



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### Product Form Solution for a Class of PEPA Models

**Citation for published version:**

Hillston, J & Thomas, N 1999, 'Product Form Solution for a Class of PEPA Models', *Performance Evaluation*, vol. 35, no. 3-4, pp. 171-192. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-5316\(99\)00005-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-5316(99)00005-X)

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1016/S0166-5316\(99\)00005-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-5316(99)00005-X)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

Performance Evaluation

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

Copyright ©2000 by The University of Edinburgh. All Rights Reserved The authors and the University of Edinburgh retain the right to reproduce and publish this paper for non-commercial purposes. Permission is granted for this report to be reproduced by others for non-commercial purposes as long as this copyright notice is reprinted in full in any reproduction.

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# Amalgamation of Transition Sequences in the PEPA Formalism\*

JANE HILLSTON

*The University of Edinburgh, Scotland*

JOANNA TOMASIK

*The University of Edinburgh, Scotland*

## Abstract

This report presents a formal approach to reducing sequences in PEPA components. Performing the described amalgamation procedure we may remove, from the underlying Markov chain, those states for which local detailed balance equations cannot be formulated. This transformation may lead to a simpler model with product form solution. Some classes of reduced models preserve those performance measures which we are interested in and, moreover, the steady state solution is much easier computationally.

## Keywords

PEPA, decomposability, reversible Markov chains, insensitive stochastic processes

## 1 Introduction

Construction and solution of a large Markov model of a real system is not a trivial task since the number of reachable states is very large and transitions between them do not follow an easily predictable pattern. The modeller faces the problem of creating and solving an infinitesimal generator matrix  $Q$  whilst coping with limited time/space computational resources and numerical precision. Using appropriate tools, such as Stochastic Process Algebras (for example: PEPA [5], TIPP [4], EMPA [1]) or the Stochastic Automata Network method [10], may help decompose the modelling task and express the model as a multidimensional Markov chain. Each of these methods lacks the versatility to deal with an arbitrary model, but each can treat some classes of models efficiently. The advantage of the modular approach to defining a Markov chain may be exploited not only when writing its description (the modeller can look at each sub-model separately) but

---

\*This work was supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council via the COMPA project (G/L10215).

also when solving it because possible state reductions, or even calculations, may be performed for processes smaller than the global one.

A class of models for which compositionality can be fully exploited are the so-called *product form* models. Such models are expressed as interactions of simple submodels and their steady state solution is a function of partial solutions of these elementary components. At the Markov chain level, fluxes between states fulfil local balance equations, which are more convenient to formulate and to solve than global balance equations, but which place restrictions on how models may be constructed. For example, for reversible models [8], detailed balance must exist between each pair of states, i.e. for every pair of states  $x_i$  and  $x_j$ ,  $\pi(x_i)q_{i,j} = \pi(x_j)q_{j,i}$ , where  $\pi(\cdot)$  is the steady state probability and  $q_{i,j}$  is the instantaneous transition rate. This subclass of product form models has been characterised syntactically in PEPA [6], meaning that the satisfaction of the detailed balance condition can be recognised without recourse to the global state space. However, the restrictions result in structures which are rarely encountered when modelling real systems.

Nevertheless, product form models are also useful as targets for transformation and given a particular performance measure, a “close” product form one may be substituted to bound the desired measure. In [3], van Dijk presents his approach towards transforming an initial Markov chain into one which has product form solution and for which a chosen performance measure is bounded from above or below. In [11] this approach is applied to some examples, which do not have product form solution, in order to find upper and lower bounds of an arbitrary chosen performance measure, using reversible PEPA models as the target for transformation. In this paper we give a more formal description of transforming a Markov chain into another, with product form solution, at the PEPA component level. Our goal is to remove Markov chain states for which detailed local balance equations are not satisfied and to bound performance measures using the new Markov chain.

The next section contains a short description of the PEPA formalism. Section 3 contains descriptions of formal tools we will use to perform activity amalgamation and discusses how the amalgamation procedure affects steady state probabilities in some cases. An extended version of this paper is presented in [7].

## 2 Outline of the PEPA Formalism

Entities of Performance Evaluation Process Algebra (PEPA) [5] are termed components. A component  $P$  can perform action  $a$ ,  $a = (\alpha, r)$ ,  $a \in Act(P)$ , where  $\alpha$  is an activity type,  $\alpha \in A(P)$ , and  $r$  is a transition rate according to an exponential distribution,  $r \in \mathbf{R}^+$ , and  $\mathbf{R}^+$  is a set of positive real numbers together with the symbol  $\top$  indicating unspecified transition rate. The set of types enabled in all derivatives of  $P$ , i.e. within the life cycle of  $P$ , is termed  $\bar{A}(P)$ . Components can interact by the use of the PEPA operations:  $(\alpha, r).P$ ,  $P + Q$ ,  $P \bowtie_L Q$ ,  $P/H$ ,  $\stackrel{def}{=}$ , where  $L \subseteq \bar{A}(P)$  is a set of types over which cooperation between components is

performed,  $H \subseteq A(P)$  is a set of types which are replaced in the component  $P$  by the undefined type  $\tau$ . The listed PEPA combinators are named: prefix, choice, co-operation, hiding, definitional equality, respectively. Alternatively,  $P \bowtie_{\emptyset} Q$  may be written as  $P \parallel Q$ . Details of the PEPA semantics are presented in [5].

We now define some terminology which we will use later in the paper.

**Definition 1** The apparent rate of action type  $\alpha$  in component  $P$  is denoted  $r_{\alpha}(P)$  and is given by:

$r_{\alpha}((\beta, r).P) = \begin{cases} r, & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \\ 0, & \text{if } \alpha \neq \beta \end{cases}$	$r_{\alpha}(P + Q) = r_{\alpha}(P) + r_{\alpha}(Q)$
$r_{\alpha}(P/H) = \begin{cases} r_{\alpha}(P), & \text{if } \alpha \notin H \\ 0, & \text{if } \alpha \in H \end{cases}$	$r_{\alpha}(P \bowtie_L Q) = \begin{cases} r_{\alpha}(P) + r_{\alpha}(Q), & \text{if } \alpha \notin L \\ \min(r_{\alpha}(P), r_{\alpha}(Q)), & \text{if } \alpha \in L \end{cases}$

For cooperation, if  $\alpha$  is in the cooperation set, the slowest participant determines the rate of the shared action.

**Definition 2** If  $P_0 \xrightarrow{(\alpha, r)} P_1$ , then  $P_1$  is a (one-step) derivative of  $P_0$ . More generally, if  $P_0 \xrightarrow{(\alpha_0, r_0)} P_1 \xrightarrow{(\alpha_1, r_1)} \dots \xrightarrow{(\alpha_{n-1}, r_{n-1})} P_n$ , then  $P_n$  is a derivative of  $P_0$ .

**Definition 3** The derivative set of a PEPA component  $P$  is denoted  $\text{ds}(P)$  and defined as the smallest set of components such that if  $P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_0$  then  $P_0 \in \text{ds}(P)$ ; and if  $P_i \in \text{ds}(P)$  and there exists  $a \in \text{Act}(P_i)$  such that  $P_i \xrightarrow{a} P_j$  then  $P_j \in \text{ds}(P)$ .

Syntactically, PEPA components are divided into two groups, model components  $M$  and sequential components  $S$  (where  $X$  denotes a constant which is a sequential component):

$$S ::= (\alpha, r).S \mid S + S \mid X \qquad M ::= S \mid M \bowtie_L M \mid M/H$$

### 3 Amalgamation of Sequences

In this section we describe a transformation procedure for PEPA models. Firstly, we define *local sequences* in PEPA sequential components building up a model. Secondly, we describe how the activity type is chosen to label the amalgamated transition. Thirdly, we define a surjective function which describes the amalgamation procedure. Finally, we propose a classification, discuss computation of the new transition rate and give examples of local sequences according to the introduced classifying scheme.

#### 3.1 Local Sequences inside a PEPA Component

Firstly, we define an internal structure of a PEPA component which destroys its potential reversibility.

**Definition 4** A pair of activity types  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$  form a local sequence in a component  $X_0$  iff, for all  $X_{j_1}, X_{j_2}$ , such that  $X_{j_1}, X_{j_2} \in \text{ds}(X_0)$ ,  $X_{j_1} \not\equiv X_{j_2}$ ,  $X_{j_1} \xrightarrow{(\alpha_P, r_{j_{12}})} X_{j_2}$  and  $X_{j_2}$  is only an one-step derivative of  $X_{j_1}$ , there exists a unique  $X_{j_3}$ , such that  $X_{j_3} \in \text{ds}(X_0)$ ,  $X_{j_2} \not\equiv X_{j_3}$ ,  $X_{j_2} \xrightarrow{(\alpha_S, r_{j_{23}})} X_{j_3}$ ,  $X_{j_3}$  is the only one-step derivative of  $X_{j_2}$ . In a local sequence  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$ ,  $\alpha_P$  is termed the *predecessor* and  $\alpha_S$  the *successor*.

Figure 1 depicts a local sequence in  $X$ ,  $(\tau, \alpha_S)$ . In this case the undefined type  $\tau$  is the predecessor and  $\alpha_S$  is the successor. For the state  $X_k$  we cannot write a local balance equation and we do not want to include this state in our calculation. Thus we replace the component  $X$  by another,  $X'$ , in which  $X'_j \xrightarrow{(\xi, R)} X'_l$ . The states  $X'_j$  and  $X'_l$  are images of  $X_j$  and  $X_l$  respectively in a transforming function. However, we have to decide what type  $\xi$  is and what is the transition rate.

### 3.2 Choice of Activity Type

The synchronising actions in a PEPA model cannot be of undefined type. If no reward is associated with the type of an independent action it may be hidden without loss of information. Thus, when only one type of the local sequence  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$  is a cooperating one, we pick it as the type of the new transition.

In the case when both actions are either synchronised or independent we assume that the succeeding activity type of a sequence absorbs the preceding one. Our assumption is a direct result of an emphasis on observation.

Consider component  $X$  shown in Figure 1. Starting from state  $X_j$ , the component performs its internal action  $(\tau, \lambda)$  and an observer cannot say of what type the activity is. When the internal action finishes, he can recognise the activity type of the consecutive action (assuming it is of “public” type). From his perspective, the change of state to  $X_k$  is of little interest. He may suppose that the time of passing from  $X_j$  to  $X_l$  has a distribution defined by a Coxian distribution equal to the convolution of the “private” and “public” exponential distributions with parameters  $\lambda$  and  $r_S$ , respectively and the type of this transition is the type of the visible transition, i.e.  $\alpha_S$ . This reasoning suggests that the activity type  $\xi$  (Section 3.1) resulting from the amalgamation procedure should be the successor type  $\alpha_S$ .




Figure 1: A local sequence in component  $X$  with internal type  $\tau$  as predecessor

### 3.3 Amalgamation Procedure

To begin, we state precisely how “an internal element” (such as  $X_k$  in Figure 1), which will be removed due to the amalgamation procedure, may be identified.

**Definition 5** A derivative  $X^*$  is an internal sequential derivative of a local sequence  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$  in  $X$  if its enabled activity multi-set is  $\{(\alpha_S, r_S)\}$  and it is an  $\alpha_P$ -derivative of a component whose enabled activity multi-set is  $\{(\alpha_P, r_P)\}$ .

A function which amalgamates local sequences and removes their internal sequential derivative is defined as follows:

**Definition 6** A function  $f : \text{ds}(X) \longrightarrow \text{ds}(X')$  is a sequential epimorphism from  $X$  to  $X'$  over a local sequence  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$  if it is a surjective function such that

1. if  $X^* \in \text{ds}(X)$  and  $X^*$  is not an internal sequential derivative of local sequence  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$ , then  $X^*$  and  $f(X^*)$  are identical,
2. for any  $a \in \text{Act}(X^*)$ , not part of local sequence  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$ , the set of  $a$ -derivatives of  $f(X^*)$  equals the  $f$ -image of the set of  $a$ -derivatives of  $X^*$ ,
3. for activities  $(\alpha_P, r_P)$  and  $(\alpha_S, r_S)$ , such that  $X_0^* \xrightarrow{(\alpha_P, r_P)} X_1^* \xrightarrow{(\alpha_S, r_S)} X_2^*$ , there is exactly one derivative of  $f(X_0^*)$ , which may be reached by performing  $(\alpha_S, R)$  such that  $f(X_0^*) \xrightarrow{(\alpha_S, R)} f(X_2^*)$ . The expected delay between  $f(X_0^*)$  and  $f(X_2^*)$  is the same as the expected delay between  $X_0^*$  and  $X_2^*$ .

Sequential epimorphism is a generalisation of weak isomorphism defined in [5].

### 3.4 Classification of Sequences to be Amalgamated

Let  $M = \triangle(X_0^{(i)}, i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1)$ , be a PEPA model made up of  $n$  sequential components, the  $X_0^{(i)}$ . The  $\triangle$  operator composes the  $X_0^{(i)}$  using PEPA's composition and hiding combinators. Let  $\alpha$  be an activity type which may occur in  $M$ , i.e.  $\alpha \in \bar{A}(M)$ . We use shorthands as stated below:

- $M$ : the set of all the components  $X_0^{(i)}, i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ ,  
 $M^{\alpha, \emptyset}$ : the set of all components  $X_0^{(i)}$  in which no action of type  $\alpha$  occurs,  
 $M^{\alpha, *}$ : the set of all components  $X_0^{(i)}$  in which an action of type  $\alpha$  may occur but these components do not cooperate over  $\alpha$ ,  
 $M^\alpha$ : the set of all components  $X_0^{(i)}$  cooperating over the activity type  $\alpha$ .

Clearly,  $M = M^{\alpha, \emptyset} \cup M^{\alpha, *} \cup M^\alpha$  and  $M^{\alpha, \emptyset} \cap M^{\alpha, *} = M^{\alpha, *} \cap M^\alpha = M^{\alpha, \emptyset} \cap M^\alpha = \emptyset$ .

Let a pair of activity types  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$  be a local sequence in some sequential components  $X_0^{(i)}$  of the model  $M$ . We restrict ourselves to the cases listed in Table 1 for which  $M^{\alpha_P, \emptyset} = M^{\alpha_S, \emptyset} = \emptyset$ . If these sets were not empty our classification would be still valid as long as their elements were cyclic components. We also assume that each sequence  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$  appears at most once in each sequential component.

To remove ambiguity, in the context of the proposed classification, we give details of the reduction of local sequences in each case. In some cases, amalgamation is only possible when certain *boundary conditions* are met, i.e. all components involved can be guaranteed to enter or exit the local sequence simultaneously.

a)	$M^{\alpha_P,*} = M$	I	$M^{\alpha_S,*} = M$		
		II	$M^{\alpha_S} = M$		
		III	$M^{\alpha_S,*} \neq M \wedge M^{\alpha_S} \neq M$		
b)	$M^{\alpha_P} = M$	I	$M^{\alpha_S,*} = M$		
		II	$M^{\alpha_S} = M$		
		III	$M^{\alpha_S,*} \neq M \wedge M^{\alpha_S} \neq M$		
c)	$M^{\alpha_P,*} \neq M$ $\wedge$	I	$M^{\alpha_S,*} = M$		
		II	$M^{\alpha_S} = M$		
	$M^{\alpha_P} \neq M$	III	$M^{\alpha_S,*} \neq M$ $\wedge$ $M^{\alpha_S} \neq M$	*	$M^{\alpha_P} = M^{\alpha_S}$
				**	$M^{\alpha_P} \cap M^{\alpha_S} = \emptyset$
				***	otherwise


Table 1: Possible manifestations of local sequences in the model  $M$ 

**Definition 7** A local sequence  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$  in component  $X$ , within model  $M$ , is a beginning sequence iff  $\alpha_P$  is not a successor in any local sequence in  $X$  and a component whose  $\alpha_P$ -derivative is an internal sequential derivative of  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$  in  $X$ , is obtained only after cooperation by all components belonging to the set  $M^{\alpha_S}$ .

**Definition 8** A local sequence  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$  in component  $X$ , within model  $M$ , is an ending sequence iff  $\alpha_S$  is not a predecessor in any local sequence in  $X$  and from an  $\alpha_S$ -derivative of an internal sequential component, all outgoing actions require cooperation of all components belonging to the set  $M^{\alpha_P}$ .

Based upon these two definitions, illustrated in Figure 2, we are able to define local sequences which are made up of exactly two actions labelled with activity types  $\alpha_P$  and  $\alpha_S$ , respectively.

**Definition 9** A local sequence  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$  in  $X$  included in a model  $M$  is a strict sequence in  $M$  if it is a beginning and ending sequence in  $M$ .

Figure 2: Examples of beginning  $((\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$  in  $U_0$ ) and ending  $((\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$  in  $W_0$ ) sequences; shorthands:  $G = (\gamma, g)$ ,  $G_\top = (\gamma, \top)$ 

Finally, we point out that we assume no reward function is associated with actions of type  $\alpha_P$  or  $\alpha_S$  for these actions will vanish during the amalgamation process. The choice of transition rate  $R$  will be discussed in the next subsection.

### 3.4.1 Phase-type Distribution

When calculating rates for amalgamated transitions we first attribute rates to  $\alpha_P$  and  $\alpha_S$  actions in the global model. Synchronised actions are performed simultaneously in a group of components, and will have a rate dictated by the semantics of cooperation. Other actions are executed independently and their instances interleave; they will have a rate which has a phase-type distribution. Such distributions are characterised by the time to absorption in a Markov chain, itself characterised by a matrix  $Q$ ; *absorption* occurs when all copies of the action have completed. We construct the Markov chain (and the phase-type distribution) representing the interleaving as shown in Figure 3 for the 3-dimensional case. The state  $(1, 1, 1)$  is its absorbing state. For  $n$  independent components, the matrix  $Q$  is obtained by a tensor (Kronecker) sum [2]  $Q = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} Q^{(i)}$  which has structure:  $Q = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} Q^* & q \\ \hline o & 0 \end{array} \right]$ , where  $Q^*$  is an upper triangular matrix,  $\dim(Q^*) = n - 1$  and  $q$  is a column vector of  $n - 1$  elements. The distribution,  $F(t)$ , of the time to complete the interleavings




Figure 3: An example of PH-distribution, 3-lattice

in  $n$  components is equal to [9]:

$$F(t) = 1 - \alpha e^{Q^* t} \underline{1} \quad \text{for } t \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad F(t) = 0 \quad \text{for } t < 0,$$

where  $\underline{1}$  is a column vector of size  $n - 1$  all of whose elements are equal to 1 and  $\alpha$  is a row vector containing initial probabilities of lattice states. The pair  $(\alpha, Q^*)$  defines the phase-type distribution. We set the initial vector  $\alpha$  to  $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$  since we always start from the state in which all instances of the action are newly enabled (state  $(0, 0, 0)$  in Figure 3). The mean  $m$  of this distribution may be calculated by the formula

$$m = -\alpha(Q^*)^{-1} \underline{1}. \quad (1)$$

### 3.4.2 Review of Sequence Cases

We review the cases listed in Table 1. Diagrams illustrating the cases are complex and for this reason we apply some abbreviations, mostly concerning types of a local sequence. Independent actions performed in a component  $X$  are written as  $a_{P_X}$  or  $a_{S_X}$  depending on whether they are of  $\alpha_P$  or  $\alpha_S$  type. For synchronised actions we introduce similar shorthand terms, for example  $A_{P_{XY}}$ ,  $A_{S_{XUZ}}$ , where the lowest subscript is a list of components which cooperate over either  $\alpha_P$  or  $\alpha_S$  type.



**Case a.I:** None of the  $\alpha_P$  or  $\alpha_S$  actions are synchronised. Consequently sequence amalgamation may be performed entirely at the PEPA component level. No “boundary condition” is required. (This coincides with weak isomorphism when both elements of the local sequence have type  $\tau$ .) The new transition rate  $R^{(i)}$  in a PEPA sequential component  $X^{(i)}$  is equal to  $\frac{r_P^{(i)} r_S^{(i)}}{r_P^{(i)} + r_S^{(i)}}$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ .

**Case a.II:** All  $\alpha_P$  actions are performed independently, all  $\alpha_S$  actions are synchronised. Here we are restricted to beginning sequences only. The activities of type  $\alpha_P$  form an  $n$ -lattice in the model. The average time  $\frac{1}{\Lambda_P}$  of passing through this structure is given by Eq. (1). The effective cooperation rate  $R_S$  in the global chain is equal to  $\min_i(r_S^{(i)})$ . The effective rate of the replacement activity for the entire strict local sequence is equal to  $R = \frac{R_S \Lambda_P}{R_S + \Lambda_P}$ .




Figure 4: An example of the **a.III** case,  $X_0 \bowtie_{\{\alpha_S, \gamma\}} Y_0 \bowtie_{\{\gamma\}} Z_0$

**Case a.III:** All  $\alpha_P$  actions are performed independently, some of the  $\alpha_S$  actions are synchronised. Again, we restrict to beginning sequences. All local sequences are replaced by actions of type  $\alpha_S$ . For components in  $M^{\alpha_S}$  the new transition rate is computed as  $\frac{\min_i(r_S^{(i)})\Lambda}{\min_i(r_S^{(i)}) + \Lambda}$ , where  $\Lambda$  is an inversion of the mean passage time through the  $n$ -lattice formed by  $\alpha_P$  actions from components in  $M^{\alpha_S}$ . For components  $X^{(i)}$  in  $M - M^{\alpha_S}$  the amalgamation procedure is performed individually; the transition rates are  $R^{(i)*} = \frac{r_{P_Z} r_{S_Z}}{r_{P_Z} + r_{S_Z}}$ . (See example in Figure 4).

**Case b.I:** All  $\alpha_P$  actions are synchronised and all  $\alpha_S$  actions are independent. This case is dual to **a.II**, so it concerns ending sequences only: firstly an action of type  $\alpha_P$  is performed in all the sequential components, secondly the components independently execute their own actions of type  $\alpha_S$ . As for **a.II** we set the transition rate of the new action,  $R$ , as an inversion of the mean of the Coxian distribution of two exponential distributions with parameters  $R_P$  and  $\Lambda_S$ .

**Case b.II:** All model components cooperate over both  $\alpha_P$  and  $\alpha_S$ . Since both elements of the local sequence are synchronised they automatically establish “boundary conditions” for launching and terminating the execution of the sequence. Thus, in this case a local sequence may be amalgamated even if it is neither a beginning nor ending sequence. We assume that all sequential components in the model contain the local sequence and that when  $\alpha_P$  is enabled in a derivative no other actions are also enabled. These conditions guarantee that the components must perform each element of the sequence with probability 1.0 (Figure 5). Under these conditions, and calculating  $R$  as above, we can show that




Figure 5: Amalgamation of a sequence for the **b.II** case, all components building up a model contain the local sequence  $(\alpha_P, \alpha_S)$ ; states of the global Markov chain,  $X_j = (X_j^{(0)}, \dots, X_j^{(N-1)})$ ,  $j = 0, 1, 2$ ,  $X'_k = (X'_k^{(0)}, \dots, X'_k^{(N-1)})$ ,  $k = 0, 2$

$\pi(X_0) + \pi(X_1) = \pi(X'_0)$ , and all other steady state probabilities are preserved.




Figure 6: An example of the **b.II** model,  $((X_1 \bowtie_{\{\alpha_P, \alpha_S, \beta, \gamma\}} Y_1) \bowtie_{\{\beta, \gamma\}} Z_0) \bowtie_{\{\gamma\}} U_0$

We have found that the reduced model preserves throughput of activities, other than the removed  $\alpha_P$ , even if some components of the model do not contain the amalgamated local sequence (see [7] for details). Figure 6 shows an example model. The initial model consists of 24 states, the amalgamated one, 20. Assuming that all the initial model's transition rates are equal to 1.0 we calculate

throughput of  $\gamma$  and  $\alpha_S$  as:  $\vartheta_\gamma = 0.11$  and  $\vartheta_{\alpha_S} = 0.22$  both before and after reduction.

**Case b.III:** All  $\alpha_P$  actions are synchronised and some  $\alpha_S$  actions are synchronised. Amalgamation in this case may be performed for ending sequences only. For the submodel consisting of  $X_0^{(i)}$  components in the set  $M^{\alpha_P}$  set whose indices are the same as those of elements of the set  $M^{\alpha_S}$ , the conditions of the **b.II** case are fulfilled. The other submodel, the components of which belong to  $M^{\alpha_{S,*}}$ , satisfies the conditions of the **b.I** case. The apparent rate of the synchronised  $\alpha_P$  action is calculated from rates in the components  $X^{(i)}$ ,  $R_P = \min_i(r_P^{(i)})$ . The rate of the synchronised  $\alpha_S$  action is equal to  $R_S = \min_{i: X_0^{(i)} \in M^{\alpha_S}}(r_S^{(i)})$ . The total transition rate of the  $\alpha_S$  action we find using Eq. (1) for  $\alpha_S$  activities of  $X_0^{(i)} \in M^{\alpha_{S,*}}$  together with the “cooperation rate”  $R_S$ .



**Case c.I:** Some  $\alpha_P$  actions are synchronised, all  $\alpha_S$  actions are performed independently. The amalgamation procedure may be performed for ending sequences only. In the components whose indices belong to  $M^{\alpha_P}$  the new activity type is set as  $\alpha_P$ , in the others as  $\alpha_S$ . For the first group, the rate of the new action is  $R = \frac{\min_i(r_P^{(i)})\Lambda}{\min_i(r_P^{(i)}) + \Lambda}$ ,  $X^{(i)} \in M^{\alpha_P}$ , where  $\Lambda$  is the inversion of the mean computed according to formula (1). For the latter group the transition rates are evaluated for each component  $X^{(i)}$  separately,  $R^{(i)*} = \frac{r_P^{(i)}r_S^{(i)}}{r_P^{(i)} + r_S^{(i)}}$ ,  $X^{(i)} \in M - M^{\alpha_P}$ .

**Case c.II:** Some  $\alpha_P$  actions are synchronised, all  $\alpha_S$  actions are synchronised. This case consists of instances of the **a.II** and **b.I** cases so only beginning sequences may be amalgamated. The rate of the synchronised  $\alpha_S$  action is equal to  $R_S = \min_i(r_S^{(i)})$ . The rate of the  $\alpha_P$  action synchronised in components in  $M^{\alpha_P}$  is  $R_P = \min_i(r_P^{(i)})$  and this value is included in the computation of total transition rate of passing through the  $n$ -lattice, according to Eq. (1).

**Case c.III:** Some components of the model cooperate over  $\alpha_P$ , some of them over  $\alpha_S$ . This case has to be considered more carefully, by three sub-cases:

★ If  $M^{\alpha_P} = M^{\alpha_S}$  we deal with **a.I** and **b.II** applied to two disjoint sets of sequential components and amalgamation is possible when done independently (Fig. 7).  
 ★★ If  $M^{\alpha_P} \cap M^{\alpha_S} = \emptyset$  the model splits into two sub-models depending on the activity type,  $\alpha_P$  or  $\alpha_S$ , over which synchronisation is carried out. One of them fulfils case **a.II** conditions, the other those of **b.I**.

★★★ Some model components cooperate only over  $\alpha_P$ , some only over  $\alpha_S$ , some over both types. Amalgamation is not possible as presented in Figure 8 by an example in which  $M^{\alpha_P} = \{Y_0, Z_0\}$ ,  $M^{\alpha_{P,*}} = \{X_0\}$ ,  $M^{\alpha_S} = \{X_0, Y_0\}$ ,  $M^{\alpha_{S,*}} = \{Z_0\}$ .

Figure 7: An example of the **c.III.\*** case,  $(X_0 \begin{smallmatrix} \rightrightarrows \\ \{ \alpha_P, \alpha_S, \gamma \} \end{smallmatrix} Y_0) \begin{smallmatrix} \rightrightarrows \\ \{ \gamma \} \end{smallmatrix} Z_0$ Figure 8: An example of the **c.III.\*.\*** case,  $(X_0 \begin{smallmatrix} \rightrightarrows \\ \{ \alpha_S, \gamma \} \end{smallmatrix} Y_0) \begin{smallmatrix} \rightrightarrows \\ \{ \alpha_P, \gamma \} \end{smallmatrix} Z_0$ 

### 3.4.3 Performance Values Results for the Reviewed Cases

Models of each case investigated in the previous subsection were computed in order to find throughput of transitions not involved in the amalgamation procedure. Depending on whether the underlying process was insensitive or not, the results were exact or approximate. In particular for our examples, cases **a.II**, **b.I**, **b.III**, **c.II** were found to be insensitive and results were exact, whereas cases **a.I**, **a.III**, **b.II**, **c.I**, **c.III.\***, **c.III.\*.\*** led to approximate results (see [7]).

## 4 Conclusions and Further Work

In this paper we have investigated the amalgamation of sequences in PEPA components in order to obtain a smaller model whilst preserving some features of the original. The resulting action type is chosen, depending upon whether the amalgamated actions are synchronised or not and an observational assumption. We have defined *local sequences* suitable for amalgamation and a classification of their manifestations. For each case we gave an explanation of how to calculate the transition rate of the new action.

Sequence amalgamation may lead to a model with a reversible Markov chain.

Further investigation will focus on when the reduced model has this feature and could be used to efficiently compute bounds of some performance measures. We will also study when the reduced chain is insensitive leading to exact measures, relative to the original chain. From a theoretical standpoint, we would like to establish an equivalence relation based on the notion of *sequential epimorphism*.

## References

- [1] BERNARDO, M., AND GORRIERI, R. A Tutorial on EMPA: A Theory of Concurrent Processes with Nondeterminism, Probabilities and Time. In *Theoretical Computer Science* (July 1998).
- [2] DAVIO, M. Kronecker Products and Shuffle Algebra. *IEEE Trans. on Comp.* 30, 2 (1981), 116–125.
- [3] DIJK, N. *Queueing Networks and Product Forms: A Systems Approach*. John Wiley & Sons, 1993.
- [4] HERMANN, H., AND RETTELACH, M. Syntax, Semantics, Equivalences, and Axioms for MTIPP. In *Conference Proceedings, PAPM'94* (1994).
- [5] HILLSTON, J. *A Compositional Approach to Performance Modelling*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [6] HILLSTON, J., AND THOMAS, N. A Syntactical Analysis of Reversible PEPA Models. In *Conference Proceedings, PAPM'98* (Nice, 1998).
- [7] HILLSTON, J., AND TOMASIK, J. Amalgamation of Transition Sequences in the PEPA Formalism. Technical report, LFCS, March 2000.
- [8] KELLY, F. P. *Reversibility and Stochastic Networks*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, New York, Brisbane, Toronto, 1987.
- [9] NEUTS, M. *Matrix-Geometric Solution in Stochastic Models — An Algorithmic Approach*. The John Hopkins University Press, 1981.
- [10] PLATEAU, B. *De l'évaluation du parallélisme et de sa synchronisation*. Thèse d'état, Université de Paris-Sud, Centre d'Orsay, Novembre 1984.
- [11] TOMASIK, J., AND HILLSTON, J. Transforming PEPA Models to Obtain Product Form Bounds. Technical report, LFCS, February 2000.

**Jane Hillston** is with the LFCS within the Division of Informatics, University of Edinburgh, Scotland; Email: `jeh@dcs.ed.ac.uk`

**Joanna Tomasik** is with the LFCS within the Division of Informatics, University of Edinburgh, Scotland, on leave from the Institute of Theoretical and Applied Computer Science, Gliwice, Poland; Email: `joto@dcs.ed.ac.uk`