written as

$$F_n = \sum_{i=1}^n T_i(n) = \frac{n}{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{n/2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2j+1} \sum_{l=0}^{2j-1} \frac{(-1)^{k+l+1}}{k!l!} =: \frac{n}{2} + A, \tag{10}$$

where A is defined as the second part of (10). In order to rewrite A , let

$$B := \sum_{j=1}^{n/2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2j} \sum_{l=0}^{2j} \frac{(-1)^{k+l+1}}{k!l!}.$$

We may rewrite B as

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \sum_{j=1}^{n/2} \sum_{l=0}^{2j-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2j+1} \frac{(-1)^{k+l+1}}{k!l!} - \sum_{j=1}^{n/2} \sum_{l=0}^{2j-1} \frac{(-1)^{n-2j+2+l}}{(n-2j+1)l!} + \sum_{j=1}^{n/2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2j} \frac{(-1)^{k+2j+1}}{k!(2j)!} \\ &= A - \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} \sum_{l=0}^{n-2k+1} \frac{(-1)^l}{(2k-1)l!} + \sum_{j=1}^{n/2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2j} \frac{(-1)^{k+2j+1}}{k!(2j)!} \\ &= A + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^{n-i} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k!i!}, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where the second equality is due to the transformation $k = n/2 - j + 1$. Next, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^{n-i} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k!i!} &= \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{k=0}^{n-i} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k!i!} - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k!} \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^n (-1)^{t+1} \sum_{l=0}^t \frac{(-1)^l}{(t-l)l!} - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k!} \\ &= -1 + \sum_{t=1}^n (-1)^{t+1} (1 + (-1))^t t! - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k!} = -1 - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k!}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this into (11), and using the identity

$$A + B = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^{n-i} \sum_{l=0}^i \frac{(-1)^{k+l+1}}{k!l!}, \tag{12}$$

we obtain

$$A = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^{n-i} \sum_{l=0}^i \frac{(-1)^{k+l+1}}{k!l!} + \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k!} + 1 \right) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{k=0}^{n-i} \sum_{l=0}^i \frac{(-1)^{k+l+1}}{k!l!} + \frac{1}{2}. \tag{13}$$

By rearranging the order of summation, and substituting $t = k + l$, we obtain

$$A = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=0}^n \sum_{k=0}^{n-l} (n-k-l+1) \frac{(-1)^{k+l+1}}{k!l!} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=0}^n \sum_{t=l}^n (n-t+1) \frac{(-1)^{t+1}}{l!(t-l)!}.$$

If we interchange summation, we can apply the binomial theorem to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^n (-1)^{t+1} \frac{(n-t+1)}{t!} \sum_{l=0}^t \frac{t!}{l!(t-l)!} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^n (-1)^{t+1} \frac{2^t}{t!} (n-t+1) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{n+1}{2} + \sum_{t=1}^n (-1)^{t+1} \frac{2^{t-1}}{t!} (n-t+1). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this into (10), we obtain the desired result. \square

Acknowledgement

The research of S. Shneer was supported by EPSRC grant EP/L026767/1.

References

- Chern, H.-H., Hwang, H.-K., Tsai, T.-H., 2015. Random unfriendly seating arrangement in a dining table. *Adv. Appl. Math.* 65, 38–64.
- Coffman Jr., E.G., Flatto, L., Jelenković, P., Poonen, B., 1998. Packing random intervals on-line. *Algorithmica* 22 (4), 448–476.
- Cooper, D.W., 1987. Parking problem (sequential packing) simulations in two and three dimensions. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* 119 (2), 442–450.
- Dehling, H.G., Fleurke, S.R., Külske, C., 2008. Parking on a random tree. *J. Stat. Phys.* 133 (1), 151–157.
- Flory, P., 1939. Intramolecular reaction between neighboring substituents of vinyl polymers. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 61 (6), 1518–1521.
- Friedman, H.D., Rothman, D., MacKenzie, J.K., 1964. Problem 62-3. *SIAM Rev.* 6 (2), 180–182.
- Georgiou, K., Kranakis, E., Krizanc, D., 2009. Random maximal independent sets and the unfriendly theater seating arrangement problem. *Discrete Math.* 309 (16), 5120–5129.
- Gerin, L., 2015. The Page–Rényi parking process. *Electron. J. Combin.* 22 (4), paper #4.4. arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.8002.
- Gotoh, K., Jodrey, W.S., Tory, E.M., 1978. Average nearest-neighbour spacing in a random dispersion of equal spheres. *Powder Technol.* 21 (2), 285–287.
- Itoh, Y., Ueda, S., 1979. A random packing model for elections. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* 31 (1), 157–167.
- Klaassen, C.A.J., Runnenburg, J.T., 2003. Discrete spacings. *Stat. Neerl.* 57 (4), 470–483.
- Kleinrock, L., Tobagi, F.A., 1975. Packet switching in radio channels: part I – carrier sense multiple-access modes and their throughput-delay characteristics. *IEEE Trans. Commun.* 23 (12), 1400–1416.
- Mackenzie, J.K., 1962. Sequential filling of a line by intervals placed at random and its application to linear adsorption. *J. Chem. Phys.* 37 (4), 723–728.
- Page, E., 1959. The distribution of vacancies on a line. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* 364–374.
- Penrose, M.D., Sudbury, A., 2005. Exact and approximate results for deposition and annihilation processes on graphs. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 15 (1B), 853–889.
- Pinsky, R.G., 2014. A one-dimensional probabilistic packing problem, In: *Problems From the Discrete to the Continuous*, pp. 21–34.
- Rényi, A., 1963. Car parking problem. *Sel. Trans. Math. Stat. Prob.* 4, 205.
- Roach, J.C., Thorsson, V., Siegel, A.F., 2000. Parking strategies for genome sequencing. *Genome Res.* 10 (7), 1020–1030.
- Runnenburg, J.T., 1982. Asymptotic normality in vacancies on a line. *Stat. Neerl.* 36 (3), 135–148.
- Shneer, S., van de Ven, P.M., 2011. Comparing slotted and continuous CSMA: throughputs and fairness. In: *In Proc. IFIP Performance*, Vol. 39, pp. 35–37.