

k^2Q : A Quadratic-Form Response Time and Schedulability Analysis Framework for Utilization-Based Analysis

Jian-Jia Chen and Wen-Hung Huang
Department of Informatics
TU Dortmund University, Germany

Cong Liu
Department of Computer Science
The University of Texas at Dallas

Abstract—In this paper, we present a general response-time analysis and schedulability-test framework, called k^2Q (k to Q). It provides automatic constructions of closed-form quadratic bounds or utilization bounds for a wide range of applications in real-time systems under fixed-priority scheduling. The key of the framework is a k -point schedulability test or a k -point response time analysis that is based on the utilizations and the execution times of $k - 1$ higher-priority tasks. The natural condition of k^2Q is a quadratic form for testing the schedulability or analyzing the response time. The response time analysis and the schedulability analysis provided by the framework can be viewed as a “blackbox” interface that can result in sufficient utilization-based analysis. Since the framework is independent from the task and platform models, it can be applied to a wide range of applications.

We show the generality of k^2Q by applying it to several different task models. k^2Q produces better uniprocessor and/or multiprocessor schedulability tests not only for the traditional sporadic task model, but also more expressive task models such as the generalized multi-frame task model and the acyclic task model. Another interesting contribution is that in the past, exponential-time schedulability tests were typically not recommended and most of time ignored due to high complexity. We have successfully shown that exponential-time schedulability tests may lead to good polynomial-time tests (almost automatically) by using the k^2Q framework. Analogously, a similar concept to test only k points with a different formulation has been studied by us in another framework, called k^2U , which provides hyperbolic bounds or utilization bounds based on a different formulation of schedulability test. With the quadratic and hyperbolic expressions, k^2Q and k^2U frameworks can be used to provide many quantitative features to be measured, like the total utilization bounds, speed-up factors, etc., not only for uniprocessor scheduling but also for multiprocessor scheduling.

1 Introduction

Analyzing the worst-case timing behaviour to ensure the timeliness of embedded systems is essential for building reliable and dependable components in cyber-physical systems. Due to the interaction and integration with external and physical devices, many real-time and embedded systems are expected to handle a large variety of workloads. Towards such dynamics, several formal real-time task models are established to represent these workloads with various characteristics, such as the the generalized multi-frame task model [8], [45] and the self-suspending task model [37]. To analyze the worst-case response time or to ensure the timeliness of the system, for each of these task models, researchers tend to develop dedicated techniques that result in schedulability tests with different computation complexity and accuracy of the analysis. Although many successful results have been developed, after many real-time systems researchers devoted themselves for many years, there does not exist a general framework that

can provide efficient and effective analyses for different task models.

Prior to this paper, we have presented a general schedulability analysis framework [19], [20], called k^2U , that can be applied in uniprocessor scheduling and multiprocessor scheduling, as long as the schedulability condition can be written in a specific form to test only k points. For example, to verify the schedulability of a (constrained-deadline) sporadic real-time task τ_k under fixed-priority scheduling in uniprocessor systems, the time-demand analysis (TDA) developed in [35] can be adopted.

The general concept to obtain sufficient schedulability tests in the k^2Q framework is to test only a subset of time points for verifying the schedulability. This idea is implemented in the k^2Q framework by providing a k -point last-release schedulability test, which only needs to test k points under any fixed-priority scheduling when checking schedulability of the task with the k^{th} highest priority in the system. Moreover, this concept is further extended to provide a safe upper bound of the worst-case response time. The response time analysis and the schedulability analysis provided by the framework can be viewed as a “blackbox” interface that can result in sufficient utilization-based analysis.

Related Work. There have been several results in the literature with respect to utilization-based, e.g., [13], [30], [32], [33], [38], [39], [47], and non-utilization-based, e.g., [17], [27], schedulability tests for the sporadic real-time task model and its generalizations in uniprocessor systems. Most of the existing utilization-based schedulability analyses focus on the total utilization bound. That is, if the total utilization of the task system is no more than the derived bound, the task system is schedulable by the scheduling policy. For example, the total utilization bounds derived in [16], [30], [39] are mainly for rate-monotonic (RM) scheduling, in which the results in [30] can be extended for arbitrary fixed-priority scheduling. Kuo et al. [32] further improve the total utilization bound by using the notion of divisibility. Lee et al. [33] use linear programming formulations for calculating total utilization bounds when the period of a task can be selected. Moreover, Wu et al. [47] adopt the Network Calculus to analyze the total utilization bounds of several real-time task models.

Bini and Buttazzo [12] propose a framework of schedulability tests that can be tuned to balance the time complexity and the acceptance ratio of the schedulability test for uniprocessor sporadic task systems. The efficient tests in [12] are based on an observation to test whether the parameters of a task set fall into a schedulable region of the fixed-priority scheduling policy. Our strategy and philosophy are simpler than [12]. First, we only look at the parameters of task τ_k (the task defined as

the k^{th} highest priority) that is under analysis by assuming that the higher-priority tasks are already verified to be schedulable. Second, similar to our recent general schedulability analysis framework $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ [20], we also apply the key idea of evaluating only k points. The tunable strategies in [12] consider to examine a subset of the time points for schedulability tests.

Distinct from the results in [12], our objective in this paper is to find closed-form schedulability tests and response-time analyses that can be independent from task and platform models. We target at sufficient schedulability tests and response time analyses that are not exact but can be calculated efficiently in linear-time or polynomial-time complexity.

Comparison to $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$: Even though $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ share the same idea to test and evaluate only k points, they are based on completely different criteria for testing. In $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$, all the testings and formulations are based on *only the higher-priority task utilizations*. In $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$, the testings are based *not only on the higher-priority task utilizations, but also on the higher-priority task execution times*. The above difference in the formulations results in completely different properties and mathematical closed-forms. The natural condition of $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ is a *quadratic form* for testing the schedulability or the response time of a task, whereas the natural condition of $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ is a *hyperbolic form* for testing the schedulability of a task.

If one framework were dominated by another or these two frameworks were just with minor difference in mathematical formulations, it wouldn't be necessary to separate and present them as two different frameworks. Both frameworks are in fact needed and have to be applied for different cases. Here, we only shortly explain their differences, advantages, and disadvantages in this paper. For completeness, another document has been prepared in [18] to present the similarity, the difference and the characteristics of these two frameworks in details.

Since the formulation of $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ is more restrictive than $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$, its applicability is limited by the possibility to formulate the tests purely by using higher-priority task utilizations without referring to their execution times. There are cases, in which formulating the higher-priority interference by using only task utilizations for $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ is troublesome or over-pessimistic. For such cases, further introducing the upper bound of the execution time by using $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ is more precise. Most of the presented cases, except the one in uniprocessor constrained-deadline systems in Appendix B are in the above category. Although $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ is more general, it is not as precise as $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$, if we can formulate the schedulability tests into both frameworks with the same parameters. In such cases, the same pseudo-polynomial-time (or exponential time) test is used, and the utilization bound or speed-up factor analysis derived from the $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ framework is, in general, tighter and better.

In a nutshell, $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ is more general, whereas $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ is more precise. If an exact schedulability test can be constructed and the test can be converted into $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$, e.g., uniprocessor scheduling for constrained-deadline task sets, then, adopting $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ leads to tight results. For example, by using $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$, we can reach the conclusion that the utilization bound for rate-monotonic scheduling is $2 - \sqrt{2} \approx 0.586$, which is less precise than the Liu and Layland bound $\ln 2 \approx 0.693$, a simple implication by using $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$. However, if we are allowed to change the execution time and period of a task for different job releases (called acyclic task model in [1]), then the tight

utilization bound $2 - \sqrt{2}$ can be easily achieved by using $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$.

Due to the fact the $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ is more precise (with respect to the utilization bound) when the exact tests can be constructed, even though $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ is more restrictive, both are needed for different cases. Both $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ are general enough to cover a range of spectrum of applications, ranging from uniprocessor systems to multiprocessor systems. For more information and comparisons, please refer to [18].

Contributions. The key contribution of this paper is a general schedulability and response-time analysis framework, $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$, that can be easily applied to analyze a number of complex real-time task models, on both uniprocessor and multiprocessor systems. A key novelty of $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ that allows a rather general analysis framework is that we do not specifically seek for the total utilization bound. Instead, we look for the critical value in the specified sufficient schedulability test while verifying the schedulability of task τ_k . This critical value of task τ_k gives the difficulty of task τ_k to be schedulable under the scheduling policy. We present several properties of $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$, which provide a series of closed-form solutions to be adopted for sufficient tests and worst-case response time analyses for real-time task models, as long as a corresponding k -point last-release schedulability test (Definition 2) or a k -point last-release response-time analysis (Definition 3) can be constructed. The generality of $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ is supported by demonstrating that either new or better results compared to the state-of-the-art can be easily obtained using $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$. Examples include:

- Several utilization-based schedulability and response analyses for uniprocessor sporadic task systems are provided in Section 5. The utilization-based worst-case response-time analysis in Theorem 4 in Section 5 is identical to the response-time analysis by Bini et al. [15] developed in parallel.
- We improve the schedulability tests in multiprocessor global fixed-priority scheduling in Appendix C. A general condition is a quadratic bound. Specifically, we show that the speed-up (capacity augmentation) factor of global RM is $\frac{3+\sqrt{7}}{2} \approx 2.823$ for implicit-deadline sporadic task systems, which improves upon the existing best speed-up factor 3 presented in [10].
- We provide, to the best of our knowledge, the first polynomial-time worst-case response time analysis for sporadic real-time tasks with jitters [3], [9] in Appendix D.
- We also demonstrate how to convert exponential-time schedulability tests of generalized multi-frame task models [8], [46] to polynomial-time tests by using the $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ framework in Appendix E.
- The above results are for task-level fixed-priority scheduling policies. We further explore mode-level fixed-priority scheduling policies by studying the acyclic task model [1] and the multi-mode task model [24].¹ We conclude a quadratic bound and a utilization bound $2 - \sqrt{2}$ for RM scheduling policy. The utilization bound is the same as the result in [1]. They can be further generalized to handle more generalized task models, including the digraph task model [44], the recurring real-time task model [6]. This is presented in Appendix F.

¹Although the focus in [24] is for variable-rate-behaviour tasks, we will refer such a model as a multi-mode task model.

The emphasis of this paper is to show the generality of the k^2Q framework by demonstrating via several task models. The tests and analytical results in the framework are with low complexity, but can still be shown to provide good results through speed-up factor or utilization bound analyses. We also note a somehow surprising finding through developing this framework: *in the past, exponential-time schedulability tests were typically not recommended and most of time ignored, as this requires very high complexity. We have successfully shown in this paper that exponential-time schedulability tests may lead to good polynomial-time tests (almost automatically) by using the k^2Q framework. Therefore, this framework may also open the possibility to re-examine some tests with exponential-time complexity to improve their applicability.*

2 Basic Task and Scheduling Models

This section presents the sporadic real-time task model, as the basis for our presentations. Even though the framework targets at more general task models, to ease the presentation flow, we will start with the sporadic task models. A sporadic task τ_i is released repeatedly, with each such invocation called a job. The j^{th} job of τ_i , denoted $\tau_{i,j}$, is released at time $r_{i,j}$ and has an absolute deadline at time $d_{i,j}$. Each job of any task τ_i is assumed to have execution time C_i . Here in this paper, whenever we refer to the execution time of a job, we mean for the worst-case execution time of the job, since all the analyses we use are safe by only considering the worst-case execution time. The response time of a job is defined as its finishing time minus its release time. Successive jobs of the same task are required to be executed in sequence. Associated with each task τ_i are a period T_i , which specifies the minimum time between two consecutive job releases of τ_i , and a deadline D_i , which specifies the relative deadline of each such job, i.e., $d_{i,j} = r_{i,j} + D_i$. The worst-case response time of a task τ_i is the maximum response time among all its jobs. The utilization of a task τ_i is defined as $U_i = C_i/T_i$.

A sporadic task system τ is an implicit-deadline system if $D_i = T_i$ holds for each τ_i . A sporadic task system τ is a constrained-deadline system if $D_i \leq T_i$ holds for each τ_i . Otherwise, such a sporadic task system τ is an arbitrary-deadline system.

A task is said *schedulable* by a scheduling policy if all of its jobs can finish before their absolute deadlines, i.e., the worst-case response time of the task is no more than its relative deadline. A task system is said *schedulable* by a scheduling policy if all the tasks in the task system are schedulable. A *schedulability test* expresses sufficient schedulability conditions to ensure the feasibility of the resulting schedule by a scheduling policy.

Throughout the paper, we will focus on fixed-priority preemptive scheduling. That is, each task is associated with a priority level (except in Appendix F). For a uniprocessor system, the scheduler always dispatches the job with the highest priority in the ready queue to be executed. For a multiprocessor system, we consider multiprocessor global scheduling on M identical processors, in which each of them has the same computation power. For global multiprocessor scheduling, there is a global queue and a global scheduler to dispatch the jobs. We consider only global fixed-priority scheduling. At any time, the M -highest-priority jobs in the ready queue are dispatched and executed on these M processors.

Note that the framework is not only limited to the above task and platform models. These terminologies are introduced only for the simplicity of presentation and illustrating some examples.

Speed-Up Factor and Capacity Augmentation Factor: To quantify the error of the schedulability tests or the scheduling policies, the concept of resource augmentation by using speed-up factors [43] and the capacity augmentation factors [36] has been adopted. For example, global DM in general does not have good utilization bounds to schedule a set of sporadic tasks on M identical processors, due to ‘‘Dhall’s effect’’ [26]. However, if we constrain the total utilization $\sum_{\tau_i} \frac{C_i}{MT_i} \leq \frac{1}{b}$, the density $\frac{C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} C_i}{MD_k} \leq \frac{1}{b}$ for each task τ_k , and the maximum utilization $\max_{\tau_i} \frac{C_i}{\min\{T_i, D_i\}} \leq \frac{1}{b}$, it is possible to provide the schedulability guarantee of global RM by setting b to $3 - \frac{1}{M}$ [2], [4], [10]. Such a factor b has been recently named as a *capacity augmentation factor* [36]. Note that the capacity augmentation bound was defined without taking this simple condition $\frac{C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} C_i}{MD_k} \leq \frac{1}{b}$ in [36], as they focus on implicit-deadline systems. For constrained-deadline systems, adding such a new constraint is a natural extension.

An algorithm \mathcal{A} is with speed-up factor b : *If there exists a feasible schedule for the task system, it is schedulable by algorithm \mathcal{A} by speeding up (each processor) to b times as fast as in the original platform (speed).* A sufficient schedulability test for scheduling algorithm \mathcal{A} is with speed-up factor b : *If the task system cannot pass the sufficient schedulability test, the task set is not schedulable by any scheduling algorithm if (each processor) is slowed down to $\frac{1}{b}$ times of the original platform speed.* Note that if the capacity augmentation factor is b , the speed-up factor is also upper-bounded by b .

3 Analysis Flow

The framework focuses on testing the schedulability and the response time for a task τ_k , under the assumption that the required properties (i.e., worst-case response time or the schedulability) of the higher-priority tasks are already verified and provided. We will implicitly assume that all the higher-priority tasks are already verified and the required properties are already obtained. Therefore, this framework has to be applied for each of the given tasks. To ensure whether a task system is schedulable by the given scheduling policy, the test has to be applied for all the tasks. Of course, the results can be extended to test the schedulability of a task system in linear time complexity or to allow on-line admission control in constant time complexity if the schedulability condition (or with some more pessimistic simplifications) is monotonic. Such extensions are presented only for trivial cases.

We will only present the schedulability test of a certain task τ_k , that is analyzed, under the above assumption. For notational brevity, in the framework presentation, we will implicitly assume that there are $k-1$ tasks, say $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_{k-1}$ with higher-priority than task τ_k . We will use $hp(\tau_k)$ to denote the set of these $k-1$ higher-priority tasks, when their orderings do not matter. Moreover, we only consider the cases when $k \geq 2$, since $k = 1$ is pretty trivial.

4 k^2Q

This section presents the basic properties of the k^2Q framework for testing the schedulability of task τ_k in a given

set of real-time tasks (depending on the specific models given in each application). Before presenting the framework, we first give a simple example to explain the underlying concepts by using an implicit-deadline sporadic task system τ , in which $D_i = T_i$ for every $\tau_i \in \tau$. The exact schedulability test to verify whether task τ_k can meet its deadline under fixed-priority scheduling on uniprocessor systems is to check

$$\exists t \text{ with } 0 < t \leq T_k \text{ and } C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \leq t, \quad (1)$$

where $hp(\tau_k)$ is the set of tasks with higher priority than τ_k . Instead of testing all the time points t in the range of 0 and T_k , for a sufficient schedulability test, we can greedily only consider to test the time points $\left(\left\lceil \frac{T_k}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1\right)T_i$ for $\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)$ and $t = T_k$. If $C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \leq t$ holds in one of those k tested time points, then we can conclude that τ_k can be feasibly scheduled under this scheduling policy.

To implement to above testing concept, we need two definitions: 1) Definition 1 defines the last release time ordering so that we can formulate the problem with linear algebra, 2) Definition 2 defines an abstracted schedulability test that can be used to model general schedulability tests regardless of the task and platform model.

Definition 1 (Last Release Time Ordering). *Let π be the last release time ordering assignment as a bijective function $\pi : hp(\tau_k) \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$ to define the last release time ordering of task $\tau_j \in hp(\tau_k)$ in the window of interest. Last release time orderings are numbered from 1 to $k-1$, i.e., $|hp(\tau_k)|$, where 1 is the earliest and $k-1$ the latest. \square*

The last release time ordering is a very important property in the whole framework. When testing the schedulability or analyzing the worst-case response time of task τ_k , we do not need the priority ordering of the higher-priority tasks in $hp(\tau_k)$. But, we need to know how to order the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks so that we can formulate the test with simple and linear arithmetics based on the total order. For the rest of this paper, the ordering of the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks implicitly refers to their last release time ordering (except explanations regarding the last release time ordering when referring to Example 4). In the k^2Q framework, we are only interested to test only k time points. More precisely, we are only interested to test whether task τ_k can be successfully executed before the last release time of a higher-priority task in the testing window. Therefore, the last release time ordering provides a total order so that we can transform the schedulability tests into the following definition.

Definition 2. *A k -point last-release schedulability test under a given last release time ordering π of the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks is a sufficient schedulability test of a fixed-priority scheduling policy, that verifies the existence of t_j with $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ such that $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k$ and*

$$C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \beta_i C_i \leq t_j, \quad (2)$$

where $C_k > 0$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, $\alpha_i > 0$, $U_i > 0$, $C_i \geq 0$, and $\beta_i > 0$ are dependent upon the setting of the task models and task τ_i . \square

Example 1. Implicit-deadline task systems: *For an implicit-deadline sporadic task system τ , suppose that we are interested to test whether task τ_k can meet its deadline or not under a fixed-priority scheduling algorithm on a uniprocessor platform. Let $|hp(\tau_k)|$ be $k-1$ and the tasks in $hp(\tau_k)$ be ordered by $\left(\left\lceil \frac{T_k}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1\right)T_i$ non-decreasingly, i.e., $t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k = T_k$. For a specific testing point at time t_j for a certain $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$, the function $\left\lceil \frac{t_j}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i$ (to quantify the workload due to the jobs released by a higher-priority task $\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)$) has two cases: 1) if $i < j$, due to the definition of t_i as $\left(\left\lceil \frac{T_k}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1\right)T_i$ and $t_i \leq t_j \leq T_k$, we know that $\left\lceil \frac{t_j}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i$ is upper bounded by $\left\lceil \frac{t_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i + C_i = t_i U_i + C_i$; 2) if $i \geq j$, due to the definition of t_i as $\left(\left\lceil \frac{T_k}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1\right)T_i$ and $t_j \leq t_i \leq T_k$, we know that $\left\lceil \frac{t_j}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i$ is upper bounded by $\left\lceil \frac{t_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i = t_i U_i$.²*

By the above analysis, for a given $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$, we know that $C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left\lceil \frac{t_j}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \leq C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} C_i$. Therefore, we know that task τ_k is schedulable by the fixed-priority scheduling if there exists $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ such that

$$C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} C_i \leq t_j.$$

In other words, by the specific index rule of the tasks in $hp(\tau_k)$ and setting $\alpha_i = 1$ and $\beta_i = 1$ for every task τ_i in $hp(\tau_k)$, we reach a concrete example for Definition 2. \blacksquare

A concrete example is provided here for illustrating Example 1.

Example 2. *Consider that $k = 3$ and $|hp(\tau_k)|$ is 2. For the two tasks in $hp(\tau_k)$, let $C_1 = 2, U_1 = 0.2, T_1 = 10$ and $C_2 = 4, U_2 = 0.5, T_2 = 8$. Suppose that $t_3 = D_3 = T_3 = 36$. By the transformation in Example 1, we know that $t_1 = 30$ and $t_2 = 32$. The last release time ordering π of $\{\tau_1, \tau_2\}$ follows the index, i.e., $\pi : \{\tau_1, \tau_2\} \rightarrow \{1, 2\}$. Moreover, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \beta_1 = \beta_2 = 1$. \square*

Similar to Definition 2, we can also define an abstracted worst-case response time analysis as follows:

Definition 3. *A k -point last-release response time analysis is a safe response time analysis of a fixed-priority scheduling policy under a given last release time ordering π of the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks by finding the maximum*

$$t_k = C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i, \quad (3)$$

with $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k$ and

$$C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \beta_i C_i > t_j, \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1, \quad (4)$$

where $C_k > 0$, $\alpha_i > 0$, $U_i > 0$, $C_i \geq 0$, and $\beta_i > 0$ are dependent upon the setting of the task models and task τ_i . \square

Example 3. Response-time for constrained-deadline task systems: *Suppose that R_k is the exact worst-case response*

²Since t_i is an integer multiple of T_i , the property $\left\lceil \frac{t_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i = t_i U_i$ holds.

time for task τ_k and $R_k \leq T_k$ under uniprocessor fixed-priority scheduling. That is, by Eq. (1), $C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i > t$ for any $0 < t < R_k$ and $C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \left\lceil \frac{R_k}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i = R_k$. Similar to Example 1, let $|hp(\tau_k)|$ be $k-1$ and the tasks in $hp(\tau_k)$ be ordered by $(\left\lceil \frac{R_k}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1)T_i$ non-decreasingly, i.e., $t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_{k-1} \leq R_k$. With the same analysis in Example 1, we know that $C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} C_i > t_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ and $R_k \leq C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i$. As a result, by the specific index rule of the tasks in $hp(\tau_k)$ and setting $\alpha_i = 1$ and $\beta_i = 1$ for every task τ_i in $hp(\tau_k)$, we reach a concrete example for Definition 3. ■

4.1 Important Notes

Before presenting the analyses based on Definition 2 and Definition 3, we would like to first explain the important assumptions and the flow to use the analytical results. Throughout the paper, we implicitly assume that $t_k > 0$ when Definition 2 is used. Moreover, we only consider non-trivial cases, in which $C_k > 0$ and $0 < U_i \leq 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$. The definition of t_k depends on how Definition 2 is constructed based on the original schedulability test, usually equal to the length of the interval (of the points to be tested in the original schedulability test), e.g., $t_k = T_k = D_k$ in Example 1. In most of the cases, we can set t_k as D_k . But, it can also be set to other cases, to be demonstrated in Appendix C for global RM scheduling.

In Definition 2, the k -point last-release schedulability test is a sufficient schedulability test that tests only k time points, defined by the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks and task τ_k . Similarly, in Definition 3, a k -point last-release response time analysis provides a safe response time by only testing whether task τ_k has already finished earlier at $k-1$ points, each defined by a higher-priority task.

In both cases in Definitions 2 and 3, the last release time ordering π is assumed to be given. In some cases, this ordering can be easily obtained. For such cases, all the lemmas in this section can be directly adopted. However, in most of the cases in our demonstrated task models, we have to test all possible last release time orderings and take the worst case. Fortunately, we will show that finding the worst-case ordering is not a difficult problem, which requires to sort the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks under a simple criteria, in Lemmas 2 and 7. Therefore, for such cases, the lemmas in this section have to be adopted by combining with Lemma 2 or 7.

We first assume that the corresponding coefficients α_i and β_i in Definitions 2 and 3 are given. How to derive them will be discussed in the following sections. Clearly their values are highly dependent upon the task models and the scheduling policies. Provided that these coefficients $\alpha_i, \beta_i, C_i, U_i$ for every higher-priority task $\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)$ are given, we analyze (1) the response time by finding the extreme case for a given C_k (under Definition 3), or (2) the schedulability by finding the extreme case for a given C_k and D_k . Therefore, the k^2Q framework provides utilization-based schedulability analyses and response time analyses automatically if the corresponding parameters α_i and β_i can be defined to ensure that the tests in Definitions 2 and 3 are safe.

k^2Q can be used by a wide range of applications, as




Fig. 1: The k^2Q framework.

long as the users can properly specify the corresponding task properties C_i and U_i and the constant coefficients α_i and β_i of every higher-priority task τ_i . More precisely, the formulation in Definitions 2 and 3 does not actually care what C_i and U_i actually mean. When sporadic task models are considered, we will use these two terms as they were defined in Section 2, i.e., C_i stands for the execution time and U_i is $\frac{C_i}{T_i}$. When we consider more general cases, such as the generalized multi-frame and multi-mode task models, we have to properly define the values of U_i and C_i to apply the framework.

The use cases of k^2Q can be achieved by using the known schedulability tests (that are in the form of pseudo polynomial-time or exponential-time tests) or some simple modifications of the existing results. We will provide the explanations of the correctness of the selection of the parameters, $\alpha_i, \beta_i, C_i, U_i$ for a higher-priority task τ_i to support the correctness of the results. Such a flow actually leads to the elegance and the generality of the framework, which works as long as Definition 2 (Definition 3, respectively) can be successfully constructed for the sufficient schedulability test (response time, respectively) of task τ_k in a fixed-priority scheduling policy. The procedure is illustrated in Figure 1. With the availability of the k^2Q framework, the quadratic bounds or utilization bounds can be automatically derived as long as the safe upper bounds α and β can be safely derived, regardless of the task model or the platforms.

We are not going to present how to *systematically and automatically* derive these parameters to be applied for the k^2Q framework. For most of the typical schedulability tests and response time analyses in real-time systems, such a derivation procedure is similar to the automatic parameter generation for the k^2U in [21].

4.2 Schedulability Test Framework

This section provides five important lemmas for deriving the utilization-based schedulability test based on Definition 2. Lemma 1 is the most general test, whereas Lemmas 3, 4, and 5 work for certain special cases when $\beta_i C_i \leq \beta U_i t_k$ for any higher-priority task τ_i . Lemma 2 gives the worst-case last release time ordering, which can be used when the last release time ordering for testing task τ_k is unknown.

Lemma 1. *For a given k -point last-release schedulability test, defined in Definition 2, of a scheduling algorithm, in which $0 < \alpha_i$, and $0 < \beta_i$ for any $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, $0 < t_k$, $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i \leq 1$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \leq t_k$, task τ_k is*

schedulable by the fixed-priority scheduling algorithm if the following condition holds

$$\frac{C_k}{t_k} \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\beta_i C_i - \alpha_i U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell))}{t_k}. \quad (5)$$

Proof: We prove this lemma by showing that the condition in Eq. (5) leads to the satisfactions of the schedulability conditions listed in Eq. (2) by using contrapositive. By taking the negation of the schedulability condition in Eq. (2), we know that if task τ_k is *not schedulable* by the scheduling policy, then for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$

$$C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \beta_i C_i > t_j. \quad (6)$$

To enforce the condition in Eq. (6), we are going to show that C_k must have some lower bound, denoted as C_k^* . Therefore, if C_k is no more than this lower bound, then task τ_k is schedulable by the scheduling policy. For the rest of the proof, we replace $>$ with \geq in Eq. (6), as the infimum and the minimum are the same when presenting the inequality with \geq . The unschedulability for satisfying Eq. (6) implies that $C_k > C_k^*$, where C_k^* is defined in the optimization problem:

$$\min C_k^* \quad (7a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } C_k^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^* U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \beta_i C_i \geq t_j^*, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1, \quad (7b)$$

$$t_1^* \geq 0 \quad (7c)$$

$$t_j^* \geq t_{j-1}^*, \quad \forall j = 2, 3, \dots, k-1, \quad (7d)$$

$$C_k^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^* U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \geq t_k, \quad (7e)$$

where $t_1^*, t_2^*, \dots, t_{k-1}^*$ and C_k^* are variables, $\alpha_i, \beta_i, U_i,$ and C_i are constants, and t_k is a given positive constant. Moreover, it is obvious that relaxing the constraint $t_j^* \geq t_{j-1}^*$ for $j = 2, 3, \dots, k-1$ by using $t_j^* \geq 0$ does not increase the corresponding objective function in the linear programming. Therefore, we have

$$\min C_k^* \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } C_k^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^* U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \beta_i C_i \geq t_j^*, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1, \quad (8b)$$

$$t_j^* \geq 0, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1, \quad (8c)$$

$$C_k^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^* U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \geq t_k. \quad (8d)$$

Let $s \geq 0$ be a slack variable such that $C_k^* = t_k + s - (\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^* U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i)$. Therefore, we can replace the objective function and the constraints with the above equality of C_k^* . The objective function (i.e., Eq. (8a)) is to find the minimum value of $t_k + s - (\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^* U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i)$ such that Eq. (8b) holds, which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & t_k + s - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^* U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^* U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \beta_i C_i \\ & = t_k + s - \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \geq t_j^*, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

For notational brevity, let t_k^* be $t_k + s$. Therefore, the linear programming in Eq. (8) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\min t_k^* - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i t_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \right) \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } t_k^* - \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \geq t_j^*, \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq k-1, \quad (10b)$$

$$t_j^* \geq 0 \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq k-1. \quad (10c)$$

$$t_k^* \geq t_k \quad (10d)$$

The remaining proof is to solve the above linear programming to obtain the minimum C_k^* . Our proof strategy is to solve the linear programming analytically as a function of t_k^* . This can be imagined as if t_k^* is given. At the end, we will prove the optimality by considering all possible $t_k^* \geq t_k$. This involves three steps:

- Step 1: we analyze certain properties of optimal solutions based on the extreme point theorem for linear programming [40] under the assumption that t_k^* is given as a constant, i.e., s is known.
- Step 2: we present a specific solution in an *extreme point*, as a function of t_k^* .
- Step 3: we prove that the above extreme point solution gives the minimum C_k^* if $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i \leq 1$.

[Step 1:] After specifying the value t_k^* as a given constant, the new linear programming without the constraint in Eq. (10d) has only $k-1$ variables and $2(k-1)$ constraints. Thus, according to the extreme point theorem for linear programming [40], the linear constraints form a polyhedron of feasible solutions. The extreme point theorem states that either there is no feasible solution or one of the extreme points in the polyhedron is an optimal solution when the objective of the linear programming is finite. To satisfy Eqs. (10b) and (10c), we know that $t_j^* \leq t_k^*$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, due to $t_i^* \geq 0$, $0 < \beta$, and $C_i \geq 0$ for $i = j, j+1, \dots, k-1$. As a result, the objective of the above linear programming is finite since a feasible solution has to satisfy $t_i^* \leq t_k^*$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$.

According to the extreme point theorem, one of the extreme points is the optimal solution of Eq. (10). There are $k-1$ variables with $2k-2$ constraints in Eq. (10). An extreme point must have at least $k-1$ *active* constraints in Eqs. (10b) and (10c), in which their \geq are set to equality $=$.

[Step 2:] One special extreme point solution by setting $t_j^* > 0$ is to put $t_k^* - \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i = t_j^*$ for every $j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, i.e.,

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq k-1, \quad t_{i+1}^* - t_i^* = \beta_i C_i, \quad (11)$$

which implies that

$$t_k^* - t_i^* = \sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} (t_{\ell+1}^* - t_\ell^*) = \sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell \quad (12)$$

The above extreme point solution is always feasible in the linear programming due to the assumption that $\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \beta_j C_j \leq t_k \leq t_k^*$. Therefore, in this extreme point solution, the objective function of Eq. (10) by rephrasing based on the condition in Eq. (12) is

$$t_k^* - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\alpha_i U_i t_i^* + \beta_i C_i) \quad (13)$$

$$= t_k^* - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(\alpha_i U_i \left(t_k^* - \sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell \right) + \beta_i C_i \right) \quad (14)$$

$$= t_k^* - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i t_k^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i \left(\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell \right) \right) \quad (15)$$

which means that $C_k^* \geq t_k^* (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\beta_i C_i - \alpha_i U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell))$.

[Step 3:] The rest of the proof shows that other feasible extreme point solutions (that allow t_j^* to be 0 for some higher-priority task τ_j) are with worse objective values for Eq. (10). Under the assumption that $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \leq t_k \leq t_k^*$, if t_j^* is set to 0, there are two cases: (1) $t_k^* - \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i > 0$ or (2) $t_k^* - \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i = 0$. In the former case, we can simply set t_j^* to $t_k^* - \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i$ to improve the objective function without introducing any violation of the constraints. In the latter case, the value of t_j^* can only be set to 0 in any feasible solutions. Therefore, we conclude that any other feasible extreme point solutions for Eq. (10) are worse.

Note that the above solution of C_k^* is still a function of t_k^* . We need to find the minimization of C_k^* with respect to t_k^* based on the fact $t_k^* \geq t_k$. Due to the assumption that $1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i \geq 0$ and $t_k^* \geq t_k$, we know that $t_k^* (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i) \geq t_k (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i)$. Therefore, $C_k^* = t_k (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\beta_i C_i - \alpha_i U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell))$ when $1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \leq t_k$, which concludes the proof. ■

Lemma 1 can be applied only when the last release time ordering of the $k - 1$ higher-priority tasks is given. We demonstrate the importance of the last release time ordering by using the following example.³

Example 4. Consider that $k = 3$ and $|hp(\tau_k)|$ is 2. For the two tasks in $hp(\tau_k)$, let $C_1 = 2, U_1 = 0.2, T_1 = 10$ and $C_2 = 4, U_2 = 0.5, T_2 = 8$. Suppose that $t_3 = D_3 = T_3 = 36$. By the transformation in Example 1, we know that $\alpha_i = 1$ and $\beta_i = 1$ for $i = 1, 2$.

There are two last release time orderings. Suppose that $\pi_1 : \{\tau_1, \tau_2\} \rightarrow \{1, 2\}$ and $\pi_2 : \{\tau_1, \tau_2\} \rightarrow \{2, 1\}$. That is, the last release time ordering is τ_1, τ_2 in π_1 , and the last release time ordering is τ_2, τ_1 in π_2 . □

Now, we can use Lemma 1 based on π_1 and π_2 :

³To demonstrate the impact of the last release time ordering, we use the original task indexes before applying π_1 or π_2 whenever referring to Example 4.

- For π_1 , the schedulability condition in Lemma 1 shows that task τ_3 in Example 4 can meet the deadline if $C_3 \leq t_3 \cdot (1 - U_1 - U_2) - (C_1 - U_1(C_1 + C_2) + C_2 - U_2 C_2) = 0.3t_3 - 2.8 = 8$.
- For π_2 , the schedulability condition in Lemma 1 shows that task τ_3 in Example 4 can meet the deadline if $C_3 \leq t_3 \cdot (1 - U_2 - U_1) - (C_2 - U_2(C_2 + C_1) + C_1 - U_1 C_1) = 0.3t_3 - 2.6 = 8.2$.

The immediate question is whether both $C_3 \leq 8$ based on π_1 and $C_3 \leq 8.2$ based on π_2 are safe. When $t_k = 36$, the transformation in Example 1 in fact adopts the last release time ordering π_1 . Therefore, Lemma 1 is only safe under π_1 in this example. As a result, the test in Lemma 1 for the above example is only valid when we apply π_1 .

However, in practice, we usually do not know how these tasks are indexed according to the required last release in the window of interest. It may seem at first glance that we need to test all the possible orderings. Fortunately, with the following lemma, we can safely consider only one specific last release time ordering of the $k - 1$ higher-priority tasks.

Lemma 2. The worst-case ordering π of the $k - 1$ higher-priority tasks under the schedulability condition in Eq. (5) in Lemma 1 is to order the tasks in a non-increasing order of $\frac{\beta_i C_i}{\alpha_i U_i}$, in which $0 < \alpha_i$ and $0 < \beta_i$ for any $i = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$, $0 < t_k$.

Proof: This lemma is proved by showing that the schedulability condition in Lemma 1, i.e., $1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i}{t_k} + \frac{\alpha_i U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell)}{t_k}$, is minimized, when the $k - 1$ higher-priority tasks are indexed in a non-increasing order of $\frac{\beta_i C_i}{\alpha_i U_i}$. Suppose that there are two adjacent tasks τ_h and τ_{h+1} with $\frac{\beta_h C_h}{\alpha_h U_h} < \frac{\beta_{h+1} C_{h+1}}{\alpha_{h+1} U_{h+1}}$. Let us now examine the difference of $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell)}{t_k}$ by swapping the index of task τ_h and task τ_{h+1} .

It can be easily observed that the other tasks τ_i with $i \neq h$ and $i \neq h + 1$ do not change their corresponding values $\alpha_i U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell)$ in both orderings (before and after swapping τ_h and τ_{h+1}). The difference in the term $\alpha_h U_h (\sum_{\ell=h}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell) + \alpha_{h+1} U_{h+1} (\sum_{\ell=h}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell)$ before and after swapping tasks τ_ℓ and $\tau_{\ell+1}$ (before - after) is

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\alpha_h U_h \beta_{h+1} C_{h+1} - \alpha_{h+1} U_{h+1} \beta_h C_h) \\ & = \alpha_h \alpha_{h+1} U_h U_{h+1} \left(\frac{\beta_{h+1} C_{h+1}}{\alpha_{h+1} U_{h+1}} - \frac{\beta_h C_h}{\alpha_h U_h} \right) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we reach the conclusion that swapping τ_h and τ_{h+1} in the ordering makes the schedulability condition more stringent. By applying the above swapping repetitively, we reach the conclusion that ordering the tasks in a non-increasing order of $\frac{\beta_i C_i}{\alpha_i U_i}$ has the most stringent schedulability condition in Eq. (5). ■

We again use the configuration in Example 4 to demonstrate the rationale behind Lemma 2. In this example, let us consider that $t_3 = T_3 = 23$. When $t_k = 23$, the transformation in Example 1 in fact adopts the last release time ordering π_2 , i.e., τ_3 is schedulable if $C_3 \leq 0.3t_3 - 2.6 = 4.3$. The schedulability condition based on the last release time ordering π_1 , i.e., τ_3 is schedulable if $C_3 \leq 0.3t_3 - 2.8 = 4.1$, is always worse than that based on π_2 by Lemma 2. Therefore, it is

always safe to use π_1 , even though it can be sometimes more pessimistic, e.g., when t_3 is 23.

4.3 Different Utilization Bounds

The analysis in Lemma 1 uses the execution time and the utilization of the tasks in $hp(\tau_k)$ to build an upper bound of C_k/t_k for schedulability tests. It is also very convenient in real-time systems to build schedulability tests only based on utilization of the tasks. We explain how to achieve that in the following lemmas under the assumptions that $0 < \alpha_i \leq \alpha$, and $0 < \beta_i C_i \leq \beta U_i t_k$ for any $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$. These lemmas are useful when we are interested to derive utilization bounds, speed-up factors, resource augmentation factors, etc., for a given scheduling policy by defining the coefficients α and β according to the scheduling policies independently from the detailed parameters of the tasks. Since the property repeats in all the statements, we make a formal definition before presenting the lemmas.

Definition 4. *Lemmas 3 to 5 are based on the following k -point last-release schedulability test of a scheduling algorithm, defined in Definition 2, in which $0 < \alpha_i \leq \alpha$, and $0 < \beta_i C_i \leq \beta U_i t_k$ for any $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, $0 < t_k$, $\alpha \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq 1$, and $\beta \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq 1$.*

Lemma 3. *For a given k -point last-release schedulability test of a scheduling algorithm, with the properties in Definition 4, task τ_k is schedulable by the scheduling algorithm if the following condition holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{C_k}{t_k} &\leq 1 - (\alpha + \beta) \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i + \alpha\beta \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \left(\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} U_\ell \right) & (16) \\ &= 1 - (\alpha + \beta) \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i + 0.5\alpha\beta \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \right)^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2 \right) \right) & (17) \end{aligned}$$

Proof: The condition in Eq. (16) comes by reformulating the proof of Lemma 1 with $\beta U_i t_k^*$ instead of $\beta_i C_i$. All the procedures remain the same, and, therefore, $\beta_i C_i$ for task τ_i in the right-hand side of Eq. (5) can be replaced by βU_i .

We focus on the condition in Eq. (17) by showing that $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \left(\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} U_\ell \right) = 0.5 \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \right)^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2 \right) \right)$. This condition clearly holds when $k = 2$ since $U_1^2 = 0.5(U_1^2 + U_1^2)$. We consider $k \geq 3$. This is due to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \left(\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} U_\ell \right) &= \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} U_i \left(\sum_{\ell=i+1}^{k-1} U_\ell \right) \\ &= 1 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2 + 0.5 \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \right)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2 \right) \\ &= 0.5 \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \right)^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2 \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $=1$ follows from the fact $\sum_{i=1}^{k-2} U_i \left(\sum_{\ell=i+1}^{k-1} U_\ell \right) = \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} U_i \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{i-1} U_\ell \right) = 0.5 \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \right)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2 \right)$. ■

Lemma 3 provides a schedulability test based on a quadratic form by using only the utilization of the higher-priority tasks with the properties in Definition 4. The following

two lemmas are applicable for testing the utilization bound(s), i.e., the summation of the task utilization.

Lemma 4. *For a given k -point last-release schedulability test of a scheduling algorithm, with the properties in Definition 4, task τ_k is schedulable by the scheduling algorithm if*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta - \sqrt{(\alpha + \beta)^2 - 2\alpha\beta \left(1 - \frac{C_k}{t_k}\right)^{\frac{k}{k-1}}}}{\alpha\beta} \right). \quad (18)$$

Proof: This can be formally proved by using the Lagrange Multiplier Method. However, it can also be proved by using a simpler mathematical observation. Suppose that $x = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i$ is given. For given α, β , and x , we know that Eq. (17) becomes $1 - (\alpha + \beta)x + 0.5\alpha\beta(x^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2)$. That is, only the last term $0.5\alpha\beta(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2)$ depends on how U_i values are actually assigned. Moreover, $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2$ is a well-known convex function with respect to U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{k-1} . That is, $\rho U_i^2 + (1 - \rho)U_j^2 \geq (\rho U_i + (1 - \rho)U_j)^2$ for any $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$. Therefore, $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2$ is minimized when $U_1 = U_2 = \dots = U_{k-1} = \frac{x}{k-1}$.

Hence, what we have to do is to find the infimum x such that the condition in Eq. (17) does not hold. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{infimum } x \\ &\text{s. t. } \frac{C_k}{t_k} > 1 - (\alpha + \beta)x + 0.5\alpha\beta \left(x^2 + \frac{x^2}{k-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This means that as long as $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i$ is no more than such infimum x , the condition in Eq. (17) always holds and the schedulability can be guaranteed. Provided that $\frac{C_k}{t_k}$ is given, we can simply solve the above problem by finding the x with $0 = 1 - \frac{C_k}{t_k} - (\alpha + \beta)x + 0.5\alpha\beta \frac{k}{k-1} x^2$. There are two roots in the above quadratic equation. The smaller root, i.e., the right-hand side of Eq. (18), is the infimum by definition. ■

Lemma 5. *For a given k -point last-release schedulability test of a scheduling algorithm, with the properties in Definition 4, provided that $\alpha + \beta \geq 1$, then task τ_k is schedulable by the scheduling algorithm if*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{C_k}{t_k} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i &\leq \\ &\begin{cases} \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha + \beta - \sqrt{(\alpha + \beta)^2 - 2\alpha\beta \frac{k}{k-1}}}{\alpha\beta} \right), & \text{if } k > \frac{(\alpha + \beta)^2 - 1}{\alpha^2 + \beta^2 - 1} \\ & \text{and } \alpha^2 + \beta^2 > 1 \\ 1 + \frac{(k-1)((\alpha + \beta - 1) - \frac{1}{2}(\alpha + \beta)^2 + 0.5)}{k\alpha\beta}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & (19) \end{aligned}$$

Proof: The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 4, but slightly more involved. We detail the proof in Appendix A. ■

By the fact that $\sqrt{(\alpha + \beta)^2 - 2\alpha\beta \frac{k}{k-1}} = \sqrt{(\alpha + \beta)^2 - 2\alpha\beta - 2\alpha\beta \frac{1}{k-1}}$, which is an increasing function with respect to k , and the fact that $\frac{k-1}{k}$ is a decreasing function with respect to k , we know that the right-hand side of Eq. (19) (when $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 > 1$) decreases with respect to k . Similarly, the right-hand side of Eq. (18) also decreases with respect to k . Therefore, for evaluating the utilization bounds, it is always safe to take $k \rightarrow \infty$ as a

safe upper bound. The right-hand side of Eq. (18) converges to $\frac{\alpha+\beta-\sqrt{\alpha^2+\beta^2+2\alpha\beta\frac{C_k}{t_k}}}{\alpha\beta}$ when $k \rightarrow \infty$. The right-hand side of Eq. (19) (when $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 > 1$) converges to $\frac{\alpha+\beta-\sqrt{\alpha^2+\beta^2}}{\alpha\beta}$ when $k \rightarrow \infty$.

4.4 Response Time Analysis Framework

We now further discuss the utilization-based response-time analysis framework.

Lemma 6. *For a given k -point response time analysis, defined in Definition 3, of a scheduling algorithm, in which $0 < \alpha_i \leq \alpha$, $0 < \beta_i \leq \beta$ for any $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, $0 < t_k$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i < 1$, the response time to execute C_k for task τ_k is at most*

$$\frac{C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell)}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i}. \quad (20)$$

Proof: The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 1. The detailed proof is in Appendix A. ■

We use the same example in Example 4 by setting $C_3 = 8$ to demonstrate how to use Lemma 6. By the transformation in Example 3, we know that $\alpha_i = 1$ and $\beta_i = 1$ for $i = 1, 2$. Now, we can use Lemma 6 based on π_1 and π_2 (defined in Example 4) to calculate the worst-case response time:

- For π_1 , the response-time analysis in Lemma 6 shows that the response time of task τ_3 in Example 4 is upper bounded by $\frac{C_3+C_1+C_2-U_1(C_1+C_2)-U_2C_2}{1-U_1-U_2} = \frac{14-0.2 \times 6 - 0.5 \times 4}{0.3} = 36$.
- For π_2 , the response-time analysis in Lemma 6 shows that the response time of task τ_3 in Example 4 is upper bounded by $\frac{C_3+C_1+C_2-U_2(C_2+C_1)-U_1C_1}{1-U_1-U_2} = \frac{14-0.5 \times 6 - 0.2 \times 2}{0.3} = 35\frac{1}{3}$.

Not all the last release time orderings are safe for the worst-case response time analysis. Fortunately, similar to Lemma 2, we can safely consider only one specific last release time ordering of the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks as shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *The worst-case ordering π of the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks under the response bound in Eq. (20) in Lemma 6 is to order the tasks in a non-increasing order of $\frac{\beta_i C_i}{\alpha_i U_i}$, in which $0 < \alpha_i$ and $0 < \beta_i$ for any $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, $0 < t_k$.*

Proof: The ordering of the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks in the indexing rule only matters for the term $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell)$, which was already proved in the proof of Lemma 2 to be minimized by ordering the tasks in a non-increasing order of $\frac{\beta_i C_i}{\alpha_i U_i}$. Clearly, the minimization of $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell)$ also leads to the maximization of Eq. (20), which concludes the proof. ■

As a result, thanks to the help of Lemma 7, we can conclude that π_1 in the example in this subsection is a safe last release time ordering to use Lemma 6 for the worst-case response time analysis.

5 Applications by Using Sporadic Task Models

This section demonstrates how to use the k^2Q framework to derive utilization-based schedulability and response-time analyses for sporadic task systems in uniprocessor and multiprocessor systems. As sporadic real-time task models are the simplest scenarios that can demonstrate how to use k^2Q , the content here is merely for explaining how to use the framework, but not for demonstrating the generality or superiority of k^2Q .

5.1 Uniprocessor Constrained-Deadline Systems

Theorem 1. *Task τ_k in a sporadic task system with constrained deadlines is schedulable by the fixed-priority scheduling algorithm if $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{C_i}{D_k} \leq 1$ and*

$$\frac{C_k}{D_k} \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{C_i}{D_k} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} C_\ell)}{D_k}, \quad (21)$$

in which the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks in $hp_1(\tau_k)$ are indexed in a non-increasing order of T_i .

Proof: This comes from Lemma 1 and 2 based on the setting $\alpha_i = 1$ and $\beta_i = 1$ to satisfy Definition 2.4. ■

Theorem 2. *Task τ_k in a sporadic constrained-deadline task system with is schedulable by the rate-monotonic (RM) scheduling algorithm if*

$$\frac{C_k}{D_k} \leq 1 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i + 0.5 \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \right)^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2 \right) \right) \quad (22)$$

or

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \right) \left(2 - \sqrt{4 - \frac{2k(1 - \frac{C_k}{D_k})}{k-1}} \right) \quad (23)$$

or

$$\frac{C_k}{D_k} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq \begin{cases} \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \right) \left(2 - \sqrt{4 - \frac{2k}{k-1}} \right) & \text{if } k > 3 \\ 1 - \frac{k-1}{2k} & \text{if } k \leq 3 \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Proof: Under RM scheduling, we know that $C_i = U_i T_i \leq U_i T_k$. Therefore, α can be set to 1 and β can be set to 1 in Definition 4. Eq. (22) is due to Lemma 3, Eq. (23) is due to Lemma 4, and Eq. (24) is due to Lemma 5. ■

The above result in Theorem 2 leads to the utilization bound $2 - \sqrt{2}$ for implicit-deadline sporadic task systems under RM scheduling. This analysis is less precise than the Liu and Layland bound $\ln 2 \approx 0.693$, a simple implication by using k^2U . However, if we are allowed to change the execution time and period of a task for different job releases (called acyclic task model in [1]), then the tight utilization bound $2 - \sqrt{2}$ can be easily achieved by using k^2Q , detailed in Appendix F.

5.2 Uniprocessor Arbitrary-Deadline Systems

For a specified fixed-priority scheduling algorithm, let $hp(\tau_k)$ be the set of tasks with higher priority than τ_k . We now classify the task set $hp(\tau_k)$ into two subsets:

⁴If $T_i > D_k$ for a certain task τ_i in $hp(\tau_k)$, we can simply set t_i to 0.

Model	α_i	β_i	c.f.
Uniprocessor Sporadic Tasks	$\alpha_i = 1$	$\beta_i = 1$	Theorems 3 and 4
Multiprocessor Global RM/DM for Sporadic Tasks	$\alpha_i = \frac{1}{M}$	$\beta_i = \frac{1}{M}$	Theorems 5, 6, 8, and 9
Uniprocessor Periodic Tasks with Jitters	$\alpha_i = 1$	$\beta_i = 1$	Theorem 10
Uniprocessor Generalized Multi-Frame, Acyclic, and Mode-Change Tasks	$\alpha_i = 1$	$\beta_i = 1$	Theorems 11, 12, and 13.

TABLE I: The α_i and β_i parameters in our demonstrated task models.

- $hp_1(\tau_k)$ consists of the higher-priority tasks with periods smaller than D_k .
- $hp_2(\tau_k)$ consists of the higher-priority tasks with periods larger than or equal to D_k .

The exact schedulability analysis for arbitrary-deadline task sets under fixed-priority scheduling has been developed in [34]. The schedulability analysis is to use a *busy-window* concept to evaluate the worst-case response time. That is, we release all the higher-priority tasks together with task τ_k at time 0 and all the subsequent jobs are released as early as possible by respecting to the minimum inter-arrival time. The busy window finishes when a job of task τ_k finishes before the next release of a job of task τ_k . It has been shown in [34] that the worst-case response time of task τ_k can be found in one of the jobs of task τ_k in the busy window.

For the h -th job of task τ_k in the busy window, the finishing time $R_{k,h}$ is the minimum t such that

$$hC_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \leq t,$$

and, hence, its response time is $R_{k,h} - (h-1)T_k$. The busy window of task τ_k finishes on the h -th job if $R_{k,h} \leq hT_k$.

We can create a virtual sporadic task τ'_k with execution time $C'_k = \left\lceil \frac{D_k}{T_k} \right\rceil C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp_2(\tau_k)} C_i$, relative deadline $D'_k = D_k$, and period $T'_k = D_k$. For notational brevity, suppose that there are $k^* - 1$ tasks in $hp_1(\tau_k)$. We have then the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *Task τ_k in a sporadic task system is schedulable by the fixed-priority scheduling algorithm if $\sum_{i=1}^{k^*-1} \frac{C_i}{D_k} \leq 1$ and*

$$\frac{C'_k}{D_k} \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k^*-1} U_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k^*-1} \frac{C_i}{D_k} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k^*-1} U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k^*-1} C_\ell)}{D_k}, \quad (25)$$

in which $C'_k = \left\lceil \frac{D_k}{T_k} \right\rceil C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp_2(\tau_k)} C_i$, and the $k^* - 1$ higher-priority tasks in $hp_1(\tau_k)$ are indexed in a non-decreasing order of $\left(\left\lceil \frac{D_k}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1 \right) T_i$.

Proof: The analysis is based on the observation to test whether the busy window can finish within interval length D_k , which was also adopted in [22] and [20]. By setting $t_i = \left(\left\lceil \frac{D_k}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1 \right) T_i$, and indexing the tasks in a non-decreasing order of t_i leads to the satisfaction of Definition 2 with $\alpha_i = 1$ and $\beta_i = 1$. ■

Analyzing the schedulability by using Theorem 3 can be good if $\frac{D_k}{T_k}$ is small. However, as the busy window may be stretched when $\frac{D_k}{T_k}$ is large, we further present how to

safely estimate the worst-case response time. Suppose that $t_j = \left(\left\lceil \frac{R_{k,h}}{T_j} \right\rceil - 1 \right) T_j$ for a higher-priority task τ_j . We index the tasks such that the last release ordering π of the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks is with $t_j \leq t_{j+1}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, k-2$. Therefore, we know that $R_{k,h}$ is upper bounded by finding the maximum

$$t_k = hC_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i, \quad (26)$$

with $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k$ and

$$hC_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} C_i > t_j, \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1. \quad (27)$$

Therefore, the above derivation of $R_{k,h}$ satisfies Definition 3 with $\alpha_i = 1$, and $\beta_i = 1$ for any higher-priority task τ_i . However, it should be noted that the last release time ordering π is actually unknown since $R_{k,h}$ is unknown. Therefore, we have to apply Lemma 7 for such cases to obtain the worst-case release time ordering, i.e., the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks are ordered in a non-increasing order of their periods.

Lemma 8. *Suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq 1$. Then, for any $h \geq 1$ and $C_k > 0$, we have*

$$R_{k,h} \leq \frac{hC_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} C_\ell)}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i}, \quad (28)$$

where the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks are ordered in a non-increasing order of their periods.

Proof: This comes from the above discussions with $\alpha_i = 1$, $\beta_i = 1$ by applying Lemmas 6 and 7 when $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i < 1$. The case when $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i = 1$ has a safe upper bound $R_{k,h} = \infty$ in Eq. (28). ■

Theorem 4. *Suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^k U_i \leq 1$. The worst-case response time of task τ_k is at most*

$$R_k \leq \frac{C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} C_\ell)}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i}, \quad (29)$$

where the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks are ordered in a non-increasing order of their periods.

Proof: This can be proved by showing that $R_{k,h} - (h-1)T_k$ is maximized when h is 1, where $R_{k,h}$ is derived by using Lemma 8. The first-order derivative of $R_{k,h} - (h-1)T_k$ with respect to h is $\frac{C_k}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i} - T_k = \frac{C_k - (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i)T_k}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i}$. There are two cases:

Case 1: If $\sum_{i=1}^k U_i < 1$, then $\frac{C_k - (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i)T_k}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i} < \frac{C_k - U_k T_k}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i} = 0$. Therefore, $R_{k,h} - (h-1)T_k$ is a decreasing

function of h . Therefore, the response time is maximized when h is 1.

Case 2: If $\sum_{i=1}^k U_i = 1$, then we know that $\frac{C_k - (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i)T_k}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i} = 0$. Therefore, $R_{k,h} - (h-1)T_k$ remains the same regardless of h .

Therefore, for both cases, the worst-case response time of task τ_k can be safely bounded by Eq. (29). Moreover, since the worst case happens when $h = 1$, we do not have to check the length of the busy window, and we reach our conclusion. ■

Corollary 1. *Task τ_k in a sporadic task system is schedulable by the fixed-priority scheduling algorithm if $\sum_{i=1}^k U_i \leq 1$ and*

$$\frac{C_k}{D_k} \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i}{D_k} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} C_\ell)}{D_k}, \quad (30)$$

where the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks are ordered in a non-increasing order of their periods.

Remarks: The utilization-based worst-case response-time analysis in Theorem 4 is analytically tighter than the best known result, $R_k \leq \frac{C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i C_i}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i}$, by Bini et al. [14]. Lehoczky [34] also provides the total utilization bound of RM scheduling for arbitrary-deadline systems. The analysis in [34] is based on the Liu and Layland analysis [39]. The resulting utilization bound is a function of $\Delta = \max_{\tau_i} \{\frac{D_i}{T_i}\}$. When Δ is 1, it is an implicit-deadline system. The utilization bound in [34] has a closed-form when Δ is an integer. However, calculating the utilization bound for non-integer Δ is done asymptotically for $k = \infty$ with a complicated analysis.

5.3 Multiprocessor Implicit-Deadline Systems

We now present how to use $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ to analyze the schedulability for implicit-deadline sporadic task systems under global rate-monotonic (global RM) scheduling. Here, we start from the pseudo-polynomial-time schedulability test by Guan et al. [29] that we only have to consider $M-1$ tasks with carry-in jobs, for constrained-deadline (hence, also for implicit-deadline) task sets. More precisely, we can define two different time-demand functions, depending on whether task τ_i is with a carry-in job or not:⁵

$$W_i^{carry}(t) = \begin{cases} C_i & 0 < t < C_i \\ C_i + \left\lceil \frac{t-C_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

and

$$W_i^{normal}(t) = \left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i. \quad (32)$$

Moreover, we can further over-approximate $W_i^{carry}(t)$, since $W_i^{carry}(t) \leq W_i^{normal}(t) + C_i$. Therefore, a sufficient schedulability test for testing task τ_k with $k > M$ for global RM is to verify whether

$$\exists 0 < t \leq T_k, C_k + \frac{(\sum_{\tau_i \in \mathbf{T}'} C_i) + (\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} W_i^{normal}(t))}{M} \leq t. \quad (33)$$

⁵This is an over-approximation of the linear function used by Guan et al. [29].

for all $\mathbf{T}' \subseteq hp(\tau_k)$ with $|\mathbf{T}'| = M-1$.

This leads to the following theorem by using Lemma 1.

Theorem 5. *Task τ_k in a sporadic implicit-deadline task system is schedulable by global RM on M processors if $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i \leq MT_k$ and*

$$U_k \leq 1 - \frac{\sum_{\tau_i \in \mathbf{T}'} C_i}{MT_k} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{U_i}{M} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i}{MT_k} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (U_i \sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} C_\ell)}{M^2 T_k}. \quad (34)$$

by indexing the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks in a non-decreasing order of $(\left\lceil \frac{T_k}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1)T_i$ for every $\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)$ and by putting the $M-1$ higher-priority tasks with the largest execution times into \mathbf{T}' .

Proof: It is not necessary to enumerate all $\mathbf{T}' \subseteq \mathbf{T}$ with $|\mathbf{T}'| = M-1$ if we can construct the task set $\mathbf{T}' \subseteq hp(\tau_k)$ with the maximum $\sum_{\tau_i \in \mathbf{T}'} C_i$. To use $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$, we are certain about which tasks should be put into the carry-in task set \mathbf{T}' by assuming that C_i and T_i are both given. That is, we simply have to put the $M-1$ higher-priority tasks with the largest execution times into \mathbf{T}' . This can be imagined as if we increase the execution time of task τ_k from C_k to $C'_k = C_k + \frac{\sum_{\tau_i \in \mathbf{T}'} C_i}{M}$. Moreover, we have $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{M}$ and $\beta_i = \frac{1}{M}$ for every task $\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)$ in this case.

Therefore, based on the test in Eq. (33), we have the last release time ordering defined by indexing the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks in a non-decreasing order of $(\left\lceil \frac{T_k}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1)T_i$ for every $\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)$. By adopting Lemma 1 with $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{M}$ and $\beta_i = \frac{1}{M}$, we know that task τ_k is schedulable by global RM if $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{C_i}{M} \leq T_k$ and

$$\frac{C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in \mathbf{T}'} \frac{C_i}{M}}{T_k} \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{U_i}{M} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i}{MT_k} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (U_i \sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} C_\ell)}{M^2 T_k}. \quad (35)$$

By reorganizing the above inequality, we reach the conclusion. ■

We can always take the pessimistic last release time ordering in Lemma 2, for concluding the following theorem.

Theorem 6. *Task τ_k in a sporadic implicit-deadline task system is schedulable by global RM on M processors if the condition in Eq. (34) holds by indexing the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks in a non-increasing order of T_i , for every $\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)$.*

Proof: This is proved based on the same argument in Theorem 5 by adopting Lemmas 1 and 2. ■

We can of course revise the statement in Theorems 5 and 6 by adopting Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 to construct schedulability tests by using only the utilization of the higher-priority tasks.

Evaluation Results We conduct experiments using synthesized task sets for evaluating the tests in Theorem 5 and Theorem 6. We first generated a set of sporadic tasks. The cardinality of the task set was 5 times the number of processors, i.e., 40 tasks on 8 multiprocessor systems. The UUniFast-Discard method [23] was adopted to generate a set of utilization values with the given goal. We used the approach suggested by Davis et al. [25] to generate the task periods according to a uniform distribution in the range of the

logarithm of the task periods (i.e., log-uniform distribution). The order of magnitude p to control the period values between the largest and smallest periods is parameterized in evaluations, (e.g., $1 - 10ms$ for $p = 1$, $1 - 100ms$ for $p = 2$, etc.). We evaluate these tests in uniprocessor systems with $p \in [1, 2, 3]$. The execution time was set accordingly, i.e., $C_i = T_i U_i$. Tasks' relative deadlines were equal to their periods.

The evaluated tests for n tasks in \mathbf{T} with $n \geq M$ are:

- *BCL*: the linear-time test in Theorem 4 in [11].
- *FF*: the pseudo-polynomial-time forced-forward (FF) analysis in Eq. (5) in [7].
- *BAK*: the $O(n^3)$ test in Theorem 11 in [5].
- *Guan*: the pseudo-polynomial-time response time analysis [29].
- *QB-BC* (from $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$): Eq. (34) in Theorem 5. This requires to sort the higher-priority tasks to define the proper last release ordering and the $M - 1$ carry-in jobs; therefore, the time complexity is $O(n^2 \log n)$ for a task set with n tasks.
- *QB-BC2* (from $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$): Eq. (34) in Theorem 6 by always using the worst-case release time ordering, which is the reverse order of the given priority assignment. The schedulability test can be implemented in $O(n \log M)$ time complexity by using proper data structures, provided that the RM priority order is given.⁶

Figure 2 depicts the result of the performance comparison. In all the cases, we can see that QB-BC is superior to all the other polynomial-time tests. QB-BC2 is slightly worse than QB-BC but the time complexity is lower. Since QB-BC and QB-BC2 are designed from a more pessimistic test than the analysis by Guan et al. [29] in pseudo-polynomial time, they are worse. But, we note that there is a significant gap in time complexity between QB-BC, QB-BC2, and Guan. Overall, the tests derived by using the $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ framework perform reasonably well with their low time complexity.

6 Conclusion and Extensions

In this paper, we present a general response-time analysis and schedulability-test framework, called $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$. Thanks to the independence upon the task and platform models in the framework, $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ can be viewed as a “block-box” interface that can result in sufficient utilization-based analyses for a wide range of applications in real-time systems under fixed-priority scheduling. We believe that the $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ framework has high potential to be adopted to solve several other problems for analyzing other task models in real-time systems with fixed-priority scheduling. The framework can be used, once the

⁶The time complexity is mainly due to the calculation of \mathbf{T}' to get the $M - 1$ tasks with the maximum carry-in execution time since the other operations can be done in $O(1)$ time complexity by using proper data structures to calculate the values when we intend to test task τ_{k+1} after task τ_k . Specifically, due to the predefined last release time ordering, when we intend to test task τ_{k+1} after task τ_k , we only have to insert task τ_k to be indexed as 1 and updating from $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (U_i \sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} C_\ell)}{M^2 T_k}$ to $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^k (U_i \sum_{\ell=i}^k C_\ell)}{M^2 T_k}$ (under the new ordering) takes only constant time complexity. Finding task set \mathbf{T}' can be implemented by using a min heap to store the $M - 1$ tasks in \mathbf{T}' . When we move from testing task τ_k (when $k \geq M$) to task τ_{k+1} , we need to compare whether C_k is larger than the minimum execution time of the tasks in the heap. If no, we keep the same task set \mathbf{T}' ; if yes, we pop out the task with the minimum execution time in the heap, and insert task τ_k into the heap. By using the heap, this operation requires time complexity $O(\log M)$. Calculating C'_{k+1} from C_k with the help of the heap can be done in $O(1)$ time complexity.

corresponding k -point last-release scheduling test or response time analysis can be constructed.

Moreover, our proposed frameworks, $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$, provide a solid mathematical foundation for deriving polynomial-time utilization-based schedulability tests and response time analyses almost *automatically*. That is, utilization-based analyses are almost automatically derived if the schedulability tests can be formulated in the scope of the frameworks. We have demonstrated several applications in this paper. Some models have introduced pretty high dynamics, but we can still handle the response time analysis and schedulability test with proper constructions so that the $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ framework is applicable. Therefore, with the presented approach, some difficult schedulability test and response time analysis problems may be solved by building a good (or exact) exponential-time test and using the approximation in the $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ framework. With the quadratic and hyperbolic expressions, $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ frameworks can be used to provide many quantitative features to be measured, like the total utilization bounds, speed-up factors, etc., not only for uniprocessor scheduling but also for multiprocessor scheduling.

When adopting $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}$ for schedulability tests, we assume that t_k is specified in Lemma 1. In this paper, we do not explore how to configure the best value of t_k and its last release time ordering π such that the resulting quadratic form is the best. Therefore, the combination of $\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{Q}/\mathbf{k}^2\mathbf{U}$ and the tunable approach by Bini and Buttazzo [12] can be an interesting future research direction, as this can potentially balance the schedulability test and the time complexity for concrete applications. Essentially, this combination is to search the proper settings of different t_k values such that the associated last release time ordering π can be less pessimistic, as demonstrated by several cases regarding Example 4 in Section 4.

Acknowledgement: This paper has been supported by NSF grant CNS 1527727 and DFG, as part of the Collaborative Research Center SFB876 (<http://sfb876.tu-dortmund.de/>), and the priority program “Dependable Embedded Systems” (SPP 1500 - <http://spp1500.itec.kit.edu>).

References

- [1] T. F. Abdelzaher, V. Sharma, and C. Lu. A utilization bound for aperiodic tasks and priority driven scheduling. *IEEE Trans. Computers*, 53(3):334–350, 2004.
- [2] B. Andersson, S. K. Baruah, and J. Jonsson. Static-priority scheduling on multiprocessors. In *Real-Time Systems Symposium (RTSS)*, pages 193–202, 2001.
- [3] N. Audsley, A. Burns, M. Richardson, K. Tindell, and A. Wellings. Applying new scheduling theory to static priority pre-emptive scheduling. *Software Engineering Journal*, 8(5):284–292, Sep 1993.
- [4] T. P. Baker. Multiprocessor EDF and deadline monotonic schedulability analysis. In *IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium*, pages 120–129, 2003.
- [5] T. P. Baker. An analysis of fixed-priority schedulability on a multiprocessor. *Real-Time Systems*, 32(1-2):49–71, 2006.
- [6] S. K. Baruah. The non-cyclic recurring real-time task model. In *Proceedings of the 31st IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium, RTSS 2010, San Diego, California, USA, November 30 - December 3, 2010*, pages 173–182, 2010.
- [7] S. K. Baruah, V. Bonifaci, A. Marchetti-Spaccamela, and S. Stiller. Improved multiprocessor global schedulability analysis. *Real-Time Systems*, 46(1):3–24, 2010.
- [8] S. K. Baruah, D. Chen, S. Gorinsky, and A. K. Mok. Generalized multiframe tasks. *Real-Time Systems*, 17(1):5–22, 1999.
- [9] S. K. Baruah, D. Chen, and A. K. Mok. Jitter concerns in periodic task systems. In *Proceedings of the 18th IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium (RTSS '97), December 3-5, 1997, San Francisco, CA, USA*, pages 68–77, 1997.




Fig. 2: Acceptance ratio comparison on implicit-deadline 8 multiprocessor systems.

- [10] M. Bertogna, M. Cirinei, and G. Lipari. New schedulability tests for real-time task sets scheduled by deadline monotonic on multiprocessors. In *Principles of Distributed Systems, 9th International Conference, OPODIS*, pages 306–321, 2005.
- [11] M. Bertogna, M. Cirinei, and G. Lipari. New schedulability tests for real-time task sets scheduled by deadline monotonic on multiprocessors. In *Principles of Distributed Systems*, pages 306–321. Springer, 2006.
- [12] E. Bini and G. C. Buttazzo. Schedulability analysis of periodic fixed priority systems. *IEEE Trans. Computers*, 53(11):1462–1473, 2004.
- [13] E. Bini, G. C. Buttazzo, and G. M. Buttazzo. Rate monotonic analysis: the hyperbolic bound. *Computers, IEEE Transactions on*, 52(7):933–942, 2003.
- [14] E. Bini, T. H. C. Nguyen, P. Richard, and S. K. Baruah. A response-time bound in fixed-priority scheduling with arbitrary deadlines. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 58(2):279, 2009.
- [15] E. Bini, A. Parri, and G. Dossena. A quadratic-time response time upper bound with a tightness property. In *IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium (RTSS)*, 2015.
- [16] A. Burchard, J. Liebeherr, Y. Oh, and S. H. Son. New strategies for assigning real-time tasks to multiprocessor systems. pages 1429–1442, 1995.
- [17] S. Chakraborty, S. Künzli, and L. Thiele. Approximate schedulability analysis. In *IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium*, pages 159–168, 2002.
- [18] J.-J. Chen, W.-H. Huang, and C. Liu. Evaluate and compare two utilization-based schedulability-test frameworks for real-time systems. *Computing Research Repository (CoRR)*, 2015. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1505.02155>.
- [19] J.-J. Chen, W.-H. Huang, and C. Liu. k^2U : A general framework from k-point effective schedulability analysis to utilization-based tests. In *IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium, RTSS*, 2015.
- [20] J.-J. Chen, W.-H. Huang, and C. Liu. $k2U$: A general framework from k-point effective schedulability analysis to utilization-based tests. In *Real-Time Systems Symposium (RTSS)*, 2015.
- [21] J.-J. Chen, W.-H. Huang, and C. Liu. Automatic parameter derivations in k^2U framework. *Computing Research Repository (CoRR)*, 2016. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1605.00119>.
- [22] R. Davis, T. Rothvoß, S. Baruah, and A. Burns. Quantifying the sub-optimality of uniprocessor fixed priority pre-emptive scheduling for sporadic tasksets with arbitrary deadlines. In *Real-Time and Network Systems (RTNS)*, pages 23–31, 2009.
- [23] R. I. Davis and A. Burns. Improved priority assignment for global fixed priority pre-emptive scheduling in multiprocessor real-time systems. *Real-Time Systems*, 47(1):1–40, 2011.
- [24] R. I. Davis, T. Feld, V. Pollex, and F. Slomka. Schedulability tests for tasks with variable rate-dependent behaviour under fixed priority scheduling. In *20th IEEE Real-Time and Embedded Technology and Applications Symposium*, pages 51–62, 2014.
- [25] R. I. Davis, A. Zalos, and A. Burns. Efficient exact schedulability tests for fixed priority real-time systems. *Computers, IEEE Transactions on*, 57(9):1261–1276, 2008.
- [26] S. K. Dhall and C. L. Liu. On a real-time scheduling problem. *Operations Research*, 26(1):127–140, 1978.
- [27] N. Fisher and S. K. Baruah. A fully polynomial-time approximation scheme for feasibility analysis in static-priority systems with arbitrary relative deadlines. In *ECRTS*, pages 117–126, 2005.
- [28] N. Guan, C. Gu, M. Stigge, Q. Deng, and W. Yi. Approximate response time analysis of real-time task graphs. In *Proceedings of the IEEE 35th IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium*, pages 304–313, 2014.
- [29] N. Guan, M. Stigge, W. Yi, and G. Yu. New response time bounds for fixed priority multiprocessor scheduling. In *IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium*, pages 387–397, 2009.
- [30] C.-C. Han and H. ying Tyan. A better polynomial-time schedulability test for real-time fixed-priority scheduling algorithms. In *Real-Time Systems Symposium (RTSS)*, pages 36–45, 1997.
- [31] W.-H. Huang and J.-J. Chen. Techniques for schedulability analysis in mode change systems under fixed-priority scheduling. In *Real-Time Computing Systems and Applications (RTCSA)*, 2015.
- [32] T.-W. Kuo, L.-P. Chang, Y.-H. Liu, and K.-J. Lin. Efficient online schedulability tests for real-time systems. *Software Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 29(8):734–751, 2003.
- [33] C.-G. Lee, L. Sha, and A. Peddi. Enhanced utilization bounds for qos management. *IEEE Trans. Computers*, 53(2):187–200, 2004.
- [34] J. P. Lehoczky. Fixed priority scheduling of periodic task sets with arbitrary deadlines. In *RTSS*, pages 201–209, 1990.
- [35] J. P. Lehoczky, L. Sha, and Y. Ding. The rate monotonic scheduling algorithm: Exact characterization and average case behavior. In *IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium*, pages 166–171, 1989.
- [36] J. Li, J. Chen, K. Agrawal, C. Lu, C. Gill, and A. Saifullah. Analysis of federated and global scheduling for parallel real-time tasks. In *EuroMicro Conference on Real-Time Systems*, 2014.
- [37] C. Liu and J. Anderson. Task scheduling with self-suspensions in soft real-time multiprocessor systems. In *Proceedings of the 30th Real-Time Systems Symposium*, pages 425–436, 2009.
- [38] C. Liu and J.-J. Chen. Bursty-interference analysis techniques for analyzing complex real-time task models. In *IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium*, 2014.
- [39] C. L. Liu and J. W. Layland. Scheduling algorithms for multiprogramming in a hard-real-time environment. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 20(1):46–61, 1973.
- [40] D. G. Luenberger and Y. Ye. *Linear and nonlinear programming*, volume 116. Springer, 2008.
- [41] L. Lundberg. Analyzing fixed-priority global multiprocessor scheduling. In *Real-Time and Embedded Technology and Applications Symposium (RTAS)*, pages 145–153, 2002.
- [42] S. Martello and P. Toth. *Knapsack problems: algorithms and computer implementations*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1990.
- [43] C. Phillips, C. Stein, E. Torng, and J. Wein. Optimal time-critical scheduling via resource augmentation. In *Proc. of the 29th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 140–149, 1997.
- [44] M. Stigge, P. Ekberg, N. Guan, and W. Yi. The digraph real-time task model. In *17th IEEE Real-Time and Embedded Technology and Applications Symposium, RTAS 2011, Chicago, Illinois, USA, 11-14 April 2011*, pages 71–80, 2011.
- [45] M. Stigge and W. Yi. Hardness results for static priority real-time scheduling. In *24th Euromicro Conference on Real-Time Systems ECRTS*, pages 189–198, 2012.
- [46] H. Takada and K. Sakamura. Schedulability of generalized multiframe task sets under static priority assignment. In *4th International Workshop on Real-Time Computing Systems and Applications (RTCSA)*, pages 80–86, 1997.
- [47] J. Wu, J. Liu, and W. Zhao. On schedulability bounds of static priority schedulers. In *Real-Time and Embedded Technology and Applications Symposium (RTAS)*, pages 529–540, 2005.

Appendix A: Proofs

Proof of Lemma 5. Similar to the proof of Lemma 4, we only have to consider the cases when U_i is set to $\frac{x}{k-1}$ to make the schedulability condition the most difficult, where $x = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i$. Suppose that $\frac{C_k}{t_k}$ is y . Then, we are looking for the infimum $x+y$ such that $y > 1 - (\alpha + \beta)x + 0.5\alpha\beta(x^2 + \frac{x^2}{k-1})$.

To solve this, we start with $y = 1 - (\alpha + \beta)x + 0.5\alpha\beta(x^2 + \frac{x^2}{k-1})$. Our objective becomes to minimize $H(x) = x + 1 - (\alpha + \beta)x + 0.5\alpha\beta(x^2 + \frac{x^2}{k-1})$. By finding $\frac{dH(x)}{dx} = 1 - (\alpha + \beta) + \frac{k\alpha\beta x}{k-1} = 0$, we know that $x = \frac{(k-1)(\alpha + \beta - 1)}{k\alpha\beta}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} y &= 1 - x \left(\alpha + \beta - \frac{0.5k\alpha\beta \frac{(k-1)(\alpha + \beta - 1)}{k\alpha\beta}}{k-1} \right) \\ &= 1 - \frac{(k-1)(\alpha + \beta - 1)}{k\alpha\beta} (0.5(\alpha + \beta + 1)) \\ &= 1 - \frac{0.5(k-1)((\alpha + \beta)^2 - 1)}{k\alpha\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Since $\alpha + \beta \geq 1$, we know that $x \geq 0$. Whether we should take the above solution only depends on whether $y \geq 0$ or not. If $y \geq 0$, then we can conclude the solution directly; otherwise, if $y < 0$, we should set y to 0. That is, by reorganizing Eq. (36) (under the assumption $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$), examining whether $y < 0$ is equivalent to testing $(1 - \frac{1}{k})((\alpha + \beta)^2 - 1) > 2\alpha\beta$, which implies to test whether $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 - 1 > \frac{1}{k}((\alpha + \beta)^2 - 1)$. If $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 \leq 1$, then $y \geq 0$ since $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 - 1 \leq 0 \leq \frac{1}{k}((\alpha + \beta)^2 - 1)$ due to the assumption $\alpha + \beta \geq 1$. Therefore, there are two cases:

Case 1: If $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 > 1$ and $k > \frac{(\alpha + \beta)^2 - 1}{\alpha^2 + \beta^2 - 1}$, then, for such a case y derived from Eq. (36) is negative. We should set y to 0. The remaining procedure here is the same as in solving the quadratic equation in the proof of Lemma 4 by setting $\frac{C_k}{t_k}$ to 0. This leads to the first condition in Eq. (19).

Case 2: If $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 \leq 1$ or $k \leq \frac{(\alpha + \beta)^2 - 1}{\alpha^2 + \beta^2 - 1}$, then, we have the conclusion that $y \geq 0$ and $x \geq 0$. We just have to sum up the above derived x and y . This leads to the second condition in Eq. (19) directly. \square

Proof of Lemma 6. Definition 3 leads to the following optimization problem:

$$\sup C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^* U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \quad (37a)$$

$$\text{such that } C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^* U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \beta_i C_i > t_j^*, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, k-1, \quad (37b)$$

$$t_j^* \geq 0, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, k-1, \quad (37c)$$

where $t_1^*, t_2^*, \dots, t_{k-1}^*$ and are variables, $\alpha_i, \beta_i, U_i, C_i$ for higher-priority task τ_i and C_k are constants. For the rest of the proof, we replace $>$ with \geq in Eq. (37), as the supremum and the maximum are the same when presenting the inequality with \geq . We can also further drop the condition $t_j^* \geq 0$, which just makes the resulting solution more pessimistic. This results in the following linear programming, which has a safe upper bound of Eq. (37),

$$\text{maximize } C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^* U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \quad (38a)$$

$$\text{such that } C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^* U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \beta_i C_i \geq t_j^*, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, k-1. \quad (38b)$$

The linear programming in Eq. (38) (by replacing $>$ with \geq and supremum with maximum) has $k-1$ variables and $k-1$ constraints. Like the proof of Lemma 1, we again adopt the extreme point theorem for linear programming [40] to solve the linear programming. Suppose that $t_1^\dagger, t_2^\dagger, \dots, t_{k-1}^\dagger$ is a feasible solution for the linear programming in (38) and $\hat{t} = \max\{t_1^\dagger, t_2^\dagger, \dots, t_{k-1}^\dagger\}$. By the satisfaction of Eq. (38b), we know that

$$C_k + \hat{t} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \geq C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^\dagger U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \geq \hat{t}.$$

As a result, we have $\hat{t} \leq \frac{C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i}$. That is, any feasible solution of Eq. (38) has $t_j^* \leq \frac{C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i}$ for any $j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$. Under the assumption that $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i < 1$ and $0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i$, the above linear programming has a bounded objective function.

The only extreme point solution is to put $C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i t_i^* U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \beta_i C_i = t_j^*$ for every $j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$. Since the objective function is bounded, by the extreme point theorem [40], we know that this extreme point solution is the optimal solution for the linear programming in Eq. (38). For such a solution, we know that

$$\forall j = 2, 3, \dots, k-1, \quad t_j^* - t_{j-1}^* = \beta_{j-1} C_{j-1}. \quad (39)$$

and

$$t_1^* = C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i (t_1^* + \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell), \quad (40)$$

where β_0 and C_0 are defined as 0 for notational brevity. Therefore, we know that

$$t_1^* = \frac{C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i (\sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell)}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i}. \quad (41)$$

Clearly, the above extreme point solution is always feasible when $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i < 1$. Therefore, in this extreme point solution, the objective function of the linear programming is

$$t_1^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i = \frac{C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i (\sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell)}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i \quad (42)$$

$$= \frac{C_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta_i C_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \beta_\ell C_\ell)}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i} \quad (43)$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Appendix B: Quadratic Bound for Uniprocessor Constrained-Deadline Tasks

To verify the schedulability of a (constrained-deadline) sporadic real-time task τ_k under fixed-priority scheduling in

uniprocessor systems, the time-demand analysis (TDA) developed in [35] can be adopted. That is, if

$$\exists t \text{ with } 0 < t \leq D_k \text{ and } C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \leq t, \quad (44)$$

then task τ_k is schedulable under the fixed-priority scheduling algorithm, where $hp(\tau_k)$ is the set of tasks with higher priority than τ_k , D_k , C_k , and T_i represent τ_k 's relative deadline, worst-case execution time, and period, respectively. For a constrained-deadline task τ_k , the schedulability test in Eq. (44) is equivalent to the verification of the existence of $0 < t \leq D_k$ such that

$$C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp_2(\tau_k)} C_i + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp_1(\tau_k)} \left\lceil \frac{t}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \leq t. \quad (45)$$

We can then create a virtual sporadic task τ'_k with execution time $C'_k = C_k + \sum_{\tau_i \in hp_2(\tau_k)} C_i$, relative deadline $D'_k = D_k$, and period $T'_k = D_k$. It is clear that the schedulability test to verify the schedulability of task τ'_k under the interference of the higher-priority tasks $hp_1(\tau_k)$ is the same as that of task τ_k under the interference of the higher-priority tasks $hp(\tau_k)$. For notational brevity, suppose that there are $k^* - 1$ tasks in $hp_1(\tau_k)$.

Theorem 7. *Task τ_k in a sporadic task system with constrained deadlines is schedulable by the fixed-priority scheduling algorithm if $\sum_{i=1}^{k^*-1} \frac{C_i}{D_k} \leq 1$ and*

$$\frac{C'_k}{D_k} \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k^*-1} U_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k^*-1} \frac{C_i}{D_k} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k^*-1} U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k^*-1} C_\ell)}{D_k}, \quad (46)$$

in which the $k^* - 1$ higher-priority tasks in $hp_1(\tau_k)$ are indexed in a non-decreasing order of $\left(\left\lceil \frac{D_k}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1\right) T_i$.

Proof: Setting $t_i = \left(\left\lceil \frac{D_k}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1\right) T_i$, and indexing the tasks in a non-decreasing order of t_i leads to the satisfaction of Definition 2 with $\alpha_i = 1$ and $\beta_i = 1$. ■

Corollary 2. *Task τ_k in a sporadic task system with implicit deadlines is schedulable by the RM scheduling algorithm if Lemmas 1, 3, 4, or 5 holds by setting $\frac{C_k}{t_k}$ as U_k , $\alpha = 1$, and $\beta = 1$.*

The above result in Corollary 2 leads to the utilization bound $2 - \sqrt{2}$ (by using Lemma 5 with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 1$) for RM scheduling, which is worse than the existing Liu and Layland bound $\ln 2$ [39].

Appendix C: Multiprocessor DM/RM Scheduling

This part demonstrates how to use the k^2Q framework for multiprocessor global fixed-priority scheduling. We consider that the system has M identical processors. For global fixed-priority scheduling, there is a global queue and a global scheduler to dispatch jobs. We demonstrate the applicability for constrained-deadline and implicit-deadline sporadic systems under global fixed-priority scheduling. Specifically, we will present how to apply the framework to obtain speed-up and capacity augmentation factors for global DM and global RM.

The success of the scheme depends on a corresponding exponential-time test. Here we will use the property to be

presented in Lemma 9, based on the *forced-forward* algorithm proposed by Baruah et al. [7] to characterize the workload of higher-priority tasks. The method in [7] to analyze fixed-priority scheduling is completely different from ours, as they rely on the demand bound functions of the tasks.

The following lemma provides a sufficient test based on the observations by Baruah et al. [7]. The construction of the following lemma is based on a minor change of the forced-forward algorithm.

Lemma 9. *Let Δ_k^{\max} be $\max_{j=1}^{k-1} \{U_j, \frac{C_k}{D_k}\}$. Task τ_k in a sporadic task system with constrained deadlines is schedulable by a global fixed-priority (workload conserving) scheduling algorithm on M processors if*

$$\forall y \geq 0, (\forall 0 \leq \omega_i \leq T_i, \forall \tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)), \exists t \text{ with } 0 < t \leq D_k + y$$

$$\text{such that } \Delta_k^{\max} \cdot (D_k + y) + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \omega_i \cdot U_i + \left\lceil \frac{t - \omega_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i}{M} \leq t.$$

Proof: This is proved by contrapositive. If task τ_k is not schedulable by the global fixed-priority scheduling, we will show that there exist $y \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \omega_i \leq T_i$ such that for all $0 < t \leq D_k + y$, the condition $\Delta_k^{\max} \cdot (D_k + y) + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \omega_i \cdot U_i + \left\lceil \frac{t - \omega_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i}{M} > t$ holds. The proof is mainly based on the forced-forward algorithm for the analysis of global DM by Baruah et al. in [7], by making some further annotations.

If τ_k is not schedulable by global DM, let z_0 be the first time at which task τ_k misses its absolute deadline, i.e., z_0 . Let z_1 be the arrival time of this job of task τ_k . For notational brevity, let this job be J_1 , which arrives at time z_1 and has not yet been finished at time z_0 . By definition, we know that $z_0 - z_1$ is D_k . Due to the fixed-priority and workload-conserving scheduling policy and the constrained-deadline setting, removing (1) all the other jobs of task τ_k (except the one arriving at time z_1), (2) all the jobs arriving no earlier than z_0 , and (3) lower-priority jobs does not change the unschedulability of job J_1 . Therefore, the rest of the proof only considers the jobs from $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_k$.

Now, we expand the window of interest by using a slightly different algorithm from that proposed in [7], also illustrated with the notation in Figure 3, as in Algorithm 1. The difference is only in the setting “strictly less than $(z_{\ell-1} - z_\ell) \cdot \hat{U}_\ell$ units”, whereas the setting in [7] uses “strictly less than $(z_{\ell-1} - z_\ell) \cdot s$ units” for a certain s . For notational brevity, \hat{U}_ℓ is the utilization of the task that generates job J_ℓ .

Algorithm 1 (Revised) Forced-Forward Algorithm

- 1: **for** $\ell \leftarrow 2, 3, \dots$ **do**
 - 2: let J_ℓ denote a job that
 - arrives at some time-instant $z_\ell < z_{\ell-1}$;
 - has an absolute deadline after $z_{\ell-1}$;
 - has not completed execution by $z_{\ell-1}$; and
 - has executed for strictly less than $(z_{\ell-1} - z_\ell) \cdot \hat{U}_\ell$ units over the interval $[z_\ell, z_{\ell-1})$, where \hat{U}_ℓ is the utilization of the task that generates job J_ℓ .
 - 3: **if** there is no such a job **then**
 - 4: $\ell \leftarrow (\ell - 1)$; **break**;
-

Suppose that the forced-forward algorithm terminates with ℓ equals to ℓ^* . We now examine the schedule in the interval $(z_{\ell^*}, z_0]$. Since $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_{\ell^*}$ belong to $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_k$, we

know that $\hat{U}_\ell \leq \Delta_k^{\max}$ for $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, \ell^*$. Let σ_ℓ be the total length of the time interval over $(z_\ell, z_{\ell-1}]$ during which J_ℓ is executed. By the choice of J_ℓ , it follows that

$$\sigma_\ell < (z_{\ell-1} - z_\ell) \cdot \hat{U}_\ell \leq (z_{\ell-1} - z_\ell) \cdot \Delta_k^{\max}.$$

Moreover, all the M processors execute other higher-priority jobs (than J_ℓ) at any other time points in the interval $(z_\ell, z_{\ell-1}]$ at which J_ℓ is not executed. Therefore, we know that the maximum amount of time from z_{ℓ^*} to z_0 , in which not all the M processors execute certain jobs, is at most

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell^*} \sigma_\ell < \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell^*} (z_{\ell-1} - z_\ell) \cdot \Delta_k^{\max} = (z_0 - z_{\ell^*}) \cdot \Delta_k^{\max}.$$

Up to here, the treatment is almost identical to that in ‘‘Observation 1’’ in [7]. The following analysis becomes different as we do not intend to use the demand bound function. Now, we replace job J_1 with another job J'_1 with *inflated execution time* in the above schedule, where J'_1 is released at time z_{ℓ^*} with absolute deadline z_0 and execution time $(z_0 - z_{\ell^*}) \cdot \Delta_k^{\max}$. According to the above analysis, J'_1 cannot be finished before z_0 in the above schedule. For each task τ_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, in the above schedule, there may be one *carry-in* job, denoted as J_i^b , of τ_i (under the assumption of the schedulability of a higher-priority task τ_i) that arrives at time r_i^b with $r_i^b < z_{\ell^*}$ and $r_i^b + T_i > z_{\ell^*}$. Let d_i^b be the next released time of task τ_i after z_{ℓ^*} , i.e., $d_i^b = r_i^b + T_i$.

According to the termination condition in the construction of z_{ℓ^*} , if J_i^b exists, we know that at least $(z_{\ell^*} - r_i^b) \cdot U_i$ amount of execution time has been executed before z_{ℓ^*} , and the remaining execution time of job J_i^b to be executed after z_{ℓ^*} is at most $(d_i^b - z_{\ell^*}) \cdot U_i$. If J_i^b does not exist, then d_i^b is set to z_{ℓ^*} for notational brevity. Therefore, the amount of workload $W'_i(t)$ of all the released jobs of task τ_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ to be executed in time interval $(z_{\ell^*}^*, z_{\ell^*}^* + t)$ is at most

$$W'_i(t) = (d_i^b - z_{\ell^*}) \cdot U_i + \left\lceil \frac{t - (d_i^b - z_{\ell^*})}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i. \quad (47)$$

The assumption of the unschedulability of job J'_1 (due to the unschedulability of job J_1) under the global fixed-priority scheduling implies that J'_1 cannot finish its computation at any time between z_{ℓ^*} and z_0 . This leads to the following (necessary) condition $\Delta_k^{\max}(z_0 - z_{\ell^*}) + \frac{\sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} W'_i(t)}{M} > t$ for all $0 < t \leq z_{\ell^*} - z_0$ for the unschedulability of job J'_1 .

Therefore, by the existence of $y = z_1 - z_{\ell^*}$ (with $y \geq 0$) and $\omega_i = d_i^b - z_{\ell^*}$ (with $0 \leq \omega_i \leq T_i$) for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ to enforce the above necessary condition, we reach the conclusion of the proof by contrapositive. That is, task τ_k is schedulable if, for all $y \geq 0$ and any combination of $0 \leq \omega_i \leq T_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$, there exists $0 < t \leq D_k + y$ with $\Delta_k^{\max}(D_k + y) + \frac{\sum_{\tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)} \omega_i \cdot U_i + \left\lceil \frac{t - \omega_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i}{M} \leq t$. ■

The schedulability condition in Lemma 9 may look at the first glance strange. We briefly explain the logical meaning (but informally) here. Suppose we would like to know whether a job of task τ_k arrived at time r_k can be finished before/at time $r_k + D_k$. To better quantify the interference from the higher-priority tasks, we would like to account for the higher-priority jobs arrived prior to r_k . The variable y defines the extension of the window of interest from $[r_k, r_k + D_k)$ to

$[r_k - y, r_k + D_k)$. The variable ω_i defines the maximum residual execution time $\omega_i T_i$ of a carry-in job of task τ_i that arrives before $r_k - y$ and should be executed in the window of interest, i.e., $[r_k - y, r_k + D_k)$. If the residual workload is at most $\omega_i T_i$, the next job can be released at time $r_k - y + \omega_i$, as shown in the proof. Task τ_k is schedulable by the global fixed-priority scheduling, if, for any combinations of $y \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \omega_i \leq T_i, \forall \tau_i \in hp(\tau_k)$, we can always finish the inflated workload $\Delta_k^{\max} \cdot (D_k + y)$ of task τ_k and the higher-priority workload in the window of interest. For formal explanations, please refer to the formal proof of Lemma 9.

Note that the schedulability condition in Lemma 9 requires to test all possible $y \geq 0$ and all possible settings of $0 \leq \omega_i \leq T_i$ for the higher-priority tasks τ_i with $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$. Therefore, it needs exponential time (for all the possible combinations of ω_i).⁷ However, we are not going to directly use the test in Lemma 9 in the paper. We will only use this test to construct the corresponding k -point schedulability test under Definition 2.

We present the corresponding polynomial-time schedulability tests for global fixed-priority scheduling. More specifically, we will also analyze the capacity augmentation factors of these tests for global RM and global DM in Corollaries 3 and 4, respectively.

Theorem 8. *Let U_k^{\max} be $\max_{j=1}^k U_j$. Task τ_k in a sporadic task system with implicit deadlines is schedulable by global RM on M processors if*

$$U_k^{\max} \leq 1 - \frac{2}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i + \frac{0.5}{M^2} \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \right)^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2 \right) \right) \quad (48)$$

or

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} U_j}{M} \leq \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \right) \left(2 - \sqrt{2 + 2U_k^{\max} \frac{k}{k-1}} \right). \quad (49)$$

Proof: We will show that the schedulability condition in the theorem holds for all possible settings of y and ω_i s. Suppose that y and ω_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ are given, in which $y \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \omega_i \leq T_i$. Let t_k be $T_k + y$. Now, we set t_i to $\omega_i + \left\lceil \frac{T_k + y - \omega_i}{T_i} \right\rceil T_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ and reindex the tasks such that $t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_k$.

Therefore, if $i < j$, we know that $\omega_i \cdot U_i + \left\lceil \frac{t_j - \omega_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \leq \omega_i \cdot U_i + \left(\left\lceil \frac{t_j - \omega_i}{T_i} \right\rceil + 1 \right) C_i = t_j U_i + C_i$. If $i \geq j$, then $\omega_i \cdot U_i + \left\lceil \frac{t_j - \omega_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \leq \omega_i \cdot U_i + \left(\left\lceil \frac{t_j - \omega_i}{T_i} \right\rceil \right) C_i = t_j U_i$. The sufficient schedulability condition in Lemma 9 under the given y and ω_i s is to verify the existence of $t_j \in \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k\}$ such that

$$U_k^{\max}(T_k + y) + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \omega_i \cdot U_i + \left\lceil \frac{t_j - \omega_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i}{M} \quad (50)$$

$$\leq U_k^{\max} t_k + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i t_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} C_i}{M} \leq t_j. \quad (51)$$

By the definition of global RM scheduling (i.e., $T_k \geq T_i$), we can conclude that $C_i = U_i T_i \leq U_i T_k \leq U_i (T_k + y) = U_i t_k$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$. Hence, we can safely reformulate

⁷This may be the reason why the authors in [7] did not exploit this test.

the sufficient test by verifying whether there exists $t_j \in \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k\}$ such that

$$U_k^{\max} t_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i U_i t_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \beta U_i t_k \leq t_j, \quad (52)$$

where $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{M}$ and $\beta \leq \frac{1}{M}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$. Therefore, we reach the conclusion of the schedulability conditions in Eqs. (48) and (49) by Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 under given y and ω_i s, respectively.

The schedulability test in Eq. (52) is independent from the settings of y and ω_i s. However, the setting of y and ω_i s affects how the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks are indexed. Fortunately, it can be observed that the schedulability tests in Eqs. (48) and (49) are completely independent upon the indexing of the higher-priority tasks. Therefore, no matter how y and ω_i s are set, the schedulability conditions in Eqs. (48) and (49) are the corresponding results from the $k^2\mathbf{Q}$ framework. As a result, we can reach the conclusion. \blacksquare

Corollary 3. *The capacity augmentation factor of global RM for a sporadic system with implicit deadlines is $\frac{3+\sqrt{7}}{2} \approx 2.823$.*

Proof: Suppose that $\sum_{\tau_i} \frac{C_i}{MT_i} \leq \frac{1}{b}$ and $U_k^{\max} \leq \max_{\tau_i} U_i \leq \frac{1}{b}$. The right-hand side of Eq. (49) converges to $2 - \sqrt{2 + U_k^{\max}}$ when $k \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, by Eq. (49), we can guarantee the schedulability of task τ_k if $\frac{1}{b} \leq 2 - \sqrt{2 + \frac{2}{b}}$. This is equivalent to solving $x = 2 - \sqrt{2 + 2x}$, which holds when $x = 3 - \sqrt{7}$. Therefore, we reach the conclusion of the capacity augmentation factor $\frac{3+\sqrt{7}}{2} \approx 2.823$. \blacksquare

Theorem 9. *Let Δ_k^{\max} be $\max_{j=1}^{k-1} \{U_j, \frac{C_k}{D_k}\}$. Task τ_k in a sporadic task system with constrained deadlines is schedulable by a global fixed-priority scheduling on M processors if $\sum_{i=1}^k U_i \leq M$, $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{C_i}{D_k} \leq M$, and*

$$\Delta_k^{\max} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(U_i + \frac{C_i}{D_k} \right) + \frac{1}{M^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \left(\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \frac{C_\ell}{D_k} \right) \right), \quad (53)$$

where the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks are ordered in a non-increasing order of their periods.

Proof: This is due to a similar proof to that of Theorem 8 and Lemma 9, by applying Lemma 1 with $t_k = D_k + y$, $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{M}$, and $\beta_i = \frac{1}{M}$, under the worst-case last release time ordering, $\frac{\beta_i C_i}{\alpha_i U_i} = T_i$ non-increasingly, in Lemma 2. Therefore, for a given $y \geq 0$, if $\Delta_k^{\max} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(U_i + \frac{C_i}{D_k + y} \right) + \frac{1}{M^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \left(\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \frac{C_\ell}{D_k + y} \right) \right)$, task τ_k is schedulable by the global fixed-scheduling. By the assumption $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq M$, we know that $C_i \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^i U_\ell}{M} \leq C_i$. Therefore⁸,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{C_i}{D_k + y} + \frac{1}{M^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \left(\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \frac{C_\ell}{D_k + y} \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{D_k + y} \frac{1}{M} \left(- \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i \left(\frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^i U_\ell}{M} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

⁸This comes from the simple algebra property that for any two vectors \vec{a} and \vec{b} of size $(k-1)$ there is $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i \sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} b_\ell = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} b_i \sum_{\ell=1}^i a_\ell$.




Fig. 3: Notation of the forced-forward algorithm for the analysis of global fixed-priority scheduling.

is minimized when y is 0. As a result, the above schedulability condition is the worst when y is 0. \blacksquare

Corollary 4. *The capacity augmentation factor and the speed-up factor of global DM by using Theorem 9 for a sporadic system with constrained deadlines is 3.*

Proof: If $\sum_{i=1}^k U_i \leq M$ or $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{C_i}{D_k} \leq M$ is violated, the capacity augmentation factor is already 1. Therefore, we focus on the case that task τ_k does not pass the schedulability condition in Eq. (53). That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_k^{\max} &> 1 - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(U_i + \frac{C_i}{D_k} \right) + \frac{1}{M^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \left(\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} \frac{C_\ell}{D_k} \right) \right) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(U_i + \frac{C_i}{D_k} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This means that the unschedulability of task τ_k under global DM implies that either $\Delta_k^{\max} > \frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i > \frac{1}{3}$, or $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{C_i}{D_k} > \frac{1}{3}$, by the pigeonhole principle. Therefore, we conclude the factor 3. \blacksquare

Remarks: The utilization bound in Eq. (49) is analytically better than the best known utilization-based schedulability test $\sum_{j=1}^k U_j \leq \frac{M}{2} (1 - U_k^{\max}) + U_k^{\max}$ for global RM by Bertogna et al. [10], since $\frac{(1-x)}{2} \leq 2 - \sqrt{2 + 2x}$ when $0 \leq x \leq 1$.

The capacity augmentation factor 2.823 in Corollary 3 is weaker than the result 2.668 by Lundberg [41]. However, we would like to point out the incompleteness in the proof in [41]. In the proof of the extreme task set, the argument in Page 150 in [41] concludes that task τ_n is more difficult to be schedulable due to the increased interference of task τ_{n-1} to task τ_n after the transformation. The argument was not correctly proved and can be optimistic since the increased interference has to be analyzed in all time points in the analysis window, whereas the analysis in [41] only considers the interference in a specific interval length. Without analyzing the resulting interference in all time points in the analysis window, task τ_n after transformation may still have chance to finish earlier due to the potential reduction of the interference at earlier time points.

The speed-up factor 3 provided in Corollary 4 is asymptotically the same as the result by Baruah et al. [7]. The speed-up factor 3 in [7] requires a pseudo polynomial-time test, whereas we show that a simple test in Eq. (53) can already yield the speed-up factor 3 in $O(k \log k)$ time complexity.

We limit our attention here for the global RM/DM scheduling. Andersson et al. [2] propose the RM-US[ζ] algorithm, which gives the highest priority to tasks τ_i s with $U_i > \zeta$, and otherwise assigns priorities by using RM. Our analysis here can also be applied for the RM-US[ζ] algorithm with some modifications in the proofs by setting $\zeta = \frac{2}{3+\sqrt{7}} \approx 0.3542$.

Appendix D: Response-Time for Periodic Tasks with Jitters

A periodic task (with jitters) τ_i is defined by its period T_i , its execution time C_i , its relative deadline D_i and, its jitter L_i . The jitter problem arises when we consider some flexibility to delay the job arrival for a certain bounded length L_i . Such a problem has also been studied in the literature, such as [3], [9].

We focus on uniprocessor fixed-priority scheduling here. The busy window concept has also been used for the schedulability analysis of fixed-priority scheduling [3]. For the h -th job of task τ_k in the busy window, the finishing time $R_{k,h}$ is the minimum t such that

$$hC_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left\lceil \frac{t + L_i}{T_i} \right\rceil C_i \leq t.$$

The h -th job of task τ_k arrives at time $\max\{(h-1)T_k - L_k, 0\}$, and, hence, its response time is $R_{k,h} - \max\{(h-1)T_k - L_k, 0\}$. The busy window of task τ_k finishes on the h -th job if $R_{k,h} \leq \max\{hT_k - L_k, 0\}$.

Lemma 10. $R_{k,h}$ is upper bounded by finding the maximum

$$t_k = hC_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} L_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i, \quad (54)$$

among all possible least release time orderings of the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks with $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_{k-1} \leq t_k$ and

$$hC_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} L_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i U_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} C_i > t_j, \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1. \quad (55)$$

Proof: Suppose that $R_{k,h}$ is known. Then, the last release of task τ_i in the busy window before $R_{k,h}$ is at time $t_i = \left(\left\lceil \frac{R_{k,h} + L_i}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1 \right) T_i - L_i$. We can index the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks by t_i non-decreasingly. By the definition of t_i , we know that $\left(\left\lceil \frac{R_{k,h} + L_i}{T_i} \right\rceil - 1 \right) C_i = \frac{t_i + L_i}{T_i} T_i U_i = t_i U_i + L_i U_i$. That is, the accumulative workload of task τ_i from 0 to t_i is exactly $L_i U_i + t_i U_i$. Due to the indexing rule, and the known $R_{k,h}$ we can now conclude the conditions in Eqs. (54) and (55).

However, it should be noted that the last release time ordering is actually unknown since $R_{k,h}$ is unknown. Therefore, we have to consider all possible last release time orderings. ■

Lemma 11. Suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq 1$. Then, for any $h \geq 1$ and $C_k > 0$, we have

$$R_{k,h} \leq \frac{hC_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (C_i + L_i U_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} C_\ell)}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i}, \quad (56)$$

where the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks are ordered in a non-increasing order of their periods.

Proof: This comes from the above discussions with $\alpha_i = 1$, $\beta_i = 1$ in Lemma 10 by applying Lemmas 6 and 7 when $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i < 1$. The case when $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i = 1$ has a safe upper bound $R_{k,h} = \infty$ in Eq. (56). ■

Theorem 10. Suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^k U_i \leq 1$. The worst-case

response time of task τ_k is at most

$$R_k \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (C_i + L_i U_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} C_\ell)}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i}, \quad (57)$$

$$+ \max \left\{ \frac{h^* C_k}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i}, \frac{(h^* + 1) C_k}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i} - h^* T_k + L_k \right\}$$

where the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks are ordered in a non-increasing order of their periods and $h^* = \left\lceil \frac{L_k}{T_k} \right\rceil + 1$.

Proof: By the definition of h^* , we know that $(h^* - 1)T_k - L_k \leq 0$, whereas $h^* T_k - L_k > 0$. When $h \leq h^*$, we know that $\max\{(h^* - 1)T_k - L_k, 0\}$ is 0. Therefore, $R_{k,h} - 0$ is maximized when h is set to h^* for any $h \leq h^*$.

The first-order derivative of $R_{k,h} - ((h-1)T_k - L_k)$ with respect to h when $h \geq h^* + 1$ is $\frac{C_k}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i} - T_k = \frac{C_k - (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i) T_k}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i}$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 4, we know that setting $R_{k,h} - (h-1)T_k$ is maximized when h is set to $h^* + 1$ for any $h \geq h^* + 1$.

As a result, we only have to evaluate the two cases by setting h as h^* or $h^* + 1$. One of them is the worst-case response time. The formulation in Eq. (57) simply compares these two response times. ■

Appendix E: Schedulability for Generalized Multi-Frame

A generalized multi-frame real-time task τ_i with m_i frames is defined as a task with an array $(C_{i,0}, D_{i,0}, T_{i,0}, C_{i,1}, D_{i,1}, T_{i,1}, \dots, C_{i,m_i-1}, D_{i,m_i-1}, T_{i,m_i-1})$ of different execution times, different relative deadlines, and the minimal inter-arrival time of the next frame [8], [46]. The execution time of the j -th job of task τ_i is defined as $C_{i,(j \bmod m_i)}$. If a job of the j -th frame of task τ_i is released at time t , the earliest time that task τ_i can release the next $(j+1) \bmod m_i$ frame is at time $t + T_j$. Here, we consider only constrained-deadline cases, in which $D_{i,j} \leq T_{i,j}$.

Takada and Sakamura [46] provide an exact test with exponential-time complexity for such a problem under task-level fixed-priority scheduling, in which each task is assigned with one static priority level. For this section, we will focus on such a setting. Specifically, we are interested in analyzing the schedulability of the h -th frame of task τ_k under the given task priority ordering. It was shown that the critical instant theorem of periodic task systems by Liu and Layland [39] does not work anymore for generalized multi-frame systems. Fortunately, as shown in Theorem 2 in [46], the critical instant of the h -th frame of task τ_k is to release a certain frame of a higher priority task τ_i at the same time, and the subsequent frames of task τ_i as early as possible. In fact, this problem has been recently proved to be co-NP hard in the strong sense in [45].

For completeness, the test with exponential time complexity by Takada and Sakamura [46] will be presented in Lemma 12 by using our notation. We define $rbf(i, q, t)$ as the maximum workload of task τ_i released within an interval

length t starting from the q -th frame. That is,

$$rbf(i, q, t) = \sum_{j=q}^{\theta(i, q, t)} C_{i, (j \bmod m_i)}, \quad (58)$$

where $\theta(i, q, t)$ is the smallest ℓ such that $\sum_{j=q}^{\ell} T_{i, (j \bmod m_i)} \geq t$. That is, $\theta(i, q, t)$ is the last frame released by task τ_i before t under the critical instant starting with the q -th frame of task τ_i .

Lemma 12. *The h -th frame of task τ_k in a generalized multiframe task system with constrained deadlines is schedulable by a fixed-priority scheduling on a uniprocessor system if*

$$\forall q_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, m_i - 1\}, \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1 \\ \exists 0 < t \leq D_{k, h}, \quad C_{k, h} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} rbf(i, q_i, t) \leq t.$$

Proof: This is a reformulation of the test by Takada and Sakamura [46]. \blacksquare

Since the test in Lemma 12 requires exponential-time complexity, an approximation by using Maximum Interference Function (MIF) was proposed in [46] to provide a sufficient test efficiently.⁹ Instead of testing all possible combinations of q_i , a simple strategy is to use $rbf(i, t) = \max_{q=0}^{m_i-1} rbf(i, q, t)$ to approximate the test in Lemma 12. This results in a pseudo-polynomial-time test. Guan et al. [28] have recently provided proofs to show that such an approximation is with a speed-up factor of 2.

We will use a different way to build our analysis by constructing the k -point last-release schedulability test in Definition 2. The idea is very simple. If task τ_i starts with its q -th frame, we can find and define

$$t_{i, q} = \sum_{j=q}^{\theta(i, q, D_{k, h})-1} T_{i, (j \bmod m_i)}$$

as the last release time of task τ_i before $D_{k, h}$. Therefore, for the given $D_{k, h}$, we are only interested in these m_i last release times of task τ_i . We need a safe function for estimating their workload. More precisely, we want to find two constants $U_{i, k, h}$ and $C_{i, k, h}$ such that $U_{i, k, h} \cdot t_{i, q} \geq rbf(i, q, t_{i, q})$ and $U_{i, k, h} \cdot t_{i, q} + C_{i, k, h} \geq rbf(i, q, D_{k, h}) = rbf(i, q, t_{i, q} + \epsilon)$. This means that no matter which frame of task τ_i is the first frame in the critical instant, we can always bound the workload from task τ_i by using $U_{i, k, h} \cdot t + C_{i, k, h}$ for the points that we are interested to test. According to the above discussions, we can set

$$U_{i, k, h} = \max_{q=0, 1, \dots, m_i-1} \max \left\{ \frac{rbf(i, q, t_{i, q})}{t_{i, q}} \right\} \quad (59)$$

$$C_{i, k, h} = \max_{q=0, 1, \dots, m_i-1} rbf(i, q, D_{k, h}) - U_{i, k, h} \cdot t_{i, q} \quad (60)$$

Now, we can reorganize the schedulability test to link to Definition 2.

Lemma 13. *The h -th frame of task τ_k in a generalized multiframe task system with constrained deadlines is schedulable by a fixed-priority scheduling on a uniprocessor system if the following condition holds: For any last release ordering π of*

the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks with $t_{1, q_1} \leq t_{2, q_2} \leq \dots \leq t_{k-1, q_{k-1}} \leq t_k = D_{k, h}$, there exists t_{j, q_j} such that

$$C_{k, h} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_{i, k, h} \cdot t_{i, q_i} + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} C_{i, k, h} \leq t_{j, q_j}, \quad (61)$$

where $U_{i, k, h}$ and $C_{i, k, h}$ are defined in Eqs. (59) and (60), respectively.

Proof: This comes from the above discussions and Lemma 12. \blacksquare

The choice of q_i only affects the last release ordering of the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks, but it does not change the constants $U_{i, k, h}$ and $C_{i, k, h}$. Therefore, Lemma 13 satisfies Definition 2 by removing the indexes q , but the worst-case last release time ordering has to be considered.

Theorem 11. *Suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_{i, k, h} < D_{k, h}$. The h -th frame of task τ_k in a generalized multiframe task system with constrained deadlines is schedulable by a scheduling algorithm on a uniprocessor system if the following condition holds*

$$\frac{C_{k, h}}{D_{k, h}} \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_{i, k, h} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (C_{i, k, h} - U_{i, k, h} (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} C_{\ell, k, h}))}{D_{k, h}}, \quad (62)$$

in which the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks are indexed in a non-increasing order of $\frac{C_{i, k, h}}{U_{i, k, h}}$ of task τ_i .

Proof: The schedulability test (under a specified last release time ordering π) in Lemma 13 satisfies Definition 2 with $\alpha_i = \beta_i = 1$. Therefore, we can apply Lemmas 1 and 2 to reach the conclusion of the proof. \blacksquare

A naïve implementation to calculate $t_{i, q}$ and $rbf(i, q, t)$ requires $O(m_i)$ time complexity. Therefore, calculating $U_{i, k, h}$ and $C_{i, k, h}$ requires $O(m_i^2)$ time complexity with such an implementation. It can be calculated with better data structures and implementations to achieve $O(m_i)$ time complexity. That is, we first calculate $t_{i, 0}$ and $rbf(i, 0, t_{i, 0})$ in $O(m_i)$ time complexity. The overall time complexity to calculate the following $t_{i, q}$ and $rbf(i, q, t_{i, q})$ can be done in $O(m_i)$ by using simple algebra. Therefore, the time complexity of the schedulability test in Theorem 11 is $O(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i + k \log k)$.

Remarks: Although we focus ourselves on generalized multiframe task systems in this section, it can be easily seen that our approach can also be adopted to find polynomial-time tests based on the request bound function presented in [28]. Since such functions have been shown useful for schedulability tests in more generalized task models, including the digraph task model [44], the recurring real-time task model [6], etc., the above approach can also be applied for such models by quantifying the utilization (e.g., $U_{i, k, h}$) and the execution time (e.g., $C_{i, k, h}$) of task τ_i based on the *limited* options of the last release times before the deadline (e.g., $D_{k, h}$ in generalized multi-frame) to be tested.

Appendix F: Acyclic and Multi-Mode Tasks

This section considers the acyclic model, proposed in [1]. That is, each task τ_i is specified only by its utilization U_i . An instance of task τ_i can have different worst-case execution times and different relative deadlines. If an instance of task τ_i

⁹The reason why this is not an exact test was recently provided by Stigge and Wang in [45].

arrives at time t with execution time $C_{i,t}$, its relative deadline is $\frac{C_{i,t}}{U_i}$, and the next instance of task τ_i can only be released after $t + \frac{C_{i,t}}{U_i}$.

For systems with known modes, we can also define a multi-mode task system. A multi-mode task τ_i with m_i modes is denoted by a set of triplet: $\tau_i = \{\tau_{i,0} = \{C_{i,0}, D_{i,0}, T_{i,0}\}, \tau_{i,1} = \{C_{i,1}, D_{i,1}, T_{i,1}\}, \dots, \tau_{i,m_i-1} = \{C_{i,m_i-1}, D_{i,m_i-1}, T_{i,m_i-1}\}\}$ to specify the worst-case execution time $C_{i,j}$, the minimum inter-arrival time $T_{i,j}$, and the relative deadline $D_{i,j}$ of the corresponding task mode $\tau_{i,j}$. For a multi-mode task τ_i , when a job of mode $\tau_{i,j}$ is released at time t , this job has to be finished no later than its absolute deadline at time $t + D_{i,j}$, and the next release time of task τ_i is no earlier than $t + T_{i,j}$. We only consider systems with constrained deadlines, in which $D_{i,j} \leq T_{i,j}$. This model is studied in our paper [31]. The difference between this model and the generalized multi-frame model is that the system can switch arbitrarily among any two modes if the temporal separation constraints in the multi-mode model are respected.

We will focus on mode-level fixed-priority scheduling on uniprocessor scheduling in this section. Suppose that we are testing whether task $\tau_{k,h}$ can be feasibly scheduled. Let $hp(\tau_{k,h})$ be the set of task mode $\tau_{k,h}$ and the other task modes with higher priority than task mode $\tau_{k,h}$. It is important to note that $\tau_{k,h}$ is also in $hp(\tau_{k,h})$ for the simplicity of presentation. For notational brevity, we assume that there are $k-1$ tasks with higher-priority task modes than $\tau_{k,h}$. Moreover, for the rest of this section, we implicitly assume that the tasks in $hp(\tau_{k,h}) \setminus \{\tau_{k,h}\}$ are schedulable by the mode-level fixed-priority scheduling algorithm under testing.

Let $load(i, t)$ be the maximum workload of task τ_i (by considering all the task modes $\tau_{i,j} \in hp(\tau_{k,h})$) released from 0 to t such that the next mode can be released at time t . That is, let $n_{i,q}$ be a non-negative integer to denote the number of times that task mode $\tau_{i,q}$ is released, in which

$$load(i, t) = \max_{\tau_{i,q} \in hp(\tau_{k,h})} \left\{ \sum_q n_{i,q} C_{i,q} \right. \\ \left. \text{s.t. } \sum_q n_{i,q} T_{i,q} \leq t \right\}.$$

We denote $C_i^{\max}(\tau_{k,h})$ the maximum mode execution time among the higher-priority modes of task τ_i than task mode $\tau_{k,h}$, i.e., $\max_{\tau_{i,j} \in hp(\tau_{k,h})} C_{i,j}$ for a given index i . Similarly, we denote $U_i^{\max}(\tau_{k,h})$ the maximum mode utilization among the higher-priority modes of task τ_i than task mode $\tau_{k,h}$, i.e., $\max_{\tau_{i,j} \in hp(\tau_{k,h})} \frac{C_{i,j}}{T_{i,j}}$ for a given index i . For notational brevity, since we define $C_i^{\max}(\tau_{k,h})$ and $U_i^{\max}(\tau_{k,h})$ by referring to $\tau_{k,h}$, we will simplify the notation by using C_i^{\max} and U_i^{\max} , respectively, for the rest of this section.

Suppose that the last release of task τ_i in the window of interest is at t_i . We define the request bound function for such a case as follows:

$$rbf(i, t_i, t) = \begin{cases} load(i, t_i) & \text{if } t \leq t_i \\ load(i, t_i) + C_i^{\max} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (63)$$

Lemma 14. *Task $\tau_{k,h}$ in a multi-mode task system with constrained deadlines is schedulable by a mode-level fixed-*

priority scheduling algorithm on uniprocessor systems if

$$\forall y \geq 0, \quad \forall 0 \leq t_i < y + D_{k,h} \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1 \\ \exists t, \quad 0 < t \leq y + D_{k,h}, \quad C_{k,h} + load(k, y) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} rbf(i, t_i, t) \leq t.$$

Proof: This is proved by contrapositive. Suppose that $\tau_{k,h}$ misses its deadline firstly at time $d_{k,h}$. We know that this job of $\tau_{k,h}$ arrives to the system at time $a_1 = d_{k,h} - D_{k,h}$. Due to the scheduling policy, we know that the processor is busy executing jobs in $hp(\tau_{k,h})$ (recall that $\tau_{k,h}$ is also in $hp(\tau_{k,h})$) from a_1 to $d_{k,h}$. Let a_0 be the last time point in the above schedule before a_1 such that the processor is idle or executing any job with lower priority than $\tau_{k,h}$. It is clear that a_0 is well-defined. Therefore, the processor executes only jobs in $hp(\tau_{k,h})$ from a_0 to $d_{k,h}$. We denote $a_1 - a_0$ as y . Let the last release of the task modes of task τ_i before $d_{k,h}$ be $a_0 + t_i$. If task τ_i does not have any release, we set t_i to 0. Therefore, we have $0 \leq t_i < y + D_{k,h}$.

Without loss of generality, we set a_0 to 0. Therefore, the workload requested by the modes of task τ_i at any time t before (and at) t_i is no more than $load(i, t)$. Moreover, the workload released by the modes of task τ_i at any time t after t_i is no more than $load(i, t_i) + C_i^{\max}$. As a result, the function $rbf(i, t_i, t)$ defined in Eq. (63) is a safe upper bound of the workload requested by task τ_i up to time t .

By the definition of the task model, task mode $\tau_{k,h}$ and the other higher-priority task modes of task τ_k may also release some workload before a_1 , in which the workload is upper bounded by $load(k, y)$. The assumption of non-schedulability of task $\tau_{k,h}$ in the above schedule and the busy execution in the interval $(a_0, d_{k,h}]$ implies that the above workload at any point t in the interval $(a_0, d_{k,h}]$ is larger than t . Therefore, we know that

$$\exists y \geq 0, \quad \exists 0 \leq t_i < y + D_{k,h} \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1 \\ \forall t, \quad 0 < t \leq y + D_{k,h}, \quad C_{k,h} + load(k, y) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} rbf(i, t_i, t) > t,$$

which concludes the proof by contrapositive. \blacksquare

Evaluating $load(i, t)$ is in fact equivalent to the *unbounded knapsack problem* (UKP). The UKP problem is to select some items in a collection of items with specified weights and profits so that the total weight of the selected items is less than or equal to a given limit (called knapsack) and total profit of the selected items is maximized, in which an item can be selected unbounded multiple times. The definition of $load(i, t)$ is essentially an unbounded knapsack problem, by considering t as the knapsack constraint, the minimum inter-arrival time (period) of a task mode as the weight of an item, and the execution time of a task mode as the profit of the item.

Lemma 15.

$$load(i, t) \leq U_i^{\max} \cdot t. \quad (64)$$

Proof: It has been shown in [42] that an upper bound of the above unbounded knapsack problem is $(\max_{\tau_{i,j} \in hp(\tau_{k,h})} \{ \frac{C_{i,j}}{T_{i,j}} \}) \cdot t = U_i^{\max} \cdot t$, which completes the proof. \blacksquare

By Lemma 14 and Lemma 15, we can now apply the k^2Q

framework to obtain the polynomial-time schedulability test in the following theorems.

Theorem 12. For a given task τ_i and a task mode $\tau_{k,h}$ under testing, let $C_i^{\max} = \max_{\tau_{i,j} \in hp(\tau_{k,h})} C_{i,j}$ and $U_i^{\max} = \max_{\tau_{i,j} \in hp(\tau_{k,h})} \frac{C_{i,j}}{T_{i,j}}$. Suppose that there are $k-1$ tasks with higher-priority modes than task mode $\tau_{k,h}$. Let Δ_k^{\max} be $\max\{\max_{\tau_{k,j} \in hp(\tau_{k,h})} \{\frac{C_{k,j}}{T_{k,j}}\}, \frac{C_{k,h}}{D_{k,h}}\}$. Suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} C_i^{\max} < D_{k,h}$. Task $\tau_{k,h}$ in a multi-mode task system with constrained deadlines is schedulable by a mode-level fixed-priority scheduling algorithm on a uniprocessor system if $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^{\max} \leq 1$ and

$$\Delta_k^{\max} \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^{\max} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (C_i^{\max} - U_i^{\max} (\sum_{\ell=i}^{k-1} C_{\ell}^{\max}))}{D_{k,h}}, \quad (65)$$

in which the $k-1$ higher-priority tasks are indexed in a non-increasing order of $\frac{C_i^{\max}}{U_i^{\max}}$ of task τ_i .

Proof: Suppose that t_i is given for each task τ_i . For the given t_i , we can define the last release time ordering, in which $t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_{k-1} \leq D_{k,h} + y = t_k$. By Lemma 15, we can pessimistically rephrase the schedulability test in Lemma 14 to verify whether there exists $t_j \in \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k\}$ such that $\Delta_k^{\max}(D_{k,h} + y) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^{\max} t_i + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} C_i^{\max} \leq t_j$. Therefore, we reach Definition 2 with $\alpha_i = 1$ and $\beta_i = 1$, and, hence, can apply Lemmas 1 and 2. Moreover, with the same argument in the proof of Theorem 9, we know that the resulting schedulability condition is the worst if y is 0 under the assumption $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^{\max} \leq 1$. ■

Theorem 13. For a given task τ_i and a task mode $\tau_{k,h}$ under testing, let $U_i^{\max} = \max_{\tau_{i,j} \in hp(\tau_{k,h})} \frac{C_{i,j}}{T_{i,j}}$. Suppose that there are $k-1$ tasks with higher-priority modes than task mode $\tau_{k,h}$. Let U_k^{\max} be $\max\{\max_{\tau_{k,j} \in hp(\tau_{k,h})} \{\frac{C_{k,j}}{T_{k,j}}\}, \frac{C_{k,h}}{T_{k,h}}\}$. Suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^k U_i^{\max} \leq 1$. Task $\tau_{k,h}$ in a multi-mode task system with implicit deadlines is schedulable by the mode-level RM scheduling algorithm on a uniprocessor system if the following condition holds

$$U_k^{\max} \leq 1 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^{\max} + 0.5 \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^{\max} \right)^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (U_i^{\max})^2 \right) \right), \quad (66)$$

or

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^{\max} \leq \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \right) \left(2 - \sqrt{2 + 2U_k^{\max} \frac{k}{k-1}} \right), \quad (67)$$

or

$$U_k^{\max} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^{\max} \leq \begin{cases} \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \right) \left(2 - \sqrt{4 - \frac{2k}{k-1}} \right), & \text{if } k > 3 \\ 1 - \frac{(k-1)}{2k} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (68)$$

Proof: Due to the RM property, we know that $T_{i,j} \leq T_{k,h}$ if $\tau_{i,j}$ is in $hp(\tau_{k,h})$. Therefore, $C_i^{\max} \leq T_{k,h} U_i^{\max}$. We now reach the conditions in Lemmas 3, 4, and 5 with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 1$. The three conditions are directly from these lemmas. ■

Note that the above tests assume implicitly that the tasks in $hp(\tau_{k,h})$ are already tested to be schedulable under the

scheduling policy. Therefore, we have to apply the results in Theorems 12 and 13 by testing all the task modes from the highest priority to the lowest priority. The following theorem provides the utilization bound for testing the whole task set in linear time for mode-level RM scheduling.

Corollary 5. Suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^k U_i \leq 1$. A system with k acyclic tasks with utilization U_1, U_2, \dots, U_k is schedulable by the mode-level RM scheduling algorithm on a uniprocessor system if

$$\sum_{i=1}^k U_i \leq \begin{cases} \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \right) \left(2 - \sqrt{4 - \frac{2k}{k-1}} \right), & \text{if } k > 3 \\ 1 - \frac{(k-1)}{2k} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (69)$$

or

$$0 \leq 1 - U_k - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i + 0.5 \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \right)^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i^2 \right) \right), \quad (70)$$

where task τ_k is the task with the minimum utilization among the k tasks.

Proof: This comes with similar arguments in Theorem 13. Adopting the utilization bound in Eq. (69) does not need to consider the ordering of the tasks. However, the quadratic bound in Eq. (70) changes for different settings of U_k . Let $\sum_{i=1}^k U_i$ be a given constant H_1 and $\sum_{i=1}^k U_i^2$ be H_2 . Then, the quadratic bound in Eq. (70) becomes $1 - 2H_1 + U_k + 0.5H_1^2 + 0.5H_2 - 0.5U_k^2$. The first order derivative of the quadratic bound with respect to U_k is $1 - U_k$, which implies that the minimum U_k leads to the worst condition in the quadratic bound in Eq. (70) under the condition $U_k \leq 1$. ■

The result in Eq. (69) in Corollary 5 is the same as the utilization bound $2 - \sqrt{2}$ (when $k \rightarrow \infty$) in [1], [31] for such a task model. Our results here are more generic than [1] and can also be easily applied for any (mode-level or task-level) fixed-priority scheduling.