

A Faster-Than Relation for Semi-Markov Decision Processes

Mathias R. Pedersen, Giorgio Bacci, and Kim G. Larsen

October 29, 2018

Abstract

When modeling concurrent or cyber-physical systems, non-functional requirements such as time are important to consider. In order to improve the timing aspects of a model, it is necessary to have some notion of what it means for a process to be faster than another, which can guide the step-wise refinement of the model. To this end we study a *faster-than relation* for semi-Markov decision processes and compare it to standard notions for relating systems. We show that checking whether a system is faster than another one is undecidable, but as a positive result we give a decision procedure for approximating it. Furthermore, we consider the compositional aspects of this relation, and show that the faster-than relation is not a precongruence with respect to parallel composition, hence giving rise to so-called parallel timing anomalies. We take the first steps toward understanding this problem by identifying decidable conditions sufficient to avoid parallel timing anomalies in the absence of non-determinism.

1 Introduction

Timing aspects are important when considering real-time or cyber-physical systems. For example, they are of interest in real-time embedded systems when one wants to verify the worst-case execution time for guaranteeing minimal system performance or in safety-critical systems when one needs to ensure that unavoidable rigid deadlines will always be met [12].

Semi-Markov decision processes are continuous-time Markov decision processes where the residence-time on states is governed by generic distributions on the positive real line. These systems have been extensively used to model real-time cyber-physical systems [16, 26].

For reasoning about timing aspects it is important to understand what it formally means for a real-time or cyber-physical system to operate faster than another. To this end we define the notion of *faster-than relation* for semi-Markov decision processes. The definition of faster-than relation we propose in this paper is a reactive version of an analogous notion of faster-than relation previously introduced in [19] for the case of generative systems. According to our relation, a semi-Markov decision process is faster than another one when it reacts to any sequence of inputs with equal or higher probability than the slower process, within the same time bound.

Similarly to [19], we show that also the faster-than relation on semi-Markov decision processes is undecidable. However, by extending the approximation




Figure 1: The context W operates in parallel with the component V . If the component U is faster than V , then if we replace V with U , we would expect the overall behaviour to also be faster.

algorithm from [19], we obtain an approximation algorithm for the case where we only consider timed events within some fixed time bound. The extension of the algorithm in [19] is not a trivial task, because the definition of faster-than relation on semi-Markov decision processes requires us to deal with universal and existential quantifications over schedulers, which were not present in the original definition in [19] for the case of generative systems.

Often, complex cyber-physical systems are organised as concurrent systems of multiple components running in parallel and interacting with each other. Such systems are better analysed *compositionally*, that is, by breaking them into smaller components that are more easily examined [4]. However, it is not always the case that an analysis on the components carries over to the full composite system. A well known example of this, occurring in real-time systems such as scheduling for processors [3, 13], are *timing anomalies*, that is, when locally faster behaviour leads to a globally slower behaviour [11].

In this paper we study the compositional aspects of the faster-than relation for semi-Markov decision processes. The situation we are interested in is depicted in Figure 1 where we have a composite system consisting of a context W and a component V , and we want to understand what happens when we replace V with another component U that is faster than V . We consider some common notions of parallel composition, and show that timing anomalies can occur using our faster-than relation, even in the absence of non-determinism. This shows that timing anomalies are not caused by non-determinism, but arise from the linear timing behaviour of processes.

We then take a first step toward recovering compositional reasoning for the faster-than relation, by identifying conditions sufficient for avoiding timing anomalies, which we call *monotonicity*. Presently we do not know whether these conditions are decidable, however we introduce another set of conditions, called *strong monotonicity*, which are decidable. Unfortunately, strong monotonicity only applies to processes which have no non-determinism.

Related Work.

The notion of a faster-than relation has been studied in many different contexts throughout the literature. The work most closely related to ours is that of Pedersen et al. [19], which considers a generative version of the faster-than relation, whereas we study the reactive version. The focus of [19] is on decidability issues, and the faster-than relation is proved undecidable. However, positive results are

also given in the form of an approximation algorithm, and a decidability result for unambiguous processes. Baier et al. [1] define, among other relations, a simulation relation for continuous-time Markov chains which can be interpreted as a faster-than relation, and study its logical characterisation. However, none of these works consider compositional aspects.

For process algebras, discrete-time faster-than relations have been defined for variations of Milner’s CCS, and shown to be precongruences with respect to parallel composition [5, 14, 17, 22]. Lüttgen and Vogler [15] attempt to unify some of these process algebraic approaches and also consider the issue of parallel timing anomalies. For Petri nets, Vogler [28, 27] considers a testing preorder as a faster-than relation and shows that this is a precongruence with respect to parallel composition. Geilen et al. [6] introduces a refinement principle for timed actor interfaces under the slogan “the earlier, the better”, which can also be seen as an example of a faster-than relation.

Work on timing anomalies date back to at least 1969 [8], but the most influential paper in the area is probably that of Lundqvist and Stenström [13], in which they show that timing anomalies can occur in dynamically scheduled processors, contrary to what most people assumed at the time. More recent work has focused on compositional aspects [11] and defining timing anomalies formally, using transition systems as the formalism [3, 21].

2 Notation and Preliminaries

In this section we fix some notation and recall concepts that are used throughout the rest of the paper. Let \mathbb{N} denote the natural numbers and let $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ denote the non-negative real numbers, which we equip with the standard Borel σ -algebra \mathbb{B} . For any set X , let $\mathcal{D}(X)$ denote the set of probability measures on X , and let $\mathcal{D}_{\leq}(X)$ denote the set of subprobability measures on X . For an element $x \in X$ of some set X , we will use δ_x to denote the Dirac measure at x defined as $\delta_x(y) = 1$ if $x = y$ and $\delta_x(y) = 0$ otherwise. We fix a non-empty, countable set L of *labels* or *actions* and equip them with the discrete σ -algebra Σ_L .

For a probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$, we denote by F_μ its *cumulative distribution function (CDF)* defined as $F_\mu(t) = \mu([0, t])$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We will denote by $Exp[\theta]$ the CDF of an exponential distribution with rate $\theta > 0$. The *convolution* of two probability measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$, written $\mu * \nu$, is the probability measure on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ given by $(\mu * \nu)(B) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \nu(B - x) \mu(dx)$, for all $B \in \mathbb{B}$ [2]. Convolution is associative, i.e., $\mu * (\nu * \eta) = (\mu * \nu) * \eta$, and commutative, i.e., $\mu * \nu = \nu * \mu$.

3 Semi-Markov Decision Processes

In this section we recall the definition of semi-Markov decision processes.

Definition 3.1. A *semi-Markov decision process (SMDP)* is a tuple $M = (S, \tau, \rho)$ where

- S is a non-empty, countable set of *states*,
- $\tau : S \times L \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\leq}(S)$ is a *transition probability function*, and

- $\rho : S \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ is a *residence-time probability function*. ▲

The operational behaviour of an SMDP $M = (S, \tau, \rho)$ is as follows. The process in the state $s \in S$ reacts to an external input $a \in L$ provided by the environment by changing its state to $s' \in S$ within time $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with probability $\tau(s, a)(s') \cdot \rho(s)([0, t])$.

Notice that Markov decision processes are a special case of SMDPs where for all $s \in S$, $\rho(s) = \delta_0$ (i.e. transitions happen instantaneously), and that continuous-time Markov decision processes are also a special case of SMDPs where, for all states $s \in S$, $F_{\rho(s)} = \text{Exp}[\theta_s]$ for some rate $\theta_s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

The executions of an SMDP $M = (S, \tau, \rho)$ are infinite timed transition sequences of the form $\pi = (s_1, t_1, a_1)(s_2, t_2, a_2) \cdots \in (S \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times L)^\omega$, representing the fact that M waited in state s_i for t_i time units after the action a_i was input. We will refer to executions of an SMDP as *timed action paths*. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\pi[i] = s_i$, $\pi\langle i \rangle = t_i$, $\pi[[i]] = a_i$, $\pi|_i = (s_1, t_1, a_1) \dots (s_i, t_i, a_i)$, and $\pi^i = (s_i, t_i, a_i)(s_{i+1}, t_{i+1}, a_{i+1}) \dots$. We let $\Pi(M)$ denote the set of all timed action paths in M , and denote by $\Pi_n(M) = \{\pi|_n \mid \pi \in \Pi(M)\}$ the set of all prefixes of length n . Hereafter, we refer to timed action paths simply as paths, unless we wish to distinguish between different kinds of paths.

Next we recall the standard construction of the measurable space of paths. A *cylinder set* of rank $n \geq 1$ is the set of all paths whose n th prefix is contained in a common subset $E \subseteq \Pi_n(M)$, and is given by

$$\mathfrak{C}(E) = \{\pi \in \Pi(M) \mid \pi|_n \in E\}.$$

It will be convenient to denote *rectangular cylinders* of the form

$$\mathfrak{C}(S_1 \times L_1 \times R_1 \times \cdots \times S_n \times L_n \times R_n),$$

for $S_i \subseteq S$, $L_i \subseteq L$, and $R_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, as

$$\mathfrak{C}(S_1 \dots S_n, L_1 \dots L_n, R_1 \dots R_n).$$

We denote by $(\Pi(M), \Sigma)$ the *measurable space of timed action paths*, where Σ is the smallest σ -algebra generated by the cylinders of the form

$$\mathfrak{C}(S_1 \dots S_n, L_1 \dots L_n, R_1 \dots R_n)$$

for $S_i \in 2^S$, $L_i \in 2^L$, and $R_i \in \mathbb{B}$.

In this paper we assume that external choices are resolved by means of memoryless stochastic schedulers, however all the results we present still hold for memoryful schedulers.

Definition 3.2. Given an SMDP $M = (S, \tau, \rho)$, a *scheduler* for M is a function $\sigma : S \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(L)$ that assigns to each state a probability distribution over action labels. ▲

We will use the notation $\tau^\sigma(s, a)(s')$ as shorthand for $\tau(s, a)(s') \cdot \sigma(s)(a)$ to denote the probability of moving from state s to s' under the stochastic choice of a given by σ . Given an SMDP M and a scheduler σ for it, the probabilistic execution of a path starting from the state s is governed by the probability $\mathbb{P}_M^\sigma(s)$ on $(\Pi(M), \Sigma)$ defined as follows.




Figure 2: If $F_\mu(t) \geq F_\nu(t)$ for all t , then U is faster than V in the first states, and after that their probabilities are the same, so U is faster than V .

Definition 3.3. Let $M = (S, \tau, \rho)$ be an SMDP. Given a scheduler σ for M and a state $s \in S$, $\mathbb{P}_M^\sigma(s)$ is defined as the unique (sub)probability measure¹ on $(\Pi(M), \Sigma)$ such that for all $S_i \in 2^S$, $L_i \in 2^L$, and $R_i \in \mathbb{B}$, with $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_M^\sigma(s)(\mathfrak{C}(S_1, L_1, R_1)) = \rho(s)(R_1) \cdot \sum_{a \in L_1} \sum_{s' \in S_1} \tau^\sigma(s, a)(s')$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_M^\sigma(s)(\mathfrak{C}(S_1 \dots S_n, L_1 \dots L_n, R_1 \dots R_n)) \\ &= \rho(s)(R_1) \cdot \sum_{a \in L_1} \sum_{s' \in S_1} \tau^\sigma(s, a)(s') \cdot \mathbb{P}_M^\sigma(s')(\mathfrak{C}(S_2 \dots S_n, L_2 \dots L_n, R_2 \dots R_n)). \end{aligned}$$

▲

Intuitively, to get the probability $\mathbb{P}_M^\sigma(s)(\mathfrak{C}(S_1 \dots S_n, L_1 \dots L_n, R_1 \dots R_n))$, we first take the probability that s takes a transition at a time point in R_1 , given by $\rho(s)(R_1)$, after which we sum over the probabilities of all the possible transitions that can be taken by choosing a label $a \in L_1$ and a state $s' \in S_1$, and then the rest of the probability is given inductively by continuing on s' . For the rest of the paper, we will omit the subscript M in \mathbb{P}_M^σ whenever it is clear from the context which SMDP is being referred to.

4 A Faster-Than Relation

Our aim is to define a relation that formalises the intuitive idea of an SMDP U being “faster than” another SMDP V . For a process U to be faster than V , it must be able to execute any sequence of actions a_1, \dots, a_n in less time than V . Since we are dealing with probabilistic systems, we must speak of the probability of executing a sequence of actions within some time bound.

Consider the two simple SMDPs U and V in Figure 2 with just a single transition label and initial states u_0 and v_0 , respectively. Here μ, ν, η are arbitrary probability measures on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, representing the residence-time distributions at each state. An arrow with label (p, a) means that when a is chosen as the action, then the SMDP takes the transition given by the arrow with probability p . The only finite sequences of actions that can be executed in these SMDPs are of the form a^n for $n > 0$.

¹Existence and uniqueness is guaranteed by the Hahn-Kolmogorov theorem [24].

For U to be faster than V , it should be the case that for any time bound t and no matter which scheduler σ we choose for V , we must be able to find a scheduler σ' for U such that there is an earlier time bound $t' \leq t$ which allows U to execute any sequence a^n within time t' with higher or equal probability than that of V executing the same sequence of actions within time t . Formally, this amounts to saying that $\mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(u_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a^n, t')) \geq \mathbb{P}^\sigma(v_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a^n, t))$, where $\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)$ denotes the event of executing the sequence of actions a_1, \dots, a_n within time t . Hence, the type of events on which we want to focus are the following.

Definition 4.1. For any finite sequence of actions a_1, \dots, a_n , and $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we say that

$$\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t) = \{\pi \in \Pi(M) \mid \forall 1 \leq i \leq n, \pi[[i]] = a_i \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^n \pi\langle j \rangle \leq t\}$$

is a *time-bounded cylinder*. The *length* of a time-bounded cylinder is the length of the sequence of actions in the time-bounded cylinder. \blacktriangle

Note that $\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)$ is measurable in $(\Pi(M), \Sigma)$, since

$$f : \Pi_n(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow S^n \times L^n \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$$

given by

$$f((s_1, o_1, t_1), \dots, (s_n, o_n, t_n)) = (s_1, \dots, s_n), (o_1, \dots, o_n), (t_1, \dots, t_n)$$

and

$$\mathbf{res}_n : \Pi(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \Pi_n(\mathcal{M})$$

given by

$$\mathbf{res}_n(\pi) = \pi|_n$$

are both measurable, and hence

$$(f \circ \mathbf{res}_n)^{-1}(S^n \times \{(a_1, \dots, a_n)\} \times B_t^n) = \mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)$$

is measurable, where $B_t^n = \{(r_1, \dots, r_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \leq t\}$.

Example 4.2. The time-bounded cylinder $\mathfrak{C}(aa, 2)$ denotes the set of all paths where the first two output labels are both a 's, and the first two steps of the path are completed within 2 time units. \blacklozenge

We will use the notation (M, s_0) to indicate that $M = (S, \tau, \rho)$ is an SMDP with initial state $s_0 \in S$ and call it *pointed SMDP*. For the rest of the paper, we fix three SMDPs $M = (S, \tau, \rho)$, $U = (S_U, \tau_U, \rho_U)$, and $V = (S_V, \tau_V, \rho_V)$, with initial states $s_0 \in S$, $u_0 \in S_U$, $v_0 \in S_V$, respectively. Now we are ready to define what it means for an SMDP to be “faster than” another one.

Definition 4.3 (Faster-than). We say that U is *faster than* V , written $U \preceq V$, if for all schedulers σ for V , time bounds t , and sequences of actions $a_1 \dots a_n$, there exists a scheduler σ' for U and time bound $t' \leq t$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(u_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t')) \geq \mathbb{P}^\sigma(v_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)).$$

\blacktriangle

Clearly, the faster-than relation \preceq is a preorder. The following proposition gives a characterisation of the faster-than relation that is often easier to work with.

Proposition 4.4. *$U \preceq V$ iff for all schedulers σ for V there exists a scheduler σ' for U such that $\mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(u_0)(C) \geq \mathbb{P}^\sigma(v_0)(C)$, for all time-bounded cylinders C .*

Proof. Clearly, if for all schedulers σ for V there exists a scheduler σ' for U such that $\mathbb{P}^\sigma(u_0)(C) \geq \mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(v_0)(C)$ for all time-bounded cylinders C , then $U \preceq V$ by taking $C' = C$. If $U \preceq V$, then consider an arbitrary scheduler σ , and time-bounded cylinder $C = \mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)$. There exists a scheduler σ' and $t' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $t \geq t'$ and

$$\mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(u_0)(a_1 \dots a_n, t') \geq \mathbb{P}^\sigma(v_0)(a_1 \dots a_n, t).$$

By monotonicity, $t \geq t'$ implies that

$$\mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(u_0)(a_1 \dots a_n, t) \geq \mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(u_0)(a_1 \dots a_n, t'),$$

and hence $\mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(u_0)(C) \geq \mathbb{P}^\sigma(v_0)(C)$. \blacksquare

Before showing an example of an SMDP being faster than another one, we provide an analytic solution for computing the probability over time-bounded cylinders in terms of convolutions of the residence time distributions.

Proposition 4.5. *For any SMDP M , scheduler σ for M , and $s \in S$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(\mathfrak{C}(S_1 \dots S_n, L_1 \dots L_n, R_1 \dots R_n)) \\ &= \sum_{s_n \in S_n} \sum_{a_n \in L_n} \dots \sum_{s_1 \in S_1} \sum_{a_1 \in L_1} \tau^\sigma(s, a_1)(s_1) \dots \tau^\sigma(s_{n-1}, a_n)(s_n) \\ & \quad \cdot \rho(s) \times \rho(s_1) \times \dots \times \rho(s_{n-1})(R_1 \times R_2 \times \dots \times R_n). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on the length n of the cylinder. If the cylinder has length $n = 1$ then

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(\mathfrak{C}(S_1, L_1, R_1)) = \sum_{s_1 \in S_1} \sum_{a_1 \in L_1} \tau^\sigma(s, a_1)(s_1) \cdot \rho(s)(R_1).$$

If the cylinder has length $n = k + 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(\mathfrak{C}(S_1 \dots S_{k+1}, L_1 \dots L_{k+1}, R_1 \dots R_{k+1})) \\ &= \rho(s)(R_1) \cdot \sum_{s_1 \in S_1} \sum_{a_1 \in L_1} \tau^\sigma(s, a_1)(s_1) \cdot \\ & \quad \mathbb{P}^\sigma(s_1)(\mathfrak{C}(S_2 \dots S_{k+1}, L_2 \dots L_{k+1}, R_2 \dots R_{k+1})) \\ &= \rho(s)(R_1) \cdot \sum_{s_1 \in S_1} \sum_{a_1 \in L_1} \tau^\sigma(s, a_1)(s_1) \\ & \quad \cdot \sum_{s_{k+1} \in S_{k+1}} \sum_{a_{k+1} \in L_{k+1}} \dots \sum_{s_2 \in S_2} \sum_{a_2 \in L_2} \tau^\sigma(s_1, a_2)(s_2) \dots \tau^\sigma(s_k, a_{k+1})(s_{k+1}) \\ & \quad \cdot \rho(s_1) \times \dots \times \rho(s_{k+1})(R_2 \times \dots \times R_{k+1}) \\ &= \sum_{s_{k+1} \in S_{k+1}} \sum_{a_{k+1} \in L_{k+1}} \dots \sum_{s_1 \in S_1} \sum_{a_1 \in L_1} \tau^\sigma(s, a_1)(s_1) \dots \tau^\sigma(s_k, a_{k+1})(s_{k+1}) \\ & \quad \cdot \rho(s) \times \rho(s_1) \times \dots \times \rho(s_{k+1})(R_1 \times \dots \times R_{k+1}). \end{aligned} \quad \blacksquare$$

Corollary 4.6. For any SMDP M , scheduler σ for M , $s \in S$, and Borel set $B \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(\mathfrak{C}(S \dots S, \{a_1\} \dots \{a_n\}, B)) \\ &= \sum_{s_n \in S} \dots \sum_{s_1 \in S} \tau^\sigma(s, a_1)(s_1) \dots \tau^\sigma(s_{n-1}, a_n)(s_n) \\ & \quad \cdot \rho(s) \times \rho(s_1) \times \dots \times \rho(s_{n-1})(B). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.7. For any SMDP $M = (S, \tau, \rho)$, scheduler σ for M , and $s \in S$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)) \\ &= \sum_{s_1 \in S} \dots \sum_{s_n \in S} \tau^\sigma(s, a_1)(s_1) \dots \tau^\sigma(s_{n-1}, a_n)(s_n) \\ & \quad \cdot (\rho(s) * \rho(s_1) * \dots * \rho(s_{n-1}))([0, t]). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Corollary 4.6, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)) \\ &= \sum_{s_1 \in S} \dots \sum_{s_n \in S} \tau^\sigma(s, a_1)(s_1) \dots \tau^\sigma(s_{n-1}, a_n)(s_n) \\ & \quad \cdot \rho(s) \times \rho(s_1) \times \dots \times \rho(s_{n-1})(B_t^n). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if we can show that

$$\rho(s) \times \rho(s_1) \times \dots \times \rho(s_{n-1})(B_t^n) = (\rho(s) * \rho(s_1) * \dots * \rho(s_{n-1}))([0, t]),$$

the proof is done.

The proof now proceeds by induction on the length n of the time-bounded cylinder $\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)$. If $n = 1$, then

$$\rho(s)(B_t^1) = \rho(s)([0, t]).$$

If $n = k + 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & (\rho(s) \times \rho(s_1) \times \dots \times \rho(s_k))(B_t^{k+1}) \\ &= \int_0^t (\rho(s_1) \times \dots \times \rho(s_k))(B_{t-x}^k) \rho(s)(dx) && \text{(Fubini)} \\ &= \int_0^t (\rho(s_1) * \dots * \rho(s_k))([0, t-x]) \rho(s)(dx) && \text{(ind. hyp.)} \\ &= (\rho(s) * (\rho(s_1) * \dots * \rho(s_k)))([0, t]) && \text{(def. of convolution)} \\ &= (\rho(s) * \rho(s_1) * \dots * \rho(s_k))([0, t]). && \text{(associativity)} \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.7 intuitively says that the absorption-time of any path of length n through the SMDP is distributed as the n -fold convolution of its residence-time probabilities. Therefore, the probability of doing transitions with labels a_1, \dots, a_n within time t is the sum of the probabilities of taking a path of length n with labels a_1, \dots, a_n through the SMDP, weighted by the probability

of reaching the end of each of these paths within time t . This is similar in spirit to a result on phase-type distributions, see e.g. [20, Proposition 2.11].

From Proposition 4.7 we can also derive the following which gives a more direct inductive definition of the probability on time-bounded cylinders. If we fix $a_1 \dots a_n$ and let t vary, we get a CDF

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(a_1 \dots a_n)([0, t]) = \mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)).$$

Proposition 4.8. *The CDF $\mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(a_1 \dots a_n)$ can be characterised inductively by*

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(a_1)([0, t]) = \sum_{s' \in S} \tau^\sigma(s, a_1)(s') \cdot \rho(s)([0, t]),$$

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(a_1 \dots a_n)([0, t]) = \sum_{s' \in S} \tau^\sigma(s, a_1)(s') \cdot (\rho(s) * \mathbb{P}^\sigma(s')(a_2 \dots a_n))([0, t]).$$

Proof. For $n = 1$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(a)([0, t]) = \mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(\mathfrak{C}(a, t)) = \sum_{s' \in S} \tau^\sigma(s, a)(s') \cdot \rho(s)([0, t]).$$

For $n = k + 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(a_1 \dots a_n) \\ &= \sum_{s_1 \in S} \dots \sum_{s_n \in S} \tau^\sigma(s, a_1)(s_1) \dots \tau^\sigma(s_k, a_n)(s_n) \cdot (\rho(s) * \dots * \rho(s_n))([0, t]) \\ &= \sum_{s_1 \in S} \dots \sum_{s_n \in S} \tau^\sigma(s, a_1)(s_1) \dots \tau^\sigma(s_k, a_n)(s_n) \\ & \quad \cdot \int_0^t (\rho(s_1) * \dots * \rho(s_n))(t - x) \rho(s)(dx) \\ &= \sum_{s_1 \in S} \tau^\sigma(s, a_1)(s_1) \cdot (\rho(s) * \mathbb{P}^\sigma(s_1)(a_2 \dots a_n))([0, t]). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.8 also shows that our definition of faster-than coincides with the one from [19], except ours is reactive rather than generative.

Example 4.9. Consider the pointed SMDPs (U, u_0) and (V, v_0) that are depicted in Figure 2. Assuming that $F_\mu(t) \geq F_\nu(t)$ for all t , we now show that $U \preceq V$. To compare U and V , first notice that we only need to consider time-bounded cylinders of the form $\mathfrak{C}(a^n, t)$, for $n \geq 1$. Since the set of actions is $L = \{a\}$, the only possible valid scheduler σ for both U and V is the one assigning the Dirac measure δ_a to all states. We consider two cases.

(Case $n = 1$) In this case we get

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(u_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a, t)) = F_\mu(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}^\sigma(v_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a, t)) = F_\nu(t).$$

Since we assumed $F_\mu(t) \geq F_\nu(t)$ for all t , this implies

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(u_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a, t)) \geq \mathbb{P}^\sigma(v_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a, t)).$$

(Case $n > 1$) By Proposition 4.7 we have both

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(u_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a^n, t)) = (\mu * \nu * \eta^{*(n-2)})([0, t])$$




Figure 3: Example showing that the faster-than relation and the simulation relation are incomparable.

and

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(v_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a^n, t)) = (\nu * \mu * \eta^{*(n-2)})([0, t]),$$

where η^{*n} is the n -fold convolution of η , defined inductively by $\eta^{*0} = \delta_0$ and $\eta^{*(n+1)} = \eta * \eta^{*n}$. Since convolution is commutative and associative, and δ_0 is the identity for convolution, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(u_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a^n, t)) = \mathbb{P}^\sigma(v_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a^n, t)).$$

We therefore conclude that $U \preceq V$. ◆

4.1 Comparison With Simulation and Bisimulation

The standard notions used to compare processes are bisimulation [18] and simulation [1]. We next recall their definitions, naturally extended to our setting of SMDPs.

Definition 4.10. For an SMDP M , a relation $R \subseteq S \times S$ is a *bisimulation relation* (resp. *simulation relation*) on M if for all $(s_1, s_2) \in R$ we have

- $F_{\rho(s_1)}(t) = F_{\rho(s_2)}(t)$ (resp. $F_{\rho(s_1)}(t) \leq F_{\rho(s_2)}(t)$) for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and
- for all $a \in L$ there exists a weight function $\Delta_a : S \times S \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that
 - $\Delta_a(s, s') > 0$ implies $(s, s') \in R$,
 - $\tau(s_1, a)(s) = \sum_{s' \in S} \Delta_a(s, s')$ for all $s \in S$, and
 - $\tau(s_2, a)(s') = \sum_{s \in S} \Delta_a(s, s')$ for all $s' \in S$.

If there is a bisimulation relation (resp. simulation relation) R such that $(s_1, s_2) \in R$, then we say that s_1 and s_2 are *bisimilar* (resp. s_2 *simulates* s_1) and write $s_1 \sim s_2$ (resp. $s_1 \preceq s_2$). ▲

We lift bisimulation and simulation relations to two different SMDPs by considering the disjoint union of the two and comparing their initial states. We denote by \sim the largest bisimulation relation and by \preceq the largest simulation relation. Furthermore, we say that U and V are *equally fast* and write $U \equiv_{\text{ft}} V$ if $U \preceq V$ and $V \preceq U$.

Example 4.11. Consider the two SMDPs U and V in Figure 3 with the same probability measure μ in all states. It is easy to see that U is bisimilar to V ,

and hence U also simulates V . However, we show that $U \not\preceq V$ in the following way. Construct the scheduler σ for V by letting

$$\sigma(v_0)(a) = 0.5, \sigma(v_0)(b) = 0.5, \sigma(v_1)(a) = 1, \text{ and } \sigma(v_2)(b) = 1.$$

Now, for any scheduler σ' for U , we must have either

$$\sigma'(u_0)(a) < 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \sigma'(u_0)(b) < 1.$$

If $\sigma'(u_0)(a) < 1$, then

$$\sigma'(u_0)(a) > (\sigma'(u_0)(a))^2 > \dots > (\sigma'(u_0)(a))^n.$$

Furthermore, we see that

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(v_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a^n, t)) = 0.5 \cdot \mu^{*n}(t) \text{ and } \mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(u_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a^n, t)) = (\sigma'(u_0)(a))^n \cdot \mu^{*n}(t)$$

for $n > 1$. Take some n such that $(\sigma'(u_0)(a))^n < 0.5$. In that case we get $\mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(u_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a^n, t)) < \mathbb{P}^\sigma(v_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a^n, t))$. The same procedure can be used in case $\sigma'(u_0)(b) < 1$. Hence we conclude that $U \not\preceq V$, and therefore also that $U \not\equiv_{\text{ft}} V$. \blacklozenge

Example 4.11 also works for schedulers with memory, although the argument has to be modified a bit. In that case, in each step either the probability of a trace consisting only of a 's or the probability of a trace consisting only of b 's must decrease in U , so after some number of steps, the probability of one of these two must decrease below 0.5, and then the rest of the argument is the same.

Example 4.12. Consider the SMDPs U and V in Figure 2 and let $F_\mu = \text{Exp}[\theta_1]$ and $F_\nu = \text{Exp}[\theta_2]$ be exponential distributions with rates $\theta_1 > \theta_2 > 0$. Then, as shown in Example 4.9, it holds that $U \preceq V$. However, we have both $U \not\preceq V$ and $U \not\sim V$. \blacklozenge

From Examples 4.11 and 4.12, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 4.13. \preceq and \preceq are incomparable, \sim and \preceq are incomparable, and we have $\sim \not\equiv_{\text{ft}}$.

5 Approximation

It has been shown in [19] that the faster-than relation is undecidable for the generative case. A small modification of the argument shows that the same is true for the reactive case.

Theorem 5.1. *It is undecidable whether $U \preceq V$.*

Proof. The result follows from the fact that $U \preceq V$ is undecidable for the generative case. Let $U = (S_U, \tau, \rho)$ be a generative Markov process with set of actions L and construct the reactive Markov process $V = (S_V, \tau', \rho')$ as follows. Let $L' = L \cup \{\#\}$, where $\#$ is a new symbol not in L . For every state $s \in S_U$, we let $s^a \in S_V$ for every symbol $a \in L'$.

$$\tau'(s_1^a, a')(s_2^{a''}) = \begin{cases} \tau(s_1)(a', s_2) & \text{if } a = a' \in L \text{ and } a'' = \# \\ \frac{1}{|L'|} & \text{if } a = a' = \# \text{ and } a'' \in L. \end{cases}$$

So each state s^a only has one outgoing action, namely a , and hence controllers play no role in the probabilities of V . Finally, let $\rho'(s^a) = \rho(s)$. Then we have

$$P_U(s)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)) = |L'|^n P_V(s^\sharp)(\mathfrak{C}(\sharp a_1 \sharp \dots \sharp a_n, t)),$$

and hence

$$P_U(s_1)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)) \geq P_U(s_2)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t))$$

if and only if

$$P_V(s_1^\sharp)(\mathfrak{C}(\sharp a_1 \sharp \dots \sharp a_n, t)) \geq P_V(s_2^\sharp)(\mathfrak{C}(\sharp a_1 \sharp \dots \sharp a_n, t)).$$

This means that $s_1 \leq s_2$ if and only if $s_1^\sharp \leq s_2^\sharp$. ■

In view of Theorem 5.1, we can extend the approximation algorithm for the generative case from [19] to the reactive case. In order to do this, we need to also consider the schedulers that are necessary for reactive systems. Instead of deciding the faster-than relation, we consider the time-bounded approximation problem, which asks the following: Given $\varepsilon > 0$, a time bound $b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and two SMDPs U and V , determine whether for all schedulers σ there exists a scheduler σ' such that

$$\mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(u_0)(C) \geq \mathbb{P}^\sigma(v_0)(C) - \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

for all time-bounded cylinders $C = \mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, x)$ where $x \leq b$.

First we identify the kind of distributions for which our algorithm will work. Given a class \mathcal{C} of distributions, we let $\text{Convex}(\mathcal{C})$ denote the closure of \mathcal{C} under convex combinations, and $\text{Conv}(\mathcal{C})$ denote the closure of \mathcal{C} under both convex combinations and convolutions.

Definition 5.2. A class of distributions \mathcal{C} is *effective* if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{C})$, $\{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid \mu_1([0, t]) \geq \mu_2([0, t]) - \varepsilon \text{ and } t \leq b\}$ is a semialgebraic set. ▲

A semialgebraic set is essentially one that can be expressed in the first-order theory of the reals, and hence membership in such a set can be decided by utilising the decidability of the first-order theory of reals [25]. In addition to effectiveness, we will also require residence-time distributions to take some non-zero amount of time to fire. This requirement is made precise by the following definition.

Definition 5.3. A class \mathcal{C} of distributions is *slow* if for any finite subset $\mathcal{C}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, there exists a computable function $\varepsilon : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n \in \text{Convex}(\mathcal{C}_0)$ we have

$$(\mu_1 * \dots * \mu_n)([0, t]) \leq \varepsilon(n, t)$$

and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon(n, t) = 0$. ▲

It has been shown in [19] that the class of uniform distributions and the class of exponential distributions are both effective and slow. The importance of the closure under convex combinations and convolutions in Definition 5.2 is explained by the following lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of distributions, and let U be a SMDP with residence-time distributions taken from \mathcal{C} . Then $\mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(a_1 \dots a_n) \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{C})$ for any scheduler σ , state s , and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in L$.*

Proof. The lemma follows essentially from Proposition 4.8. For $n = 1$ we get

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(a) = \sum_{s' \in S} \tau^\sigma(s, a)(s') \cdot \rho(s) \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{C}).$$

For $n > 1$ we get

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(a_1 \dots a_n) = \sum_{s' \in S} \tau^\sigma(s, a)(s') \cdot (\rho(s) * \mathbb{P}^\sigma(s')(a_2 \dots a_n)),$$

and since $\mathbb{P}^\sigma(s')(a_2 \dots a_n) \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{C})$ by induction hypothesis, it follows that $\mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(a_1 \dots a_n) \in \text{Conv}(\mathcal{C})$. ■

Lemma 5.4 shows that, for fixed schedulers σ and σ' , we can decide whether $\mathbb{P}^\sigma(u)(C) \geq \mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(v)(C)$ whenever U and V have effective residence-time distributions using the first-order theory of reals.

The following theorem shows that, again for fixed schedulers, we can find an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the probability of any time-bounded cylinder with length greater than N is less than ε . Therefore any such time-bounded cylinder trivially satisfies the inequality (1) and can thus be disregarded.

Theorem 5.5 ([19, Theorem 5]). *Let U be a SMDP with slow residence-time distributions. For any state $s \in S$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and scheduler σ , there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{P}^\sigma(s)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, b)) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq N$.*

All that is left now is to consider schedulers. However, since we only need to consider time-bounded cylinders up to some finite length, we can also represent a scheduler as a collection of finitely many probability distributions over the action labels. Each such distribution can in turn be represented as a collection of real variables that must sum to no more than 1. Hence schedulers can also be represented in the first-order theory of reals.

Theorem 5.6. *Let U be a SMDP with slow residence-time distributions. Then the time-bounded approximation problem is decidable.*

Proof. By Theorem 5.5, we can find some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(v_0)(C) - \varepsilon \leq 0$ for any scheduler σ' and any time-bounded cylinder bounded by b and of length $n \geq N$. This means that for any such time-bounded cylinder, we trivially have

$$\mathbb{P}^\sigma(u_0)(C) \geq \mathbb{P}^{\sigma'}(v_0)(C) - \varepsilon$$

for any scheduler σ . It is therefore enough to only consider time-bounded cylinders of length $n \leq N$.

Now let σ be a scheduler. We can represent σ in the first-order theory of reals as follows. For each state s and label a (recall there are finitely many of these), let $x_{s,a}$ be a real variable. Then we interpret $x_{s,a}$ to be the probability $\sigma(s)(a)$, and we impose the constraint $\sum_{a \in L} x_{s,a} \leq 1$. The whole time-bounded approximation problem can therefore be encoded in the first-order theory of reals, and is thus decidable. ■

6 Compositionality

Next we introduce the notion of composition of SMDPs. As argued in [23], the style of synchronous CSP composition is the most natural one to consider for reactive probabilistic systems, so this is the one we will adopt. However, we leave the composition of the residence-times as a parameter, so that we can compare different kinds of composition.

Definition 6.1. A function $\star : \Delta(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) \times \Delta(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}) \rightarrow \Delta(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ is called a *residence-time composition function* if it is commutative, i.e. $\star(\mu, \nu) = \star(\nu, \mu)$ for all $\mu, \nu \in \Delta(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$. \blacktriangle

One example of such a composition function is when \star is a coupling, which is a joint probability measure such that its marginals are μ and ν . A simple special case of this is the product measure $\star(\mu, \nu) = \mu \times \nu$, which is defined by $(\mu \times \nu)(B_1 \times B_2) = \mu(B_1) \cdot \nu(B_2)$ for all Borel B_1 and B_2 .

In order to model the situation in which we want the composite system only to take a transition when both components can take a transition, it is natural to take the minimum of the two probabilities, which corresponds to waiting for the slowest of the two. In that case, we let

$$F_{\star(\mu, \nu)}(t) = \min\{F_\mu(t), F_\nu(t)\},$$

and we call this *minimum composition*. Likewise, if we only require one of the components to be able to take a transition, then it is natural to take the maximum of the two probabilities by letting

$$F_{\star(\mu, \nu)}(t) = \max\{F_\mu(t), F_\nu(t)\},$$

which we call *maximum composition*. A special case of minimum composition is the composition on rates used in PEPA [10], and a special case of maximum composition is the composition on rates used in TIPP [7].

Further knowledge about the processes that are being composed lets one define more specific composition functions. As an example, if we know that the components only have exponential distributions, then we can define composition functions that work directly on the rates of the distributions. If $F_\mu = \text{Exp}[\theta]$ and $F_\nu = \text{Exp}[\theta']$, then one could for example let $\star(\mu, \nu)$ be such that

$$F_{\star(\mu, \nu)} = \text{Exp}[\theta \cdot \theta'].$$

This corresponds to the composition on rates that is used in SPA [9], and we will call it *product composition*. Note that product composition is not given by the product measure.

Definition 6.2. Let \star be a residence-time composition function. Then the \star -composition of U and V , denoted by $U \parallel_\star V = (S, \tau, \rho)$, is given by

- $S = U \times V$,
- $\tau((u, v), a)((u', v')) = \tau_U(u, a)(u') \cdot \tau_V(v, a)(v')$ for all $a \in L$ and $(u', v') \in S$, and
- $\rho((u, v)) = \star(\rho_U(u), \rho_V(v))$. \blacktriangle

When considering the composite SMDP $U \parallel_\star V$ of two SMDPs U and V , we will also write $u \parallel_\star v$ to denote the composite state (u, v) of $U \parallel_\star V$ where $u \in S_U$ and $v \in S_V$.




Figure 4: For different instantiations of μ' , ν' , and η' , the context W leads to parallel timing anomalies for product, minimum, and maximum rate composition, respectively.

6.1 Parallel Timing Anomalies

If we have two components U and V , and we know that U is faster than V , then if V is in parallel with some context W , we would expect this composition to become faster when we replace the component V with the component U . However, sometimes this fails to happen, and we will call such an occurrence a *parallel timing anomaly*.

In this section we show that parallel timing anomalies can occur for some of the kinds of composition discussed in Section 6. We do this by giving different contexts W for the SMDPs U and V from Figure 2, for which it was shown in Example 4.9 that $U \preceq V$. Our examples of parallel timing anomalies make no use of non-determinism or probabilistic branching, thus showing that the parallel timing anomalies are caused inherently by the timing behaviour of the SMDPs. For ease of presentation, we let the set of labels L consist only of the label a in this section.

Consider the two SMDPs U and V depicted in Figure 2. For the examples in this section, let $F_\mu = \text{Exp}[2]$, $F_\nu = \text{Exp}[0.5]$, and let η be arbitrary.

Example 6.3 (Product composition). Let \star be product composition and let the context (W, w_0) be given by Figure 4, where $F_{\mu'} = \text{Exp}[10]$, $F_{\nu'} = \text{Exp}[0.1]$ and $\eta = \eta'$. In $U \parallel_\star W$, the rates in the first two states will then be 20 and 0.05, and in $V \parallel_\star W$ they will be 5 and 0.5. Consider the time-bounded cylinder $\mathfrak{C}(aa, 2)$. Then we see that

$$\mathbb{P}(u_0 \parallel_\star w_0)(\mathfrak{C}(aa, 2)) \approx 0.09 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(v_0 \parallel_\star w_0)(\mathfrak{C}(aa, 2)) \approx 0.30,$$

showing that $U \parallel_\star W \not\preceq V \parallel_\star W$. Hence we have a parallel timing anomaly. What happens is that in the process $V \parallel_\star W$ the probability of taking a transition before time 2 with rate 5 is already very close to 1, so the process $U \parallel_\star W$ does not gain much by having a rate of 20, whereas in the next step, $V \parallel_\star W$ gains a lot of probability by having a rate of 0.5 compared to the rate 0.05 of $U \parallel_\star W$. \blacklozenge

Example 6.4 (Minimum composition). Let \star be minimum composition and let the context (W, w_0) be given by Figure 4, where $F_{\mu'} = \text{Exp}[1]$, $F_{\nu'} = \text{Exp}[2]$, and $\eta = \eta'$. The rates of $U \parallel_\star W$ are then 1 and 0.5, whereas they are 0.5 and 2 in $V \parallel_\star W$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(u_0 \parallel_\star w_0)(\mathfrak{C}(aa, 2)) \approx 0.40 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(v_0 \parallel_\star w_0)(\mathfrak{C}(aa, 2)) \approx 0.51,$$

so $U \parallel_\star W \not\preceq V \parallel_\star W$. What happens in this example is that in the second step, $U \parallel_\star W$ has the same rate as $V \parallel_\star W$ had in the first step. This means that $U \parallel_\star W$ must be proportionally faster in the second step. However, $V \parallel_\star W$ has a rate of 2 in the second step, but $U \parallel_\star W$ only had a rate of 1 in the first step. \blacklozenge

Example 6.5 (Maximum composition). Let \star be maximum composition and let the context (W, w_0) be given by Figure 4, where $F_{\mu'} = \text{Exp}[2]$, $F_{\nu'} = \text{Exp}[1]$, and $\eta = \eta'$. $U \parallel_\star W$ then has rates 2 and 1, and $V \parallel_\star W$ has rates 2 and 2. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(u_0 \parallel_\star w_0)(\mathfrak{C}(aa, 2)) \approx 0.75 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(v_0 \parallel_\star w_0)(\mathfrak{C}(aa, 2)) \approx 0.91,$$

so $U \parallel_\star W_3 \not\leq V \parallel_\star W_3$. The reason for the timing anomaly in this case is clear: $V \parallel_\star W$ simply has a higher rate in each step than $U \parallel_\star W$ does. \blacklozenge

6.2 Avoiding Parallel Timing Anomalies

We have seen in the previous section that parallel timing anomalies can occur. We now wish to understand what kind of contexts do not lead to timing anomalies. In this section we assume that the set L of transition labels is a finite set. Also, we fix a residence-time composition function \star and two additional SMDPs $(W, w_0) = (S_W, \tau_W, \rho_W)$ and $(W', w'_0) = (S_{W'}, \tau_{W'}, \rho_{W'})$ which should be thought of as contexts. Next we identify conditions on (W, w_0) such that $U \preceq V$ will imply $U \parallel_\star W \preceq V \parallel_\star W$.

We first give conditions that over-approximate the faster-than relation between the composite systems by requiring that when U and W are put in parallel, then the composite system is point-wise faster than U along all paths. Likewise, we require that when V and W are put in parallel, the composite system is point-wise slower than V along all paths. If we already know that U is faster than V , this will imply by transitivity that $U \parallel_\star W$ is faster than $V \parallel_\star W$. We have already seen in Example 4.9 that a process U need not be point-wise faster than V along all paths in order for U to be faster than V . However, by imposing this condition, we do not need to compare convolutions of distributions, but can compare the distributions directly.

We first introduce some terminology. We will say that a SMDP M has a *deterministic Markov kernel* if for all states s and labels a , there is at most one state s' such that $\tau(s, a)(s') > 0$.

Definition 6.6. A *state path* in M is a sequence of states s_1, s_2, \dots where for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a label $a \in L$ such that $\tau(s_i, a)(s_{i+1}) > 0$. For a state path $\pi = s_1, s_2, \dots$, we let $\pi[i] = s_i$, $\pi^i = s_i, s_{i+1}, \dots$, $\pi|_i = s_1, s_2, \dots, s_i$, and we let $\Pi[M]$ denote the set of all state paths in M . For a state $s \in S$, we let $\Pi[s] = \{\pi \in \Pi[M] \mid \pi[1] = s\}$ and we let $\Pi_n[s] = \{\pi|_n \mid \pi \in \Pi[s]\}$. \blacktriangle

Definition 6.7. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that \star is *n-monotonic* in U, V, W , and W' , written $(U, W) \lesssim_\star^n (V, W')$, if W' has a deterministic Markov kernel and

- $F_{\rho(\pi_U[i] \parallel_\star \pi_W[i])}(t) \geq F_{\rho_U(\pi_U[i])}(t)$ and $F_{\rho_V(\pi_V[i])}(t) \geq F_{\rho(\pi_V[i] \parallel_\star \pi_{W'}[i])}(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$,
- for all schedulers σ_U for U there exists a scheduler $\sigma_{U,W}$ for $U \parallel_\star W$ such that we have

$$\tau^{\sigma_{U,W}}(\pi_U[i] \parallel_\star \pi_W[i], a)(\pi_U[i+1] \parallel_\star \pi_W[i+1]) \geq \tau_U^{\sigma_U}(\pi_U[i], a)(\pi_U[i+1]),$$

and

- for all schedulers $\sigma_{V,W'}$ for $V \parallel_\star W'$ there exists a scheduler σ_V for V such that we have

$$\tau_V^{\sigma_V}(\pi_V[i], a)(\pi_V[i+1]) \geq \tau^{\sigma_{V,W'}}(\pi_V[i] \parallel_\star \pi_{W'}[i], a)(\pi_V[i+1] \parallel_\star \pi_{W'}[i+1])$$

for all state paths $\pi_U \in \Pi_n[u_0]$, $\pi_V \in \Pi_n[v_0]$, $\pi_W \in \Pi_n[w_0]$, and $\pi_{W'} \in \Pi_n[w'_0]$, and for all $a \in L$ and $1 \leq i < n$. Furthermore, we will say that \star is *monotonic* in U , V , W , and W' and write $(U, W) \lesssim_\star (V, W')$, if it is n -monotonic in U , V , W , and W' for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. \blacktriangle

Clearly, if $(U, W) \lesssim_\star^n (V, W')$, then $(U, W) \lesssim_\star^m (V, W')$ for all $m \leq n$. The next result shows that if $(U, W) \lesssim_\star (V, W')$, then we are guaranteed to avoid parallel timing anomalies.

Theorem 6.8. *If $(U, W) \lesssim_\star (V, W')$ as well as $U \preceq V$ and $W \preceq W'$, then we have $U \parallel_\star W \preceq V \parallel_\star W'$.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, x)$ be an arbitrary time-bounded cylinder, and let $\sigma_{V,W'}$ be an arbitrary scheduler for $V \parallel_\star W'$. Because $(U, W) \lesssim_\star (V, W')$, there exists a scheduler σ_V for V and a path π such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^{\sigma_{V,W'}}(v_0 \parallel_\star w'_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)) \\ &= \tau^{\sigma_{V,W'}}(\pi[1], a_1)(\pi[2]) \cdots \tau^{\sigma_{V,W'}}(\pi[n], a_n)(\pi[n+1]) \\ & \quad \cdot (\rho(\pi[1]) * \cdots * \rho(\pi[n]))([0, t]) \\ & \leq \tau_V^{\sigma_V}(\pi_V[1], a_1)(\pi_V[2]) \cdots \tau_V^{\sigma_V}(\pi_V[n], a_n)(\pi[n+1]) \\ & \quad \cdot (\rho_V(\pi_V[1]) * \cdots * \rho_V(\pi_V[n]))([0, t]) \\ & \leq \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_{n+1}[v_0]} \tau_V^{\sigma_V}(\pi[1], a_1)(\pi[2]) \cdots \tau_V^{\sigma_V}(\pi[n], a_n)(\pi[n+1]) \\ & \quad \cdot (\rho_V(\pi[1]) * \cdots * \rho_V(\pi[n]))([0, t]) \\ & = \mathbb{P}^{\sigma_V}(v_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)), \end{aligned}$$

Since $U \preceq V$, there must exist some scheduler σ_U for U such that

$$\mathbb{P}^{\sigma_V}(v_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)) \leq \mathbb{P}^{\sigma_U}(u_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)).$$

Again, since $(U, W) \lesssim_\star (V, W')$, there exists a scheduler $\sigma_{U,W}$ for $U \parallel_\star W$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^{\sigma_U}(u_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)) \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_{n+1}[u_0]} \tau_U^{\sigma_U}(\pi[1], a_1)(\pi[2]) \cdots \tau_U^{\sigma_U}(\pi[n], a_n)(\pi[n+1]) \\ & \quad \cdot (\rho_U(\pi[1]) * \cdots * \rho_U(\pi[n]))([0, t]) \\ & \leq \sum_{\pi_W \in \Pi_{n+1}[w_0]} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_{n+1}[u_0]} \tau_U^{\sigma_U}(\pi[1], a_1)(\pi[2]) \cdots \tau_U^{\sigma_U}(\pi[n], a_n)(\pi[n+1]) \\ & \quad \cdot (\rho_U(\pi[1]) * \cdots * \rho_U(\pi[n]))([0, t]) \\ & \leq \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_{n+1}[u_0 \parallel_\star w_0]} \tau^{\sigma_{U,W}}(\pi[1], a_1)(\pi[2]) \cdots \tau^{\sigma_{U,W}}(\pi[n], a_n)(\pi[n+1]) \\ & \quad \cdot (\rho(\pi[1]) * \cdots * \rho(\pi[n]))([0, t]) \\ & = \mathbb{P}^{\sigma_{U,W}}(u_0 \parallel_\star w_0)(\mathfrak{C}(a_1 \dots a_n, t)). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

The special case where $W = W'$ shows that this condition is sufficient to avoid parallel timing anomalies. We do not know if it is decidable whether

$(U, W) \lesssim_\star (V, W')$. However, there is a stronger condition which is decidable in the case of finite SMDPs. We present it in the next definition.

Definition 6.9. We say that \star is *strongly n -monotonic* in U, V, W , and W' and write $(U, W) \leq_\star^n (V, W')$ if W' has a deterministic Markov kernel and for all state paths $\pi_U \in \Pi_n[u_0]$, $\pi_V \in \Pi_n[v_0]$, $\pi_W \in \Pi_n[w_0]$, and $\pi_{W'} \in \Pi_n[w'_0]$, the first condition of Definition 6.7 is satisfied and

- for all schedulers σ_U for U and all schedulers $\sigma_{U,W}$ for $U \parallel_\star W$, it is the case that

$$\tau^{\sigma_{U,W}}(\pi_U[i] \parallel_\star \pi_W[i], a)(\pi_U[i+1] \parallel_\star \pi_W[i+1]) \geq \tau^{\sigma_U}(\pi_U[i], a)(\pi_U[i+1]),$$

and

- for all schedulers $\sigma_{V,W'}$ for $V \parallel_\star W'$ and all schedulers σ_V for V , it is the case that

$$\tau^{\sigma_V}(\pi_V[i], a)(\pi_V[i+1]) \geq \tau^{\sigma_{V,W'}}(\pi_V[i] \parallel_\star \pi_{W'}[i], a)(\pi_V[i+1] \parallel_\star \pi_{W'}[i+1])$$

for all $a \in L$ and $1 \leq i < n$. If $(U, W) \leq_\star^n (V, W')$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that \star is *strongly monotonic* in U, V, W , and W' and write $(U, W) \leq_\star (V, W')$. \blacktriangle

The conditions of Definition 6.9 are the second and third conditions from Definition 6.7 with the existential quantifier strengthened to a universal quantifier. It is obvious that $(U, W) \leq_\star (V, W')$ implies $(U, W) \lesssim_\star (V, W')$, and hence we get the following corollary.

Corollary 6.10. *If $(U, W) \leq_\star (V, W')$ as well as $U \preceq V$ and $W \preceq W'$, then $U \parallel_\star W \preceq V \parallel_\star W'$.*

Example 6.11. Let U and V be given by Figure 2 with $F_\mu \geq F_\nu$ as in Example 4.9. Let \star be minimum rate composition and consider the context W from Figure 4, where $\mu' = \mu$, $\nu' = \nu$, and $\eta' = \eta$. There is only one possible scheduler σ , which is the Dirac measure at a , and hence it is clear that the second and third conditions are satisfied. We also find that

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\rho(u_0 \parallel_\star w_0)}(t) &= F_{\rho_U(u_0)}(t) & F_{\rho_V(v_0)}(t) &= F_{\rho(v_0 \parallel_\star w_0)}(t) \\ F_{\rho(u_1 \parallel_\star w_1)}(t) &= F_{\rho_U(u_1)}(t) & F_{\rho_V(v_1)}(t) &= F_{\rho(v_1 \parallel_\star w_1)}(t) \\ F_{\rho(u_2 \parallel_\star w_2)}(t) &= F_{\rho_U(u_2)}(t) & F_{\rho_V(v_2)}(t) &= F_{\rho(v_2 \parallel_\star w_2)}(t) \end{aligned}$$

and hence the first condition is also satisfied, so $(U, W) \leq_\star (V, W)$. \blacklozenge

Example 6.12. All the examples we gave in Section 6.1 are not monotonic, and hence also not strongly monotonic, since they all violate condition 1 of monotonicity.

In Example 6.3, this is because

$$F_{\rho(v_0)}(t) = \text{Exp}[0.5](t) < \text{Exp}[5](t) = F_{\rho(v_0 \parallel_\star w_0)}(t)$$

for any $t > 0$. Likewise, in Example 6.4 we have

$$F_{\rho(u_0 \parallel_\star w_0)}(t) = \text{Exp}[1](t) < \text{Exp}[2](t) = F_{\rho(u_0)}(t)$$

for any $t > 0$. Finally, in Example 6.5 we have

$$F_{\rho(v_0)}(t) = \text{Exp}[0.5](t) < \text{Exp}[2](t) = F_{\rho(v_0 \parallel_\star w_0)}(t)$$

for any $t > 0$. \blacklozenge

We now wish to show that it is decidable whether $(U, W) \leq_\star (V, W')$ for finite SMDPs, thereby giving a decidable condition for avoiding timing anomalies. To do this, we first show that in order to establish strong monotonicity, it is enough to consider paths up to length

$$m = \max\{|S_U| \cdot |S_W|, |S_V| \cdot |S_{W'}|\} + \max\{|S_U|, |S_V|, |S_W|, |S_{W'}|\} + 1,$$

due to the fact that they start repeating.

Lemma 6.13. *Let U and V be two finite, pointed SMDPs. For any state paths π_U and π_V of length $l > |S_U| \cdot |S_V|$, there will be $i < j \leq |S_U| \cdot |S_V| + 1$ such that $\pi_U[i] = \pi_U[j]$, $\pi_V[i] = \pi_V[j]$.*

Proof. Since there are $|S_U| \cdot |S_V|$ ways of choosing a pair $(u_i, v_j) \in S_U \times S_V$ of states from U and V , if we pair the states of π_U and π_V such that we get the pairs $(\pi_U[1], \pi_V[1]), (\pi_U[2], \pi_V[2]), \dots, (\pi_U[l], \pi_V[l])$, there must be two of these pairs that are the same because $l > |S_U| \cdot |S_V|$. Hence we get states $\pi_U[i] = \pi_U[j]$ and $\pi_V[i] = \pi_V[j]$ with $i < j \leq n$. It also follows that i and j can be chosen so that $i < j \leq |S_U| \cdot |S_V|$, because otherwise we would have $j - i > |S_U| \cdot |S_V|$ different pairs

$$(\pi_U[i], \pi_V[i]), (\pi_U[i+1], \pi_V[i+1]), \dots, (\pi_U[j], \pi_V[j]),$$

contradicting the fact that there are only $|S_U| \cdot |S_V|$ such different pairs. \blacksquare

Lemma 6.14. *Let (U, u_0) , (V, v_0) , (W, w_0) , and (W', w'_0) be finite, pointed SMDPs. If $(U, W) \leq_\star^m (V, W')$, then $(U, W) \leq_\star (V, W')$.*

Proof. Assume that $(U, W) \leq_\star^m (V, W')$. Then $(U, W) \leq_\star^k (V, W')$ for all $k \leq m$. Hence it remains to show that $(U, W) \leq_\star^k (V, W')$ for all $k > m$.

Let $k > m$ and consider two state paths $\pi_U = u_1 u_2 \dots u_k$ and $\pi_W = w_1 w_2 \dots w_k$ of U and W , respectively, both of length k . By Lemma 6.13 there must exist $i < j \leq |S_U| \cdot |S_W| + 1$ such that $u_i = u_j$ and $w_i = w_j$. Since there exists a state path from u_1 to u_i , it must be possible to reach this state in less than $|S_U|$ steps, and likewise for W . Hence there must exist $l \leq \max\{|S_U|, |S_W|\}$, and state paths

$$u_1 u'_2 \dots u'_l u_i u_{i+1} \dots u_j \quad \text{and} \quad w_1 w'_2 \dots w'_l w_i w_{i+1} \dots w_j$$

of length $l + (j - i) \leq \max\{|S_U|, |S_W|\} + |S_U| \cdot |S_W| + 1 \leq m$. Hence we know that the conditions of Definition 6.9 are satisfied for $u_i \dots u_j$ and $w_i \dots w_j$. By removing the states $u_{i+1} \dots u_j$ and $w_{i+1} \dots w_j$ from π_U and π_W we end up with two new state paths π'_U and π'_W of length $k' = k - (j - i)$. We can keep doing this as long as $k' > m$, so at some point we must end up with state paths π_U^* and π_W^* of length $k^* \leq m$, for which the conditions of Definition 6.9 are satisfied by assumption, and hence they are satisfied for all of π_U and π_W . The same argument can be applied to two state paths π_V and $\pi_{W'}$ of V and W' , so we conclude that $(U, W) \leq_\star (V, W')$. \blacksquare

We can now use the first-order theory of the reals to show that strong monotonicity is a decidable property.

Theorem 6.15. *Consider the finite pointed SMDPs (U, u_0) , (V, v_0) , (W, w_0) , and (W', w'_0) . If for all state paths $\pi_U \in \Pi_m[u_0]$, $\pi_V \in \Pi_m[v_0]$, $\pi_W \in \Pi_m[w_0]$, and $\pi_{W'} \in \Pi_m[w'_0]$ we have that $\{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid F_{\rho(\pi_U[i] \parallel_* \pi_W[i])}(t) \geq F_{\rho_U(\pi_U[i])}(t)}\}$ and $\{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid F_{\rho_V(\pi_V[i])}(t) \geq F_{\rho(\pi_V[i] \parallel_* \pi_{W'}[i])}(t)}\}$ are semialgebraic sets for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, then it is decidable whether $(U, W) \leq_*^m (V, W')$.*

Proof. Note first of all that since L and W' are finite, it is decidable whether W' has a deterministic Markov kernel by looking at all the states. By Lemma 6.14, it suffices to check whether $(U, W) \leq_*^m (V, W')$ where

$$m = \max\{|S_U| \cdot |S_W|, |S_V| \cdot |S_{W'}|\} + \max\{|S_U|, |S_V|, |S_W|, |S_{W'}|\} + 1.$$

This can be done by exploiting the decidability of the first-order theory of the reals in the following way. Since L is finite and U , V , W , and W' are all finite, there are finitely many state paths $\pi_U \in \Pi_m[u_0]$, $\pi_V \in \Pi_m[v_0]$, $\pi_W \in \Pi_m[w_0]$, and $\pi_{W'} \in \Pi_m[w'_0]$. Because of this, and since the sets

$$\{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid F_{\rho(\pi_U[i] \parallel_* \pi_W[i])}(t) \geq F_{\rho_U(\pi_U[i])}(t)}\}$$

and

$$\{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid F_{\rho_V(\pi_V[i])}(t) \geq F_{\rho(\pi_V[i] \parallel_* \pi_{W'}[i])}(t)}\},$$

which we need to check for the first condition, were assumed to be semialgebraic, it is possible to express the conditions of Definition 6.9 in the first-order theory of the reals, using finitely many quantifiers and inequalities. Since the first-order theory of the reals is decidable, the truth value of the resulting formula is decidable. \blacksquare

For uniform and exponential distributions with minimum or maximum composition, the corresponding sets are all semialgebraic, and the same is true for exponential distributions with product composition. Theorem 6.15 can therefore be used for these types of composition.

Unfortunately, strong monotonicity is a very strict requirement. In effect, it requires that there is only one possible action, and hence rules out non-determinism. However, strong monotonicity still makes sense as a requirement on processes with no non-determinism, since all our examples of timing anomalies in Section 6.1 are of this form.

Proposition 6.16. *If $(U, W) \leq_* (V, W')$, then L is a singleton set or u_0 is a deadlock state.*

Proof of Proposition 6.16. We prove the contrapositive. Suppose $|L| > 1$ and u_0 is not a deadlock state. Because u_0 is not a deadlock state, there must exist some state path π_U such that $\pi_U[1] = u_0$ and $\tau_U(\pi_U[1], a)(\pi_U[2]) > 0$ for some $a \in L$. Since $|L| > 1$, we can find some $b \in L$ with $a \neq b$. Now construct schedulers given by $\sigma_{U,W}(s) = \delta_b$ and $\sigma_U(s) = \delta_a$ for any state s . Then

$$\tau^{\sigma_{U,W}}(\pi_U[1] \parallel_* \pi_W[1], a)(\tau_U[2] \parallel_* \tau_W[2]) = 0$$

but

$$\tau_U^{\sigma_U}(\pi_U[1], a)(\tau_U[2]) > 0,$$

and hence the first condition of Definition 6.9 is violated. \blacksquare

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have investigated the notion of a process being faster than another process in the context of semi-Markov decision processes. We have given a trace-based definition of a faster-than relation, and shown that this definition is closely connected to convolutions of distributions. The faster-than relation is unfortunately undecidable, but we have shown how to approximate a time-bounded version of it. By considering composition as being parametric in how the residence times of states are combined, we have given examples showing that our faster-than relation gives rise to parallel timing anomalies for many of the popular ways of composing rates. We have therefore given sufficient conditions for how such parallel timing anomalies can be avoided, and we have shown that these conditions are decidable.

The main challenge that we face when trying to construct algorithms for the faster-than relation is that of schedulers, and in particular the juxtaposition between the universal and existential quantification over schedulers. For example, we had to strengthen the existential quantifier to a universal one in order to decide the conditions for avoiding parallel timing anomalies. This is because we know that locally, for any scheduler σ , there exists a scheduler σ' which works. However, it is not clear that all of these σ' can be collected coherently into a single scheduler which works globally. Solving this challenge would allow us to decide the property of monotonicity instead of the too-strong property of strong monotonicity, as well as prove decidability for so-called unambiguous processes.

The conditions we have given for avoiding timing anomalies do not look at the context in isolation, but depend also on the processes that are being swapped. It would be preferable to have conditions on a context that would guarantee the absence of parallel timing anomalies no matter what processes are being swapped.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Bo Friis Nielsen, Nathanaël Fijalkow, Reza Pulungan, and Robert Furber for insightful discussions and pointers to the literature. This research was supported by the Danish FTP project ASAP, the ERC Advanced Grant LASSO as well as the Sino-Danish Basic Research Center IDEA4CPS.

References

- [1] Christel Baier, Joost-Pieter Katoen, Holger Hermanns, and Verena Wolf. Comparative branching-time semantics for Markov chains. *Inf. Comput.*, 200(2):149–214, 2005.
- [2] Patrick Billingsley. *Probability And Measure*. Wiley-Interscience, 3rd edition, 1995.
- [3] Franck Cassez, René Rydhof Hansen, and Mads Chr. Olesen. What is a timing anomaly? In Tullio Vardanega, editor, *12th International Workshop on Worst-Case Execution Time Analysis, WCET 2012, July 10, 2012, Pisa, Italy*, volume 23 of *OASICS*, pages 1–12. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2012.

- [4] Edmund M. Clarke, David E. Long, and Kenneth L. McMillan. Compositional model checking. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS '89), Pacific Grove, California, USA, June 5-8, 1989*, pages 353–362. IEEE Computer Society, 1989.
- [5] Flavio Corradini, Roberto Gorrieri, and Marco Roccetti. Performance pre-order: Ordering processes with respect to speed. In Jirí Wiedermann and Petr Hájek, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 1995, 20th International Symposium, MFCS'95, Prague, Czech Republic, August 28 - September 1, 1995, Proceedings*, volume 969 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 444–453. Springer, 1995.
- [6] Marc Geilen, Stavros Tripakis, and Maarten Wiggers. The earlier the better: a theory of timed actor interfaces. In Marco Caccamo, Emilio Frazzoli, and Radu Grosu, editors, *Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control, HSCC 2011, Chicago, IL, USA, April 12-14, 2011*, pages 23–32. ACM, 2011.
- [7] Norbert Götz, Ulrich Herzog, and Michael Rettelbach. Multiprocessor and distributed system design: The integration of functional specification and performance analysis using stochastic process algebras. In Lorenzo Donatiello and Randolph D. Nelson, editors, *Performance Evaluation of Computer and Communication Systems, Joint Tutorial Papers of Performance '93 and Sigmetrics '93, Santa Clara, CA, USA, May 10-14, 1993*, volume 729 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 121–146. Springer, 1993.
- [8] Ronald L. Graham. Bounds on multiprocessing timing anomalies. *SIAM Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 17(2):416–429, 1969.
- [9] Holger Hermanns, Ulrich Herzog, and Vassilis Mertsiotakis. Stochastic process algebras - between LOTOS and Markov chains. *Computer Networks*, 30(9-10):901–924, 1998.
- [10] Jane Hillston. *A compositional approach to performance modelling*. Distinguished Dissertations in Computer Science. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [11] Raimund Kirner, Albrecht Kadlec, and Peter P. Puschner. Precise worst-case execution time analysis for processors with timing anomalies. In *21st Euromicro Conference on Real-Time Systems, ECRTS 2009, Dublin, Ireland, July 1-3, 2009*, pages 119–128. IEEE Computer Society, 2009.
- [12] Edward A. Lee. Cyber physical systems: Design challenges. In *11th IEEE International Symposium on Object-Oriented Real-Time Distributed Computing (ISORC 2008), 5-7 May 2008, Orlando, Florida, USA*, pages 363–369. IEEE Computer Society, 2008.
- [13] Thomas Lundqvist and Per Stenström. Timing anomalies in dynamically scheduled microprocessors. In *Proceedings of the 20th IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium, Phoenix, AZ, USA, December 1-3, 1999*, pages 12–21. IEEE Computer Society, 1999.

- [14] Gerald Lüttgen and Walter Vogler. A faster-than relation for asynchronous processes. In Kim Guldstrand Larsen and Mogens Nielsen, editors, *CONCUR 2001 - Concurrency Theory, 12th International Conference, Aalborg, Denmark, August 20-25, 2001, Proceedings*, volume 2154 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 262–276. Springer, 2001.
- [15] Gerald Lüttgen and Walter Vogler. Bisimulation on speed: A unified approach. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 360(1-3):209–227, 2006.
- [16] Sneana Maovi, Saa Stoi, and Rade Hajdin. Application of semi-markov decision process in bridge management. *IABSE Symposium Report*, 105(28):1–8, 2015.
- [17] Faron Moller and Chris M. N. Tofts. Relating processes with respect to speed. In Jos C. M. Baeten and Jan Friso Groote, editors, *CONCUR '91, 2nd International Conference on Concurrency Theory, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, August 26-29, 1991, Proceedings*, volume 527 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 424–438. Springer, 1991.
- [18] Martin R. Neuhäüßer and Joost-Pieter Katoen. Bisimulation and logical preservation for continuous-time Markov decision processes. In Luís Caires and Vasco Thudichum Vasconcelos, editors, *CONCUR 2007 - Concurrency Theory, 18th International Conference, CONCUR 2007, Lisbon, Portugal, September 3-8, 2007, Proceedings*, volume 4703 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 412–427. Springer, 2007.
- [19] Mathias Ruggaard Pedersen, Nathanaël Fijalkow, Giorgio Bacci, Kim G. Larsen, and Radu Mardare. Timed comparisons of semi-Markov processes. In Shmuel Tomi Klein, Carlos Martín-Vide, and Dana Shapira, editors, *Language and Automata Theory and Applications - 12th International Conference, LATA 2018, Ramat Gan, Israel, April 9-11, 2018, Proceedings*, volume 10792 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 271–283. Springer, 2018.
- [20] Muhammad Reza Pulungan. *Reduction of Acyclic Phase-Type Representations*. PhD thesis, Faculty of Natural Sciences and Technology, Saarland University, 2009.
- [21] Jan Reineke, Björn Wachter, Stephan Thesing, Reinhard Wilhelm, Ilia Polian, Jochen Eisinger, and Bernd Becker. A definition and classification of timing anomalies. In Frank Mueller, editor, *6th Intl. Workshop on Worst-Case Execution Time (WCET) Analysis, July 4, 2006, Dresden, Germany*, volume 4 of *OASICS*. Internationales Begegnungs- und Forschungszentrum fuer Informatik (IBFI), Schloss Dagstuhl, Germany, 2006.
- [22] Ichiro Satoh and Mario Tokoro. A formalism for remotely interacting processes. In Takayasu Ito and Akinori Yonezawa, editors, *Theory and Practice of Parallel Programming, International Workshop TPPP'94, Sendai, Japan, November 7-9, 1994, Proceedings*, volume 907 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 216–228. Springer, 1994.
- [23] Ana Sokolova and Erik P. de Vink. Probabilistic automata: System types, parallel composition and comparison. In Christel Baier, Boudewijn R.

- Haverkort, Holger Hermanns, Joost-Pieter Katoen, and Markus Siegle, editors, *Validation of Stochastic Systems - A Guide to Current Research*, volume 2925 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–43. Springer, 2004.
- [24] Terence Tao. *An Introduction to Measure Theory*. Graduate studies in mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2013.
- [25] Alfred Tarski. *A Decision Method for Elementary Algebra and Geometry*. University of California press, 1951.
- [26] O. S. Thomas and J. O. Sobanjo. Semi-markov decision process: A decision tool for transportation infrastructure management systems. In *International Conference on Transportation and Development*, 2016.
- [27] Walter Vogler. Timed testing of concurrent systems. *Inf. Comput.*, 121(2):149–171, 1995.
- [28] Walter Vogler. Faster asynchronous systems. *Inf. Comput.*, 184(2):311–342, 2003.